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INTRODUCTION

In the 1630s, Sir Thomas Browne wrote about the power of profane music to inspire a religious experience: “for even that vulgar Taverne Musicke, which makes one man merry, another mad, strikes in mee a deepe fit of devotion, and a profound contemplation of the first Composer, there is something in it of Divinity more than the eare discovers.” Born in 1605—the year the Catholic Gunpowder Plot against King James I demonstrated that the business of the Reformation was very much unfinished—Browne grew up at a time when the power and proper roles of sacred and profane music were constantly in dispute. Seventeenth-century debates flowed directly from previous generations’ dissension about religious and popular music. This perpetually contentious music was everywhere: Music was performed in taverns, streets, churches, and playhouses; divergent ideas about music were expressed and exchanged in pulpits, printed tracts, poetry, and plays. These conflicts had profound consequences for church and stage alike, shaping ecclesiastic reforms as well as the English theater.

Concerns about the harmful religious and spiritual consequences of music and music-making were nothing new. English Lollards had worried about the vanity of religious music and the profanity of popular entertainments since well before Henry VIII’s complicated version of Protestantism became the law of the land. Early Protestant reformers took up similar concerns, and when the Anglican compromise retained more musical

---

ceremony than many reformers had advocated, adherents of Puritanism and other extreme forms of Calvinism continued to write and preach about the dangers of music. Against continued skepticism and protests of music, many English men and women sang, danced, played instruments, and patronized musical plays; they also advocated for music’s spiritual efficacy and thus for its retention in church services. Browne, for instance, champions music’s spiritual power when he writes: “whatsoever is harmonically composed, delights in harmony; which makes me distrust the symmetry of those heads which decl aime against all Church musick.”

“Those heads” to which Browne refers were primarily seventeenth-century Puritans who decried the dangers of music. In a time of unprecedented religious turmoil and burgeoning but contentious theatrical activity, people’s ideas about the sacred and social functions of music were mixed, and were constantly in flux. “Tudor Musical Theater: Staging Religious Difference from Wisdom to The Winter’s Tale” argues that the theater’s representations of contentious music—from liturgical processions to ballads and dances to parodic rites—often expressed a social compromise among contemporary religious arguments.

The theater is a “form of embodied social thought,” in Steven Mullaney’s phrase, allowing communities to give voice to their concerns, excitements, and equivocations. That voice is often a musical one. The theater’s unique ability to juxtapose sacred and profane music makes dramatic representations of church music and popular songs powerful performance tools. Theatricalized music is effective and contentious precisely because it re-

---

2 Ibid.

presents both profane and sacred musical forms with actors’ bodies and voices. Musical performance exposes the performativity of all kinds of music; actors can sing like priests or balladeers.

Chapter 1 of this dissertation begins in late fifteenth-century East Anglia, a center of Lollard thought, by considering the liturgy and profane songs represented in religious drama. Moving to the 1530s, chapter 2 focuses on the surprisingly musical plays of early Protestant theatrical polemic. Chapter 3 addresses ways in which Elizabethan amphitheater drama expressed late sixteenth-century concerns over music’s power in Christopher Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*, and the final chapter explores music’s community-forming function in Shakespeare’s Jacobean *Winter’s Tale*. My overarching argument is that these plays present ambivalent musical moments that remain open to a variety of conflicting interpretations by their diverse audiences. Performing sacred music alongside profane ballads and street dances, these plays expose to some listeners the hollowness and iterability of all music, while they demonstrate to others the vitality and demotic appeal of liturgical music. Indeed, theatricalized religious music can allow audience members to celebrate a religious past that is being destroyed by reform, to laugh at the facile differences between state religions, or to participate in a dramatized devotional experience that alters the way they think about their personal spiritualities.

In this dissertation, I respond to recent medieval and early modern theater scholarship that takes seriously the role of religion in shaping early English drama, and the theater’s effects on changing religious practice. Taking cues from scholars like Sarah Beckwith, Huston Diehl, and Stephen Greenblatt, I synthesize theatrical and literary

---

4 W.B. Worthen makes a compelling case for understanding dramatic writing as one of the many “tools in the technologies of performance”; I see musical production as another such tool. W.B. Worthen, *Drama Between Poetry and Performance* (Chichester: Wiley–Blackwell, 2010), 2, 20–22.
criticism, religious history, and theology in order to examine the crucial interplay of stage and church. But my work also attends to acoustic culture and to musicology. Sound and music studies are often neglected by literary critics, cultural historians, and drama scholars, though recent books by Bruce Holsinger and Bruce Smith call attention to the centrality of music to all aspects of medieval and early modern English life. “Tudor Musical Theater” thus explores the productive synthesis of recent dramatic scholarship addressing religion and ritual theory with new work on historical acoustics.

Between the mid-fifteenth and early seventeenth centuries, music, theater, and religion were in a dynamic relationship with the communities that created and consumed them, and with each other. English musical, theatrical, and religious cultures continued to change under the pressures of politics, protest, and popular opinions. At the same time music, theater, and religion were mutually constitutive forces, constantly representing and helping to shape one another. Ballads voiced diverse religious viewpoints and retold theatrical narratives; psalms sung in church incorporated ballad tunes, while reformers compared the Roman liturgy to the theater; and actors staged religious rituals and re-performed all kinds of sacred and popular music. Thus the formation of the Anglican Church; the rises of polyphony, psalmody, and balladry; and the growth of the professional


theater are related developments. “Tudor Musical Theater” traces this braid of influence.

This introduction takes each part of the project’s title in turn to consider the central issues of Tudor [religious] history, Tudor music, and Tudor musical theater, before detailing the particular plays that this dissertation addresses.

**THE TUDOR PERIOD**

The years spanned by “Tudor Musical Theater” are ones of unprecedented religious, musical, and theatrical change. These years exceed the official temporal boundaries of the reign of the House of Tudor; drama from the years preceding and following the tumultuous Tudor monarchies represents early murmurings and later echoes of that official period’s cacophonies. The fifteenth-century play *Wisdom* (chapter 1) is from the late York period, and the *Winter’s Tale* (chapter 4) is Stuart. In the intervening years, English theater audiences and church congregations (who were in large part one and the same) witnessed Lollards, Catholics, and Protestants martyred for heresy as the official state religion changed from Catholicism to Henrician and then Edwardian Protestantism, from Edwardian Protestantism to Marian Catholicism, and finally from Marian Catholicism to Elizabethan Protestantism.

While the dynamism of this long period has often been noted, religious historiographies often neglect the way religious conflicts and resolutions can be traced from the late medieval heresies to the uneasiness of the Church of England.

Interest in English Lollardy, a crucial part of the religious landscape of chapter 1, has been steady among historians, theologians, and literary scholars. The heretical religious movement that began in Oxford in the mid-fourteenth century under the leadership of John Wyclif was geographically and doctrinally diffused by the late fifteenth century; J. Patrick
Hornbeck’s recent work argues for the complex diversity of nonconformist thought. While beliefs varied, most “later Lollards,” as J.A. Thomson calls them in his important book by the same name, continued to protest Latin church ritual and (crucially) music. Work by Thomson as well as Maureen Jurkowski, Colin Richmond, and Margaret Aston calls attention to the Lollards of fifteenth-century East Anglia, and heterodoxy’s complex associations with social status. Somewhat surprisingly, these historians point to the tolerant co-existence of Lollard and orthodox practice in East Anglia. Gail McMurray Gibson’s and Theresa Coletti’s localized studies of the region demonstrate the relationship between East Anglia’s religious diversity, economic prosperity, and extraordinary theatrical output. Both early Protestant reformers and contemporary scholars see the seeds of the Reformation in Lollards’ anti-ceremonialism; John Foxe’s Book of Martyrs documents the lives and deaths of the most fervent fourteenth- and fifteenth-century heretics, including many from East Anglia, and Anne Hudson calls her book on Lollardy The Premature Reformation.

For the last twenty years, scholarship on the English Reformation has addressed the unique complexities of the hard-won Anglican compromise(s). Eamon Duffy’s influential Stripping of the Altars, which emphasizes the persistence of what he calls “traditional religion”

7 J. Patrick Hornbeck II, What is a Lollard?: Dissent and Belief in Late Medieval England (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).


throughout the sixteenth century, has prompted others to consider England’s religious
changes as “English Reformation,” to use the title of Christopher Haigh’s book on the
subject. While older historiographies saw the sixteenth century as a time when England left
its Catholic, “medieval” past for a Protestant “early modern” future, cultural and religious
scholarship now focuses on the ways in which Catholic rituals, festivities, and theatrical
forms did not die out, but were rather adapted and reformed. Arthur Marotti demonstrates
the continued vitality of Catholic Religious Ideology and Cultural Fantasy in early modern
England, and the vigor and persistence of Catholic culture is on display in Robert Miola’s
recent compilation of early modern Catholic source materials. Recent scholarship continues
to confound any attempts to draw neat divisions between heterodoxy and orthodoxy,
Catholicism and Protestantism, medieval and early modern.

Calls to cross the medieval/early modern divide pervade recent academic journals,
essay collections, and monographs. This trend has extended to theater studies, which has
often kept “medieval” religious civic drama separate from “early modern” secular
professional drama, despite the performance of cycle and morality plays well into Elizabeth’s
reign (not to mention the profane content of the earlier drama and the religious content of
the later drama). It seems, however, that much of this trans-historical theater scholarship of
the last twenty years has taken the “to” out of David Bevington’s 1962 From Mankind to
Marlowe; that is, it looks at the influence of late medieval moralities and civic cycle drama on

University Press, 1992); Christopher Haigh, English Reformations: Religion, Politics, and Society under the Tudors

13 Arthur Marotti, Religious Ideology and Cultural Fantasy: Catholic and Anti-Catholic Discourses in Early Modern England
(South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005); Robert Miola, ed., Early Modern Catholicism: An Anthology of
Primary Sources (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

14 For recent examples of each, see Jennifer Summit and David Wallace, “Rethinking Periodization,” Journal of
Medieval and Early Modern Studies 37, no. 3 (Fall 2007): 447–451; Gordon McMullan and David Matthews, eds,
Reading the Medieval in Early Modern England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); and John Parker,
Elizabethan playhouse theater while neglecting over half a century of early Tudor religious drama and humanist comedy. And yet, the early and middle parts of the sixteenth century are precisely the times when religious change was most frantic and unsettling; the end of Henry VIII’s reign (1547), Edward’s fragile Protestant years (1547–1553), Mary’s bloody reinstatement of Catholicism (1553–1558), and the early years of Elizabeth’s reign are fascinatingly dynamic in terms of religious history. Drama of this period—the subject of my second chapter—negotiates religious change more urgently and directly than the drama of the later early modern period.

The religious heresies and reforms that moved through England from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries were carried through the soundwaves. Doctrines were preached from the pulpits, debated in courts and public streets, enacted on stages, and whispered in clandestine gatherings. From its early days, the Reformation privileged hearing over seeing. Henry VIII’s archbishop Thomas Cranmer and others often pointed to Romans 10:17: “so the faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.” What form “the word of God” took was an urgent question for reformers: should the word of God be heard through music?

Tudor Music

A mid-sixteenth century Protestant homily imagines the complaints of a woman parishioner regarding the acoustic changes of the Reformation: “Alas gossip, what shal we now do at Church …since we cannot heare the like pyping, singing, chaunting, & playing uppon the organs that we could do before[?]” The homily immediately chides the woman’s

---

15David Bevington, From Mankind to Marlowe: Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962). This trend can be evidenced, for example, in John Parker’s 2007 Aesthetics of the Antichrist: Christian Drama to Christopher Marlowe (a title evocative of Bevington), which includes three chapters on fifteenth century drama and religious experience, and a final one on Marlowe’s plays.
sentiment: “we ought greatly to rejoyce and give God thankes, that our Churches are
delivered of all those things which displeased God so sore, & filthily defiled his holy house
and his place of prayer.” The tensions between the “pyping, singing, chaunting, & playing”
many found spiritually powerful and the purity of the Protestant ideal of Word alone
stretches across and beyond the Tudor period. While a number of Lollards and later
Reformers argued that music “filthily defiled” the church, the country’s inability to part with
musical liturgy and ecclesiastic songs resulted in an Anglican church that retained more
music than the forms of Protestantism that survived on the Continent.

Nonetheless, the sounds that the English heard in their churches and cathedrals went
through many changes between the late fifteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Lollard
complaints against the vanities of orthodox musical ritual—a minority voice in the years
around 1500—gave way to an official attack on the sounds of traditional religion when
Henry VIII repudiated the Pope and declared himself head of the Church of England in
1534. When he closed the monasteries in the 1530s, he also closed their choir schools, and
under the influence of Archbishop Cranmer and Henry’s minister Thomas Cromwell, a slow
but sure assault on “popish” musical practice spread. Henry himself wavered on musical
rites, and by the late sixteenth century, his daughter Elizabeth was doing the same.
Supporters of her more musical Anglicanism, and Puritans who objected to all music or
restricted the practice to the singing of congregational Psalms, continued the battle over
church music into the seventeenth century. And while the sounds in churches were

16 Printed in The second tome of homilees of such matters as were promised, and intituled in the former part of homilees. Set out by the aucthoritie of the Queenes Maiestie: and to be read in every parishe church agreably (London, 1571), 271–2, http://cebo.chadwyck.com.

17 The effects of these battles on ecclesiastic musical practice are well documented by musicologists Peter LeHuray and Nicholas Temperley, and Percy Scholes elaborates on the particular case of the Puritans. Peter LeHuray, Music and the Reformation in England 1549–1660 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967);
changing, popular music was growing into big business. The printing press enabled the sale and circulation of broadside ballads, instrumental sheet music, and treatises on music and dance.

Recent scholarship continues to articulate the relationship between religious and popular music, and the centrality of these musics in English life. Bruce Smith has sparked recent interest in the *Acoustic World of Early Modern England*, exploring the central role that both secular and sacred music played in the lives of royalty and peasants alike. A 2006 Folger Library exhibit on “Music in Early Modern England” produced a book of scholarly essays that also printed primary source material on the subject. Christopher Marsh’s massive 2010 book *Music and Society in Early Modern England*, with its accompanying CD of specially recorded music, provides cultural historians from all fields with a new sense of the myriad sounds produced and heard in this period. The role of music on the stage is explored by both Smith and Marsh, who add to scholarship by other musicologists and historians on early English theatrical music.

But while musicologists and historians have approached the subject, dramatic scholars tend to ignore the particular ways that music makes meaning in performance. This dissertation helps remedy the usual focus on visual and textual aspects of early drama by listening differently for the effects of melody, tone, and voice.

---


TUDOR MUSICAL THEATER

Early English theater audiences spoke of going to “hear” a play, rather than going to “see” it. I favor the term “audience” over “spectator” throughout my dissertation not only because I prefer the aural etymology to the visual, but because I prefer to think of audiences as a mixed plural rather than a unified singular. Examining the ways in which theatrical music was heard by these diverse audiences, this dissertation reveals that staged performances of sacred and profane songs are a hermeneutic site in which discourses converge, commenting on the everyday musical experience the plays re-present. Melodies quoted from church and street, scatological parodies of ritual, and sincere reproductions of the liturgy are as crucially connotative as the play’s texts and spectacles, but acoustic forces tend to be ignored in dramatic analyses.

My thinking about performance as represented in the extant texts of Tudor plays is informed by W.B. Worthen’s query: “How can performance studies help move the literary conception of drama beyond the incapacitating notion of performance as a version of the text?”20 I analyze the possibilities in and ambiguities of dramatic texts in performance, looking for interpretive potential rather than specific meanings or readings for a play. Tudor drama creates the matrix of dialogic performance-to-text issues that Worthen lays out for non-musical drama, but the extra layers of performance-generated meaning brought on by quotation of melody, vocal quality, and instrumentation complicate these musical plays further. Performance of song does not just represent the song’s words; it pairs text with another set of interpretive codes that are themselves represented in that moment.

An audience’s agency in interpreting these multi-valenced performance moments is central to my argument. When referring to a contested subject like religion, musical

performances on stage recall and evoke a multiplicity of related memories and emotions. Be it the hybridized Catholic and Lollard climate of the late fifteenth century or the shifting and overlapping mixtures of Catholics and Protestants, and later of Puritans and Anglicans, the audiences responded variously to theatrical re-presentations of the sacred and secular music of their present lives, as well as the sounds of their pasts.21

When considering audience response to these plays, I keep in mind Joseph Roach’s notion of privileging living memory and “restored behavior” as much as the historical archive of scripted records.22 While historical scholarship grounds my arguments, I also use contemporary performance to think about the complex audience subjectivities of the past. This project thinks through in what limited ways modern theater, ritual, and musical entertainment reflect medieval and early modern performances, and how our modern experiences constellate transhistorical issues regarding re-presentation and audience reception. My understanding of the pragmatics of theatrical presentation is thus informed by my participation in contemporary performing arts as an actor, singer, dancer, and audience member.

FROM WISDOM TO THE WINTERS’ TALE

Chapter 1, “Re-Presenting Representation in East Anglian Drama,” examines two plays that quote from or parody musical liturgy alongside representations of popular songs and dances. In Wisdom, the re-performance of Catholic musical ritual, the reformist, Lollard-leaning sermon, and the profane songs of the vices accumulate to project the

21 Theories of subject formation help me theorize an audience whose members are mixed in religious sympathies not only from person to person, but also within themselves individually. My understanding of Judith Butler’s revision of Foucault on the way subject formation happens at a young age helps explain the special difficulties for recent Protestant converts during the sixteenth century, those forced converts who have been raised in a traditional religious context. Judith Butler, The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997).

interdependence of sacred and secular life as well as the compatibility of orthodox and heterodox practice. While early drama scholars have often favored a Catholic reading of the play, recent historical research on the religious hybridity of fifteenth-century East Anglia, mentioned above, supports my interpretation of *Wisdom* as offering an aural compromise. In the Digby *Mary Magdalene*, the parodied Catholic ritual, drinking songs, and a *Te Deum* offer a reconciliation of religious difference in a way similar to *Wisdom*. Moreover, the play sets this local, hybridized faith system against the religious alterities of the Orient. Chapter 1 responds to recent scholarship addressing fifteenth-century East Anglian drama, including historicist work by Victor Scherb and Lawrence Clopper.\(^23\) Beckwith along with Jody Enders and Claire Sponsler have demonstrated that medieval drama also benefits from a more theoretical approach, and the chapter’s use of narrative and performance theories is inspired by that work.\(^24\)

The second chapter, “Reforming Aurality in John Bale’s Plays,” examines musical drama during the awkward infancy of the Reformation. While early Tudor drama remains understudied, the work of scholars like Paul Whitfield White and Greg Walker has emphasized the crucial role this drama had in promoting English religious reforms to a variety of social groups.\(^25\) Most critics of Tudor drama find early Protestant playwright John Bale an unwavering polemicist. However, a closer examination of his plays *Three Laws, King*

---


Johan and God's Promises reveals that despite a fanatical stance in some of his prose work, his position towards the reform of church music is surprisingly compromised. Three Laws lambasts Catholic ceremonial music throughout, but the play ends with a liturgical musical restoration of God's Law, suggesting Bale's inability to imagine the sort of music-less church idealized by some of his fellow reformers. The history play King Johan refines Catholic liturgical music as a vain and devilish source of corruption while railing against auricular confession. But, Bale's more widely printed Biblical and antiphonal God's Promises recontextualizes sacred music in a new liturgical framework. Bale's irresolution reveals the complexities of Tudor debates about church auralities, and his dramatized traditional music suggests the sort of attachments that led to the Anglican compromise.

The third chapter, “Sounding Out Uncertainty in Doctor Faustus,” moves to Elizabethan drama, looking at the way Marlowe’s play enacts the country’s religious crises. New Historicists like Diehl, Greenblatt, and Alan Sinfield are interested in how the “faultlines” of religious change are made manifest on stage, but they have not focused on theatrical representations of the period’s contentious religious music. Most Marlowe critics—including for example Jonathan Dollimore and Sara Munson Deats—read Doctor Faustus as religiously and morally ambiguous. A closer examination of the play's handling of musical and magical discourses reveals that it stages specific dilemmas regarding musical efficacy. Penelope Gouk and Gary Tomlinson have written of the way in which practices and theories of music and magic were closely bound up in each other in sixteenth-century England. I argue that Marlowe's theologically indeterminate Doctor Faustus is deliberately


ambiguous about the question of sonic efficacy, and in sound’s relationship to both magic and religion. The play stages a hermeneutic crisis that leaves audiences to consider the power that church rites, bawdy music, and magical musical sciences may have on their souls.

The final chapter, “Making Music and Divinity in The Winter’s Tale,” shows how the staged music of Shakespeare’s late play collaborates with other performance tools to create the play’s affective power and to suggest a reconciliation of community. Phebe Jensen’s recent work on the plays’ representations of traditional religious festivity along with work by Marotti and Richard Wilson on “Catholic Shakespeare” call attention to the oblique religious politics of The Winter’s Tale. Wes Folkerth, David Lindley, and Ross Duffin’s musical scholarship has illuminated historical information about the songs, instruments, actors, and musicians that created the sounds of Shakespeare’s plays. In my analysis, the dances, ballads, and folks songs of The Winter’s Tale’s fourth act and the seemingly miraculous instrumental music of the final scene are needed to bring literal and figurative harmony to a family and country marked by deafness and silence in the play’s first three acts. Listening to these musical moments allows one to hear how the play’s auralities convey a harmonizing tonality that moves toward reconciling both onstage characters as well as the play’s religiously diverse audiences.

While this project must necessarily take a written form, I hope that it will not be read in silence. I wish to create a “cultural archaeology of sound” by not only describing this


period’s music, but also by encouraging readers to listen to the many available recordings of early English music made by groups like the Tallis Scholars, Sequentia, and the Dufay Collective. I have selected a number of recordings to accompany each of the four chapters, and refer specifically to these throughout the discussion to illuminate and illustrate my analysis. Recordings to accompany the first two chapters are available at http://web.me.com/katiebrokaw/Site/Music_1%262.html; music for the final two chapters may be found at http://web.me.com/katiebrokaw/Site/Music_3%264.html.

---

CHAPTER 1: 
RE-PRESENTING REPRESENTATION IN EAST ANGLIAN DRAMA

The year is 1500 and a man in East Anglia is watching a play. After several hours of
this play called Mary Magdalene’s spectacle, song, dance, and dialogue, the actor playing the
hermit-priest steps forward and addresses the audience:

Now, frendys, thus endyth thy matere—
To blysse brying tho that byn here!
Now clerkys, wyth voycys cler,
“Te Deum lavdamus” lett us syng!” (2135–9)

Led by the play’s professional actors, singers, and minstrels, the man sings along to the Te
Deum, joining in chorus with all those in the audience. To hear the Te Deum on this afternoon
is to hear something that sounds like what he hears every week in Mass, and indeed many of
the voices are the same. But this is not church, it is theater, and the sacred song of praise is
led not by a priest, but by an actor playing a hermit who becomes a priest in the plot of the
play. The musicians are likely paid to accompany not just theatrical Te Deums but also
profane town dances.

The man recalls another regional dramatic production. In that play, Wisdom, who is
Christ (composed 1470?), hired minstrels play a series of bawdy dances during the play’s
temptation sequence. The final dance features six dancing women, three of them cross-
dressed as gallants. They perform the same steps, in the same flirtatious manner, that the

---

31 All quotations from “The Digby Mary Magdalene,” in Early English Drama: An Anthology, ed. John C.
to a play’s line numbers.
man sees on many a bleary late night visit to his local tavern, and he is as taken with them in this play as he is when he is out drinking and sinning. But these women on stage are not whores: they are actor-dancers playing whores. And, during the course of the play, the musicians perform more sacred antiphons and processionals than profane dances.

This imagined man and all members of an East Anglian drama audience are familiar with the sacred and profane music performed in plays they attend. Quotations of both types of musical performance are signs on stage, signifying extra-theatrical experiences of religious and secular daily life. So it is that in the theater-space, representation is re-presented, held up for inspection by an audience accustomed to experiencing sacred and profane music every day. In a culture with readily available performance options from the most solemn to the sinfully indulgent, the theater performs a unique function. East Anglia is the center of fifteenth-century theatrical activity, producing more saint, morality, and cycle plays than any other region. What does this drama do that neither church liturgy nor frivolous and sensual street culture can do alone? In the theater-space, the fact that these musical performances are performed as quotation, as *signs* of liturgy and *signs* of daily popular culture, fundamentally changes the nature of the performances. The drama’s juxtaposition of both sacred and profane music opens up questions about the efficacy of contemporary religious ritual, and its distinctions, or perhaps lack thereof, with available popular entertainments like street ballads, drinking songs, and dancing. In plays that yoke together such different musical moments

---

32 I say “theater-space” to indicate the many and varied venues of East Anglian theatrical production ranging from outdoor platforms to churchyards to private banquet halls. Purpose-built theaters, of course, do not re-emerge in Europe until the sixteenth century.

33 This chapter will not address anti-theatricalism. Despite a long-held academic position that the relatively well-known *Treaties Against Miracle Playing* was Lollard polemic, scholars now think that most Lollards were not particularly anti-theatrical. In Anne Hudson’s words: “The subject of miracle plays is not one that seems to have attracted much attention from the Lollards; the text’s inclusion here is not because of its representative nature in the movement, but because it has attracted modern discussion as an unusual contemporary criticism.
without the stabilizing presence of an interpreter (as is the case in later morality plays) or an overarching biblical narrative (as is the case in cycle drama), these questions are left to the audience.

This drama brought together a diverse audience of lay folk and clergy, rich and poor, Lollards and Catholics.34 Around the turn of the fifteenth century, East Anglia was home to four orthodox monasteries while also being a hotbed of proto-Protestant Lollard writing, practice, and sympathy.35 The man who sang along to the *Te Deum* of Mary Magdalene and clapped in time with *Wisdom’s* dancers would have approached these musical moments from a personal perspective that could have been orthodox, heterodox, or a hybridized combination of doctrinal elements from both Catholicism and Lollardy.

Historians have recently taken increased interest in the heretical religious climate of late medieval East Anglia.36 Maureen Jurkowski explains that East Anglian Lollardy was
largely a rural phenomenon, and that its adherents included both the affluent and influential and the poor. J. Patrick Hornbeck warns of oversimplifying long-lasting and diffuse religious movements by calling all heretics “Lollards” or “Wycliffites,” but nonetheless sees “family resemblances” between dissenters across East Anglia, and across England.

While East Anglian Lollards had been persecuted—and three burnt at the stake—in the early fifteenth century, no one, not even parish priests, had lodged complaints about them and few non-Lollards appeared as witnesses against the accused. Norwich Bishop Alnwick’s persecutions from 1428–1431 were likely a result of exhortations from the archbishop. In Shannon McSheffrey’s words, “Lollards were…benignly tolerated by the orthodox.” Theresa Coletti describes the population as hybridized: religious “hybridity was exceptionally active in East Anglia, where the religious culture sustained a wide range of options and behaviors, showing itself relatively tolerant of the nonconformity it harbored and bred while clinging at the same time to habits and beliefs of what [Eamon] Duffy has called ‘traditional religion.’” Indeed, not only were many of the firmly orthodox tolerant of Lollards, but also it seems that many people were neither literally die-hard Lollards willing to be martyred nor orthodox Catholics ready to rat out their neighbor for heresy. Rather, much

---

37 Maureen Jurkowski, “Lollardy and Social Status in East Anglia,” *Speculum* 82, no. 1 (2007): 121, 122, 151. Jurkowski’s recent research uses estate records and title deeds as well as the heresy trial documents, episcopal registers, tax assessments, and testamentary evidence long used by other scholars of Lollardy.

38 J. Patrick Hornbeck II, *What is a Lollard?: Dissent and Belief in Late Medieval England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 11. Hornbeck takes his idea of “family resemblances” from Ludwig Wittgenstein. He later explains that his findings “endorse the trajectory of a more recent scholarly consensus: that the notions of a monolithic Lollard movement and a linear dissemination of heterodox views from the academic to the popular context are vastly oversimplified, if not in fact simply inaccurate,” 196.

39 McSheffrey, *Gender and Heresy*, 73.

of East Anglia practiced a complex and hybridized faith, (re)considering issues such as sacramentality, vernacular translation, and ritual efficacy on individual bases.

Despite the complexity of these overlapping behaviors and beliefs, John Thomson’s assessment of the basic beliefs of later Lollards in East Anglia still holds. As his earlier study elucidated, these Lollards were generally anti-sacramental, objecting particularly to baptism, marriage, and confession (a sacrament represented in both Wisdom and the Digby Mary Magdalene). They were also anti-sacerdotal and anti-authoritarian, skeptical of the church’s involvement in temporal affairs and in the necessity of priestly mediation. They were not merely critical, however, as they supplemented their complaints against orthodoxy with an advocacy of access to and study of vernacular scripture, personal relationships with God, and common sense rationalism.41

Historians and critics tend to focus on the visual aspects of Lollard theologies: heterodox protests against image idolatry and church adornment receive much critical attention. But Lollards were equally interested in the auralities of ecclesiastic and everyday experience. Surviving tracts and records show that they were particularly concerned with church music, and its secular counterparts. Late medieval East Anglian heretical tracts often take cues from Wyclif himself, who wrote that the devil uses church music as a sinful substitute for reading and learning about God’s law:

Also bi song þe fend lettþ men to studie and preche þe Gospel; for sîp mannyȝ wittis ben of certeyn mesure and myȝ t, þe more þat þei ben occupied aboute sicþ bi mannus song, þe lesse moten [compelled] þei be sett about Goddis lawe. Þis stirrþ men to pride, and iolite, and oþere synnys, and so unableþ hem many gatis [paths] to understonde and kepe Holy Writte…42


Indeed, it was a lasting concern that “sich bodily song” displaces “devocion in herte” and is able to “stirr us to many grete synnes, and to forȝ e us self.” Both *Wisdom* and the Digby *Mary Magdalene* perform sacred and profane music; the profane music is almost always represented as tempting, and the sacred music could be seen as distracting depending on an audience member’s beliefs.

Lollards, orthodox authorities, and East Anglian playwrights were all concerned with music’s various powers. Questions about performed music’s efficacy and entertainment are central to doctrinal debates, and the plays’ theatrical representations of these musics engage these ongoing arguments. The musical moments of these two plays quote performances that theorist Richard Schechner would label “efficacious” and “entertaining.” In Schechner’s formulation, efficacy, or social drama, is linked with “ritual,” with “results,” providing a “link to the absent Other.” Efficacious performance may “possess” an audience member, Schechner suggests; the “audience participates,” and the “audience believes.” The ritual moments within these East Anglian plays evoke the sacraments and liturgy of the Church and quote efficacious performances. Entertainment, or aesthetic drama, on the other hand, is “theater,” which is “fun”; rather than being for an Other, it is “only for those here,” and the “audience watches” (and, I would insist, listens) as the “audience appreciates this self-conscious performance.” The secular song and dance sequences in *Wisdom* and *Mary*
Magdalene are the plays’ most entertaining moments in Schechner’s terms.\(^{46}\) As secular-sponsored dramas commenting on and augmenting ritual, *Wisdom* and the Digby *Mary Magdalene* challenge Schechner’s notions of social and aesthetic drama.

In a series of memorable and provocative musical and silent theatrical moments, both *Wisdom* and *Mary Magdalene* negotiate contested religious ideas before their diverse audiences by inviting reflection on what it means for all types of performance to be efficacious or entertaining. *Wisdom* represents an orthodox sacrament—penance—and orthodox liturgical practice as well as a vernacular sermon that would have been favored by Lollards, thereby supplementing two available religious ideologies. This supplementarity exposes the inadequacies of orthodox sacraments and musical liturgy, and also of the non-ritualized, non-sacerdotal devotion proposed by Wyclif and his followers. Orthodox and Lollard worship experiences are again re-presented in the Digby *Mary Magdalene*, a play that unifies these competing Christian practices by presenting orientalized versions of Saracen and Pagan religious alterities.

**SOLEMNITY AND SIN IN *WISDOM, WHO IS CHRIST***

Meaning in *Wisdom, Who is Christ* is “aural, musical, visual, and gestic” rather than merely verbal.\(^{47}\) W.A. Davenport writes, “*Wisdom* is the medieval play most easily envisaged

---

\(^{46}\) While Schechner recognized early on that entire performances are not purely efficacious or purely entertaining—“they form the poles of a continuum”—he yet views efficacy and entertainment as distinct categories found in a performance experience. Schechner, *Performance Theory*, 130.

as ballet...because the essential elements of the play are expressed visibly.” Indeed, movement and dance are key to the play’s effectiveness, but, as with the ballet, the non-visible employment of music while these movements transpire also functions semiotically and narratologically. An analysis of Wisdom’s many musical moments reveals that they negotiate East Anglian debates about the efficacy of orthodox sacrament and religious ritual within the context of a secular, at times profane culture. Such an analysis suggests the overlap and limits of the terms “efficacy” and “entertainment”; it is at the intersections and boundaries of theatrical and ritual theory that this play does its most profound cultural and theological work, suggesting the interdependence of drama and religion, of the sacred and profane, and of orthodox and heterodox doctrine and practice. In a region that offered such a variety of religious experience and popular entertainment while debating the relationship between the two, a play like Wisdom performs a specific mediatory function. The juxtaposed liturgical processions and profane dances suspend meaning ambiguously between Lollard and orthodox views about performed music.

Wisdom survives in two manuscripts, each indicative of some of its generic characteristics. Its inclusion in the so-called Macro manuscript (c. 1500, Folger V.a. 354) along with The Castle of Perseverance and Mankind ensconces it in the tradition of professional, large-scale morality plays. Like Castle of Perseverance and Mankind, Wisdom follows the four-part morality play structure of innocence, temptation, life in sin, and redemption. This structure is


adapted throughout the Tudor period, from John Bale’s Protestant polemic *Three Laws* (1538, discussed in chapter 2), to Nicholas Udall’s boisterous comedy *Ralph Roister Doister* (1552), to Christopher Marlowe’s *Dr. Faustus* (1589, discussed in chapter 3). Its inclusion (as a fragment) in MS Digby 133 (1515–25) along with *Mary Magdalene, The Killing of the Children,* and *The Conversion of Saint Paul* links it to the genres of miracle and saint plays. *Wisdom* also employs secular dance as a theatrical device, like the other three Digby plays.

Scholars have posited several locations and contexts for the auspices of *Wisdom,* with its extravagant cast of forty actors, singers, dancers, and musicians. These range from an outdoor, professional troupe presentation that toured the area to an intimate, one-off performance in the banquet hall of a country house. Gail McMurray Gibson’s conjecture, that the play was performed at Bury St. Edmund’s for a mixed audience of monastic and lay clergy, and of powerful and not-so-powerful townspeople, is grounded in archival and manuscript evidence. If the play were performed in a country house, as Lawrence Clopper argues, that audience would have combined monks and aristocrats and chapel players in a noble household that also included the serving classes. The play’s mixture of asceticism and

---

50 It is also worth noting that both Bale and Udall were native East Anglians. For more on the history of morality plays, see Robert Potter, *The English Morality Play* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975).


sumptuousness, intellectualism and bawdry, solemnity and sin, suggests that *Wisdom* may have played for several of these audiences, each of whom would interpret the play’s religious messages differently. Both Gibson’s and Clopper’s theories are based on key features of the play—a mixed audience, Suffolk geography, and an extravagant performance budget—features that would indicate similarly heterogeneous audiences despite performance particulars.

If modern-day musicals are defined by their use of song at key moments in the drama, it is possible to think of *Wisdom* as a musical. The play’s crucial moments—the presentation of Anima’s innocence, the falling into sin sequence, Anima’s contrition for her fallen state, and the redemption—are all accompanied by music as well as by the elaborate and changing visual spectacle of costumes, props, and choreography. *Wisdom* presents orthodox sacrament as well as other traditional sung church liturgy, but also re-presents vernacular preaching, a practice favored by Lollard reformers. In a region where so many Catholics and Lollards and hybridized-faith-practitioners went to plays together, *Wisdom* actively and intentionally suggests an interdependence of orthodox and Lollard practice.

**LITURGY RE-ACCENTUATED**

The play’s opening moments could be interpreted by some as an affirmation of orthodox doctrine and the efficacy of religious ritual to uphold and confirm innocence and simple devotion. The play’s first solemn musical procession begins right after Wisdom, who is Christ, and the female Anima express their mutual devotion and Wisdom explains that the soul has two parts, outward sensuality and inward reason. The peaceful stability of the innocent soul, Anima, is made manifest by her Five (outward) Wits, represented by five

---

virgins. As the stage direction indicates, they enter “fyve virgynes in white kertylyys and mantelys, wyth chevelers [wigs] and chappelettys [head wreaths], and syng[ing] ‘Nigra sum sed Formosa, filia Jerusalem, sicut tabernacula cedar et sicut pelles Salamonis’” (stage direction after 164). This moment of visualized and musicalized innocence signifies Anima’s state of grace and innocence rather than her susceptibility to sin; Wisdom warns them, “kepe you clene and ye shall never deface,” and indeed it is not these virgins who succumb to temptation in the course of the play, but the Three Mights of the inward soul: Mind, Will, and Understanding (174). The actors were likely either boys or women, and so the acoustic innocence may have sounded like a recent recording of a female ensemble singing a medieval “Nigra sum” antiphon (track 1).

After introducing the Three Mights, the Five Wits lead the Mights, Wisdom, and Anima off stage, singing “‘Tota pulchra es’ et cetera’” (stage direction after 324). The whole verse comes from an antiphon sung for the procession on Trinity Sunday, taken from the Song of Songs 4.7: “You are completely beautiful, my love, and there is no spot in thee.” In the dramatic action of the play, the verse praises the innocence and purity of Anima moments before the first spots of sin appear. It is impossible to know to what melody the Virgins sing this antiphon, but the stage direction’s casual “et cetera” implies an easy

---

54 Quotations and line numbers are from “Wisdom,” in Early English Drama: An Anthology, ed. John C. Coldeway (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1993), 68–104. After they sing, Anima immediately translates their Latin into the vernacular as:

Anima: The dougghters of Jerusalem me not lake [find no lack in me]
    For this dyrke schadow I bere of humanyte
    That as the tabernacull of cedar wythowt yt ys Blake
    And wythine as the skyn of Salamone full of bewty. (165–8)

Davidson suggests that they are more than just Outward Wits, for if the Wits were merely the five outward senses, “it would be most strange that Anima should refer to them as ‘fyve prudent vrgyns’ (162),” so they must be the five Wise Virgins from the parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins. Davidson, Visualizing the Moral Life, 92.

55 “Nigra sum,” from Song of Songs, Stile Antico, Harmonia Mundi compact disc 807489.
familiarity. It is likely that all aspects of this Trinity Sunday processional are here quoted: the words, the music, and the solemn choreography.

Many performance theorists have noted the reflexivity of medieval theatrical and sacramental performance. Schechner writes of the way that the medieval Mass employed “avante garde” techniques; it forced an audience into participation and it integrated dance, music, and drama. “Yet for all of this,” he writes, “I would still call the Mass a ritual rather than theater. Why? Because it was efficacious...It used the theater but did not become the theater.”

Schechner takes a contemporary conviction of this efficacy for granted, oversimplifying the complex and overlapping dynamics of late medieval theater and ritual. The late medieval *Wisdom* was performed at a time when the efficacy of the Mass as well as other sacraments and liturgical activity was being questioned by Lollardy. It was precisely the entertainment value of ritual music that worried Lollards. In one tract, Catholic priests are criticized because:

> Also þei magnyfien more new songe founden of sinful men þan þe gospel of ihu crist, þat is cristene mennus salvacion; for þei bisien [solicit] hem fastere to kunne [know] & do & teche þis newe song þan to kunne & kepe & teche cristis gospel; & þis is merviele [terrible], for þis song distractiþ þe syngere fro devocion & lettith men fro consceivynge of þe sentence.

That is, musical ritual is the opposite of efficacious; it “distractiþ” from the personal devotion and reasoned knowledge that is “cristene mennus salvacion.” To turn Schechner around, *Wisdom* uses ritual but does not become ritual, and to some audience members, the play exposes the precise kinship between ritual “efficacy” and entertaining musical theatrics.

Dramaturgically, these processions represent the innocence of the soul Anima, but they also re-present East Anglian spiritual practice. That is, in the logic of the play, these


liturgical performances use words and gestures typically performed by a priest to represent an abstract concept, the pure, uncorrupted, devout soul. But on a phenomenological level, this moment is recreating typical church liturgy in the mouths and bodies of actors instead of clergymen. Lollardy’s discomfort with this sort of choreographed, sung Latin ritual forms an important part of Wisdom’s context; these are the first two out of four liturgical processions the play stages. In addition to the complaint that music distracts listeners from the word and from true devotion, Lollard objections to church music usually centered on its lack of biblical foundation for musical liturgy, the idea that singing obscures the words that are being sung, and the vanity of learning musical skill. A typical tract complains of the “grete enakkyng [singing with trills] of curious song in menes eeres.” Another explains that “For by ther grete crying of song, as sechaunt, counter note & orgene, thei ben lettid fro studynge & prechynge of the gospel.” The presence of the “Nigra sum sed formosa” and “Tota pulchra es” may confirm orthodox views of the efficacy of ritual by reverentially performing it. But in addition to potentially pointing out the ritual’s kinship with entertainment, the fact that the ritual is dialogized, performed by actors instead of clerics, calls into question the idea of ecclesiastic authority. This sort of de-authorization and democratization of ritual is Lollard-inspired, but the fact that laymen are still performing orthodox ritual suggests a middle ground. This is one of several moments in both plays that are anti-authoritarian without being anti-sacramental.


59 From Corpus MS. X. F.D. Matthew calls this tract “Of Prelates,” in The English Works of Wyclif Hitherto Unprinted, 77. The tract also refers to “veyn knackynge of new song,” 76.

60 Even if, in some performances, the actors were clerics, they are still displaying the performativity of ritual when performing in a drama.
Archival work by Colin Richmond and Margaret Aston, and by Thomson, Jurkowski, and Hornbeck, confirms that an audience for *Wisdom* would have been inclined to accept or critique the orthodoxy of this liturgical moment, in varying degrees depending on the person, and further, depending on the person’s inclinations on the day of the play (then as now, personal faith is a journey, not a fixed entity). Upper class audience members would have been particularly free to contemplate multiple interpretive possibilities. Richmond and Aston have proven that if a person with heretical sympathies had a high enough social standing, little to no punishment would be inflicted unless he or she committed direct treason against the State. Such a person could own and read vernacular Scripture and could contemplate disendowment of the clergy, iconoclasm, or pacifism with the personal spiritual interest of a modern day American Catholic considering Yogic meditation. Richmond and Aston imagine the jealousy of a lower-class Lollard: “[I]t’s all right for you; you don’t have to worry about owning or reading scripture. No bishop is going to harry someone of your estate…” Class issues comprise just one of the factors affecting personal belief in late medieval East Anglia. Hornbeck encourages scholars to place the complex theological leanings of Lollards of all classes not “on a two-dimensional continuum between ‘orthodox’ and ‘heterodox’ but, instead, within a three-dimensional matrix of individuals’ beliefs, texts, and social circumstances.” Literacy and access to Lollard texts, gender, precise geography, and family’s beliefs all further complicate the individual beliefs of audience members.

---

61 Margaret Aston and Colin Richmond, *Lollardy and the Gentry in the Later Middle Ages* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997). Jurkowski also writes that East Anglian Lollards “suffered more for their heretical beliefs than their affluent counterparts,” “Lollardy and Social Status,” 151.

62 Hornbeck, *What is a Lollard?*, 197.
An audience member at a production of *Wisdom* would have interpreted the play based not only on the heretical tracts and the orthodox rejoinders he had read or heard about, but on his complex and socially constituted interface with his neighbors. Crucially, the plays’ self-conscious representations of other extra-theatrical performances, of religious ritual in the opening scene and street song and dance later in the play, rely on audiences meeting the actors halfway to create meaning. The audience is invited not only to participate, but also to recall and fill in their own memories of what is being re-presented: of hearing these antiphons sung in church, for example. In Anne Ubersfeld’s words, “The spectator enjoys the specifically theatrical pleasure of doing ‘his own thing’ with the elements offered to him.” Such memories are by nature personal and diverse to the person. The play’s use of liturgy invites the sort of *aporia* endemic to a region filled with Lollards and Catholics and those who saw themselves as a mixture of both.

For those who sincerely felt the spiritual efficacy in such processions, the re-creation of the music and movement would affirm the ability of these visual and aural acts to, in Schechner’s words, “link to an absent other.” For some in the audience, re-performance is a validating tribute, or even an invitation to participate in a theatricalized version of church ritual. Such re-creations of the church’s performance practices continue today when, for example, a secularly sponsored community or professional group presents a holiday show. In the *Holiday Spectacular* performed annually in my Central Illinois hometown, the reading of Luke 2 by an actor playing a minister and the singing of “Oh Come all Ye Faithful” by a choir of amateur and semi-professional singers (the robes are borrowed from a local Methodist church) is met with genuine feelings of ritual-like devotion, even tears, by some in

---


the audience. Such people are layering their memories of and belief in their home church’s Christmas ritual. The theatrical performance—the beautiful descant, the robes, the Gospel reading—recreates, for them, ritual efficacy.

However, fifteenth-century and contemporary audiences alike are filled with skeptics, with people who remain aware that everything on stage is a re-presentation. As theater semiotician Jiri Vetřský explains, “all that is on stage is a sign,” that is, even a chair-on-stage stands for a real chair. The theater-space of *Wisdom*—be it a banquet hall, outdoor platforms, or a university college—is not the church, and voluntary theatrical experience, professional or amateur, is not ritual. Even if, as could have been the case, members of the clergy are participating in the play, they are always actors when they put on theatrical costume.

Just as, for Mikhail Bakhtin, speech becomes heteroglossic when dialogized in a novel, the processions and sacraments and songs and dances of *Wisdom* are a “double-voiced discourse” serving the dramatic narrative of the play and the refracted intention of the playwright. These performative expressions are recontextualized by virtue of being performed in a theater-space (be it outdoor or indoor, aristocratic or monastic or communal), rather than a church or the street, and as part of one cohesive work, by one body of actors, dancers, and musicians. That is, sacred and profane musical performances are brought into an immediate dialogic tension that strains both forms. The theatrical

---


66 Bakhtin defines heteroglossia as “another’s speech in another’s language, serving to express authorial intentions but in a refracted way,” and explains that this double-voiced discourse “serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two intentions: the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author.” Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 324.
performances “smudge” and “distort” the original liturgy and popular culture; in Bakhtin’s
definition, these forms are re-accentuated. 67 The play’s potential critique of prescribed liturgy
is best exposed in this theatrical re-accentuation. That is, the theater reflects and transforms
ritual experience by presenting ritual as theater.

JUXTAPOSING SACRED AND PROFANE

The Trinity Sunday antiphon’s placement within the morality narrative invites
dramaturgical and theological ambivalence for its audience. Julie Paulson argues that the
“dramatic visual spectacles” of the liturgy stand in “sharp contrast to Lollardy’s anti-
sacramentalism and iconoclasm.” 68 But the liturgy’s immediate juxtaposition with profane
music and dance challenges such an orthodox reading. The stage directions state what
happens immediately after the ten actors and singers process off stage: “And aftyr the song
entreth Lucyfer in a dewyllys array without and within as a prowde galonte, seynge thus”
(stage directions after 324). Bevington sees this liturgical interlude as “the end of purity and
the beginning of defacement,” but perhaps some Lollard sympathizers in the audience would
have seen a causal relationship between the religious procession and the next scene. 69

Liturgical spectacles are followed by four devil-inspired “dramatic visual spectacles,” which
are at least as visually and aurally stimulating as the Song of Songs antiphons.

Someone sympathetic to Lollard views of the hollowness and corruption of religious
ceremony would have been unsurprised to see this musical liturgical moment lead directly to
the devil. It was common for Lollards to see church music as wordly entertainment that
pleases the devil, a formula that equates Latin religious music with profane song and dance.

67 Bakhtin says that re-accentuation “may fundamentally distort” the novel style and has to do with the
“sometimes smudging” of the finer nuances of what is being dialogized. Bakhtin, The Dialogic Imagination, 419.

68 Julie Paulson, “A Theater of the Soul’s Interior: Contemplative Literature and Penitential Education in the

69 Bevington, “Blake and wyght, fowl and fayer,” 27.
In the early fifteenth-century tract of “sixteen points on which the Bishops accuse Lollards,”
the orthodox rejoinder to Lollard tenets includes a concession to this idea: “But wane prestis
or religious singen þe latanye for pride, for ipocrisie or for couatise þan þei plesen not God,
but þe fende and þe worlde, wich ben þe maistris þat þei seruen.”70 The statement indicates
the influence Lollard thought had on fifteenth-century orthodoxy, which was beginning to
be skeptical of musical ritual performances in ways that might have seemed heretical to
earlier generations.

In Wisdom’s temptation sequence, sinful, boisterous song and movement immediately
replace the solemnity of liturgical song and movement. The dances of this sequence re-
define and re-use the raw materials—the sound and choreography and words—of the
liturgy. Phenomenologically, liturgy and street dance are both a matter of bodies in motion,
of instruments and voices making melody. These bawdy devil’s dances are their own
efficacious, enrapturing rituals; musical liturgy has been, like Anima, besmirched. Only in the
theater-space, where a company of actors and musicians perform both sacred and profane
music, is this proximity and overlap revealed and exploited.

For the first musical number of the temptation and fall sequence, Mind, Wisdom,
and Understanding put on gallant clothing and proclaim what little shame they have. Mind
proclaims, “now let us syngel,” and Will springs about as they croon in three-part harmony;
the text even indicates who takes tenor, middle, and treble (613). The play does not indicate
a song, giving the performers the flexibility to choose the most popular song of the moment,
if they choose. Three-part harmony is a highly skilled type of singing. It would make sense
that liturgical singers, for example clerics at Bury St. Edmunds, would be able to do this type
of singing and could be cast in these roles. Or, if the performers are laymen, perhaps

70 From MS Trinity College Cambridge B 14.50, reprinted in Hudson, Selections from English Wycliffite Writings,
23/161–3.
professional singer/actors, they are demonstrating their ability to sing the most musically complicated types of liturgy. Singing the mass and singing a street ballad require the same skills, and the interchangeability of musical talent highlights the fine line between secular and spiritual entertainment. The three gallants even discuss their song with both sacred and profane praise after singing it. Understanding calls it “at the best, to God avowe,” while Will proclaims that their music “As mery as the byrde on bow” (622, 623)

In the sequence following, each Might in turn has his own song and dance, indicative of the sin to which he has been tempted. Whatever dance music was played, the tunes would have likely been upbeat, and the stage directions indicate that they were played by ensembles with multiple instruments. The sudden use of instruments and the pounding of the actors’ feet on the floor would have meant that this moment could not be more acoustically different—louder, faster, more fun and seductive—from the likely a cappella liturgical songs sung by the Mights. Compare this medieval English dance tune to the “Nigra sum” (track 2). The Mights are tempted to the sins of pride and lechery, as well as a deceptive form of covetousness, perjury. A fifteenth-century Suffolk court book indicates that at least some East Anglian Lollards equated these very sins with the false priests who deceive parishioners with their sung masses:

And þese singemesses þat be eleped prestes ben no prestes, but þay be lecherous and covetous men, and fals deceyvours of þe puple; and with þar sotel techying and prechyng, synyng and redyng, piteously þay pile þe puple of þar good, and þarwith þay susteyne here pride, here lecher, here slowthe and all other vices.  

The book includes a number of heresy cases kept by fifteenth-century Norwich officials. For some in the Wisdom audience, the Mights’ dances continue to expose the dangers—the sinful

71 “English Dance” from L’estampeida, Dufay Collective, Avie compact disc 15.

72 From the Confession of Hawisia Moone of Loddon, 1430, contained in Westminster Cathedral Dioesan Archives as MS B.2 Reprinted Hudson, Selections from English Wycliffite Writings, 35/40–44 (emphases mine).
efficacy—of all kinds of music. The dances simultaneously expose the danger of music and pose a danger to the audience by the fact that their live performance enters auditors’ ears and eyes.

Mind welcomes six dancers and an unknown number of trumpet-playing minstrels to the stage for a devil’s dance, a dance associated with the Lord of Misrule when pipers and drummers would dance through the church. Mind points out the sacred and profane valences of the trumpet, an instrument he finds convenient to have around because it “shulde blow to the jugement,” and it is also useful in battle (701). He does not mention the fact that trumpets usually signify Pride (as they do for example in Ancrene Wisse), the sin by which he is specifically tempted in this scene. The trumpets’ visual and aural valences are thus both worldly and spiritual; despite being devilish, scatological, and a metaphor for pride, this is the instrument of the judgment day. In a more orthodox understanding of the moment, even sin leads to salvation.

The trumpet’s ability to signify eschatological import or strident honking was recognized by the early middle ages. Bruce Holsinger writes that the “ubiquitous” notion of the preacher as trumpet was an “allegorical commonplace” by the ninth century: “Tuba est sonus praedicationis” (the Trumpet is the sound of preaching), wrote Rhabanus Marus. In the first century, Quintilian had criticized bad, showy preaching as “booming inarticulately as
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74 The thirteenth-century rule for anchorites warns of hell’s punishments for the boastful: “The proud are his [the devil’s] trumpeters. They draw in the wind of worldly praise, and with every idle boast they puff it out again, as trumpeters do, making noise and loud music to declare their greatness.” In Anchoritic Spirituality, trans. Anne Savage and Nicholas Watson (New York: Paulist Press, 1991), 125.

if they had a trumpet inside them.” Mind’s dance to trumpets thus also subtly critiques vacuous preaching. Such a criticism would be directed at Catholic priests and Lollard sermonizers alike, inviting an East Anglian audience member to fill in meaning in accord with their own doctrinal sympathies, recognizing that both sides of the religious debate have called for reform of empty rhetoric in the pulpit.

The next dance, Mind tells the audience, is called the “Madam Regent,” a now lost popular dance, and Understanding specifies that the dancing of it is “the quest of Holborn cum into this placys” (731). The stage directions indicate that a minstrel with a bagpipe accompanies the dance. The popular dance is equated with Perjury, specifically the corrupt justice system of London, and the dancers are all dressed as jurors. A rare moment of political satire, this dance anticipates the largely political uses to which the morality play structure will be put in the later Tudor period. It also highlights the fact that religious and secular matters are not separate.

After these dances, Will brags that he is ready to show his “sprynge of Lechery,” and explains that his dancers are whores who tell the truth when they lie; the pun would have been familiar (741). Crucially, Will tells the audience, these whores “off the comyn (oftentimes) they synge eche wek by and by” (751). Thus it is exposed that whores are frequent singers, showing that musical people represent the extremes of society: cantors of the liturgy, on one hand, and minstrels and whores on the other. The whores even sing weekly, as if it were a prescribed ritual. For a Lollard, the connection is expected. But in the play’s narrative, it may also simply reinforce the duplicity of temptation. Will introduces six masked women (real women, it seems): three are dressed as gallants and three as matrons. They perform a dancing brothel accompanied by minstrels playing hornpipes, representing

---

76 Quintillian, from *Institutio*, qtd. ibid., 47.
lechery.\textsuperscript{77} Six dancing women, half of them cross-dressed, whirling about in a couple
dance—surely this would have been one of the defining moments of any production of
\textit{Wisdom}.

These boisterous songs and dances must have been nothing if not, in musical theater
terms, showstoppers—showstoppers that put the raucously fun sin of brothels and pubs on
stage as surely as the opening of \textit{The Best Little Whorehouse in Texas}. While the narrative
purpose of these dances is to show that such revelry leads to a corruption of the soul, that
purpose does not change the fact that they are being performed with a huge cast of dancers
and minstrels. The producers of \textit{Wisdom}, be they a professional troupe, a guild, or a wealthy
private citizen and his household, invested resources of time and money (musicians are
expensive; dance and music take substantial rehearsal) to make sin look and sound
spectacular. The spectacle’s efficacy pulls the audience into a somatic experience of familiar,
toe-tapping melodies, laugh-out-loud jokes, maybe even participation in the dances. Thus
these spectacles demonstrate the simultaneity of efficacy and entertainment. The more
entertaining the performance—the better the music, the louder the laughter, the more
energetic the dancing—the more it possesses the audience and involves them in a dangerous,
ritual-like “collective creativity.”\textsuperscript{78}

These four song and dance sequences force everyone in the audience, be they
religious or secular, whore-mongering or celibate, sympathetic to Lollardy or Catholicism or
both, to confront sin, look it straight in the eye, and then resist it. The sin dances expose the
danger of the dancing and music that they are, at that moment, in fact performing. A street

\textsuperscript{77} John Marshall suggests that the “Matrons” to which the text refers were probably wives, and some of them
were then dressed as gallants. The women of the text are the dancers, not the characters. Marshall, “‘Her
Virgynes,’” 113, 117.

\textsuperscript{78} Schechner, \textit{Performance Theory}, 131.
dance or a liturgical procession, a drinking song or an antiphon: all take the same human bodies and abilities to perform, and, when performed with any skill, all seduce and entrance their audience in similar ways with the same tricks of melody, harmony, rhythm, and choreographed precision.

The kinship between sacred and profane music was a source of Lollard concern. Lollard objections to music have a long, and orthodox, history. Holsinger writes of the persistent medieval worry that “sacred musical pleasure threatens always to lapse into profane musical perversions.”79 Citing everyone from church fathers to medieval popes to Chaucer, Holsinger reveals the way in which there was deep anxiety as well as celebration over the somatic experience of music. *Wisdom* holds the “sonorous body,” in Holsinger’s phrase, as well as the moving body, up for inspection. Not only is the similitude of the bodies of the sacred and profane performers made apparent, but also the carnal effect on the audience is similar in both types of performance. Just as a toe-tapping, skirt-flopping dance aurally and visually takes arousing possession of the body, so does orthodox ritual possess one aurally and visually, even olfactorily, though its deep harmonies, iconographic props and costumes and movements, and spicy incense. For those more sympathetic to Lollardy’s anti-aestheticism and anti-ritual, these performances disclose the sense in which sacramental and liturgical ritual is mere theater, as rehearsed and simply somatic as any entertainment.

These re-accentuated performances—antiphon-on-stage, drinking song-on-stage, for examples—act as signifiers of the antiphon or the drinking song in the real world. In Derrida’s words, “the sign is always the supplement to the thing itself.”80 Because these

---


musical theatrical performances are signs, they are also supplements of the represented signifieds, exposing the inadequacies of those religious and secular performances they signify. *Wisdom*’s theatrical re-presentations of profane and sacred performances augment the original performances of quotidian culture. The fact that this drama was so popular in fifteenth-century East Anglia affirms its necessity: the audience and performers needed drama to supplement available ritual practices and entertainment options.

The *Wisdom* playwright refracts, in Bakhtin’s term, fifteenth-century East Anglian culture, exposing its fault lines. By performing religious and secular practice together, the play reveals the independent deficiencies of both church ritual and secular daily life. The profane popular culture of street ballads, drinking songs, and even whores can only be redeemed through spiritual practice. At the same time, the life of complete religious asceticism is unattainable for most people. The play pragmatically acknowledges an interdependence of sacred and secular life, which is the very narrative logic of morality plays and even the story of Christ’s redeeming passion. While either liturgy or popular musical culture may seem whole and sufficient, their placement side by side in this play shows their reliance on each other.

Supplementarity reveals what cannot be taken for granted about fifteenth-century life, articulating that on their own, neither liturgical ritual nor popular song and dance are adequate expressions of the body and soul’s daily experience. The play’s structure of juxtaposition demonstrates that the profane is not sufficient: all dances and songs need the context of religious salvation, the balance of ceremonial solemnity. While *Wisdom* was being performed, reason-driven scholasticism was losing its hold under threats of Lollardy and
other reform movements. While the play emphasizes both liturgy and theological reasoning, the presentation of the sinful dances reminds orthodox clergy, Lollards, and hybridized layfolk alike that the edifice of an entirely religious life is just that. Whether they partake in clerical study of Latin biblical exegesis, in prescribed ecclesiastic sacraments, or in heterodox examination of vernacular scripture and private prayer, no audience member leads an entirely religious life. In the play’s final sequence, the audience learns that while sin and profanity take their toll, a multitude of spiritual practices both orthodox and heterodox redeem the believing soul. While the play equivocates on the most effective medium of spiritual conversion, the necessity of a sinner’s remorse is certain. As the melodies and choreography of the sin dances linger in the audience’s mind, the laments and celebrations of the play’s final moments compete for attention and adherence.

**Theological Supplementarity**

When Anima reappears after the sin dances, she is “in the most horrubull wyse, fowlere than a fende” (s.d. after 902). Wisdom recognizes the sin within her, chasing small boys playing devils (representative of the seven deadly sins) out from under that horrible mantle. After the Mights in turn confess their sins, Anima asks Wisdom “what shall make her clene” (954). Wisdom informs her that only “very contrcycyon” will purify her soul—“all the preyer” that can be said will do nothing “wythowt sorowe of hert” (961, 966, 967). She is sent off stage, weeping and singing her sorrow. The stage directions for Anima’s song reveal

---

81 Scholasticism, taught in European universities between about 1100 and 1500, emphasized dialectical reasoning and rigorous analysis, and was popularized by thinkers like Thomas Aquinas and Anselm of Canterbury.

82 Fiona Somerset explains that there is a false notion that Lollardy was anti-intellectual. In fact, most followers of Wyclif were distrustful of simple affective devotion, and Wycliffism was seen as a threat in part because it puts learning out of place by teaching the laity more about argumentation and Biblical and theological complexities than orthodox ecclesiasts thought they should know. Somerset, “Wycliffite Spirituality,” in *Text and Controversy from Wyclif to Bale: Essays in Honor of Anne Hudson*, ed. Helen Barr and Ann M. Hutchison (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2005), 376.
this moment’s reciprocity with and indebtedness to liturgy: “the soul syngeth in the most lamentabull wyse, with drawte noyts as yt ys songyn in the passion wyke” (S.D. after 996). She sings “Magna velud mare contricio” from Lamentations, verses sung as part of the Holy Thursday service. As she “weeps into the night,” the audience is reminded of the Passion and the fact that Christ died for souls corrupted by the lechery and greed they have just witnessed.

Paulson’s reading of the play as assertively orthodox assumes that at this moment a priestly confession occurs, in order to avoid the “dangerous suggestion that sacerdotal confession and absolution are mere theater.” But whether or not this suggestion was avoided was open to interpretation depending on an audience member’s doctrinal sympathies. Not all in the audience would have felt in this moment a communal affirmation of the necessity of church-sponsored and performed penance. For Lollard sympathizers who believed that penance needed no sacerdotal authority but only “very contrycyon” in the private presence of God, Anima’s musical lament, and the fact that it is ripped wholesale from one of the church’s most sacred rituals, is excessive and indulgent, aestheticizing a matter that should be personal, painful, bare.

Medieval theologians had long debated where the sacramentality of penance—that most “awkwardly but productively dialogic of the sacraments”—lay. For some, the sinner’s contrition absolved the sin; for others, the priest’s words held the efficacy. Lollards not only believed that the authority of penitence resided in contrition, but also they increasingly felt that obligatory sacerdotal confession subjected, even oppressed, the confessor. In the fifteenth-century tract of sixteen points on which the bishops accuse the Lollards, the
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84 Beckwith, Signifying God, 90.
second tenet listed (the first is the denial of transubstantiation) is “that schrift [confession] of mouþe is not needful to helþe of soule, but only sorowe of hert doþ awye every synne.”

That is, not only does a priest not need to hear a confession, but also the confession need not even be mouthed aloud.

Wisdom’s explicit emphasis on the “very contrycyon” of the heart makes thus ambivalent where the authority of Anima’s offstage confession lies. Wisdom insists that Anima “aske mercy” from “God” (983) before saying that the “Holy Chyrch” will reconcile and protect her (984, 988). While an orthodox audience member might hear “Holy Chyrch” and assume Wisdom is prescribing sacerdotal confession, Wisdom’s lack of a specific sacerdotal reference and the emphasis on contrition also open up the possibility of a reformed holy church, one that does not demand priestly satisfaction as a part of penance.

The bishops’ “orthodox” rejoinder in the tract of sixteen points indicates the way in which Lollard ideas had begun to compromise orthodoxy by the fifteenth century:

Also we graunteyn þat schrifte of mouþe is needful to al suche þat ben counseled of God for to make it mekeliche [humble]. But ȝut [yet] very contricious is more needful, forwhi [for indeed] wiþouþ ten schrifte of mouþe may a syneful man be saved in many a caas, but wiþouþ ten veri contricious of herte mai no syneful man of discreciou be saved.

Such an emphasis on contrition as the essential agent of salvation indicates that Lollard concerns were addressed even in orthodox contexts, and that Lollardy continued to influence orthodoxy. Wisdom’s emphasis on the sinner’s contrition performs this common ground between and among theological viewpoints.

Upon Anima’s reappearance on stage, the play presents her contrition and finally absolution through both orthodox liturgy and the sort of reasoned vernacular sermon that
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86 Ibid., 20–1/69–73.
Lollards endorsed. Lollard sympathizers in the audience would have welcomed the homily on the Nine Virtues taken from the fourteenth-century contemplative Richard Rolle that immediately follows Anima’s song, delivered by Wisdom, who is Christ. The sermon goes on for sixty-six lines; Wisdom instructs the audience on a bare stage, as a preacher might, to give money to the poor, weep for Jesus’ passion, suffer for God’s love, keep vigil, have pity and compassion for one’s sick neighbor, refrain speech for reverence, be only pleasant to one’s neighbor, pray often, and love God above all else (997–1064). A represented sermon is not a theatrical showstopper, but this moment performs the only type of ecclesiastic duty Lollards found spiritually efficacious. The tract of “Of Prelates” stresses:

prelatis ben more bounden to preche trewely þe gospel þan þes sugetis ben holden to paie here dymes…Also prelatis ben more bounden to þis prechynge, for þat is comaundement of crist before his deþ and eke aftir, þan to seie matynes, masse, even song, or placebo, for þat is mannus ordynaunce.87

In his study of many such tracts, Hornbeck concludes “almost every dissenting text we have considered emphasized preaching in preference to the administration of the sacraments and the other traditional duties of the late medieval clergy.”88

This formal sermon is wholly consistent with gospel teaching and emphasizes deeds and contemplation over ritual and ceremony. While Rolle himself was an orthodox mystic who directed his work to anchorites, his use of the vernacular to explain devotional fervor as well as his scriptural translations appealed to later Lollards. His writings appear in several Wycliffite manuscripts. Somerset explains that the Lollard uses of Rolle attests to the wide appeal of spiritual alternatives to an audience much broader than the sort that would be

88 Hornbeck, What is a Lollard?, 172.
inclined to the extremes of either martyrdom or abjuration. The content of the sermon, then, would appeal to Lollards but would not disenfranchise orthodox Catholics, suggesting the common ground between religious mindsets. Rolle’s contemplative language, in the mouth of an actor playing Wisdom/Christ, demonstrates the efficacy of intellectual, personal, non-mediated communion with God.

Paulson argues that Wisdom appropriates the contemplative language of self-knowledge and “shows that such language is itself inadequate, and indeed incomprehensible, without the forms of self-recognition only available through Christian ritual practice.”

Surely the reverse is also true, that ritual is itself inadequate, and, perhaps especially, incomprehensible, without the thoughtfulness, deliberation, and directness of contemplation and spare, non-musicalized language. To clear the stage at the play’s dramatic climax for nothing but a homiletic speech of some length (I calculate it would take approximately four minutes for an actor to give) does not show that language is “inadequate.” This moment demonstrates the efficacy of a different kind of non-visual aurality.

In the play’s last musical sequence, the Five Virgins, Anima, and Mind, Will, and Understanding enter singing from the Psalms, celebrating the fact that the Church has given them grace (s.d. after 1064). The musical ritual does not get the final word, as the play ends with a verbal discussion of Anima’s conversion. The final lines of the play do not take doctrinal sides:

Ande so to end wyth perfeccyon
That the doctryne of Wysdom we may sew,
Sapiencia Patris, grawnt that for hys passyon!
Amen! (1614)


90 Paulson, “A Theater of the Soul’s Interior,” 278.
Thus, Anima is restored by both the sacrament of penance and by the intellectual sermon, and her redemption is celebrated liturgically and verbally. An orthodox Catholic might think that the middle of the play shows what happens when there are no rites and ceremonies, as Lollardy would have it, for as soon as the procession leaves, chaos ensues, and order can only be restored through Anima’s soulful singing. And a Lollard-sympathizer would be glad that Anima could not be saved by sacrament alone, needing the thoroughness of an intellectual sermon delivered in the vernacular. Indeed, while the re-accentuated performance of liturgy puts the ritual of sacrament in quotation marks, calling attention to the musicality and choreography of sacred rites, sermon is less changed by performance. That is, the fact that the play’s characters also speak dialogue does little to undermine the authority of the word, which according to Lollard theologies retains its efficacy in any setting, and on the lips of preacher and layperson alike. Even an actor can read and preach effectively, but sacrament performed by an actor is voided by virtue of not being sacerdotal.

*Wisdom*’s re-presentations of East Anglian religious culture—of liturgy-and-sacrament-as-theater, of preaching-as-theater—suggest by virtue of their supplemental status that neither orthodox nor Lollard forms of worship are wholly efficacious. Each member of an audience would uniquely answer the question of how these two theologies might combine and supplement each other into the most effective and spiritually fulfilling personal faith. If dramatic representation is necessary, and it seems that it was in fifteenth century East Anglia, and if that drama signifies the liturgy, then liturgy is shown to be not wholly sufficient on its own. *Wisdom* presents the elements that might complete a spiritual life: private prayer, vernacular and intellectual sermon. But of course the signification of these heterodox forms of worship in turn suggests that they are augmented or completed by orthodoxy’s ritual. The overarching logic of *Wisdom* suggests that neither orthodox nor Lollard theology is alone.
sufficient, thus implying a compatibility of East Anglian religious difference. This reconciliation is consistent with current ideas about how faith was practiced in this hybridized spiritual culture. In a later East Anglian play, *Mary Magdalene*, this appeasement of Christian religious difference is further fused by setting this local hybridized faith system against the threatening religious alterities of the Orient.

**SATIRE, SILENCE, AND SACRAMENT IN THE DIGBY *MARY MAGDALENE***

The 2100-line Digby *Mary Magdalene* is often referred to as something like “the most complex and interesting play in the whole repertoire of early English drama.”91 Theresa Coletti, in the most sustained and deep analysis of the drama to date, argues that “granting the play’s transgression of official religion and ecclesiastic authority,” the text of the saint play “unequivocally reinforces traditional [orthodox] late medieval religious culture.”92 However, a closer examination of the musical and silent moments in *Mary Magdalene* indicates rather that the play invites Lollard, orthodox, and especially hybridized contemplation of the ways in which religious liturgy and sacrament create and sustain a complex community that is internally heterogeneous, yet unified in its Christianity. The play’s use of a woman preacher as protagonist, its irreverently hilarious parodic mass, its repeated use of the vernacular, and its unauthorized presentation of the *Te Deum* cannot merely be “granted”; the play’s “transgressions” are an acknowledgement and endorsement of Lollardy, though not an unequivocal one.93 As with *Wisdom*, the play suggests a hybridized
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92 Coletti, *Mary Magdalene*, 149.

93 Clopper echoes several critics when he says that, “it may be argued that the play speaks for a Lollard agenda in which laypeople, whether male or female, have the right to evangelize.” *Drama, Play, Game*, 247. For more on Wycliffite debates regarding women’s ability to be preachers, see Margaret Aston, “Lollard Women Priests?” in
doctrine of ritualized, communal worship and vernacular, private devotion. *Mary Magdalene* "acknowledges the ideological investments of late medieval religious experience," but this acknowledgement of local religious differences is set against a promotion of fear and disgust at Saracens and Pagans, the inverted religious alterities of the play’s antagonists.94

*Mary Magdalene* is a “penitential drama if ever there was one,” in Clopper’s terms, a play that mixes “allegory, history, and romance.”95 Like many medieval romances, the play moves across landscapes far and wide, encountering a variety of “Others”: in this case, religious inferiors needing conversion. The play’s dialect suggests a Norfolk origin, and the fact that it was owned in the sixteenth century by physician and collector Myles Blomefylde introduces a strong possibility that it was performed in Essex into the third quarter of the sixteenth century.96 Producers of this play, whether professionals or clerics or a combination of both, provided actors to portray fifty speaking parts (doubling was likely employed) and scaffolds and set pieces to indicate nineteen distinct locations. It was a place and scaffold production, though the challenges of the play’s set, cast, and sound effects have made it difficult to speculate on how the play’s technical feats were pulled off.97 The play falls clearly
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94 Coletti, *Mary Magdalene*, 149. The play treats Judaism more favorably. It is a “Jew” who tells Martha the good news of the resurrected Jesus’s arrival at the castle (869–72), and Jews are not implicated, as they so often were, in Christ’s death.

95 Clopper, *Drama, Play, Game*, 236.

96 In “The Digby Plays and the Chelmsford Records,” *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama*, 18 (1975): 103–121, John Coldewey writes about four performances performed in Chelmsford in 1462. The records show that the plays called for scaffolds, a theatrical hell, and temple for one play, and minstrels for all the plays. Coldewey suggests that the plays were the Digby plays, including *Mary Magdalene* (but not *Wisdom*). He offers the tantalizing further suggestion that the festivities included extra-theatrical music: “Since the minstrels supplied music for dancing during the performance and received the generous payment of 5s, we might well wonder if the dancing were extended afterwards for the townsfolk’s enjoyment,” 114.

97 In place-and-scaffold staging, the open acting area (the place) is surrounded by individual stages (the scaffolds) that represent the play’s various locations. This staging was used for many East Anglian plays, like *Castle of Perseverance*, the Digby *Killing of the Children*, and the Digby *Conversion of St. Paul*. See for example Meg
into two halves, and whether or not these were performed on two occasions as Coldewey has argued, it is useful to distinguish between the episodic, personal, and almost wholly vernacular first half of the play and the more unified, public, ritualistic, and musical second half. Whether the play was performed in Chelmsford, Norwich, King’s Lynn, Ipswich, Lincoln, or somewhere else, or in a combination of these places (all scenarios have been posited), Mary Magdalene’s audience was certainly economically and religiously diverse.

This saint play uses theatrical spectacle to convey the play’s narratives and aesthetic vision; in Coletti’s words “spectacle is both a medium of conversion and the dramatic signature of demons and lecherous pagan priests.” But as in Wisdom, these most holy and most vulgar moments of the play are aural, too, depending on music for their effects. Coletti elucidates the way the play’s über-spectacle works verbally and visually:

The play…identifies words and theatrical images as parallel sources of sacred truth or illusion. The play deploys its metalinguistic and hypertheatrical resources to represent how its dramatic subject and the dramatic medium itself are variably positioned in relation to the sacred. As resources of religious and dramatic epistemology, word and spectacle in the Digby play dynamically interact and mutually reinforce each other.

While the two strands of words and images are crucial, I would add that a third strand, that of sound, is an equally important and mutually reinforcing resource of the play’s “religious and dramatic epistemology.”


Coldewey first argues for two performances in “The Digby Plays and the Chelmsford Records,” 103–121, and reaffirms it in his edition of the play in Early English Drama, 186–252, and most recently in “The non-cycle plays and the East Anglian tradition,” 211–234.

Auspice theories are discussed by Coletti, Mary Magdalene, 38.

Ibid., 194.

Ibid., 124.
Sounds are crucial connotative forces in several of the play’s hyper-theatrical scenes, scenes that employ music or silence or both to add codes of melody, instrumentation, vocal quality, or a lack of sound to the scene’s visual and textual signs, heightening the sense of dangerous sin or divine sanctity. Mary’s temptation and fall is a lecherous dance between her and Curiosity, and the silly, drunken singing of the Shipman and his boy represents more popular entertainments. In one of the play’s most hermeneutically complex moments, the King and Queen of Marseilles’ priest and his boy perform a pagan parodic mass, a profane distortion of the holy sacrament of penance. Two other sacraments are represented as sacred, and the silence during which the baptism of the King and the hermit priest’s administration of the Eucharist to Mary are performed heightens their theatricality and perhaps their perceived efficacy. The play’s final moments feature more serious representations of sacred music, in the form of the angels’ song when Mary is assumed into Heaven and the final Te Deums that are sung with limited audience participation.

**Musical Entertainments and Parodic Sacramentality**

The only musical moment in the first half of the play, Mary’s dance with Curiosity, works on stage much like the temptation dances in *Wisdom*. This moment borrows not only from the dances and songs of the street, but also from the vernacular tradition of love lyric. The scene is a tavern, and Curiosity approaches Mary with literally flowery flattery: “A, dere dewchesse [duchess], my daysyys ice [daisy’s eye]” and “prenses, parde, ye be my hertys hele [heart’s healer]” (515, 521). Skeptical, Mary asks how he could “love me so sodenly?” (535) and Curiosity describes Mary Magdalene’s irresistibility as a product of her gender: “your person, itt is so womanly,/I can not refreyn me, swete lelly” (525–6). The deal is sealed

---

when Curiosity asks Mary to dance. The exchange is familiar, likely using language any East Anglian man would have used to invite his sweetheart to dance:

Curiosity: …But wol yow dawns, my own dere?  
Mary: Syr, I assent in good maner.  
Go ye before, I sue [follow] you nere…(530–2)

Lines later, Mary calls Curiosity her “dere derlyng” and professes that she will “dye for [his] sake” (534, 6). After they exit, the Bad Angel and Satan declare victory, for “she is fallen in ower gorgly gromys [drunken grasp]” (549). Like Anima’s Mights in Wisdom, Mary is seduced by the worldly temptations of lechery and drink, cloaked as romantic love. The dance between Curiosity and Mary was probably not long—surely part of the point is that romantic lust happens very fast. Rastall suggests that in its early performances at least, “they would perhaps have danced a basse dance to the music of shawms and trumpet,” and he also suggests that a flautist and drummer or a single player with pipe-and-tabor would have been adequate.103 The fact that this dance is the only use of instrumentation in the first half of the play guarantees that, however spirited the choreography, this is a moment that stands out acoustically.

Mary is seduced by “appearances” and “language,” but equally by the aural and tactile pleasures of street music and partner dancing. Clopper’s assessment of the scene’s whirlwind musical romance supports my sense that the dance looked and sounded bawdy, like Will’s “syrnge of lechery” in Wisdom. Curiosity’s quick affection “is matched by Mary’s quick decision to follow him in a (no doubt) sensuous dance and a quicker exit. The scene skillfully demonstrates how easily people are fooled by appearances and language, how the

103 Rastall, The Heavens Singing, 173. For an example of how the one-man band of pipe and tabors looked and sounded, view clip 1.
flesh so willingly follows the world.”

Music is used to represent sin, or at least to accompany it. Both the Mary character and the audience hear the same tempting music, the same sirens’ song, so that it is possible that an audience member could feel seduced as well.

In Mary Magdalene, the sinner’s conversion back to a life of virtue and evangelism begins a mere eighteen lines later, and thus the rather standard morality play allegory of the fall into sin is not the play’s central or crucial conflict, nor is its representation the play’s most threatening force. The larger threats of the play are the non-Christian tyrants: Caesar and Herod, introduced in part one, and part two’s King of Marseilles. Each tyrant, much like the Herods, Pilates, Caesars, and Pharoahs of cycle drama, swears and prays to a perverted Lord or God figure, usually Mahound or the devil. Caesar asks “Belyall” to bless his scribe’s face (21) as he orders him to proclaim that all “precharsse of Crystys incarnacyon” shall die (29). These tyrants, true to their Gospel equivalents, actively work to destroy Christ and his followers, but unlike the allegorized World or Curiosity, these tyrants possess the particular characteristics of names, staffs of messengers and servants and secretaries, distinct set locations, costumes, and specific (if stereotyped) religious identities. They may be biblical-historical, but they also feel contemporary. The audience relates to Mary or Syrus or Lazarus as people not unlike any upper class East Anglian, and they see the play’s tyrants as representing any powerful and unknowable foreign leader from a non-Christian, non-English country.

Against these religious and political threats, the play suggests that both orthodox and heterodox Christians can and must recognize their similarities in order to combat a common enemy.

---

104 Clopper, Drama, Play, and Game, 240.
In *Mary Magdalene*’s second half (beginning at line 925), non-Christian practice is fully theatricalized in the form of a perverted mass for the pagan King of Marseilles, whom Jesus Christ has charged Mary to convert. When the King himself is first presented, his opening boast sounds much like Caesar’s at the start of the play’s first half, but it becomes even more rhythmic and alliterative when he lyrically praises his wife the Queen. Even if the King actor does not burst into song delivering these lines, one can imagine their aural impact. His words entertain and seduce with musical poetics, language again borrowed from vernacular love lyric:

> I have a favorows fode [pleasing wife] and fresse [fresh] as the fakown [falcon]  
> She is full fayur in hyr femynyte;  
> Whan I loke on this lady, I am losty as the lyon  
> In my syth [sight];  
> Of delcyte most delcyyowys,  
> Of felachyp most feleyyowys,  
> Of alle fodys [wives] most favarows—  
> A, my blysse in beuteus bryght! (942–950)

After the introduction of the King and Queen, the play’s action turns to telling the story of Jesus’ resurrection, Mary’s encounter with the disguised risen Lord, and His appearance to all three Marys. After representing these sacred moments—this part of the play reenacts the church’s oldest liturgical drama—the scene shifts back to Marseilles for a thoroughly re-accented religious ritual that is irreverent, scatological, and comical, but also disturbing in its proximity to contemporary religious practice.

The multi-part religious ceremony includes a dramatized pagan sacrifice, music, nonsense Latin incantation, and a “priestly” absolution of sin echoing the orthodox sacrament of penance. Dangerous, non-Christian religious alterity, then, is represented as a parody of orthodox religious practice. Bakhtin writes that in parodic re-accentuation, the

---

106 Marseilles became the naval base for the Franco-Ottoman Alliance in 1536, giving the overt references to Islam the veneer of historical validity. The non-ideological East-West alliance was widely scorned; it is perhaps the sort of compromise that this play condemns.
parodic quality may be “easily and quickly lost to perception, or be significantly weakened”; it can “offer internal dialogic resistance to the parodying intentions.”107 Thus regardless of the Mary Magdalene playwright’s intentions in representing the religiously perverse by means of parodying orthodox practice, the scene’s immediate context dialogically resists any one message. Depending on an audience member’s sympathies, perverted orthodox sacrament could seem truly threatening or aptly humorous, or perhaps an awkward combination of both.

At the start of the scene, the King invites and implies participation from the whole audience in what sounds like a rather joyous religious event: “Now, lorddys and ladyys of grett apprise [reputation]…/this day to do a sacryfyce/wyth multetude of myrth before ower goddys all” (1133, 1135-6). The Queen further delineates the Saracen nature of the sacrifice, and makes their religion sound more like a party than a solemn affair:

Queen: To that lord curteys and keynd, 
Mahond, that is so mykyll of myth [great of might], 
Wyth mynstrelly and myrth in mynd, 
Lett us gon ofer in tha hye kyngis syth. (1139–1142)

As is typical in late medieval drama, the play’s heathen others worship both Mahound and the devil. The Queen thus calls for a Saracen version of holy rites, which seem to mix festivity and solemnity.

Parodying orthodox doctrine, the King cannot have his religious ceremony without sacerdotal authority. The heathen priest (“Presbyter,” in the text) and his boy, Hawkyn, enter to administer the ceremony: they seem to think it will be holy. The Presbyter orders the boy to ring bells to gather the people (recall that bell ringing is a Catholic practice to which some

107 Bakhtin, The Dialogic Imagination, 419.
Lollards objected), “fore here shall be a grett solemnyte” (1147). While the priest prays to Mahound to get the boy to shut up, the boy’s taunting gets so scatological and suggestive that it is difficult to tell if the moment on stage would be hilarious or disturbingly lecherous (and indeed, it would depend on how it was played): “A fartt, mastyr, and kysse my grenne! [groin]” (1171). The boy’s further suggestion that the priest’s “kenred is asprongyn [family is widespread] late[ly]” (1174) condemns priests as lecherous and abusive of their power. The priest’s ensuing beating of the boy, ignored by all present including the King, is dark comedy, likely riotous in performance while also suggesting a corruption that is anything but amusing. Dramatically, this grossness sets up a contrast between the Christians and the sick heathens. At the same time, priestly abuses of power were a subject of Lollard critique, and the interactions between a priest and his maligned boy might be interpreted as an anti-sacerdotal warning by those who saw ecclesiastical power as corrupt.109

The Presbyters’ instructions to the boy evoke the very props—the altar, the book, the vestments—that were necessary for orthodox mass: “boy, a boke anon thou bring me!/Now, boy, to my awter I will me dresse—/On shall my vestment and myn array” (1181–3). The boy’s “servyse of this day,” a parodic mass chanted in mock plainsong, bears reproducing in full:

\[
\begin{align*}
Lecyo maboundys, \textit{viri fortissimi sarasenorum:} \\
Glabiosum \textit{ad glvmandum glumardinorum,} \\
Gornondorum alocorum, \textit{stamplinantum cursorum,} \\
Cownthys fulaturn, \textit{congrvryandum tersorum,} \\
Mursum malgorum, \textit{mararayorum,} \\
Skeartum sialporum, \textit{fartum cardiculorum,} \\
Slavndri stromptpm, \textit{corbolcorum,} \\
\textit{Snuguer snagoer wewolfforum}
\end{align*}
\]


109 See the quotation above from the Confession of Hawisia Moone of Loddon, that calls priests “lecherous and covetouse,” from Hudson, Selections from English Wycliffite Writings, 35.
Standgardum lamba beffettorum,
Strowtum stardy strangolcorum,
Rygour dagour flapporum
Castratu raty rybaldorum
Howndys and hoggys, in heggys and hellys,
Snakys and toddys mott be yower bellys!
Ragnell and Roffyn, and other in the wavys,
Graynt yow grace to dye on the galows! (1189–1202)

The first line is the only real Latin, in a sense turning Turk the Christian office: “the Book of Mahound, most mighty men of Saracens.” Beyond the scatological “fartum” and “castratum,” the otherworldly “werwolfforum” and “strangollcorrum,” and the violent “rygour dagour,” the service is silly mumbo jumbo.

After the boy utters the service, the Presbyter invites the lords and ladies of ranks “lesse and more” (1202) to give their offering to Saint Mahound:

And ye shall have grett pardon
That longyth to this holy place
And receive ye shall my benesown [blessing]
And stond in Mahowndys grace. (1206–9)

While the scene does not feature the sinner’s confession, it represents and perverts the priest’s absolution. The joke would be the same for any East Anglian: fifteenth-century Christian would likely think that unconverted pagans are irredeemable sinners who could never be granted grace by Saint Mahound. But the mockery further suggests that sacerdotal authority to absolve sins is itself laughable; again, that implication could be interpreted as seriously concerning or humorously true. The proximity of this parodic ritual to orthodox absolution favors a Lollard-leaning interpretation, but not exclusively (the alterity of Marseilles need not implicate Catholicism for all audience members).

After the sacrament, the priest and his boy perform a duet, making a point similar to that made by the harmonizing Mights in *Wisdom: any* trained musician can sing or play profane music as well as sacred music. After the boy sings the mass, the presbyter demands
purely entertaining music: “Now boy, I pray the, lett us have a song!” (1222). The boy complies; the priest will sing, too, and take the melody while the boy “wyth mery tune the trebyll to syng” (1227). The preparation is comical and mocks pretentious singers, with the priest reminding the boy to “cowff up the brest” (1224) and the boy humming, presumably to find his pitch. The song (which is not listed) goes wrong after an unspecified amount of singing. “Hold up!,” the priest yells, “for all owte of rule thou dost me bryng!” (1228, 9).

Rastall explains that the problem is likely a pitch problem: “since the priest has the easier task in singing the plainsong tune, this says little for his own musical ability. ‘All owte of rule’ implies that there is a body of theoretical knowledge in use, and that the boy is causing the Priest to make mistakes within that area.”

As with any deliberately bad singing, the effect would only be truly entertaining if both the Presbyter and the boy actor were highly skilled singers, and indeed the parodic mass would only have been funny if it sounded like a real mass. The musical abilities of the actors point to the ways in which liturgical religious practice may be mere aesthetics, performed for pride not praise, as the Lollards warned. Musical talent and charisma can entertain theater audiences, and they can entertain church congregations, too, distracting from the word and preventing the personal sacred relationship that dissenters take to be the sole type of spiritual efficacy.

The sequence of ritual in Marseilles suggests many meanings simultaneously. As comic entertainment, the scene potentially demonstrates that sacrament lacks true efficacy. It is the bad guys, the Saracen pagans, who perform this inverse Christianity, but its effectiveness as comedy relies on the notion that sacrament—words, music, movement, and material objects that effect spiritual change when performed and handled by a priest—is in

---

some measure absurd. As any East Anglian regardless of their views on Latin ritual would have got the “in-joke,” this moment on one level unifies its audience community, even if some in the audience might have laughed extra hard at the joke, thinking that it was exposing the obscurity of orthodoxy’s Latinity and solemnity. The hermeneutical burden of this re-presented and altered sacrament rests on an audience who would feel the parody’s weight in different ways. The satire is as multivalent as fake-conservative Stephen Colbert interviewing real-conservative Bill O’Reilly; a variety of pre-existing biases in the audience skews interpretation of parody in different directions.

Audience members more sympathetic to Lollardy witness how easy it is to mock the alienating effects of Latin gibberish, relics, sacrament, bell ringing, and religious music, to dialogize orthodox ritual in pagan voices. The vernacular Bible and private prayer are less easily mocked, proving to some that they are more efficacious spiritually. A more Catholic response would be that only truly wicked people could mock so sacred a ritual as penance; the scene shows the dangerous corruption of Saracen-pagan practice. John Parker writes about a similarly inverted parodic sacrament—an Antichrist’s Eucharist—in the Chester cycle. For Parker, the Chester Antichrist play “redeems through laughter” the real Eucharist, reaffirming its questionable efficacy (if the Antichrist’s mass is fake and dramatized, Christ’s mass of the church, by virtue of it being the opposite, is real). This complex line of interpretation would be available to Mary Magdalene’s audience, but, as would also be the case for the Chester parody, the play does not univocally force this orthodox response. Thus, this

111 In Victor Scherb’s assessment, “as parody of church practice, it constitutes an in-joke on garbled and incomprehensible ecclesiastical Latin[…], but it also places these mis-speakers outside the Christian community, uses them in fact to construct paganism as a blasphemous parody of Christianity.” Scherb, Staging Faith, 185–6.

entertainingly theatrical moment that mocks real ritual efficacy does something more profound than merely entertain. Ritual-as-entertainment, as satire, is a missing element in Schechner’s categorization. Turning efficacy into parody can produce strong emotions of fear or insult, or it can provoke serious laughter at a contested matter, or it may do both. This is the play’s most ambivalent scene, firmly residing in the boundary between efficacy and entertainment. The audience’s divergent and overlapping responses to the scene would have in common a shared disgust for the Saracens. The scene thus simultaneously points out doctrinal differences among the audience regarding sacrament, while unifying them under a broader category of Christian religious identification.

The entertainment value of music is again exploited by the play’s other man–boy pairing: the shipman and his boy. This scene does not do the theological work of the parodic mass, but it seduces and enthralls the audience in another raucous showstopper. After Mary is charged by Jesus to go to Marseilles to convert the King and Queen and their people (“Alle the lond shall be techyd alonly be thee,” Jesus’ angel messenger tells her, 1382), a ship immediately and fortuitously arrives on the scene to take her there; the sailing ship must have been another of the play’s technical wonders. But while the sudden appearance of the vessel may seem like something out of a romance or lai (one thinks of Guigemar’s boat in Marie de France’s lai, for example), the playwright peoples the ship with an unromantically crude shipman and his spirited but much abused boy.

As if the similarities between this seafaring pair and the priest and his boy were not clear enough, these two also sing the play’s final two song and dance numbers. Indeed one can easily speculate that two singing actors doubled the Presbyter/boy pair and the Shipman/boy pair. Both boys are reluctant to serve their master; for example, when the shipman demands a drink, the tired child whines, “I may natt, for slep, I make God a
vow!/Thou shall abyde ytte, and thou were my syere! [even if you were my father]” (1398–9). Scatological humor follows: the boy is constipated with “swyche a crampe” (1407) and he can only “ly and wryng tyll I pysse” (1409). The shipman proceeds to beat the disobedient boy, just as the Presbyter had (stage direction after 1418) and he is only interrupted by Mary’s appearance and her request to hitchhike on their boat.

The Shipman and his boy sing twice in this scene. They sing upon arrival into the playing space—“Here shall entyre a shyp wyth a mery song”—and again after seeing land, when they spot the orientalized geography of “Torkye” and “Satyllye” and sing until they reportedly hit sand (stage direction after 1394; 1435, 7).113 As both songs are left unspecified in the text, this moment have could been improvised (like the Priest and his boy’s song) by the two actors. Any currently popular song of the sea or street could be used, to the audience’s probable delight. Again there is a potentially Lollard-sympathetic reading of these songs: note how similar these crude, singing lowlifes are to a supposedly holy officer and his choirboy, the play might say to a reformer.

Such an interpretation, however, has its limits in the wider context of the play. The final scene’s deployment of music to represent heaven means that a reformist audience member would realize that the play does not want the baby thrown out with the bathwater, as it were. Mary Magdalene has shown that there is nothing more seductive, entertaining, and captivating than music: from Curiosity’s dance with Mary to the Priest and his boy’s off-tune debacle to the choreographed and raucously sung sea shanties. Thus, it is the charge of the Church not only to prevent people from falling into sin by way of secular song and dance, but also to provide a spiritual music that seduces, entertains, and captivates its listeners. Mary Magdalene presents this sacred music at the end of the play, giving orthodox musical ritual a

113 “Satyllye” refers to Attalia, also called Asia Minor.
chance to trump the profane auralities of the earlier scenes. However, as this use of church music can only ever be theatricalized re-presentation, its status as supplement confounds the efficacy of actual ritual, exposing its kinship with entertainment.

**Silence and Community Songs**

Before turning to the play’s use of sacred music to challenge secular music, I want to examine another nonverbal theatrical device deployed by the play: silence. A song and dance number is not the only way to break the monotony of spoken dialogue in a play. Even so cheesy a modern (but biblical) musical as *Joseph and the Amazing Technicolor Dreamcoat* knows that silence is arresting, riveting, and memorable, especially if used in solemn or climactic moments; Shakespeare knew this, too. Wayne Narey uses Schechner’s distinctions to explain the meta-theatricality of silences. He is speaking of moments of ritual in the cycle plays when he writes:

> Silences that are efficacious as opposed to entertaining differ in their metatheatricality only insofar as they remind us that we are engaged in reality, not play, that we are effecting a transformation—in this instance, the reality of eternity and our need for salvation.¹¹⁵

*Mary Magdalene* stages several instances of efficacious silence: performers and audience collectively experiencing a transformative event, if they choose to view it as such.

After the shipman and his boy have cast the Queen and her child overboard, the widowed (or so he thinks) King finds Peter and tells him that Mary Magdalene has sent him on this pilgrimage, “for to crestyn [Christianize] me from wo and wrake [harm]” (1826). He asks to be baptized, and the stage direction reads: “*Tunc aspargit illum cum aqua*” (“Then he sprinkles him with water,” SD after 1843). It is not that Peter’s words—“In the name of the

---

¹¹⁴ I am thinking of Joseph’s encounter with Jacob at the musical’s end, when he gives him his folded up coat in silence. And Shakespeare’s stage direction in Coriolanus: “[Coriolanus] holds her by the hand, silent.” Act 5, Scene 3, SD after 182.

Trenite/Wyth this watyr I baptysse thee‖ (1839–40)—perform an Austinian speech act to protect the King “from the fyndys bond” (1838). Rather, the efficacy is a performative gesture authorized by a prop, Peter’s holy water. Asserting the necessity of sacrament despite its kinship with theater (or perhaps because of this likeness), this sacramental moment could be seen as an “orthodox rejoinder” to Lollardy. But the ease with which such a sacrament can be reproduced on stage—in the end there is still, phenomenologically speaking, little difference between efficacious and entertaining performance—invites skepticism from any anti-ritual audience member. The fact that this performed sacrament is coupled with Mary’s long sermon on creation affirms the power of the vernacular word and suggests the possibility of hybridized religious efficacy, of silent, mysterious solemnity supplemented by audible, clear explication.

Such thinking may also be applied to the hermit-turned-priest’s administration of the Host to Mary before her death at the end of the play. The priest does not even bless the bread or say the familiar “Hoc est enim corpus meum.” Rather, the weight of the sacrament falls in the hands of Mary as she silently receives the bread; the stage direction reads: “Here she reseyvyth it” (2018). Thus the play re-stages orthodox sacrament in two key scenes: the King’s final conversion ritual before being reunited with his wife, and Mary’s pre-death rite, and these scenes are theatrically heightened by pausing for silent gesture.

The Mary Magdalene playwright employs silence to make the play’s final moments captivating and memorable, able to upstage the profane song and dances. The visual spectacle of angels descending from some higher level would have been impressive, competing for punch with such effects as the burning house or the moving ship. Mary fasts in the wilderness and Jesus orders the angels to give her spiritual and bodily food: “Wyth

116 “This is my body,” the words of the elevation, from Luke 22:19 and Matthew 26:26.
gostly fode relevyd shall she be/Angellys! Into the clowdys ye do hyr hauns [raise her up]/There fede wyth manna to hyr systynouns [sustenance]” (2005–7). The angel obeys and the lengthy stage direction documents what must have been one of the play’s most powerful silent moments: “Here shall to angyllys desend into wyldyrnesse, and other to shall bring an oble [mass wafer], opynly aperyng aloft in the clowddys; the two benethyn shall bring Mari, and she shall receive the bred, and than go ayen [again] into wyldyrnesse” (stage direction after 2018). The opening of a cloud set piece and two angels hoisting Mary into these clouds before placing her back in the wilderness are indeed impressive feats. The moment’s coincidence of the Eucharist with the recreation of a cosmic historical miracle theatricalizes and contextualizes this crucial sacrament as itself a sort of miracle.

The fact, though, that this Eucharist is administered by a hermit-cum-priest who is in reality an actor undermines the authority of real priests. The turning of bread into body by means of incanting sacred words is the ultimate performative utterance, in J.L. Austin’s definition. Such an utterance is “in a peculiar way hollow or void if said by an actor on the stage”; surely no one believed the actor was actually turning the prop bread into Christ’s body.117 The performativity of priesthood was very much a concern of Lollards. In a typical Wycliffite formulation, costume and script do not grant spiritual authority: “crounne and cloth maken no prest, ne þe emperours bishop wip his wordis, but power þat crist þ Yueþ [gives].”118 Lollards almost universally questioned the doctrine of transubstantiation. An East Anglian woman went so far as to point out that if every eucharistic sacrament is God, then Gods are “passed through [people’s] posteriors into fetid stinking privies” every day.119

118 From the Ashburnham MS. “De Papa,” in Matthew, English Works of Wyclif, 467.
The re-staging of the Eucharist calls into question the authority of ecclesiasts and the efficacy of sacrament. When elucidating the idea of the supplement, Derrida claims:

presence ought to be self-sufficient...that is to say it does not have to be supplemented, it suffices and is self-sufficient; but that also means that it is irreplaceable; what one would substitute for it would not equal it, would be only a mediocre makeshift.\(^{120}\)

When thinking about the Mass and its supplementary re-presentation, one might say that \textit{Real Presence} ought to be self-sufficient. If the orthodox Eucharist—“that flagrant transgression of the evidence of the senses”—is irreplaceable, without substitute, unequivocally sufficient as ritual experience, then it should not so easily be signified and supplemented by the theater.\(^{121}\) The reproduction of the Eucharist on stage exposes its inadequacies: its lack of realness, its lack of presence. This equivocation favors a Lollard critique of transubstantiation, but again it remains unlikely that all members of an East Anglian audience would have felt the same about this representation of their ritual. Even for an orthodox believer, theatrical representations of sacraments, popular in various forms throughout England, drain some of the numinous from ritual efficacy. These sorts of staged moments deplete the capacities of “sacramental theater,” in Beckwith’s phrase, and that emptying only quickens as the country moves towards the Reformation.

Before the silent miracle/ritual of the hermit-administered Eucharist, the Angel hints at his ability to do what angels do best (at least in every extent cycle drama and countless stone and glass versions in medieval churches) when he praises Jesus as “O thou Osanna, angellys song!” (2013). Angels’ musical abilities need no introduction, and their singing constitutes the most famous and analyzed music of medieval drama; Rastall even titles his

\(^{119}\) Translated by and quoted in McSheffrey, \textit{Gender and Heresy}, 112. The East Anglian woman echoes Wyclif’s horror at the thought of Christ’s body going through human digestion, in \textit{De Eucharistia tractatus maior}.

\(^{120}\) Derrida, \textit{Of Grammatology}, 145.

\(^{121}\) In Beckwith’s useful phrase, \textit{Signifying God}, 60.
first book on the subject *The Heaven Singing*. Mary is assumed into the clouds twelve lines
after her first upward journey to receive the manna, this time not in silence but accompanied
by what was likely sublimely beautiful singing and playing: “*Here shall she be halsyd [hauled up]*
*wyth angellys wyth reverent song. Assumpta est Maria in nubibus. Celi gardent, angeli lavdantes felium Dei,*
et dicit Mari [Mary is taken up into the clouds, the Heavens rejoice, the Angels praising the son of God, and
Mary says]” (stage direction after 2030). The moment echoes assumption plays in most cycle
dramas for another Mary, the Blessed Virgin one, who receives glorious musical treatment
in, for example, the East Anglian N-Town Mary play. The moments’ inter-theatrical
resonances would not have made the music and spectacle any less magnificent, but would
certainly have pleased the traditionalists in the audience who, as was typical in East Anglia,
followed the cult of Mary Magdalene, recalcitrant sinner and hero of the common [wo]man.

The angels likely performed another scene-stealing song, seventeen lines before the
play’s ending when the stage direction reads: “*Gaudent in celis [They rejoice in heaven]*” (stage
direction after 2122). As with the bawdy songs, the text’s lack of specificity as to which song
was sung would allow producers of the play the freedom to choose timely texts or new
musical settings to delight the audience, so that the glory of these songs can compete with
and outweigh the hilarity of the play’s popular songs.

The play concludes with the singing of the *Te Deum*, the song of praise that ends
most Sunday matins in the Divine Office.\(^\text{122}\) The Hermit invites any clerks present to join in
song:

\begin{quote}
Hermit: Now frendys, thus endyth thys matere—
To blysse bring tho that byn here!
Now, clerkys, wyth voycys cler,
*“Te Deum lavdamus”* lett us syng! (2136–9)
\end{quote}

\(^{122}\) To hear a medieval *Te Deum* that was part of a medieval drama, listen to track 4, “Te Deum” from *Ludis
A number of audience members—priests, parish clerks, choirboys, and lay singers—would have been able to join in at this moment, making it sound like a church service on a typical Sunday. As Rastall explains, “to a church-going nation this means business as usual, even if not in a church building.” The fact that the _Te Deum_ is sung _not_ in a church building is crucial, however. In a facile way, Latin liturgy gets the final word in this play; on the surface, orthodoxy seems to be reaffirmed. But the fact that a hermit actor, not a priest, leads the _Te Deum_ destabilizes the official discourse of the church, and questions priestly authority. The melodies and harmonies would sound the same, if not better, considering the presence of so many professional singers and musicians.

For some Lollards, priest-like authority is given to _all_ believers, man and woman, lay and clerical: “þer shulde be bot oo degre alone of prestehod in þe chirche of God, and every good man is a prest and hath power to preche þe worde of God.” The moment thus uses a beloved orthodox musical ritual to suggest the more heretical idea of efficacy and authority through faith, not position.

Any song that is as familiar and oft sung as the _Te Deum_ performs community and cultural functions as well as religious ones. The singing of the _Te Deum_ would have been so expected, so reminiscent of daily East Anglian life in the cultural center that was the Church, that it might not have offended even the most anti-sacramental among the audience. In the way that an unpatriotic American or Brit still usually manages to join in with “The Star Spangled Banner” or “God Save the Queen,” the _Te Deum_ is just joyful and innocuous enough to invite both sincere spiritual rapture from a moved orthodox audience member.

123 Christopher Marsh talks about the make-up of pre-Reformation church choirs in wealthy areas like East Anglia. Liturgical music would be sung by the parish priest as well as parish clerk, chantry priests, choirboys, and English laymen who were invited to join choirs. Christopher Marsh, _Music and Society_, 394-5.

124 Rastall, _The Heaven Singing_, 374.

125 From the _Sixteen points_, qtd. in Hudson, _Selections from English Wycliffite Writings_, 19/16-18.
and non-committed participation from a more heterodox one. But the *Te Deum* in the play is not ending an actual service; it is only a representation of a song from the Divine Office, a supplement to that liturgy. When I sing the “Star Spangled Banner” in my hometown Fourth of July play, I am singing an entertaining quotation of a patriotic song, rather than performing a patriotic act, and the audience is doing the same. For performers and audience members alike, the singing of “The Star Spangled Banner” or the *Te Deum* either affirms a sense of community and (likely false) homogeneity with other Americans or Christians, or reminds them of the distance between themselves and the cultural practices embraced by those around them, practices of which they may be skeptical or disdainful.

The de-authorized performance of this orthodox song and its shared familiarity invite all audience members to remember their commonalities. The *Te Deum* constitutes a community relying firstly on the exclusion of non-Christians, in the way that singing “The Star-Spangled Banner” affirms community by excluding those who don’t know the song, that is, non-Americans. Using Adorno’s sociology of music, Holsinger writes, “the sense of harmonious solidarity music gives to those who sing in one chorus often founds itself upon the violent exclusion of those whose voices are silenced.”

In the sense that all East Anglians are Christians able to sing along to the *Te Deum*, then, this moment confirms their communal solidarity, unification predicated on their distinction from those pagans who do not sing *Te Deum*, the orientalized non-English others the play caricatures.

In the larger East Anglian religious context, the laity’s frequent inclusion in a church service via the *Te Deum* only offers an arbitrary, fictionalized inclusion in the ecclesiastic structure. The orthodox church’s hierarchy was still in place in fifteenth-century East Anglia, and reinforced in every ecclesiastic event. For example, only clerics were allowed into the

---

sanctuary to witness the miracle of transubstantiation while the parishioners attempted to view the act through an opening in the choir screen. The play’s theatrical representation of the church’s means of ideological dissemination calls attention to the way in which unifying community through song only masks real ecclesiastic power, a power that usually distances the laity from faith’s central mysteries. The clergy’s authority to be the sole distributors and leaders of sacraments, of the Word, of liturgical music making, has been called into question repeatedly throughout a play that represents a woman preacher and restages two sacraments with actors and props. This final participatory moment further marginalizes clerical hierarchy by giving leadership of a community-affirming musical experience to lay actors and musicians. Regardless of their personal theologies, all East Anglians are invited to join in an egalitarian, laity-led song from orthodox ritual. They must be Christian to participate, or even be in the audience, but episcopal authority is exposed as redundant. In this way, the singing of the *Te Deum* enacts a hybridized religious experience, a compromise of a cherished orthodox tradition re-accented through lay authorization. This is precisely the sort of compromise that early Protestant reformers and playwrights found ideologically productive, particularly with regards to music. The Digby *Mary Magdalene* performs a civic function, forming community out of its disparate groups while reinforcing both the tensions and the overlaps between them.

127 Lollard Walter Brut wrote that “the soul of a man and the soul of a woman are of the same special species. Therefore, since the soul of man is capable of priestly power, it follows equally that the soul of a woman is capable of the same power….Nothing more is required for someone to become a priest except that he be admitted by God.” Translated by Alastair Minnis, “‘Respondet Waltherus Bryth…’: Walter Brut in Debate on Women Priests,” in *Text and Controversy from Wyclif to Bale: Essays in Honor of Anne Hudson*, ed. Helen Barr and Ann M. Hutchison (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2005), 230. I have not made heretical and orthodox ideas about gender central to my discussion, but others have, including Coletti, passim, and McSheffrey, passim. McSheffrey notes that despite the many wealthy woman who helped spread Lollardy, “the later Lollard communities continued to be dominated by men, and the social construction of those communities made it very difficult for women to get their foot in the door except under the influence of male relatives. Lollardy was made by, and in a sense for, men,” *Gender and Heresy*, 149.
The End of Sacramental Theater

In the early fifteenth-century treatise *Dives and Pauper*, a rich man and a poor one debate doctrinal and theological issues (as well as secular ones). The rich Dives personifies the sort of newly literate but pious layman who populated much of East Anglia starting in the early fifteenth century.\(^{128}\) When the two debate liturgy, Dives’ objections to church music sound like a Lollard’s: “Me þynkith it were betere to seyn Godis offys in holy chirche withoutyn note þan to seyn it be note & hackyn þe wordis and þe silablis in or preyere & our preysynge.”\(^{129}\) Pauper’s rebutting point of view, as editor Priscilla Barnum explains, is “neither apology for the shortcomings of the clergy nor a plea for a Wyclifian reform of doctrine but rather something between the two.”\(^{130}\) Pauper responds by defending music, with the caveat that a singer must be intent on praising God:

> And þerfor what we syngyn in our preyere we don non displesance to God but mychil plesance, inasmuchil as we presyn hym & worchepyn hym with our power, for every note syngynge to God in chirche or in oþir place with good entencion is a preysyng to God…And but men presyn God with song þat connyn syngyn whan þey mon in dew tyme, ellys þey synyn grevously.\(^{131}\)

This idea begins to suggest that music may be retained in a Reformed church that focuses on the singer’s intent, and is precisely the sort of compromise that will be crucial to the Reformation.

Barnum sees Pauper as a representation of “a moment and a point of view in the history of the pre-Reformation period that is sparsely documented, perhaps because it was

---


\(^{129}\) *Dives and Pauper*, 206/28-30.

\(^{130}\) Barnum, “Introduction,” x.

\(^{131}\) *Dives and Pauper*, 206-7/40-48.
so fleeting.” Pauper’s pro-compromise perspective is dramatized in *Wisdom* and the Digby *Mary Magdalene*, where the compatibility of music and reformist doctrine is suggested and performed.

The slow inclusion of dissenting beliefs into mainstream ideas has long been the model of social and religious change. Hornbeck writes:

> It is important to note that the *interface between mainstream and dissenting religious culture* operated in both directions. Not only can dissenting groups be affected by developments within the wider community, but the presence of dissenting viewpoints can provide the impetus for mainstream institutions to stress certain ideas over others…In East Anglia, the interplay of dissenting and ‘orthodox’ religious culture shaped the theological emphases of both communities.

The priority of *Wisdom* and the Digby *Mary Magdalene* to represent this interplay suggests that East Anglia’s religious hybridity contributed to its astonishing theatrical output as much as its financial prosperity did. Drama was a means of articulating and negotiating objections to liturgical practice, most particularly, musical liturgical practice.

*Wisdom* and the Digby *Mary Magdalene* are both forms of “Sacramental Theater” in Sarah Beckwith’s phrase. For Beckwith, medieval drama is a theater of signs; something on stage stands in for something sacred, as it does in a sacrament like the Eucharist. But the integrity of these theatrical signs—these bodies and props as well as songs and dances and processions—begins to crumble under the weight of the materiality of performance, the plays’ irreducible, concrete signifiers.

---


133 Emma Lipton suggests that the East Anglian N-Town plays functioned similarly: “The theatrical promotion of lay piety would have appealed not only to moderate constituencies, such as the wealthy merchant patrons of the numerous parish churches in East Anglia, but even…to Lollard extremists.” Lipton, “Performing reform: Lay piety and the marriage of Mary and Joseph in the N-Town cycle,” *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, 23 (2001): 409.


135 Beckwith, *Signifying God*, 70.
These supplementary signifiers put pressure on both theatrical and religious experience in England on the eve of the Reformation. Beckwith claims that the theatricalization of religious ritual does not empty out its content, but rather shows that sacrament is conditionally efficacious, all words always being at the mercy of the particulars of their enactment.\(^\text{136}\) However, while a York cycle or East Anglian play might not have instantly drained religious ritual of its efficacy for all in the audience upon first performance, the tenet that sacrament and liturgy were conditional was at best a temporary fix to a slow leak. The more that ritual was reproduced on stage, be it as parody or sincere quotation, the more its own efficacy was undermined. In the tension between the original church ritual and the supplementary theater’s re-presentation, the cracks in sacramental theater’s potency and believability began to emerge. When new kinds of theatrical representation started to be written and performed during England’s slow, complex, and hybridized Reformation, this drama supplemented and then replaced a form of theater that had drained both itself and the church ritual it sought to augment.

In the early days of the English Reformation, music is a central debate. As the next chapter will discuss, people continued to have complex personal attachments to the music of traditional religion, attachments that are exposed in the plays of reformer John Bale. Bale, who admired Wyclif as the “morning star” of the Reformation, agreed on principle, but not in practice, with the notion that music was distracting and unholy. The sixteenth century brought England a unique state religion—the Anglican Compromise—that retained more music than its Protestant European counterparts.\(^\text{137}\) The seeds of that compromise—word

136 Citing Victor Turner and J.L. Austin, Beckwith elucidates this theory ibid., 115.

137 The seeming improbability of the English Reformation’s music, considering its debt to Lollardy, is indicated in statements such as Donald Smeeton’s: “The Reformation is credited with fathering a whole hymnody. It is strange, therefore, to note the attitude of the Wycliffites.” Smeeton, Lollard Themes in the Reformation Theology of William Tyndale (Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies, 1986), 218.
and music supplementing each other—can be seen in *Wisdom* and the Digby *Mary Magdalene*.

In the plays of East Anglia-born John Bale, ambiguous and compromised musical performances explore a new kind of ritual efficacy.
CHAPTER 2: REFORMING AURALITY IN JOHN BALE’S PLAYS

In John Bale’s 1538 allegorical history play, the titular, idealized Proto-Protestant King Johan describes how the clergy have mentally and financially impoverished his country:

Than for Englandes cause I wyll be somewhat playne.
Yt is yow, Clargy, that hathe her in dysdayne.
With yowre Latyne howres, serymonyves and popetly playles. (413–5)\textsuperscript{138}

Throughout Bale’s theatrical Protestant polemic, “Latyne howres” and other types of Catholic ceremony are performed and derided, and these musical and sacramental representations iterate the King’s point that Roman practice “decayes” God’s holy word. King Johan disparages “howres, serymonyves” and “playes,” but the extant oeuvre of England’s greatest early Protestant playwright reveals that Bale himself was conflicted about such things.

John Bale, one of the leading English polemicists of the Reformation, recognized early on the “constitutive role” drama could have in the spread of Protestantism.\textsuperscript{139} Thomas Cromwell, chief minister to Henry VIII and leading architect of the English Reformation in the 1530s, patronized Bale and his company. In 1535, Cromwell’s secretary and publicist

\textsuperscript{138} All quotations from John Bale, The Complete Plays of John Bale, vols. 1 and 2, ed. Peter Happé (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1985). Three Laws and God’s Promises were both printed in 1538, and King Johan was likely first written sometime in the late 1530s, too.

\textsuperscript{139} The phrase comes from David Scott Kastan, who explains: “By mid-century, friend and foe alike had come to recognize the constitutive role of theatrical activity in England’s Reformation.” Kastan, “‘Holy Wurdes’ and ‘Slypper Wit’: John Bale’s King Johan and the Poetics of Propaganda,” in Rethinking the Henrican Era: Essays on Early Tudor Texts and Contexts, ed. Peter Herman (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 268.
Richard Morison had proposed that the Crown combat Popish feasts and superstitious theater with a propagandistic drama advancing Reformation ideals:

Howmoche better is it that those plaies shulde be forbidden and deleted and others dyvyssed to set forthe and declare lyvely before the people eies the abhomynation and wickedness of the bisshop of Rome, monkes, ffreers, nonnes, and such like.\textsuperscript{140}

By 1538, Bale had written all five of his extant plays, and at least nineteen more. While Morison had focused on the visual benefits of theatrical propaganda, the role of sound, particularly musical sounds, was crucial to ongoing debates about the reform of church services, and music is prominently represented in early Protestant drama.\textsuperscript{141} While King Johan’s anti-musical stance resembles Bale’s prose polemics, in his morality drama Three Laws, music is used to restore order to the church, and the biblical \textit{God’s Promises} is structured around liturgical antiphons. Bale’s plays, and his other writings, reveal that despite his well-earned reputation as a fanatic, he is moderate and compromising when it comes to religious music.\textsuperscript{142} His maneuvering exposes the flexibility and contentiousness of acoustic issues in early Tudor religious and theatrical contexts. Bale’s theatrical work contributes to these conversations about music and hearing in important but conflicting ways, and those contradictions mark the ongoing changes of the early English Reformation.


\textsuperscript{141} Morison continues, “Into the commen people thynges sooner enter by the eies, then by the eares: remembryng more better that they see the that they heere.” Ibid., 14. Morison’s visual bias is unusual for the sixteenth century.

\textsuperscript{142} David Bevington’s assessment of Bale is typical of his reputation in later monographs: describing the reformers, he writes: “They must in fact have been a tricky lot to handle. Bale was perhaps the most tactless and independent” \textit{Tudor Drama and Politics: A Critical Approach to Topical Meaning} (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), 98. Peter Happé’s edition of his plays (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1985) and biography (Amherst: Twayne, 1996) have done much to promote and defend the study of Bale. Recent scholarship continues to uphold the notion that Bale was more of a propagandist than an artist, that “his prime objective is always and exclusively the polemical point,” in the words of Rainer Pineas, “The Polemical Drama of John Bale,” in \textit{Shakespeare and the Dramatic Tradition: Essays in Honor of S.F. Johnson}, ed. W.R. Elton and William B. Long, 194–210 (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1989).
Bale’s particular representations of music and sound expose the larger problems of ecclesiastic reform: his ambivalence regarding church rite reveals the pressures of nostalgia and popular opinion. Those very pressures eventually led to an Anglican compromise that provided a more musical worship experience than many early English Protestants had proposed (and a more musical experience than is found in the forms of Protestantism that prevailed on the European continent). Bale’s biography, while by nature unique, makes him a particularly representative product of the theatrical and religious climate of the early sixteenth century.

Born in Suffolk in 1495, Bale spent his early childhood in East Anglia, where plays like *Wisdom* and *Mary Magdalene*, discussed in chapter 1, were performed with frequency. The young Bale must have attended these popular theatrical events, for later he would go on to borrow forms and techniques from the drama of his childhood. While he grew up in a region full of practicing Lollards, Bale was resistant to reformed thought, and his parents sent him to the Carmelite House in Norwich when he was twelve. At the monastery, Bale was trained in sacred music, the antiphons and anthems and chants of Catholic rite, like these antiphons to the Virgin Mary, the Carmelite’s saint (track 5).

His earliest writings, all entirely orthodox, reveal a fascination with religious-musical experience, and one of his hymns to the Virgin, written in 1526, survives. He remained with the Norwich Carmelites until going up to Cambridge in 1514, as a member of the order. He studied at Cambridge while (future Archbishop of Canterbury) Thomas Cranmer was a fellow there, at a time when early humanism and Protestant ideas from the continent were being debated and

---

143 Bale ignores the Lollards in his earliest writings, and even soon after conversion “he was scarcely aware of their importance as ‘morning stars’ of the faith he had recently adopted.” He later regrets his ignorance and valorizes Wyclif throughout his career. Leslie Fairfield, *John Bale: Mythmaker for the English Reformation* (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 1976), 40.

promoted. Looking back later in life on his Cambridge years, however, Bale said that he wandered about Cambridge in “blindness of mind.” His early work exuberantly, vehemently upholds orthodoxy and the Carmelite order; it is filled with devotions to the Virgin Mary and other saints, reverence for the liturgy, and formal ecclesiastic scholarship.

Bale was known for his passionate orthodox fervor even while he came of age in a region with particularly marked religious hybridity. As discussed in chapter 1, East Anglia at the turn of the fifteenth century was relatively tolerant of the many forms of Lollardy that continued to be practiced and discussed in the region. Bale was not only likely exposed to East Anglian drama, but also the Carmelite order was well known for their dramatic production; drama would have marked his orthodox vocational practice, too. Thus, Bale’s pre-conversion experiences shaped the reformer-playwright in his later years. As a Protestant Reformer, Bale recalled his own early refusal of Lollardy and of Cambridge humanism, understanding the stubbornness of a religious subject brought up on the seductive images and sounds of the Catholic Church. As a Tudor playwright who understood the efficacy of religious drama, Bale refashioned the morality plays of his Suffolk youth in *Three Laws*, and the cycle drama that had been popular among the Norwich Carmelites in *God’s Promises*. But Bale did not merely rework old material: in *King Johan* he wrote the first extant English tragedy and England’s first history play. John Bale is truly a *Tudor* playwright in that his plays share features of both late medieval and early Elizabethan drama.

Bale’s break with Catholicism—at the behest of a Suffolk Protestant courtier—likely occurred around 1533, while he was a Carmelite Prior of the White Friars at Ipswich. He stayed on as a friar even after repudiating the Mass, sacraments like auricular confession, and the cult of Mary and the saints; he initially hoped to use his pulpit to spread the reformed

---

gospel. For the rest of his career, Bale was caught between external pressures—ever-changing official policies from the crown, vocational responsibility, financial and political pressures to support and protect his family—and his internal convictions, which had gone through a deep, very personal break.\footnote{Peter Happé lays out some of the challenges of early Tudor conversion: “In a period when both Catholics and Protestants could suddenly find themselves in mortal danger over their beliefs, the way toward change could not have been easy, especially as great political imperatives could overshadow religious belief from time to time.” Happé, \textit{John Bale}, 4.} Pursuing his passion for reform, he at last left the Carmelites in 1536 and moved to London, and his career as Protestant playwright and polemicist began.

His shift to radical religious politics came with significant personal risks. The consequences of Bale’s conversion and fiery promotion of reform included two exiles: the first to Wesel, Germany in 1540, after Henry VIII executed Bale’s friend, patron, and protector Thomas Cromwell, and again to Basel after the accession of Queen Mary in 1553, at which time Bale had been bishop of Ossory in Kilkenny, Ireland. While most of his plays were written in the late 1530s, “Bale and his Felowes,” as his company of actors was called, continued to perform the plays until the reign of Elizabeth, and Bale had many of them printed while in exile.

The frequency and extremity of changes in official religious policy in mid-sixteenth-century England meant that Bale’s reformed sense of self was in a dynamic relationship with Tudor power structures. Judith Butler writes of the “larger cultural and political predicament” of taking an oppositional relation to power: “the subject might be thought as deriving agency precisely from the power it opposes.”\footnote{Judith Butler, \textit{The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection} (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), 18.} As Stephen Greenblatt has pointed out, Tyndale’s gospel was most powerful when it was being burned, and there is a sense in
which Bale’s plays, too, were most potent when his reformed positions were most threatened.\textsuperscript{148}

While Bale does derive agency from the Catholic-leaning powers he opposes—a wavering Henry VIII and Queen Mary, in particular—his messages are more nuanced and compromised than Butler’s theories of power psychology might allow. While Bale’s critical reputation is that of an aggressive polemicist, his reforming zeal about music and aural experience is surprisingly moderate in his plays. The fissures created by Bale’s conversion—his early passion for the very rites and ceremonies he would later be obliged to condemn—produce a divided religious identity that gains external efficacy in the public sphere by the fact of its contradictions, for Bale’s complexities are not unique. Bale’s ability to articulate Protestantism is constituted by attachments to traditional religion he likely shared with many in his audience.

Bale’s company toured England, and later Ireland, playing to audiences filled with noblemen (even monarchs) and servants alike.\textsuperscript{149} These diverse audiences shared the experience of self-definition in a tumultuous political climate, and were all members of communities filled with sympathizers and practitioners of myriad types of ever-changing religious denominations. Bale often intentionally exploits his audience’s shared religious past and present diversity, for example when he recreates Catholic ritual in detail in order to parody it and hollow out its sanctity. But this man of the theater and Carmelite training is never able fully to advance the doctrine of \textit{sola scriptora}, in Luther’s phrase. Bale’s lifelong devotion to sacred musical experience makes him unable to uphold the Protestant message


\textsuperscript{149} White lays out the touring patterns of Bales troupe in \textit{Theater and Reformation}, 22–7. White calls Bale’s audiences both socially and demographically diverse, and finds in records of a 1538 performance of \textit{King Johan} in Canterbury that the audience included a shipman, higher clergy and nobility, and servants, 28.
that the way to salvation is through God’s word alone. Bale’s inability to abandon musical ritual entirely is indicative of the sort of compromising mindset and attachment to traditional religion that ultimately led to the formation of the Anglican Church.

Many early English Protestant reformers were adamantly against church music, and Bale agrees with this position in much of his polemical prose. In the Votaries, Bale complains that the “Popes clergie…speciallye in the churche here of Englanede” have commanded people to participate in “euensonges, howres, processions, lightes, masses, ryngynges, synginges, sensynges, and the deuyll and all of such hethnysh wares” (emphases mine).\textsuperscript{150} The characterization of music as a clerical practice meant to dupe its congregants into blind submission is typical of Protestant anti-ceremonialism. But while Bale toes the party line in his prose, he compromises this position when he writes for a medium that is itself performative. Theatrical performance mimics ritual performance in ways that print never can: it thus makes sense that it was through performance and not through prose-writing that Bale realized that music was an indispensable element of religious experience.

“Bale and his Felowes,” were primarily patronized by Thomas Cromwell, but they were supported by Archbishop Thomas Cranmer, too.\textsuperscript{151} The troupe contained at least five male actors, who had been musically trained, probably in the choir schools. The group likely included more ex-friars and clerics like Bale, and as Paul Whitfield White hypothesizes, “of course, every monk who had to participate in the divine office would have had some experience with plainsong and perhaps even with the polyphony fashionable in Tudor

\textsuperscript{150} John Bale, \textit{The Actes of English voltaryes} (Antwerp: S. Mierdman, 1546), http://eebo.chadwyck.com

\textsuperscript{151} Paul Whitfield White provides a history of Bale’s company, which is the only troupe prior to Shakespeare’s for which we can assign patron, playwright, and a repertory of extant plays. He thinks that it is representative of other troupes engaged in stage propaganda during the early Reformation; Bale’s is one of over fifty noblemen’s troupes on records. White, \textit{Theater and Reformation}, 12–13.
anthems and antiphons.”  

In three of his five extant plays—*Three Laws*, *King Johan*, and *God’s Promises*—Bale utilizes his company’s ability to perform musical theater filled with songs both sacred and profane, and with religious rituals both parodied and sincere. These three plays negotiate their audiences’ mixture of sympathies regarding traditional and reformed practices by representing Catholic rite as both ridiculous and, in certain contexts, efficacious, and by creating a specific and new kind of music for the Protestant church.

“Hearing is physiological, it needs direction,” writes Herbert Blau, and attention to the theatrical music of John Bale reveals a reformer interested in directing and refiguring aural experience. While much has been written about the Reformation of the image and visuality in Tudor religious and theatrical life, a closer look at contemporary representations and discussions of aurality reveals that there was an equally complex debate about aural phenomena. Although it is relatively easy for Bale to uphold the Protestant anti-image bias—*God’s Promises*, for example, is almost void of visual effects, and costumes and spectacle are nearly always Catholic and diabolical, he is unable to deny the efficacy of the auditory sense. Even as Bale fixates, in *King Johan* in particular, on the evils of auricular confession, the Word itself is often aurally experienced, through sermons or biblically inspired music. The sounds of Bale’s plays echo with the many conflicting practices and ideas about religious aurality resonating in Tudor churches, courts, streets, and performance spaces.

**THREE LAWS: SOLEMNITY AND SIN REDUX**

*Three Laws* is an apocalyptic rewriting of Christian history in which Infidelity and his six papal vices assault and corrupt God’s Laws through three periods of history, those of Natural Law, Moses’ Law, and Christ’s Law. As a reworked morality play, it is the play

---

152 Ibid., 21.

closest to Bale’s East Anglian dramatic roots. But Bale subverts that tradition, turning a play like *Wisdom* into Protestant polemic by making the Vice figures into Catholic clerics. The play’s figuring of the Roman Catholic Church as a corrupting force as old as time, and of the Pope as the Antichrist, is less than subtle polemic. The five-act play was likely written in the early 1530s when Bale was newly converted to Protestantism. As such, the play lambasts virtually every element of the Catholicism he had so recently left, from aural confession to masses for the dead to monasticism itself.154 However, for all of *Three Laws*’ ranting against Roman liturgy and music, the final act sees the restoration of God’s law celebrated musically, and the printed play ends with a sixty line macaronic “Songe upon Benedictus,” based upon verses from Luke.

Like all of Bale’s plays, *Three Laws* has long and varied performance and textual histories. It reached Tudor audiences from all religious and demographic groups, through a variety of forms, and in several locations. These performance and textual histories also reveal the play’s success: Bale continued to present and print it for decades. Evidence of doubling indicates that the play was performed by professional players, for aristocrats and townspeople alike; and Bale prepared a 1551 performance of *Three Laws* while Rector at Bishopstoke Hampshire, likely employing parishioners from the serving classes as actors. The text used for that performance probably resembled the one Bale had printed in Wesel, Germany in 1548 while in exile; that printing made the text widely available for reading and performance by other professional or amateur troops. *Three Laws* was performed in noble

---

154 David Bevington provides a thorough catalogue of the elements of traditional religion Bale represents and demeans: “paxes, images, *ave maria*, crossings and kissings, censing, candles, ear confession, beads, rings, cream, oil, relics, transubstantiation, justification by works versus faith, purgatory, masses for the dead, pilgrimages, pardons, simony, monasticism.” Bevington, *Tudor Drama and Politics*, 97.
households and churches, before powerful leaders and poor parishioners. Professionals, household servants, and at times, Bale himself acted it.\footnote{For more on the play’s performance history, see Happé, \textit{The Complete Plays} vol. 1, 22 and White, \textit{Theater and Reformation}, 12.}

\textit{Three Laws} retains the festive comedic and musical elements that marked the sort of drama that had been a part of Bale’s East Anglian monastic life, and a part of the cultural lives of much of his audience. The seven musical moments of \textit{Three Laws} borrow contexts from the drama of Bale’s youth: as in \textit{Wisdom} and the Digby \textit{Mary Magdalene}, Bale’s theatrical music represents the sacred, the profane, and the profaned sacred. But in \textit{Three Laws}, the profaners are not vaguely defined devil workers or ominous caricatures of religious alterity. The lead vice, Infidelitas (Infidelity) and the other vices of \textit{Three Laws} are very specifically Catholic; they are the leaders and workers of a Christian church, one with which much of Bale’s theater audience still identified. The awkward and cogent specificity of Bale’s vice figures and their crimes is made manifest in their perversions of Catholic rituals. The play’s musical moments allow the message to be contemporarily relevant and polemical, as opposed to allegorical and universal, as they are in East Anglian moralities.

The play begins with an address by Baleus Prolocuter, played by Bale himself in performances in which he was present. The Prolocuter’s final instruction reveals the playwright’s emphasis on the auralities of drama and religion. Whereas many late medieval and Tudor prologues end with a directive to watch, Baleus Prolocuter tells the audience that with the God actor now in his place, they should “marke therfor what he sayeth” (l. 35). The play’s first act, in which God explains to Naturae Lex (Natural Law), Moseh Lex (Moses’ Law) and Christi Lex (Christ’s Law) that they are distinct in person but one in the deity, does not feature any music.
The action of the second act centers on the corruption of Natural Law (the time between Adam and Moses) by two specific vices, Sodomismus (Sodomy) and Idololatria (Idolatry) both led by Infidelity. Infidelity enters singing a silly song:

Brom, brom, brom, brom, brom [broom]
Bye brom, bye, bye.
Bromes for shoes and powchernges [rings for closing a purse],
Botes and buskyns [half boots] for new bromes.
Brom, brom, brom. (176–180)\textsuperscript{156}

Musically advertising his brooms, he presents himself as a street peddler. The “Brom” song title is printed in the Stationer’s Register of 1563–4; broom-selling songs were a particularly popular type of street cry, and are still being recorded today (track 6).\textsuperscript{157} Extant copies of the play print a blank stave below the words—actors could fill in the popular tune to which they wanted to set the song, or even compose their own. The near proof of a catchy, upbeat tune breaking the auditory monotony of a performance that had until that point consisted only of formal dialogue about commandments indicates the extent to which melody and tempo are crucial connotative forces. If the audience’s attention had drifted, it is back now, and Bale has ensured that the audience will “mark” this crucial character, too.

The audience was likely pleased to hear such a familiar song, but that familiarity quickly extends beyond traditional street culture to the audience’s attachments to traditional religion. Part of Bale’s theatrical project is to manufacture an anachronistic precedent for Catholic corruption. Infidelity immediately follows his song by greeting Natural Law in a way that reveals him to be a practicing Catholic:

I wolde have brought ye the paxe,
Or els an ymage of waxe,
If I had knowne ye heare…
I was in soch devocyon,

\textsuperscript{156} Bale, \textit{The Complete Plays}, vol. 2, 72.

\textsuperscript{157} “Buy Broom Buzzems,” on \textit{Northumberland Alone}, Alex and Keith Swailes, Believe.
I had nere broken a vayne. (184–6, 191–92)

Infidelity’s status as peddler and Catholic implies that traditional religion profits from the selling of things: there is little difference between selling a broom or a pax (a tablet imprinted with the image of the crucifixion). The analogy is one that Bale must have found effective, for in his 1548 verse *An Answer to a Papistical Exhortation*, he replies to a papist attack by comparing the Pope’s poetic powers to those of a peddler: “Everye pylde pedlar/Wyll be a medlar/Though ther wyttes be drowsye/And the lernynge lowsye.”

Infidelity’s musical entrance thus not only instantly changes the play’s mood and form—we are now in a musical comedy—but also makes this vice character the most compelling and likable character on stage; traditional religion is rendered as a lack of fidelity, as popular, unserious, and seductive.

According to the doubling scheme printed in *Three Laws*, “into five personages maye the partes of thys Comedy be devyded,” with the first as: “The Prolocutour, Christen Fayth, Infydelyte.” That Bale would have cast himself as the vice, the play’s leading part and by far the most musical, indicates that he must have been a talented singer and entertainer. Bale’s thorough musical knowledge is easily proved by his prose tracts and letters (and will be discussed below) and easily suggested by his training as a Carmelite friar. One can speculate about where he acquired his performing chops—Carmelite drama and musical rites are certainly leading contenders—but at any rate, no playwright would assign himself to his play’s most musically and comedically challenging part if he was not confident that he would be up for the task.

---


159 Happé, *Complete Plays*, vol. 2., 121.
Bale, the former friar turned Protestant playwright/actor, exploits his monastic musical training to create a character whose singing dramatizes the corrupting power of Catholic ceremony, which Bale saw as selling indulgences, chantries, and prayers for the dead to benefit the Church and exploit the parishioners’ fears of death and purgatory. Infidelity’s song upon entrance establishes the crucial point that this—a silly peddler’s ditty—is the sort of music this character embraces. Later, when Infidelity and his cohorts sing from the Roman Breviary, profane music is directly equated with the jumbled Latin religious music that is as manipulative as peddler’s songs.

In the scene that ensues, Infidelity cajoles and teases the rather credulous Natural Law with a verbal skill that made at least one twenty-first-century reader laugh out loud. For all of Bale’s qualms about the evils of secular diversions, he was able to justify the use of the best tricks of the entertainment trade for his own purposes. But perhaps Bale’s casting of himself as Infidelity betrays some anxiety over the vulgar role: assured of his own moral fortitude, he took on the part to prevent another actor from potentially having too much soul-corrupting fun indulging in the acting of Infidelity’s sins.

The line between entertainment and efficacy is a fine one for Bale, who uses popular music and literary/dramatic forms with tenuous moral justification to capture his audience’s attention long enough to hear his polemic message. Regarding Bale’s use of comedy, Brian Gourley writes that “farce is admittedly never merely entertainment, rather it is a vehicle by which the political and theological views of the Reformation are openly disseminated and debated in the public realm.”¹⁶⁰ The play is funny, with Infidelity vowing to keep Natural Law as far away from his professed purpose to worship God alone “as my grandma kept her cat/from lyckynge of her creame” (341–2). But when Infidelity reveals a few lines later that

¹⁶⁰ Brian Gourley, “Carnivalising Apocalyptic History in John Bale’s King Johan and Three Laws,” 175.
his strategy for doing so is to unleash Sodomy and Idolatry on mankind, the play’s use of these specific vices—well-publicized alleged Catholic sins—raises the stakes considerably and turns the subject matter gravely serious and pointedly relevant. Entertainment here is not a distraction from the tedious controversies of Tudor England, but a hopefully efficacious vehicle for exposing and discussing those very controversies.

As with the drama of late medieval East Anglia, the Three Law’s immediate political and religious contexts define what drama can do, and in Bale’s case, these “plays of persuasion” do real work, slandering Catholic authority and ceremony.161

For example, when Sodomy and Infidelity enter together, Sodomy, dressed as a monk, says or sings:

Have in than, at a dash
With swash, myry annet swash
Yet maye I not be to rash
For my holy orders sake. (395–8)

Early editors have suggested that the italicized words are the refrain to a popular song, one sung in the later plays A Pore Helpe and Nicholas Udall’s Ralph Roister Doister.162 Whether or not Sodomy actually sings upon entrance, his arrival establishes the notion that he enjoys the pleasures of vulgar music. His musical tastes suggest that the sexual sins of monastic life—“sodomy” meant any kind of sexual depravity—are related to the monks’ indulgence in secular entertainments.163

---


163 The OED defines sodomy as “an unnatural form of sexual intercourse,” and documents early uses of the word that involve women, for example, 1387 Trevisa, Higden (Rolls) III. 5: “Mempricius...forsook his wyf at the laste, and vsede sodomye as a schrewe schulde.”
Bale addresses Catholic music’s effects on parishioners, too. Sodomy’s “owne swetehart of golde,” the sex-changing, darkly magical Idolatry, professes her adherence to the popish faith (480). In six stanzas, Idolatry mocks Catholic practice as pagan superstition:

Saint Germaine keeps her chickens from harm (507–9), and a bit of sheep’s dung with Saint Frances’ girdle will protect from an illness, for example (539–42). But the witch-Catholic’s first stanza contains the most biting satire. Read alone, these lines seem like the professions of a good Catholic:

I never mysse but paulter [mumble]
Our blessed ladys psaulter
Before saynt Savers aulter
With my bedes ones a daye.
And thys is my commen cast,
To heare Masse first or last,
And the holy frydaye fast,
In good tyme mowt I it saye (499–506).

Equating both idolatry and witchcraft to reading the Psalter, saying the rosary, and hearing the mass condemns contemporary practices that were still part of the lives of many in Bale’s audiences. Idolatry’s insistence that she “never mysse” a devotional or liturgical practice points to the stronghold the Church had on its adherents.

The idea that coercing congregants into hearing and reciting masses is part of the church’s plans for corrupting mankind is further elaborated on when Infidelity gives his instructions to Sodomy and Idolatry, on how to “corrupt in man / the lawe wryt in hys hart” (654–5). Infidelity gives distinct commands to each of the vices, and to Sodomy he charges the rituals and sounds of the Roman rites, emphasizing death rituals:

Set thu fourth sacramentals
Saye dyrge, and synge for trentals,
Stodye the Popes decretals,
And mixt them with buggerage [buggery/sodomy]. (671–4)
Thus it is implied that since the beginning of human history, an evil mixture of sacramentals
(that is, ceremonies that are not sacraments, like administering holy water), dirges, Requiem
masses, and other Papal music have been associated with unnatural sexual behavior.

Henry’s Ten Articles of 1536 aimed to get rid of “abuses…under the name of
purgatory” that were performed “to make men believe that through the Bishop of Rome’s
parrds souls might clearly be delivered out of purgatory.” But, the Purgatory article
maintained that a Christian man should “pray for souls departed…and also to cause others
to pray for them in masses and exequies [funeral rites], and to give alms to others to pray for
them.”164 Corporate intercession for the dead was one of the most central and persistent
rituals of traditional religion, and the Office for the Dead, the Placebo and Dirge, Trentals,
and the requiem Mass were the most stubbornly upheld practices throughout the
Reformation. When William Marshall issued an English Primer in 1534 that omitted the
Dirge, the outcry was so fierce that he reissued a second edition with the Dirge restored a
year later.165 Like many reformers, Bale found death rituals extra-biblical and open to
corruption, and was frustrated by Henry’s defense of them and their continued popularity.
Bale suggests that these songs and prayers for the dead fall on deaf ears while financially and
spiritually bankrupting the souls who perform them. Additionally, Sodomy’s role in
encouraging these aural death rites suggests that the desperation of the bereaved opens the
door for sexual abuse by the clergy.

The act ends dramatizing Bale’s thesis for Idolatry and the other corrupter of Natural
Law, Sodomy. The play suggests that man was first corrupted sexually, a seduction enabled

164 The Ten Articles of 1536 were the first articles of faith to be adopted by the Convocation during Henry’s
reign, and are an intriguing and problematic mixture of reformed and traditional doctrine. Reprinted in Religion
and Society in Early Modern Europe: A Sourcebook, ed. David Cressy and Lorainne Ferrell (New York: Routledge,

165 For more on traditional death rituals and the doctrine of Purgatory, see Duffy, The Stripping of the Altars,
338–376; 382.
by both the Church’s performance of ritualized music and its encouragement of secular music. Infidelity calls for a group song after the three vices lay out their plans for distorting Natural Law:

To quycken our sprets amonge  
Synge now some myry songe,  
But lete it not be longe,  
Least we to moch offende. (695–98)  

The “merry” song is not indicated, but Infidelity’s ironic suggestion that they keep it short so as not to offend too much implies that the actors were to sing something sufficiently bawdy, like the many drinking catches that remained popular throughout the sixteenth century (track 7).  

The stage directions and lines following the call for this secular song, printed in Latin, translate to:

After the song Infidelity shall say in a high/loud voice: Let us pray. Almighty and everlasting God, who has formed the laity in our image and likeness, grant, we beg, that just as we live by their sweat, so may we deserve to enjoy perpetually their wives, daughters, and maidservants. Through our lord Pope. (699–703)  

In this scene, profane song is immediately paired with a mock liturgical moment that suggests, in Latin, that church officials had sexual relations with female congregants, taking advantage of their authority as confessor and the relative privacy of the act of confession. The humor is dark and pointed, and would have been variously comprehended by those in

---

166 Act three ends much the same way, with Infidelity proposing a song at line 1219 to recreate their mind and celebrate his plans with Avarice and Ambition to corrupt Moses’ Law. Act four does not end in song, but Infidelity celebrates the burning of Christ at line 1754 by saying that he will not be able to sing and make cheer.  

167 “Troule the Bowle to me,” on compact disc accompanying Music and Society in Early Modern England. Marsh writes that this catch for unaccompanied men’s voices, printed in 1580, was “guaranteed to stimulate musical and alcoholic camaraderie among any small group of men,” 527.  
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the audience. The full force of the joke would have only been felt by those who understood the Latin: nobles and church officials, many monastically trained like Bale himself. For those who comprehended the joke, the accusation is harsh and lurid. Bale takes the risk of offending precisely those with the most power, but also, those most able to help enforce his propaganda. The immediate juxtaposition of bawdy song and sacred prayer suggests that corruption may be aural, and that Catholic monks are as depraved as those who perform lascivious songs. By linking carnal lust to aural penetration, Bale condemns Catholic monks as being both sexually and spiritually threatening.

White calls Bale’s mixture of vulgar songs and sacred rite an “original feature” of his stage polemic.\textsuperscript{169} It is more helpful, perhaps, to see his theatrical musical techniques as adapting the juxtaposition of sacred and profane used in the earlier East Anglian drama discussed in chapter one. That drama negotiated Lollard and orthodox religious difference, and Bale’s plays revise the alignments of good and evil to fit a new agenda and newly refigured hybridized audiences.

Act 3, the destruction of Mosch Lex (Moses’ Law) by Avaricia (Avarice) and Ambitio (Ambition), continues to suggest sexual depravity among church leaders and their music, beginning with Infidelity’s tour-de-force reenactment of a duet of sorts between a friar and an old nun. At the top of the act, Infidelity enters in the middle of a laughing fit. Moses’ Law, innocently eager to make a friend, asks Infidelity what is so funny, and Infidelity reports that the fun happened the previous night at Compline:

\begin{quote}
In ded yester daye it was their dedycayon,
And thyrde in Gods name came I to se the fashion.
An olde fryer stode forth with spectacles on hys nose
Begynnynge thys Anteme—a my fayth, I do not glose—
\textit{Lapides preciosi}. (810–14)
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{169} White, \textit{Theater and Reformation}, 38.
The *Lapides preciosi* comes from the *Breviarum Romanum*’s common for the dedication of a church. As with Infidelity’s act 2 entrance, a blank stave is given, allowing an actor to write down the tune they sing, and it is likely that the actor sang at least a few lines from the Divine Office here. The demands of Latin and singing in the role of Infidelity mean that any troupe performing this play would have cast an actor trained in liturgical music; Bale himself originated the role. Thus the part requires an actor to call upon his memories of the liturgy to recreate in jest what he once sang in earnest.\(^{170}\)

The mockery continues when Moses’ Law asks what followed the friar’s song. Infidelity explains that the nun was “Crowynge lyke a capon, and thus began the Psalme:

/Saepe expugnaverunt me a iuventute mea‖ (818–9). Again a blank stave is given, and the represented nun is to sing from Psalm 128:1; the Latin translates to “often they have overcome me in my youth.” An audience member trained in Latin would perhaps get the joke immediately, but for the laity in the audience, Infidelity explains the salaciousness:

A symple probleme of bytcherye [lechery]  
Whan the fryre begonne, afore the nonne,  
To synge of precyouse stones  
‘From my youth,’ sayt she, ‘they have confort me,’—  
As it had bene for the nones. (821–5)

That is, the nun had responded to the friar’s reference to “precyouse stones” by implying that there are stones—testicles—that have long brought her and her fellow nuns comfort. Bale’s inclusion of this bawdy joke not only suggests sexual encounters between monastic “celibates” and nuns (a theme that recurs throughout several of Bale’s prose tracts), but also it implies that church ritual itself contains coded references to such improprieties. The laity may not know what filth they hear and sing, so polluted and convoluted is the Latin breviary.

---

\(^{170}\) Happé emphasizes that “Singers trained at choir schools would have very detailed memories of the liturgy,” *The Complete Plays*, vol. 1, 24.
In the third act, Avaricia (Avarice) explains that the priests, and thus also the laity, are kept stupid by the tediousness of Latin hours:

The byshoppes must holde their prestes in ignoraunc
With longe Latyne houres, least knowledge to them chaunce;
Lete them have longe mattens, longe evensonges and longe masses;
And that wyll make them as dull as ever were asses. (1145–8)

A similar point is made in act 4 when Hypocrisis (Hypocrisy), a grey friar, explains to Christi Lex (Christ’s Law) that he is too busy to preach God’s word because “We have long mattens, long laudes, houres, longe pryme; / Masse, evensonge, complyne and all must be done in tyme” (1625–6). The idea that the rites of traditional religion are meant to keep priests and the laity too busy to hear God’s word and too stupid to know the difference is less outrageous than the claim that there are sexual innuendos imbedded in sacred services. Even an audience member resistant to reform might concede the point that the ritual requirements of the Church take a lot of time, and that their repetition drowns out the auralities—preaching, scripture reading—that Protestants found more efficacious.

After three acts of equating music with the devil, manipulation of the laity, and sexual depravity, one might expect that Bale’s vision of a reformed religion is one that privileges the word to the exclusion of musical worship. The final act, a version of Revelation, features a vengeful God’s apocalyptic burning of Infidelity and the restoration of the three laws. The play ends, in the early Edwardian printing of 1548, praising Henry for his role in banishing Infidelity’s six vices from England and asserting that “hys noble sonne Edwarde,” and “Quene Kateryne and the noble Lorde Protectour” would continue to perform that Reformation (2033, 2040). Thus Bale pairs the biblical banishment of Antichrist with contemporary England’s religious politics.

God restores each of the three laws through verbal speech acts: three 6-line purifications banishing forever the offending vices in succession. The Laws’ immediate
reaction, the first actions of what is symbolically the new church, are not a request to hear
the gospel, as one might expect in a play focused on restoring the primacy of the biblical
word. After praising God and promising to serve the people, the Laws call for song:171

\[\text{Naturae Lex:} \text{ In} \text{ rejoice} \text{ of} \text{ thys, make we} \text{ some} \text{ melodye.} \]
\[\text{Moseth Lex:} \text{ The} \text{ name of} \text{ our} \text{ God} \text{ to} \text{ prayse} \text{ and} \text{ magnyfye.} \]
\[\text{Christi Lex:} \text{ I as} \text{ sen} \text{ therto, and wyll syngle} \text{ very gladlye.} \]
\[\text{Hic ad Dei gloriae cantabunt} \text{ ‘In exitu} \text{ Israel de} \text{ Aegypto,’ vel aliud simile.} \text{ [This to the} \text{ Glory of} \text{ God they sing ‘when} \text{ Israel came out of} \text{ Egypt’ or some such song.]} \]

(1911–3)

The stage direction suggests that the three laws sing from the Psalter (this is Psalm 113), but
the exact song is left open to improvisation.

The song could have been one of Bale’s own creations. The 1548 playtext ends with
a sixty-six line macaronic “Song upon Benedictus Compyled by Johan Bale.” There are no
directions about when and how the song is to be sung, but the words “thus endeth thys
comedy concernyng the laws” are not printed until after the song’s text, so the song is
clearly part of the play.172 The text comes not from the Psalms but from Luke 1:68-79,
which is also used in the canonical lauds of Roman rite; the Latin scriptural components are
thus well known and related to the theme of Psalm 113 that is suggested in the stage
directions. Interestingly, Bale leaves the Latin gospel untranslated, adding lines of his own
English between the first and last lines of each verse, as in the first stanza:

Benedictus dominus Deus Israel
Whych hath overthrowne the myghty Idoll Bel,
The false god of Rome, by poure of the Gospell,
And hath prepared from the depe lake of hell,
Redemptionem plebis sue. (1–5)

171 Happé points out that the Laws’ lines immediately preceding this introduction to song (906–10) paraphrase
the Nunc dimittis from the Compline service, Complete Plays, 2:179. Thus even before song is called for, Bale is
creating a reformed version of Catholic rite.

172 The song is printed on page 124 of Happé’s edition.
It may be that Bale includes a capitulation to traditional religion here as a way “to sugar the pill of the new learning…among his spectators who might not be convinced,” as Thora Blatt suggests. But while it is perhaps a savvy move to include a linguistically hybridized song enacting the heterogeneity of practices from Roman rite to Protestant anti-ceremonialism, Bale’s inclusion of the song goes against the tide of the movement of which he was a part. During the course of Three Laws’ performance history, this reformed music was variously conservative, outlawed, or consistent with monarchical preference.

Peter LeHuray documents the extensive Edwardian reforms stipulating severe restrictions on singing in church. The song printed at the end of Three Laws would have been illegal under many of the 1540s Edwardian reforms enacted while the play continued to be performed and reprinted; only hymns of praise to God directly, and in English, were to be sung. Bale, for all his concern over the evils of confusing and manipulative Latin music, fights for the retention of some music in a reformed church, provided that it is scripturally based. That this music is more compromised, and more papal, than the music he and his fellow reformers advocate in their prose suggests Bale’s desire to appeal to diverse audiences even while asserting Protestant ideals; it also suggests a personal inability to part entirely with the ritual elements of his formative years.

Bale is unwilling to imagine a church without music. While remaining adamant in his condemnation of extra-biblical music, like funeral dirges, he advocates a place for more scripturally based singing. Bale’s Carmelite upbringing and lifelong interest and participation in liturgical culture may betray the purity of his sola scriptorum message, but his inability completely to condemn traditional musical practices kept his work and ideas persistently

---


relevant and politically sound through much of the mid-sixteenth century, as Henry VIII and Elizabeth I (as well as the Catholic Queen Mary, of course) expressed a similar unwillingness to part with sacred music.

**King Johan: Killing Kings and Ceremonies**

Like *Three Laws*, *King Johan* engages in that typical obsession of early Protestant reformers: the search for and invention of historical precedent for their reforms. And also like *Three Laws*, *King Johan* sacrifices historical accuracy for the sake of polemic. Bale refashions England’s thirteenth-century king into a proto-Protestant martyr, at odds with allegorical-turned-historical figures like Sedition, who becomes Archbishop Stephen Langton, and Usurped Power, revealed to be the Pope himself. Bale’s *King Johan* anachronistically rails against ceremonies of the Church while calling for attention and adherence to the gospel alone. Before his execution, King Johan describes the sounds of Catholicism—bells, singing, instrumental music—as noisy trash preventing the aural flow of scriptural teaching:

```
Why, know ye it not? The prechyng of the Gospel.
Take to ye yowre traysh, yowre ryngyng, syngyng and pypyng,
So that we may have the scryptures openyng. (1391–3)
```

The play is filled with satiric representations of this “ryngyng, syngyng, and pypyng,” presented in varying degrees of correspondence with the Roman rite. In an early analysis of the play, Edwin Miller points out that rites make up fully one fifth of *King Johan*, causing Bale’s propaganda to be “emotional” for an audience still invested in and practicing such

---

175 The point is explored at some length in Fairfield, *John Bale*, 56.

176 For more on this sacrifice, see Pineas, “The Polemical Drama of John Bale,” 194.

cere monies. The play reacts strongly and specifically to Henry’s Ten Articles of 1536, which upheld and protected Catholic traditional rituals, including auricular confession.

While on one level *King Johan* has often been read as a polemic in support of Royal Supremacy, critics like David Scott Kastan have pointed out the instability of such an assertion. Bale’s *King Johan* resembles a fantasy king created by a wishful playwright more than the real King Henry. Bale’s king would have pleased many in what was perhaps the play’s initial audience: records show that the play was performed by Bale and His Fellows, patronized by Cromwell, at the household of Cranmer during the 1538–39 Christmas season. When performed for these chief architects of the English Reformation, Bale’s tragic play served as a warning to the country’s most important religious leaders of what could be at stake if the reformist cause continued to lose ground. The play’s political edge sharpened as the Tudor period wore on; a disillusioned Bale revised it in the late 1540s after the accession of Edward VI, and he added an epilogue in 1560, as a newly crowned Elizabeth I was confronting the consequences of Queen Mary’s Catholic regime.

The precise performance history of *King Johan*, which only survives in manuscript, will never be known. Greg Walker argues that the play, with its direct political messages, was only meant as a specific intervention for powerful courtly audiences and was never intended for print. Whether or not it was printed, it is clear that this play’s primary goal was to address Henry’s backsliding on reform, and, in later revisions, to warn new monarchs of the

178 Edwin Miller, “The Roman Rite in Bale’s *King Johan*,” *PMLA* 64 (1949): 803, 802. Recently, Alice Hunt claimed that Bale used staged ceremony to show that rite is not ineffective as such, but lacks legitimate authorization unless it is justified by the gospel, *The Drama of Coronation: Medieval Ceremony in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 107.

179 Kastan, “‘Holy Wurdes’ and ‘Slypper Wit,’” 272.

180 Evidence of this performance is explained in Walker, *Plays of Persuasion*, 173, 194.

181 Ibid., 169–215. Happé argues, however, that the play was revised for print, *John Bale*, 24.
dangers of following in his overly compromising footsteps. Its most immediate audiences were the powerful ecclesiastic and governmental authorities in its many courtly performances.

The two-act *King Johan* opens with the widow Englande telling the king about the grief she endures under the country’s clergy. Sedicyon enters, presenting himself as the gossipy vice from the start: “What, yow two alone? I wyll tell tales, by Jesus!” (43). Tyrants of medieval drama like Caesar or the King and Queen of Marseilles in the Digby *Mary Magdalene* (discussed in chapter 1) usually swear by a perverted non-Christian trinity: Mahound, Apollo, Termagaunt. In Sedition and his cohorts, Bale creates characters that take the dramatic tradition of swearing by religious others and perverts it into a swearing by Christian deities and practices: “by Jesus,” and “by the Holy Trinity!” (52). In Bale’s dangerous dramatic world, vices are no longer evil pagans: they invoke the same God any law-abiding Englishman does, and acoustically identical oaths are a matter of intent.

The play’s first musical moment reiterates that point. Sedition’s stage direction as he waits for the entrance of his partner in crime, Dissimulation, is simply: “seyng the leteny” (636). Litanies are infinitely repeatable; listen for example to track 8.182 The Sedition actor sings the actual litany of the saints, still protected under English law in the 1530s and early 40s. He breaks it up with barnyard vulgarities: “Lyst, for Godes passyon! I trow her cummeth sum hoggherd / Callyng for his pygges: such a noyse I never herd!” (637–8). Once on stage, Dissimulation joins the singing, and the Latin turns parodic and is mixed with the vernacular, as praying is equated with cursing:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Dissimulation syng: } & \text{Sancte Dominice, ora pro nobis. (Pray for us, Saint Dominic)} \\
\text{Sedicyon syng: } & \text{Sancte pyld monache, I beshrow vobis. (Saint Bald Monk, I curse you)}
\end{align*}
\]

---

Dissimulaycon syng: Sancte Francisse, ora pro nobis. (Pray for us, Saint Francis) (639–41)

The difference between a prayer and a curse is also a matter of intent, and Bale implies that whenever Catholic officiates pray, they take the Lord’s name (literally) in vain.\(^{183}\) When Dissimulation continues, it is to pray for King Johan’s death through the *Pater Noster*, another legal Christian practice. Defending his decision to pray to the church for Johan’s death, Dissimulation parodies the Libera Me: “Here syng this: / A Johanne Rege iniquo, libera nos, Domine” (650). The parroting of sacerdotal singing is likely to have amused those who already saw such pronouncements as mere performance, and the scene sets up Bale’s play-length metaphor of Church power as stagecraft.

The theatricality of the Mass was “the very basis of the searching and vituperative polemics of reform,” in Sarah Beckwith’s words.\(^{184}\) Indeed, the casting of priests as apish actors who trick congregants into taking bread for body was common rhetoric in early Protestant prose. Beckwith sees Bale’s *King Johan* as staging ritual in order to transform it into disguise: it is “an antitheatrical campaign that sought to render suspicious the entirety of Roman ceremony.”\(^{185}\) Beckwith focuses on attempts by Bale and other reformers to deauthorize the Eucharist as the center of ecclesiastic power “through a systematic figuration of ecclesiastical office as theater,” but the play also refigures death ritual, auricular confession, and other aural and visual sacramentals as mere theater.\(^{186}\)

---


185 Ibid., 145.

186 Ibid., 149.
Bale creatively exploits the theatricality of the Roman Church by turning Dissimulation into a producer of sorts, who assigns parts to his cast of clerics and prelates in order to keep congregants paying hefty sums. Unsurprisingly, the first roles Dissimulation mentions are those who sing in Latin:

To wynne the peple I appoynt yche man his place:  
Sum to syng Latyn, and sum to ducke at grace;  
Sum to go mummyng, and sum to beare the crosse…  
Though I seme a shepe, I can play the suttle foxe:  
I can make Latten to bryng this gere to the boxe. (698–700, 714–15)

Assigning roles for the lucrative production of religion, Bale’s Dissimulation reveals the playwright’s familiarity with the professional theater world of which he was a part. Bale combines personal experiences—his time as a Carmelite and his employment as a player/playwright—to fashion a diabolical theatrical economy for the Catholic characters in the world of the play. Doing battle with his own past as well as his ongoing theatrical career, Bale’s assaults deploy the material conditions of his own early life and set a standard of Protestant purity that is ultimately untenable, and unrealized in an Anglican compromise that retained many of the traditional practices Bale’s play mocks.

The play continues to make a travesty of Bale’s Carmelite past as more characters of ecclesiastical authority perform the liturgy. Unchanged or minimally altered quotations of the Breviary are desacramentalized by their theatrical context—a ritual moment is often immediately followed by the same characters performing a vulgar song and dance. The theatricality of such musical moments builds as Dissimulation and Sedition welcome Private Wealth, a cardinal of Dissimulation’s own upbringing, and his friend, Usurped Power, to the stage. Their entrance, as would be typical of morality play vices, is musical:

*Here cum in Usurpyd Powre and Private Welth, syngyn on after another.*  
*Usurpid Powre syng this: Super flumina Babilonis suspenderimus organa nostris.*  
*Privat Welth syng this: Quomodo cantabimus canticum bonum in terra aliena.* (764–5)
The words come almost verbatim from Psalm 136:1–4, and Sedition correctly identifies the Office of the Dead, a ritual that reformers strongly opposed: “[b]y the mas, me thinke they are syngyng of placebo” (766, emphasis editorial). While Usurped Power’s Latin is a direct quotation of the Psalms (“By the waters of Babylon we hung our harps”), Private Wealth changes one word, putting the word “bonum” (good) in for the Vulgate’s “domini” (God’s). Private Wealth thus asks not “How shall we sing the Lord’s song in a new land,” but “how shall we sing a good song in a new land?” Private Wealth has presented himself and his friend as musical entertainers, more concerned with their ability to sing good songs than with singing God’s songs. The portrayal of prelates as skilled entertainers implies that a church so heavily invested in its musical production rewards performance skill more than faithfulness or knowledge. The scene further suggests that Roman ecclesiasts are entertainers first, that for them the visual and aural aesthetics of ritual are more important than the ceremony’s ability to convey a message or communicate with God.

The anxiety that church leaders are merely good showmen is further demonstrated when, in one of the play’s most comic physical spectacles, Private Wealth, Usurped Power, and Dissimulation lift Sedition up in the air, and the four burst into song. Sedition immediately complains about the ineptitude of his lifters, warning: “I wyll beshyte yow all yf ye sett me not downe softe” (804). Later, he jokes about his literal levity and calls for music:

I am so mery that we are mett, by Saynt John,  
I fele not the groune that I do go upon.  
For the love of God, lett us have sum mery songe. (825–7)

The sight of three men lifting a fourth in the air would have been a memorable one, and physical comedy requires skill and practice. Thus when Usurped Power responds to Sedition’s request for music with “Begyne thy self than, and we shall lepe in amonge” (828), the verb “lepe” is likely a directive. The song is probably a dance, and perhaps one that
included keeping Sedition aloft, or tossing him about. After Sedition praises the
performance—“I wold ever dwell here to have such mery sporte” (829)—Private Wealth
reveals Usurped Power to be the pope:

Private Wealth: Thow mayst have yt, man, ye thow wast hether resorte,
For the holy father ys as good a felowe as we.
Disimulation: The Holy Father? Why, I pray the, which is he?
Private Wealth: Usurpid Powre here, which thought he apparaunt be
In this apparell, yet hathe he autoryte. (830–5)

Beckwith emphasizes the way in which disguise and spectacle (to which I would
add acoustic performance) are the theatrical elements at the heart of Protestant critique of Catholic rite.
For Beckwith, the disguises of Usurped Power and his friends mean that the work of the
play is to uncover disguise itself, that is, to uncover “not that the actors are monks and
ecclesiasts, but that the ecclesiasts are actors.” But it must also be noted that these
uncovered actors are, in many cases, ex-friars. Their characters’ point about disguise is
granted extra authority by the actors’ former religious positions. Bale’s Fellows are
powerfully able to reveal that monks and other ecclesiasts are mere actors because they used
to be monks and now work as actors.

By figuring the pope as a singer and dancer in disguise, the play argues that he and all
who follow him enable music both “sacred” and profane in order to corrupt souls and
generate revenue. Throughout his career as a polemicist, Bale continued to express the
notion that minstrel music and popish music were related, as in his Epistle Exhortatorye of
1544. The epistle goes so far as to imply that Catholics encouraged the profanity of minstrels
and players:

Non leaue ye [Catholic prelates] vnueced and vntribled / No so moche as the poore
mynstress players of interludes / but ye are doyn with them. So longe as they played

---
187 Beckwith, Signifying God, 152.
and sange bawdye songes / blasphege God and corruptinge mennes consciences ye neuer blamed them / but were verye well contented.\textsuperscript{188}

Sedition, Private Wealth, and Usurped Power’s songs and dances identify them as vices, economically equating the pope’s Catholicism with “corruptinge” entertainments. “Bawdy songes” are thus an indispensible theatrical device for Bale’s polemic, belying his condemnation of these entertainments in his non-dramatic writings.

The Vespers for the Dead and whatever popular song the four actors perform are both mined from the daily lives of the audience, from their ecclesiastic and secular community engagements. When familiar tunes are reproduced, the melodies recall the contexts in which the listener first or most often heard them; in this case, a church service that had sincerely included the Office and any number of everyday locations in which popular songs are sung. The performance of familiar tunes also inspires a sense of participation. Whether or not an auditor sings along or taps his toes, he is finishing the tune in his head along with the performers in participatory anticipation. The play’s message, that the Roman death rite has distracted from and corrupted the chances of salvation, becomes a personal experience. While experiencing \textit{King Johan} in performance, an audience member’s memories of his own spiritual and demotic engagements are exploited to demonstrate the point that everyone has been duped by the powers of sedition.

The play continues to get personal as it relentlessly derides the most private of sacraments, that of auricular confession. The issue was especially fraught when the play was composed and first performed. Henry’s Ten Articles upheld the full sacrament of penance and auricular confession in no uncertain language:

\begin{flushright}
\textit{Item}, that in no wise they do contemn this auricular confession which is made unto ministers of the church, but that they ought to repute the same as a very expedient and necessary mean, whereby they may require and ask this absolution at the priest’s
\end{flushright}

hands, at such time as they shall find their consciences grieved with mortal sin, and have occasion so to do, to the intent they may thereby attain certain comfort and consolation of their consciences.\(^{189}\)

Against this legal article, Bale sides with Cromwell and Cranmer in understanding auricular confession as a means of papal and episcopal domination, a way to exert undue power over the laity.\(^{190}\)

The topic of confession first arises early in act 1 when Sedition explains to King Johan that he dwells undetected in a priest’s costume, hearing “ere confessyon” underneath “benedicte” (267). The sacrament is so efficient for the Catholic vices’ spying that it becomes central to their plan to take down King Johan. When Usurped Power returns (now dressed as the Pope), along with Private Wealth (as a Cardinal) and Sedition (as archbishop Stephen Langton), the three chastise him for his loose lips. In what ensues, the words and gestures of confession are mocked:

*The Pope:* Ah, ye are a blabbe! I perseyve ye wyll tell a
I lefte ye not here to be so lybera
*Knele and knoke on thi bryst.*

*Dissymulacyon:* Mea culpa, mea culpa, gravissima mea culpa!
Geve me yowre blyssing *pro Deo et sancta Maria.*

*The Pope:* Thow hast my blyssyng. Aryse now and stond asyde.

*Dissymulacyon:* My skyn ys so thyke yt wyll not throw glyde. (1026–31)

After the three formally curse King Johan, the pope calls for a final song “to syn[g] meryly” before they disperse, and thus ceremony is again paired with profane, silly music (1054). The satire is the sharper for its proximity to real confession. The fact that Dissimulation recites words from the actual rite—the one still prescribed by English law—boldly asserts that the current practices under Henry are sinful and ridiculous. The play’s biting treatment of a


\(^{190}\) In Henry’s Six Articles of 1539, which were more conservative still, confession is again defended: “Sixthly, that auricular confession is expedient and necessary to be retained and continued, used and frequented in the church of God,” reprinted in *Religion and Society*, 26. White points out that where it not for Bale’s protection from Cromwell, the play’s debunking of Auricular Confession would have landed Bale in jail. White, *Theater and Reformation*, 21. As is mentioned above, Cromwell’s 1540 execution ended that protection, at which point Bale’s first exile began.
sacrament Henry repeatedly and specifically upheld reveals the extent to which Bale uses the play as a platform for protest and critique.

At the start of the act two, the priestly benefits of auricular confession to which Sedition alluded in Act One are reaped when Nobility confesses his sins to Sedition (1148–89). Before absolving him, Sedition bribes and manipulates Nobility, describing his power to do so as a sort of spell: “Naye, whyll I have yow here underneath *benedicite, / In the Popes be halfe I must move other thynges to ye‖ (1166–7). Believing that Sedition’s claim to papal authority is equivalent to divine authority, Nobility submits, and Sedition absolves him of all his sins. The play demonstrates how easily the manipulative spell of confession turns even the most well-minded into Popish puppets, seduced into committing treason and forfeiting their privacy by falsely authorized ceremony. Sacerdotal confession, falsely ritualized by ceremony, betrays an issue that for reformers should have been between a sinner and his or her God. The early reformers—Bale, Tyndale, Cranmer, and Cromwell—continue Lollardy’s critique of auricular confession, which is represented in *Wisdom* (chapter 1). The betrayal of privacy and the nature of sins (which are often sensational) create a “tawdry oddity,” a sacrament that was attacked on similar grounds by both Lollards and Protestants.

Confession and absolution are again briefly parodied when the King is stripped of his power and forced to confess to sins he did not commit (1781–5). Thus Bale approaches the issue of auricular confession from several angles: he suggests the ceremony’s
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192 Along with Bale, Tyndale also agreed with the Lollards that confession had resulted in sexual abuses and that the rite itself lacked historical justification. See Donald Dean Smeeton, *Lollard Themes in the Reformation Theology of William Tyndale* (Kirksville, MO: Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies, 1986), 218.

manipulative power, its histrionic capacity, and even its ability to assist in usurping legitimate authority. While the wrong kinds of music, and too much of it, drown out the laity’s ability to hear the direct gospel truth, confessing sins one may or may not have committed into the intermediary ears of a priest—one of the few Catholic sacraments performed in part in the vernacular—orally releases information and personal sentiments that are used against a confessee. In Bale’s formulation, the Catholic powers produce a deafening, muddled Latin clamor that keeps the people from God’s clear and true word, and then they coerce them into sharing personal and political information, instead of encouraging them to pray to God directly in their own tongue, or to use their breath to spread the Gospel.

The final scenes of the play associate all types of music with Catholic evil. As King Johan falls from power and is murdered, the vices repeatedly call for and perform celebratory music. Before he enters, disguised as the monk who will poison the king, Dissimulation is heard offstage singing a secular Christmas drinking song:

Wassayle, wassayle, out of the mylke payle,
Wassayle, wassayle, as whyte as my nayle,
Wassayle, wassayle, in snowe, froste, and hayle. (2086–8)\(^{194}\)

Once on stage, Dissimulation is all solemnity and submission, duping King John into trusting him. The offstage song serves to remind the audience of how disguise and dissimulation work. A drunken fool can play the parts of a monk and a murderer with ease: the fun “never wyll fayle.” For these depraved dissimulators, the play implies, secular holiday traditions like Wassailing are no different than the supposedly sacred music prescribed by the Catholic Church.\(^{195}\)

\(^{194}\) For another Christmas carol celebrating the season’s festive drinking, listen to track 9, “A merry caroll for the same day.” Dufay Collective. Audio CD accompanying Marsh.

\(^{195}\) Duffy writes about the way in which Masses of the Christmas season had particularly widespread lay familiarity, with frequent incorporation into carols, *Stripping of the Altars*, 15. This suggests to me a long
The Roman Church’s sacred music is called for right after Dissimulation hands King Johan the poison. Sedition had promised that Dissimulation would avoid hell after his crime because he would employ five monks to sing the mass for his soul (2041). Before King Johan makes his dying speech, Sedition delivers on his promise:

*Sedicyon:* I have provided for the, by swete Saynt Powle. Fyve monkes that shall syrge contynually for thy sowle. That, I warande the, thu shalt not come in helle.

*Dissimulacyon:* To sende me to heaven goo rynge the holye belle And syrge for my sowle a masse of *Scala Celi,* That I maye clyme up aloft with Enoch and Heli. I do not doubte it but I shall be a saynt. (2124–30)

After duplicitously poisoning his sovereign, Dissimulation feels confident of his salvation and assured of sainthood. Thus in the world of *King Johan,* music creates and accompanies sin, but also, it ameliorates the immediate effects of even the most heinous of transgressions. It is particularly apt that the Mass is for Cecilia, patron saint of church musicians and music. Bale is concerned, like all reformers, with the corruption of death rituals, and he is particularly concerned with the rituals’ seductively musical auralities. The sounds of Roman rite—prayers for the dead, vocalized confessions to priests, incomprehensible incantations and chants—drown out the gospel and draw hearers into a false sense of eschatological security.

After the dead King Johan is solemnly eulogized, a transhistorical, royal Protestant figure called Imperial Majesty restores control by commanding Civil Order, Nobility, and Clergy to ensure that the Gospels reclaim their rightful place (2438–39). Imperial Majesty also plans to exile Sedition and his co-conspirators. As if on cue, Sedition stumbles upon the scene, singing: “Pepe I see ye! I am glad I have spyed ye” (2457). Bale finds it so important

---

196 The character Imperial Majesty is a direct appeal to Henry VIII and the political establishment. Henry continued to insist on an Augustinian imperial model of church leadership throughout his lifetime.
that his metaphorically tone deaf vice enter singing that he draws a stave of music.\textsuperscript{197}

Sedition’s jarring jollity after the seriousness of Imperial Majesty’s restoration of order renders followers of Catholicism as frivolous and out of touch. Sedition explains that his fun-loving ways are just like those of his hero the Pope, “a trymme fellawe, a ryche fellow, yea, and myry fellawe” (2557). When asked by Imperial Majesty how Sedition proves that the Pope is a merry fellow, Sedition replies: “He hath pypes and belles, with kyrye, kyrye, kyrye” (2564).

The kyries of papists—their singing, their instruments—in this play sound like the clamor of minstrels, the sounds of sin. \textit{King Johan} does not end in song, as in \textit{Three Laws}, but with a solemn prayer. The final mood is one of warning, projecting the unsettled feeling that in a land still echoing with profanities, souls duped into sacerdotal confession, and baffling Latin rite, the job of the Reformers is far from complete. The play’s message on the evils of music is consistent with the John Bale who wrote in his 1545 \textit{Image of Both Churches} that the first thing the papists did after banishing “Christ and his pure doctrin for euer” was to set up “songe in the church with the Latine seruice, bell ringing, and Organ playinge.”\textsuperscript{198} A savvy polemicist, Bale is unrelenting in his response to Henry’s Ten Articles, exposing or fabricating the dangers of the ceremonies—death rituals and auricular confession in particular—that Henry’s laws protect.

Yet even while \textit{King Johan} presents the consistent message that music is always a corrupting force, \textit{God’s Promises}, written around the same time, performed far more widely, and printed for an even larger distribution, asserts an opposite thesis. If, as Beckwith claims,

\textsuperscript{197} \textit{King Johan} exists in manuscript form only, and Bale himself draws a stave of music that John Stevens transcribes for Happe’s edition, 93. Bale’s stave can be seen on page 57 of his manuscript, a facsimile of which can be found in \textit{Kynge Johan}, Materialen zue Kunde de älteren englischen Dramas, vol. 25 (Vaduz, Germany: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1963).

“the undeniable force of [Bale’s] theatrical logic is the obliteration of Catholic ritual and ceremony,” in God’s Promises Bale reconstructs and re-forms ceremony from the ruins, fashioning a new ritualized music for the reformed church. Against the vulgar music and distorted rites of King Johan, the sincere antiphons of God’s Promises reveal Bale’s deep ambivalence regarding sacred music.

**God’s Promises: Musical Compromise**

God’s Promises is the first of three surviving plays, along with Johan Baptystes Preachynge and The Temptation of our Lord, comprising Bale’s biblical cycle. After a Praefatorio spoken by Bale himself (“Baleus Prolocutor”), the play is divided into seven short and formal acts, each featuring a biblical story in which one man interacts with God and is granted a promise. That promise is celebrated, in each act, with a musical antiphon, printed in both Latin and English. In order, they tell of God’s promises to Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, Isaiah, and finally John the Baptist, creating a segue into Johan Baptystes Preachynge. One actor would have played God throughout, while a second would have played all of the other characters.

The play has received little critical attention, and that attention has often been harsh: it is “hard to imagine a less attractive way to win converts,” writes Lois Potter, and Cathy Shrank comments that “Bale chooses to tell, not show,” deliberately emphasizing word over spectacle. Both critics underestimate the vital role God’s Promises’ antiphons play in making God’s represented word attractive to the unconverted. Indeed, the play privileges the word over visual spectacle, but it also gives musical sound a prominent theatrical and devotional role. The esteem that sacred music is given in the play is a radical departure from the

---


perverted liturgy and the profane songs of *Three Laws* and *King Johan*, and the anti-music wrath of many of Bale’s prose tracts. *God’s Promises* offers a Protestant sacred musical alternative to the Catholic rite Bale hated. While Bale thoroughly discards some of its central ritual practices—auricular confession, offices for the dead—his music for antiphonal worship, the anthems that were musically central to most services, changes Roman liturgical practice very little. Bale does not forget his debt to his religious past, to England’s religious past.

*God’s Promises* was likely written later in the 1530s than *Three Laws* or *King Johan*, and perhaps the play’s temperance reveals that Bale is adjusting to the reformers’ increasingly compromised and tense positions. Whereas *King Johan* makes specific anti-sacramental arguments to a specific audience, the printed and more widely performed *God’s Promises* suggests that reformed practice, when controlled and biblically grounded, can retain some sacramental and musical elements. The play, along with *Johan Baptystes Preachyng* and *The Temptation of our Lord*, has a long and diverse performance history, and went through multiple printings at least through 1578. There is evidence of a parish performance of the cycle plays at St. Stephen’s church near Canterbury on September 8, 1538, and Bale records a detailed account of the plays’ disastrous performances in Kilkenny, Ireland on the day of Mary’s 1553 coronation, while he was Bishop of Ossory (he had to leave Ireland for fear of execution, so outraged were the Irish church and government authorities). And, while there are no surviving records of Great Hall performances, it is likely that the plays were seen by aristocrats and students in a number of such settings. *God’s Promises* was performed over a
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period of at least fifteen years, retaining its musical elements despite Bale’s contemporaneous polemics against sacred music.

While he rails against it in other contexts, Bale relies on the Roman Breviary for the music of God’s Promises. Antiphons are a common element of traditional liturgy; a soloist sings and the choir responds. The song at the end of act 1 is typical of all seven acts, a form that deviates little from antiphons in Catholic services. Adam ends his soliloquy with a call for song: “I have it in faythe and therfor I wyll synge/Thys Antheme to hym that my salvacyon shall brynge” (177–78). Below that final line is printed the stage direction:

Then on bended knee he begins in a loud voice the anthem, O Wisdom, which the Chorus takes up, with an organ accompaniment, as he goes out. Or with the same accompaniment it could be sung in English, thus:

O eternal Sapyence, that proceedest from the mouthe of the hyghest, reachynge fourth with a great power from the begynnynge to the ende, with heavenly swevenes dysposyne all creatures, come now and enstruct us the true waye of thy godlye prudence. (179–82)

Adam replicates the traditional liturgical gesture of kneeling and is accompanied by an organ, as per liturgical practice. It is also crucial that while English is given as an alternative, the primary stage direction is in Latin and calling for Latin. The singing actor is likely to have been monastically trained (or trained in a university), and is using skills developed there to reproduce the liturgy in a musical setting reminiscent of traditional practice.

The actor playing Adam had a particularly taxing job: while the directions of Adam’s song are that it be sung in a “loud” voice, Abraham is to sing in a high voice, Moses clearly,
David melodiously, and John the Baptist resoundingly. That Bale paid enough attention to a singer’s timbre and tone to include such varying and detailed directives again reveals the playwright’s keen musical ear. Such descriptors indicate that Bale developed a semiotics of voicing to create character: a clear-voiced Moses, a high-pitched Abraham, and a confident-sounding John the Baptist convey distinct meanings through their singing that cannot be conveyed through spoken word. An actor would not have had time to change costumes between acts, so the play experiments with the power of sound alone to create character and meaning. Moving beyond the good and evil auralities of morality plays, Bale has exposed a more dramatically subtle way of using theatrical music.

The play is less innovative, though, in its use of the antiphons themselves, and their lack of revision from the Breviary is inconsistent with Bale’s commitment to the vernacular and to liturgical reform. The antiphons all come from the sequence intended to follow the Magnificat each day of Advent (December 17–23): they are unchanged except for their order. While an English translation is printed as an alternative, it is just that. LeHuray suggests that changes to England’s liturgy did not begin until 1537 when Henry began to take an interest in the Lutherans, and the full English Litany was not printed until 1544. Those facts help explain Bale’s antiphonal format at the time of composition in the 1530s: the inclusion of any English seems forward thinking in that context, and the use of the organ merely expected. Cranmer worked on the English litany with Henry until the king’s death in 1547, and within six months of Edward’s coronation, Latin processions were entirely outlawed. Records show that liturgical music in places like Canterbury, York, and Windsor,
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205 Abraham’s voice is to be “alta voce” (stage direction after 423), Moses’ is “clara” (stage direction after 551), David’s is “carnora” (stage direction after 677), and John’s is “resona” (stage direction after 942).

were restricted and often replaced with speaking. Many reformers advocated a banishment of all instruments, which only compete with the sound of the word. Against the tide of mid-century Protestant reform, *God's Promises* was performed with organs in 1553.

Bale details his 1553 performance in his *Vocacyon of Johan Bale to the bishorick of Ossorie in Irelade his persecucions in the same & finall delyverance*, printed very soon after the events described took place. He explains that on August 20th of that year, “was the Ladye Marye with us at Kylkennye proclaimed Quene of Englande / Fraune and Irelande.” He complains about the “processions / musters and disgyssinges” of the priests in their costumes. Bale writes that he took Christ’s testament in his hand and marched to the market cross with “the people in great nombre folowinge,” where he preached among the chaos about the prelates’ vain pageants. Bale sees no irony, though, in explaining his company’s equally theatrical response:

> The yonge men in the forenone played a Tragedy of Gods promises in the olde lawe at market crosse with organe plainges and songes vey aptely. In the afternone agayne they played a Commedie of sanct Johan Baptistes preachinges of Christes baptisyng and of his temptacion in the wildernesse to the small contentacion of the prestes and other papistes there.

Soon after these performances, Bale learned that several prelates of Kilkenny had plans “to slea” him, and he fled Ireland for the continent, where he spent his second exile, lasting throughout the Marian regime.

The Kilkenny religious authorities’ unfavorable response to the play is not likely to have been a result of the play’s music, which would have pleased and perhaps drawn in a

---

207 Ibid., 7–8.


209 Ibid., 58. Bale’s description of his actors as “yonge” has been interpreted to imply that choir boys, who would have been good singers, certainly, were used in this performance. For more see White, “Reforming Mystery’s End,” 133; and Potter and Sanders et. al, 115.
largely Catholic audience. It is unclear whether the words were sung in Latin or English, but
the use of the portative organ is apparent. Early Reformation prescriptions regarding the
use of church music, if any was allowed, were clear. Songs were to be sung in the vernacular
and they were to be strictly scriptural, the congregation was to sing in unison and in a
restrained, thoughtful style; each syllable should only receive one sung note for the sake of
clarity, and no instruments were to be used. Bale’s insistent and persistent use of the organ,
and his possible retention of Latin, violate the prescriptions of his fellow reformers. The
antiphons do not just demonstrate a commitment to vernacular worship, as Shrank argues,
but also negotiate a startling compromise between Catholicism and Protestantism. Thus
for all his reputation as an unwavering polemical hothead for reform, Bale combines a
Protestant theology with Catholic-leaning liturgical music. Because of their call and response
format, antiphons quote the Bible while encouraging communal listening to the Word as well
as singing; it is perhaps for this reason that Bale’s reformed aurality retained the practice.

While a few scholars have examined the way God’s Promises refigures the biblical
narratives of the Corpus Christi cycles, not even Beckwith addresses the degree to which
God’s Promises might refashion what she calls the sacramentality of Corpus Christi theater. Beckwith claims that for Corpus Christi drama the theatricalization of the liturgy does not
empty out liturgy’s content, but “may be a way of examining the very conditions under

210 Happé explains that a similar organ is described in the Norwich Grocers’ book recording organs bought in 1534, Complete Plays, vol. 2, 128.


212 For a compelling treatment of Bale’s plays as reformed cycle drama, demonstrating the Bible as a point of consensus between Catholics and Protestants, see White, “Reforming Mysteries’ End,” 121–87.
which it can be efficacious.” To this I add that Bale’s Protestant biblical drama, with its embedded liturgical performances, does not just tell the stories of the Bible, but also contextualizes them in a (reformed) liturgical framework. Bale’s play demonstrates that musical ritual grounded in clear scriptural understanding is consistent with the principles of Protestant reform. English Catholicism’s most communal expression of Biblical understanding, of sacrament, and of theater—the Corpus Christi plays—provides a model for Bale to present a religious experience that is not unlike the participatory narratives of that civic drama.

While musicologists cite Bale’s prose as an example of anti-music vitriol, even his most spiteful condemnations of music betray his attachments. In his Image of Both Churches, a 1544 commentary on Revelation, he writes of the music of the popish devils:

The mery noyes of them that play vpon harpes, lutes and fidels, the sweet voice of musicians y’ sing with virginals, vials and chimes, the armony of them that pipe in recorders, flutes, and drums, and the shirle showt of trumpets, waits, & shawmes, shall no more be heard in thée to yé delight of men.

So detailed a list could not be produced by someone lacking in musical experience and interest. His modifiers for this music—“mery,” “sweet,” “melodious”—suggest regret: he does not seem to be describing Satan’s singing.

Elsewhere in the same text Bale outlines a new type of music:

And sweettly they yttered w’t their voyces a song that seemed all newe, before y’s seat of y’s Lord, before y’s foure beastes, & before the auncient elders. This song is the word of the Lorde, all new both to the good and to the i The faythfull it renueth in the spirit of their mynds, prouoking them to do on a new man in Christ.

213 Beckwith, Signifying God, 115. Beckwith suggests that “much of [Bale’s] dramatic work is an attempt to replace and supersede the civic Corpus Christi dramas,” but leaves God’s Promises out of her analysis of Bale, 148.


The songs of God’s Promises are songs of the new learning: biblical songs of praise to be sung eventually in clear and loud English, reflecting the spirituality of the believer in direct, personal communion with God. While Bale may have aspired to that ideal, in practice he was only able to produce a musical alternative that parrots the old faith’s sounds almost exactly. That gap between the reformed ideal and the little-changed practice may have saved Bale’s head when he lived under the rule of music-loving monarchs like Henry VIII and Elizabeth I, both of whom disagreed with the radical reformers’ recommendations for limiting or banning church music. Ultimately, Bale’s inability to change musical liturgy fundamentally, and his reliance on traditional theatrical and religious practice, reflects the difficulties of systemic change itself, which is usually slow, tortuous, and often compromised.

There are many contradictions in the works of prior, playwright, and polemicist John Bale. He preached, played, and printed (his friend John Foxe’s trifecta for disseminating reform) against a religious practice that he simultaneously reproduced, ultimately helping to preserve for England elements of traditional religion that continental Protestants expunged. Theatricalized Catholic music, even parodied, allowed an audience member still attached to orthodox practices to see his plays as acknowledging the cultural and spiritual cache processionals and antiphons and dirges continued to have. If Butler is right that “the subject loses itself to tell the story of itself,” one sees in retrospect that Bale’s story as reformer loses some of its Protestant principles in its telling.217 But within the context of English church history, those losses of principle allow for gains in practice, as the Anglican Church preserved some of the rich auralities of England’s religious past.

216 Ibid., 243.
As the sixteenth century wore on, the role of theater began to change with the advent of the professional amphitheater companies in London. While theater companies became more secular in theory, they continued to negotiate the issues of music, ritual, and religious unrest addressed in late medieval East Anglian drama and in John Bale’s plays. As theaters gained in popularity, so too did the protests against them. Anti-theatricality became quickly associated with Protestant anti-ceremonialism, and the newest form of hard-line reformers, the Puritans, often pointed out the shared use of music in church and on stage. In 1577, for example, John Northbrooke complained that “christian people doe runne unto the Churche, as to a Stage playe, where they may be delighted with pypping and singing (and doe thereby absent themselves from hearing the worde of God preached).” As the religious, musical, and theatrical climate of England changed, debates over the efficacy of religious musical ritual continued to be dramatized on the Elizabethan, and eventually Jacobean stages. In the last Elizabethan play to directly deal with religion (direct reference to God or the Bible soon became taboo and was eventually banned by a 1606 Act of Parliament), Christopher Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus explores the ability of music, magic, and religion to seduce and enchant, and also the inability of humans to know for certain the powers of such things.

218 John Northbrooke, Spiritus est vicarious Christi in Terra. A treatise wherein Dicing, Dauncing, Vaine plaies or Enterludes with other idle pastimes &c. commonly used on the Sabboth day, are reproved by the authoritie of the word of God and auntient writers (London, 1577[?]), 85, http://eebo.chadwyck.com.
CHAPTER 3: SOUNDED OUT UNCERTAINTY IN DOCTOR FAUSTUS

When Doctor Faustus decides to use his philosophical learning to gain immeasurable knowledge and power, he tells himself, “A sound Magician is a mighty god” (1.1.64). While his formulation primarily employs the adjectival sense of “sound” as solid and secure, aural sound will be crucial to his learning and use of magic; he will become a magician of sounds, too. This quotation pulls together three discourses that are crucial to an understanding of Christopher Marlowe’s play, those of sound, religion, and magic. Doctor Faustus (1588–97) explores the differences between salvation and sin, between ritual efficacy and immoral entertainment, through a variety of means, including its representations of Catholic ritual, popular song and dance, conjured musical magic, and the sounds of both heaven and hell.

Contemporary critics have noted Doctor Faustus’ engagement with the two professions most protested by late sixteenth-century Puritans: the magician and the player.

219 I quote directly from the A-text: Christopher Marlowe, The Tragical History of D. Faustus (London, 1604) and the B-text, The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus (London, 1616), both reprinted in facsimile (Menston, UK: Scolar Press Limited, 1970). Line numbers (as well as act divisions) refer to Doctor Faustus: A and B-texts, ed. David Bevington and Eric Rasmussen (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993). Unless otherwise indicated, I quote from the A-text. Many critics argue that the A-text is more Marlovian than the B-text, but I see both as equally valid cultural artifacts of the early modern period. The more theatrically specific B-text helps clarify what was likely performed in the A-text.

220 While both published versions of Doctor Faustus were likely written in collaboration with other playwrights (beginning in the late 1580s), I will refer only to “Marlowe,” representing Marlowe and his collaborators.

221 See for example Sara Munson Deats, “‘Mark this show’: Magic and Theater in Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus,” in Placing the Plays of Christopher Marlowe: Fresh Cultural Contexts, ed. Sara Munson Deats and Robert A. Logan (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 13.
Puritanical treatises against magic and anti-theatrical tracts share a common anxiety about music, as a science and as a lewd type of performance. In the late sixteenth century, natural magicians saw music as efficacious in communicating with higher powers. Musicologists Gary Tomlinson and Penelope Gouk have shown the many intersections between music and magic, dating back to Platonic and Aristotelian conceptions of the celestial spheres and their earthly effects, including the production of certain musical pitches.222 The magical arts even share key etymological roots with music in words like “enchant” and “charm,” both from the Latin cantare, to sing. The late sixteenth century saw a renewed interest in music’s associations with magic and divinity, even as it also saw a rise in popular musical entertainments like ballads and dances. Both kinds of music were re-presented on the stage, and both types of music influenced religious musical practice.

While public theaters were representing music and magic on the stage, debates raged on about the powers of both. Protestants had been divided into myriad sub-groups who were debating the efficacy of religious, theatrical, and magical music. Many Puritans objected to all or most types of music, while moderates (Anglicans), and the Queen herself, promoted the retention of more musical rite in church services, defending the theater and the study of natural magic. At the same time, groups of recusant Catholics continued to worship in enclaves all around England and Protestant Europe, while being scapegoated by Puritans for the perceived theatricality, musicality, and superstitious sorcery of their faith. Puritans associated theatrical and magical musics with Catholic theology and ritual practice, and criticized Anglicans for wavering about the retention of musical, magical popish rites.

The Puritans also protested all kinds of magical practice, even the types that were said to lead to a greater understanding of God. They conflated natural and black magical arts and objected to both as powered by the devil. Natural magic had been recently popularized by Heinrich Cornelius Agrippa (German, 1486–1535) and John Dee (English, 1527–1609), who suggested that knowledge of the occult (that is, hidden) properties of the world and universe could be used to achieve a state of divinity.\(^{223}\) Agrippa and Dee used the late antique writings of the pseudo-historical Hermes Trismegestus as well as the hermetically influenced work of Marsilio Ficino (Italian, 1433–1499) and Pico della Mirandola (Italian, 1463–1494) to propose that personal transcendence and access to God could be achieved through knowledge of the natural world and its correlation to heavenly spheres.

Faustus embraces the letter of these magical ideas, but not their usual purpose. Whereas these famous natural magicians had used occult studies to enhance their belief in God-the-Creator and their Christian faith, Faustus rejects Christian divinical studies to exclusively study the earthly powers of the occult, thus exemplifying Puritans’ worst fears about magical study. When he bids “divinitie, adieu,” Faustus not only divorces himself from studies of the Bible and church Fathers, but also decides that divine access is not the end to his practice (1.1.50). He aligns himself with natural magicians early in the play, saying he “Will be as cunning as Agrippa was,/Whose shadowes made all Europe honor him” (1.1.119–20). Unlike Agrippa’s arts, Faustus’ practice blends natural magic with black magic, an almost universally condemned devilish witchcraft. He seeks access only to earthbound musical and magical arts—tricks, spells, songs, and dances—while his study is only driven by a quest for the earthly power that knowledge might bring him. By the end of the play, he is reduced to using magic to fetch grapes for the Duchess of Anholt. The music Faustus hears,

enjoys, and creates does not lead him to higher states of being, as it could for many natural magicians and pro-music Christian thinkers, but rather condemns him to all that is lower, in terms of both bodily and universal strata.\textsuperscript{224}

In \textit{Doctor Faustus}, the theater becomes a venue for representing the types of performances—ceremonial, musical, lewd, magical—that Puritans worried about. The play represents secular dances, Catholic musical rites, the music of the spheres, and the sounds of heaven. At the same time, hearing is represented as highly fraught and potentially dangerous. Faustus' reactions to sounds result in a fantastical life and death as sinful as any Puritan could imagine. Taking Puritanical attacks against magic, music, theater, and dance to their logical end, the play asks the audience if these things do lead to the devil, or if enactment of the Puritans' greatest fears has shown the implausibility of their protests.

Since the earliest days of its performances, critical reception of \textit{Doctor Faustus} has been conflicted, falling on all sides of questions about the play's representations of religion and magic.\textsuperscript{225} Jonathan Dollimore and others have seen the play as deliberately ambiguous: "such resolution is what \textit{Doctor Faustus} as interrogative text resists. It seems always to represent paradox—religious and tragic—as insecurely and provocatively ambiguous, or worse, as openly contradictory."\textsuperscript{226} Critics tend to focus on the play’s ambiguity as a complex

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{224} I echo Mikhail Bakhtin's phrases here, used in “Images of the Material Bodily Lower Stratum,” \textit{Rabelais and His World}, trans. Hélène Iswolsky (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), 368 and passim.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{225} For a recent critical history of \textit{Doctor Faustus} highlighting the persistent reading of the play as ambiguous, see Robert Logan, “The State of the Art: Current Critical Research,” in \textit{Doctor Faustus: A Critical Guide}, ed. Sara Munson Deats (London: Continuum, 2010), 72–95. Logan suggests that future criticism should separate the play's deliberate and non-deliberate ambiguities, think more critically about audience reception, and address the play's stagecraft more carefully, 83. I attempt to do all three of these things in my analysis.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
muddling of both a Calvinist/Puritan worldview suggesting that Faustus is predestined to damnation, and an Anglican/Catholic theology in which he could have repented and saved himself even up to the last minute.\(^{227}\)

The play’s ambiguity about man’s agency in his fate is not its only indeterminacy. *Doctor Faustus* is equally (and intentionally) ambiguous about the powers of sound. Sounds can seduce and un-chasten, and they can delight and charm. One’s reaction to sounds may save or damn the soul. By representing the contested sounds, the theater asks the audience both about the sounds’ efficacy—*is* something happening?, and their agency—*who* is making something happen? These questions of acoustic efficacy and agency intersect with theological debates about free will or predestination, as it is never entirely clear how the spells Faustus chants, the seductive sounds he adores, or the salvific pleas he ignores work to damn him, and if he has had the agency in producing and reacting to these sounds, or if such things were pre-determined.

Marlowe’s play adapts the *English Faust Book* (1588?) or perhaps another version of the Faust legend (the real magician Faustus died in Germany in 1539, and the German Faustbook was published in 1587).\(^{228}\) The playwright avoids censorship by sticking close to his published source material, as the censors had approved the prose work. However, the ontological status of the theater—its actual performance of the sounds and spectacles that damn the story’s character—gives Marlowe’s version entirely new powers. Performance raises the stakes in its implication of the listening audience: the humor is more raucous, the seduction more physical, the rituals more blasphemous, the sounds of hell more frightening.

---


and all of these things are experienced rather than just reported. Indeed, the theater itself becomes a snare of seductive, frightening sights and sounds: the performance of sinful sounds may threaten the chaste ears of the audience. The play coyly enacts Puritan John Northbrook’s protest against the theater and its music:

   Thou beholdest thee in an open theatre, a place where ye soule of the wise is snared & condemned: in those places (sayth he) thou...hearest spurciloquia, filthie speaches, ...where thou shalt by hearing divelishe and filthie songs hurte thy chaste eares.²²⁹

Indeed, the power of Doctor Faustus as theatrical experience in large part stems from its dangerous enactment of the snaring and condemning of a soul. Sound travels through the airwaves not only to the ears of the actor playing Faustus, but also to the audience’s ears. The play’s “filthie speeches,” “divelishe and filthie songs,” and darkly magical chants may hurt an audience’s chaste ears, too.

Music and musical references are central to every part of Faustus’ story. His fall is facilitated by his delight over a devil’s dance, a procession of the seven deadly sins, and sublime music played by resurrected classical personas. With his magical knowledge he tortures the Pope and his friars while they are performing a musical rite, pleases an Emperor with a musical dumbshow, and allows himself the musically-accompanied sight of Helen of Troy herself. In the end, the sounds of heaven and hell echo with the unnerving power of the earthly sounds that have damned Faustus. This chapter brings together analysis of the play’s most acoustically significant moments, sixteenth-century documents addressing the dangers and wonders of music, and contemporary speech-act and dialogic theories to articulate the way the play stages a hermeneutic crisis regarding the power of sound.

“Divinity, Adieu”: The Sounds of Falling

²²⁹ Northbrooke, Spiritus est vicarious, 61.
When the audience first encounters Faustus, they hear him telling himself to “Settle thy studies, Faustus, and beginne/To sound the deapth of that thou wilt profess” (1.1.1–2). He is thus reminding himself that his journey of study, magic, and conquest will involve both listening and sounding forth. Using the now-obscure sense of the verb sound as “to penetrate” in order to describe sinking into his soul’s depths, Faustus puns on the fact that he will make “sound” when he “professes.” Faustus’ understanding of magic as a sonic force is informed by natural magicians’ understanding of the acoustic power of words, a power that can be understood as similar to the perlocutionary forces associated with speech acts.

Faustus’ proclamation to sound the depths of his magic is consistent with a notion shared by Renaissance magicians that language is more potent when sounded than when written. For Agrippa, spoken words have the power to alter people and things:

Words therefore constitute a most fitting bond between the speaker and the listener and carry with them not only the meaning but even the force of the speaker, transmitting and bearing a certain energy to the listener with such strength that not only he but other bodies and even inanimate things are altered.

That “certain energy,” with its power to alter other beings and things, is exactly what Faustus seeks to understand and harness. Words uttered and heard are not the only acoustically powerful forces in the play, however. Faustus also learns that the musical sounds that accompany utterances have power, and that non-verbal musical sounds have the ability to alter “other bodies and even inanimate things.”

---

230 He also anticipates the sense of sounding as inquiry developed centuries later: the OED’s first cited use of the word “sound” as making inquiry or investigating is Thomas Jefferson in 1793: “They have sent commissioners to England to sound for peace.” www.oed.com.

231 Speech acts, which have transformative power at the moment of articulation, are famously defined by J.L. Austin in How to do Things with Words (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962; 1975), passim.

232 All Agrippa is from De occulta philosophia libra tres (Cologne, 1533). Translated in Gary Tomlinson, Music in Renaissance Magic, 59–60. For Agrippa and others, writing mediates and thus diminishes the idea: voice is more powerful in part because it is closer to thought that written word.
The play’s audiences were aware, at least on a basic level, of the ongoing publication of treatises promoting and explaining magic. The popularity of these treatises was accompanied by the condemnations of these ideas in other treatises by religious (primarily Puritan) writers, and by the laws against witchcraft that led to witch trials throughout England.\textsuperscript{233} Most understood that there were two kinds of magic: a systematic, universal philosophy of word and man, the knowledge of which helped unite him with God’s divine mysteries, and a black magic gathering power not from the natural world but from the devil.

In Thomas Elyot’s 1538 dictionary, he explains,

> Magike…is in two sortes, one is the secret knowledge of the naturall qualities and hydde operations and causes of thynges, and that is called Magia naturalis, naturall magike: Ano other is superstitious & devillishe, called witche crafte, sorcery or other lyke detestable names, whiche is unlofull by the lawes of god and man.\textsuperscript{234}

While Faustus associates himself with natural magicians’ desires to understand the “hydde operations and causes of thynges,” he is also interested in a magic that is literally “devilish.” Faustus uses sorcery instead of natural magic when he enters “to conjure” devils at the start of the play’s third scene (stage direction before 1.3.1). He begins his “incantations,” trying “the uttermost Magicke can performe” (1.3.5, 1.3.15). That is, Faustus does not merely use words to alter reality, as a natural magician might. He uses them to conjure a new reality, something only attempted by devilish witchcraft; indeed, he calls on a trinity of devils to summon Mephistopheles.

Faustus’ ritual is in Latin, the language of many ancient and recent magical treatises, and also of the Catholic mass.\textsuperscript{235} The lengthy incantation suggests a correlation between

\textsuperscript{233} As Gouk explains, “From the emperor’s court in Prague to the papal court in Rome, and cutting right across Catholic–Protestant divisions, we see numerous instances of natural magicians and philosophers professing their secret skills. Yet even as there was patronage of the occult at the highest level, so too there was renewed persecution of witches across the same geographical area.” Ibid., 71.

Catholics and demons, a trope popular with reformers who had long since branded the mass as hocus pocus and rewritten the devils of morality plays as Catholic prelates (as in Bale’s *Three Laws*, discussed in chapter 2). Part of the power of the words seems to come from the fact that they are *chanted* rather than merely spoken, echoing the notion that the Mass’ words, when chanted under the right conditions, turn bread into Christ’s body. Andrew Sofer points out that such incantations are performative speech acts, that “[p]erformativity, then, is a kind of magical altering of reality through the power of the word, one that channels what might well be called an occult force.” Power here seems to come not only from the fact of out-loud articulation, but also from the conditions of that articulation and the music-like form that Catholic-sounding articulation takes.

In the 1580s, the demonizing of Catholics as practitioners of dark magic was common practice. Arthur Marotti writes about the effects of the 1582 publication of Catholic martyr Edward Campion’s biography, *A true reporte of the death & martyrdom of M. Campion Jesuite and preiste*, by Thomas Alfried. The account includes reports of miracles, including the martyr’s ability to lift his body up while burning to death; these reported miracles gave hope and inspiration to underground Catholics. Puritans associated miracles with the old religion; healing, relics, the Eucharist, any physical manifestations of the spiritual were suspect. To Puritans, these miracles were at best superstitions, and at worst demonstrations of necromancy.

---

235 When he refers to his incantations as “heavenly words,” Faustus furthers the notion that he used scriptural phrases for conjuring (1.3.38).
Part of the occult force of Faustus’ spells comes from the extra-verbal sounds of chanting; the Faustus actor could even intone rhythm and timbre that sound like the Mass. Catholic belief in the miracle of a dead object turning into living flesh—the central act of the Mass—became the basis of associating Catholics with dark magical arts like necromancy. Necromancy involves the revival of dead beings and the conjuring of spirits, and was a forbidden and feared type of dark magical demonology. Faustus, according to the prologue, aligns himself not only with Agrippa and other natural magicians, but also with this dark art. As the chorus explains, “[h]e surffets upon cursed Negromancy” (prologue 25). After he bids divinity adieu, he valorizes the dark art as a new form of bliss: “These Metaphysickes of Magicians/And Negromanticke bookes are heavenly” (1.1.51–2). In conjuring devils, Faustus demonstrates that he is as interested in dark arts as he is in natural magic.

Faustus’ first magical act is its own kind of miracle. His Latin incantation is reminiscent of the Catholic Mass, but with the effect of conjuring a devil out of thin air instead of a body out of bread. Different audience members could perceive the act differently: the Latin conjuring could suggest the similarities between Catholicism and necromancy, it could warn against the profaning of the sacred Mass, or it could feel like a joke pointing to the absurdity of the association between Catholicism and dark arts. Sounds do the conjuring in both cases: both the melodies of Mass chants and the songs and words of actors have perlocutionary force. Faustus seeks control over these sounds; he wants to learn how to use them to acquire power. Doctor Faustus suggests that those who create sounds and images (be they magicians, musicians, priests, or actors), and those who search for knowledge of all things (be they magicians, theologians, or maybe even artists) may be acquiring and exerting powers that will have beneficial consequences in the afterlife (or none at all), or they may be entertaining devils unaware.
Faustus seems to believe that his conjuring of Mephistopheles is successful because he chants the right words in the right way: “such is the force of Magicke and my spels” (1.3.32). That is, he believes he has committed a speech act by sounding forth properly, under the right conditions. Mephistopheles explains to him, however, that it was not his “conjuring speeches” that “raise[d]” him, but rather Faustus’ intention: “That [the conjuring speeches] was the cause, but yet per accident” (1.3.46, 47). If Mephistopheles is to be believed, then, the spells were not themselves agents producing their own effect but rather the pretext that provided occasion for the operation of Mephistopheles’ agency. Sofer points out that the ontological stakes of this kind of seemingly citational magic are uncertain; the spells are perlocutions with power beyond the conjurer’s skill, but according to Mephistopheles, their power comes from the speaker’s intent rather than the felicitous quotation of the right words in the right way. While Faustus seems to believe Mephistopheles’ assessment of intention’s primary importance, Mephistopheles is of course an agent of the devil and cannot entirely be trusted. It may be that intention provides the spells with their power, but Mephistopheles might be lying, too, in which case the act itself might have the same dangerous perlocutionary force no matter the speakers’ intention.

The audience does not know how this dark magic works, and that uncertainty mimics the questions invoked by the sensory betrayal of the Mass: does transformation occur because of priestly intent, or do the words themselves have hidden powers? While some critics of Catholicism saw the Mass as merely theatrical—no transformation takes place at all—some saw Catholic rites as actively dangerous, as the devil’s theater. The connection between dark magic and traditional religion is made more explicit when Faustus

238 Bevington and Rasmussen explain the meaning of the scholastic term “per accidens” in their edition, Doctor Faustus, 128.

addresses the devil he conjured. Faustus orders the Devil to “Goe and returne an old Franciscan Frier,/That holy shape becomes a divell best” (1.3.26–7). Mephistopheles promptly obliges, returning costumed as a friar. The costume change enacts Puritanical ideas that the Catholic rites are controlled by devils acting like priests (the history of this idea is explored in chapter 2).

The association of devils with Catholics was made over and over throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; by the 1580s, the devil-priest-player idea was already more of cliché than a metaphor with any fresh power. Thus it is unclear if the rather ridiculous request of Faustus really reinforces the anti-Catholic sentiment, or if Mephistopheles’ costume parodies instead those reformers who continued to make the by then hackneyed association. The meta-theatricality of this re-presented theatrical metaphor could, for some, demonstrate that the Puritanical casting of priests as devils is mere show, too. The Latin incantations and Mephistopheles’ friar costume may thus be interpreted as anti-Catholic or as anti-anti-Catholic; audience members were likely to have felt differently about the joke. The moment divides the audience between those who see Mephistopheles’ costume change as aptly performing the link between devils and Catholicism, and those who see the scene as exposing the absurdity of equating devils with Catholics. The very ambiguity of the parody thus reveals the hypocrisy of any polemical interpretation of a moment like this. For if a theatrical sign, itself representing an oft-used polemical stance, can be read as either verifying or satirizing the truth of the claim (that Catholics and devils are of the same accord), then the claim itself is necessarily destabilized.

SHOWS FOR A WAVERING SOUL

When the chorus details the Icarian fall of Faustus in the play’s prologue, they describe the pleasures he now enjoys because of “learnings golden gifts,” explaining that
“Nothing so sweete as magicke is to him/Which he preferres before his chiefest blisse” (25, 24, 26–7). Throughout *Doctor Faustus*, magic’s benefits to Faustus are described in similarly sensory terms: they are “sweet” and bring “bliss,” as well as “delight” and “pleasure.” Sweetness may refer to olfactory and gustatory delight, but since at least 900 C.E., the word has also meant “pleasing to the ear.” And indeed, the play provides more examples of acoustic pleasure than delightful tastes or smells. Music accompanies Faustus’ abjuration of divinity, which is at the same time an embrace of magic’s sensual sweetness.

Sound’s sweetness is central to both Faustus’ hopes of salvation and his seduction back to hellbound earthly delights. As he goes back and forth between determination to fulfill his deal with the devil and the desire to repent, Faustus’ ears are the means through which he hears the irresistible sounds of earthly music as well as the ultimately futile pleas of the Good Angel. The phrase “chaste eares” became a popular term by the late sixteenth century to describe the type of selective hearing necessary to lead a good Christian life. It is used in the Geneva Bible, and in several sermons and treatises. Faustus despairs at the start of act 2 that he “must needes be damnd,/An cant…not be saved” (2.1.1–2). The speech soon turns into one of the many moments in the play in which Faustus wavers on his plan, unsure if his damnation is now certain, or if he may repent and be saved. Faustus’ doubt is attributed to a sound unheard by the audience: “Why waverest thou? O something soundeth in mine eares:/Abjure this Magicke, and turne to God againe” (2.1.7–8). But

---

240 Oxford English Dictionary’s definition 4a.

241 Of course, Faustus also delights in visual and somatosensory pleasure, which are less frequently referred to as “sweet,” and which are the subject of many critical analyses.

242 A search for “chaste eares” on Early English Books Online yields 65 texts using the phrase.

243 From Ezekial XXIII, verse 8: “The holy ghost vseth these tearmes which seeme straunge to chaste eares to cause this wicked vi[ce] of idolatrie.” *The Bible and Holy Scriptures conteyned in the Olde and Newe Testament* (Geneva, 1561), http://eebo.chadwyck.com.
Faustus talks himself out of listening to the virtuous voice of the Good Angel. Later in the scene, the sounds of dark magic, audible to both Faustus and the audience, further strengthen his resolve to abjure God and turn to magic. Every time Faustus wavers, the specter of the free will versus predestination debate is raised. The play asks if Faustus really has the agency to “Abjure this Magicke,” to heed the Good Angel and return to God. The audience cannot know for certain if musical rite, or the words of the preacher, or the sounds of profane music, have real power to save or damn a soul. Keeping ears “chaste” requires first the knowledge of what sounds have dangerous powers, and *Doctor Faustus* suggests that this is not always knowable.

All Puritans, it seems, agreed that dance music was one of the most threatening kinds of music. But the potential dangers and delights of dance are two sides of the same coin. When Faustus hallucinates the words “Homo fuge” on his arm and questions whether or not he should fly to God, Mephistopheles decides to distract him from his paranoia by means of a song and dance. The line and stage direction read:

> Me: Ile fetch him somewhat to delight his minde.
> Exit
> Enter with divels, giving crownes and rich apparell to Faustus, and daunce, and then depart.

Erika Lin points out that the word “delight” had sexual connotations in early modern usage, often referring to the pleasure of sin, and spelled “delight” (as opposed to the Middle English “delite”) because “it was erroneously believed to derive from the world ‘light,’ also associated with promiscuity.”

Lin focuses on the way in which the dance itself and “the crowns and rich apparel simultaneously mobilized both the referential and the performant functions in the service of pleasure and delight,” demonstrating that “spectacle is both

---

enjoyable entertainment and dangerous show.” The multi-functionality of the scene as entertainment and dangerous efficacy is not produced by visuals alone. The sounds of this dance—the music that accompanies the movement—also connote both pleasure in entertainment and perilous lasciviousness. The song might have been played by the town waits, who were often employed by late sixteenth century theater companies. The waits could play jigs on their loud shawms (or hautboys, an early version of the oboe), and so the moment could have sounded something like track 11. The musicians would have likely played a familiar tune—something they had played on other occasions, too. Thus the devil’s dance would have sounded and felt like the entertainments popularly enjoyed in early modern England, and their sense of danger would be all the more palpable and relevant.

The popularity of dance music made it a frequent and urgent target of Puritanical vitriol. Northbrooke rails: “What newe kinde of daunces, and newe devised gestures the people haue devised, and daylye doe devise, it will grieue chaste eares to heare it, good eyes to see it, or tongue to vtter it.” Christopher Marsh catalogues the abuses Northbrooke, Stubbes, and many others hurled at dance music: it was “filthy,” “lewd,” “wanton,” “fleshly,” and “lascivious,” a “form of spiritual whoredom.” The devil’s dance awakens dangerous sexual urges in Faustus, urges that later inspire him to conjure Helen. The clown Robin directly associates dance with lust and wantonness. When, in the following scene, Robin finds Faustus’ book of magic, he hopes to use it to create music that will have

245 “Kemp’s Jig,” from CD accompanying Christopher Marsh, *Music and Society in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010). Waits were night watchmen who used their shwarms to warn of danger, but also played music with their instruments with such skill that even Thomas Morley praised them. As minstrels, they were hired to play at everything from masques to weddings. See David Wulstan, *Tudor Music* (London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1985), 43. On Waits being hired when instruments beyond those usually in a theater consort were needed, see Bruce Smith, *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1999), 220.

246 Northbrooke, *Spiritus est vicarious*, 141.

precisely the effects Northbrooke warns against. Holding the “booke in his hand,” he exclaims that “now wil I make al the maidens in our parish dance at my pleasure starke naked before me” (2.2.4–5).

In addition to its associations with lust, dance was also called “devilish,” “wicked,” and “heathen,” it was thought to be one of Satan’s agents of seduction. Thus a devil’s dance exemplifies and performs contemporary objections to dance. In the world of Doctor Faustus, magic has the power to conjure the sort of music that leads to lusty sin, and to the devil himself.

The play asks about the dangers of the performances it represents, but it also asks about the dangers of the theater itself. Mephistopheles is a theatrical creator, conjuring a visual and aural show to delight the mind of his patron, Faustus. In addition to their concern about spectacle, anti-theatrical treatises articulate a frequent anxiety that plays’ sounds are damning. Such concern is often simultaneously associated with the theatricality of Popish practice. Describing what he calls the “Theater of Popes” and their ecclesiastic courts, Phillip Stubbes for example writes about filth that “chaste eares would blush once to heare spoken of.”Doctor Faustus mischievously reverses Stubbes and others: rather than saying that sounds and sights of Popish rites are theatrical, it asks if the theater’s music and spectacle is ritualistic. The devils’ dance is not merely an earthly delight or a lascivious pleasure, but a performance of a devils’ ritual. The performance of this association between devils and theater either exposes the claim’s veracity, or its ludicrousness.

---

248 Ibid., 358. Northbrooke exemplifies both concerns when he says that dancing is “a libertie to wantonnesse, a friende to wickednesse, a prouocation to fleshlye lust, [and an] enimie to chastitie,” Spirits est vicarious, 135.

249 The title of the tract bears reproducing in full: Phillip Stubbes, The theater of the Popes monarchie wherein is described as well the vncleane liues of that wicked generation, as also their Antichristian government, and usurped kingdome: together with their horrible superstition, and blasphemous religion, as it is now vused at this present, where Antichrist the Pope & his members do beare rule (London: Thomas Dawson, 1585), http://eebo.chadwyck.com.
The meta-theatrical moment, an enactment of profane delight, thus addresses the Puritans’ frequent conflation of anti-theatricalism with anti-ceremonialism. In Northbrooke’s attack on church music, for example:

christian people doe runne vnto the Churche, as to a Stage playe, where they may be delighted with pyping and singing (and doe thereby absent themselues from hearing the worde of God preached) in this case we must rather abstaine from a thing not necessarie, than to suffer their pleasures to be cockered with the destruction of their soules.  

Mephistopheles’ plan to “delight” Faustus thus may for some audience members corroborate Northbrooke’s concern about all types of musical pleasure: its inherent theatricality and its ability to drown out the “hearing the worde of God preached” will destroy the soul of the listener.

However, the scene’s performance in a theater necessarily destabilizes the Puritans’ concern, for either the playwright and actors do not fear hell, or the notion that the music in church and theater can be “cockered with the destruction of their soules” is demonstrably ludicrous. It may be that all music endangers souls, it may be that only some types do, or it may be that music has no inherent power for destruction or salvation: musical efficacy is called into question by the nesting-boxes of representation. Performing the overlap between (anti-)ceremony and (anti-)theater, the theater (which itself is pro-theater, one assumes) aligns itself with ceremony, declaring that no one can know for sure the dangers of either type of performance.

If the sound of this sinful music and the sight of lascivious dance is damning, as the Puritans claimed, the performance of it might also damn the audience when they hear and see it. Sofer, challenging Austin’s distinction between successful performatives (of speech

250 Northbrooke, Spiri tus est vicarius, 85.
acts) and “hollow” (and unsuccessful) theatrical quotations of them, explains that “Austin’s distinction breaks down whenever a speech act in the world of the play makes a material difference in the world of the playhouse.” The same must also be true for these sound (and gesture) acts; they make material difference and seem to produce actual sin, to actually endanger souls. The power of music and dance to do this may lie in the devil’s skill, the dance itself, or in the (un)believing, corruptible soul. Boldly performing these acts, the play may either be endangering the souls of the audience, or exposing the implausibility of devils’ agency in earthly dancing. Different audience members could interpret the devil’s dance differently, but they were likely to waver on the scene’s meaning. The audience is caught between a skepticism that would absolve them from the fear that they had sinned by experiencing the performed devil dance, and the belief that the play’s reality is true and that they, like Faustus, have thus endangered themselves by taking pleasure in these acoustic and visual delights. The more one is absorbed into the play’s story, the more one fears for oneself. Moreover, the more one believes in the danger of these performances, the more one must also believe in the danger of the theater, while in the theater.

In act 2, scene 3, the power of music is separated from dance and theatricality to suggest that sound itself has long held unknown powers. Defenders of religious music used its associations with the classical past to point towards its longstanding spiritual efficacy. In the anonymous In Praise of Musicke (1585), music’s abilities to divide soul from body and lift “up [man’s] cogitations above himselfe” are attributed in part to the fact that music “is ancient and of great continuance…it was translated from the religious of the heathen, which

---

in hymnes and songes, yeelded all reuerence and honor to their gods of wood & stone.\footnote{Praise of Musicke, wherein besides the antiquitie, dignitie, delectation, & vsu thereof in ciuill matters, is also declared the sober and lawfull use of the same in the congregation and church of God (Oxford, 1585), 152, http://eebo.chadwyck.com.}

The author of this tract sees ancient, heathen musics as part of a trajectory that ends with Christian hymns, with both types of music calling on a similar correspondence between heaven and earth. For Faustus, however, music’s ancient power is useful only for its earthly beauty, not for its reverential capabilities.

When Faustus again wavers about whether or not to repent, he is tempted back to the dark side by memories of musical sounds. Learning that heaven is glorious, Faustus decides that he will “renounce this magicke, and repent,” a pronouncement that summons the Good and Evil Angels (2.3.11). Salvation and temptation are again acoustically represented, as the Angels exhort Faustus and he cries “who buzzeth in mine eares I am a spirite?” (2.3.14). He concludes that his heart is “so hardned” to the sounds of salvation that he can’t sound forth the words “salvation, faith, or heaven,/But feareful echoes thunders in mine eares,/Faustus, thou art damnd” (2.3.19–21). In this moment, he decides to trade the possibility of hearing heaven’s music for the surety of hearing his conjured earthly music.

As Faustus explains it, he continues actively to enjoy his fallen state because it is filled with ancient songs inaccessible to those not acquainted with the dark arts:

And long ere this I should have slaine my selfe,
Had not sweete pleasure conquerd deepe dispaire.
Have not I made blinde Homer sing to me,
Of Alexanders love, and Enons death,
And hath not he that build the walles of Thebes,
With ravishing sound of his melodious harp
Made musicke with my Mephastophilis,
Why should I dye then, or basely dispaire? (2.3.24–31)
Faustus brags that he has heard Homer himself sing *The Iliad*'s stories, and cites a favorite Renaissance illustration of the power of music, one even cited by Northbrooke.\(^{253}\) Faustus, with the help of his knowledge of magic and the aid of Mephistopheles (who is also a musician, it seems), has heard the most famous of antique musicians make their “ravishing sound[s].” The recollection of these musics is enough to lift Faustus out of despair over his fate. Music has saved him from what many audiences and critics see as his biggest sin, the sin of despair. But while his access to these sounds has saved him from committing suicide, his “sweete pleasure” at this music is itself a sin of vain indulgence. Committing one sin, he saves himself from another. The memory of this music is enough for him to continue: “I am resolv’d Faustus shal nere repent” (2.3.32). He cannot “renounce this magicke, and repent” if this magic brings him this music; he is soothed and addicted to these sounds. He may be forfeiting heaven’s music (which is briefly heard in the final act of the B text) for Homer’s voice and Amphion’s harp, but music is so powerful that he cannot give up hearing it.

Faustus’ labeling of this classical music as “ravishing” calls on a central issue regarding musical efficacy. “Ravishing” is one of the most frequent adjectives used to describe music in the early modern period, but the word simultaneously conveys spiritual and sexual valences. The sound of music “ravish’d hearts,” and also bodies.\(^{254}\) For those who believed in music’s spiritual efficacy, like the Catholics and Anglican musical apologists, music’s somatic and soulful effects were bound up in each other. Anglican priest Richard Hooker praised God for music’s power, concluding, “O the wise conceit of that Heavenly Teacher, which both by his skill found out a way, that doing those things wherein we delight,

\(^{253}\) In Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, Amphion, ruler of Thebes, was such a skilled harpist that his music moved the stones themselves to build a protective wall around Thebes. Northbrooke writes, “I may also speake howe the Poetes fable, that when the walles of Thebes the citie were buylt, the stones of their owne motion came together with the founde of the Harpe.” *Spiritus est vicarious*, 82.

\(^{254}\) In one of many early modern account of mortals hearing supernatural music, the sound of angels in Westmorland “ravish’d the hearts of those stood by/So sweet the Musick did abound.” From *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. R.C. Latham and W. Mathews (London: HarperCollins, 1995), vol. IV, 186.
we may also learn that whereby we profit!” For Puritans, music’s ability to ravish was exactly its danger. By leading to sensory pleasure, music moved a person’s reasonable self: “both by the sweetnesse of the soundes it moueth the senses, and by the artificiousnesse of the number and proportions, it deliteth reason it selfe.” Faustus’ ravishment by music seems purely physical, but the spiritual valences of ravishment suggest that music has an inverted divinity, the power to lead a soul to hell instead of heaven.

The memory of Homer and Amphion’s sounds makes Faustus thirsty for knowledge about their production. Plato and Aristotle had both assigned pitches to planetary spheres, so when Faustus turns from his description of Homer and Amphion’s music to questions about astrology, the cognitive link is the classically-born idea of the music of the spheres. The association is made more clear in the B text, where Faustus’ question to Mephistopheles—“Tel me, are there many heavens above the Moone”—is amended to “Speake, are there many Spheares above the Moone?” (A 2.3.35; B 2.3.33). His questions could be asked of a natural magician, but Faustus is interested in the answers only insofar as they bring him access to more devilish delights.

The scene perverts ideas about music’s efficacy used by natural magicians and Christian music apologists by creating a new kind of black musical power. For European natural magicians, music was a central means of communication with and understanding of divinity. Pico’s classically influenced idea that music is the most effective of sciences was widely held; Agrippa cites him when writing that “nothing is more efficacious in natural magic than the hymns of Orpheus if they are presented with appropriate harmonies, careful
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attention, and apt ceremonies known to the wise." This statement in praise of music must also contain an inherent warning: to be efficacious (efficacius), the music must be “appropriate” (debita), and made with “careful attention” and “apt ceremony” (omni attentione ceteraeque circumstantiae). As the Latin suggests, the circumstances need to be right for this sound act (as opposed to speech act) to have power for good; but what if the harmonies are not appropriate or careful or apt?

Hooker makes a similar point when he suggests that church music can have affective force, bringing people to God, under the right conditions:

the force and efficacy of the thing it self, when it drowneth not utterly, but fitly suiteth with matter altogether sounding to the praise of God, is in truth most admirable, and doth much edifie, if not the Understanding, because it teacheth not; yet surely the Affection, because therein it worketh much.

The music Faustus hears has force and efficacy, but it leads neither to God nor to real understanding. It may be that music has the power to either save or damn, or it may be that context creates music’s abilities. The crucial uncertainty is that the right conditions are not easy to determine.

Faustus’ fall has been accompanied by music, and music’s power has convinced him to embrace the fate of a sinner. Music and dance, the signs of sins used in medieval morality plays like Wisdom (described in chapter 1), have been produced so convincingly for Faustus that unlike Wisdom’s Anima, Faustus will not repent. Rather he will travel the world using black magic to delight others in the way he has been delighted, to provoke, create, and hear more music.

FAUSTUS’ MUSICAL SHOWS

---

258 Hooker, The works of Mr. Richard Hooker, 184–5.
At the start of act 3, “Learned Faustus,” who now “know[s] the secrets of Astronomy” (3.chorus.1–2, in Wagner’s words), relates that he has travelled all over France and Italy, taking pleasure in the “delight” of travel (3.1.2). The play begins staging his delights, including visits to Rome and the Holy Roman Empire, and finally the conjuring of ancient Greece. Faustus shifts from being audience to Mephistopheles’ shows to becoming himself the theatrical conjurer. The shows of Faustus’ hedonistic Grand Tour include his invisible intrusion into the Pope’s banquet and subsequent excommunication by the church he says he disdains, a musical dumbshow staged to impress the Holy Roman Emperor, and his multi-sensory indulgence in the conjuring of Helen of Troy for his sole pleasure.

He first arrives in Rome, where Mephistopheles tells him that he “maist perceive/What Rome containeth to delight thee with” (3.1.29–30). In the B-text, Faustus makes his enchantment in the earth’s sensory pleasures more explicit: “Whilst I am here on earth: Let me be cloyd/With all things that delight the heart of man./My foure and twenty yeares of liberty/I'le spend in pleasure and in daliance” (B 3.1.58–61). A sennet announces the arrival of the Pope and his Cardinal and bishop, and the ceremonial notes of trumpet or cornet mean that music also sounds of power, a valence as seductive as lasciviousness (clip 2).259 “Sennet” cues occur at least sixty times in extant early modern plays, always to mark the entrance of a powerful personage.260 In the B-text, there are two further trumpet cues, including one specifically called for by the Pope (Adrian) in his humiliation of (rival Pope) Bruno: “Sound Trumpets then,” he exclaims (B 3.1.96). Trumpet sounds mark Papal power,

259 In the more theatrical and complex scene in the B-text, the group is larger, with two cardinals, two bishops, monks, friars, Pope Adrian and rival Pope Bruno, and Raymond, King of Hungary. The clip shows a contemporary herald trumpet player advertising the type of fanfare, or sennet, he can play for twenty-first-century power figures, including “television stars,…US Presidents, and corporate CEOs.” http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NkD0MxNY_Bw&feature=related

just as they evoke political and military power in countless other early modern plays. But it is crucially uncertain if Papal power extends only over earthly Catholics, or if these heralded figures actually have divine access, too.

Mephistopheles makes Faustus invisible so that he can torture the unsuspecting religious figures (by snatching their banquet dishes, boxing their ears) so much that they think they are tormented by “some ghost newly crept out of Purgatory” (3.1.73). The reference to Purgatory further reminds the audience of the prelates’ adherence to Catholic doctrines now abolished in England. While Catholic rite had been banned since Elizabeth’s 1558 ascension, many adults in the audience would recall, often fondly, the Latin devotional rituals of traditional religion. Roger Martin (1527–1615) lived through the Reformation’s turmoil in Suffolk, and in his 1590 “Memories of Long Melford,” he vividly recalls the liturgies and festivals of his youth. On Palm Sunday, for example, a singing procession reached the Lady’s Chapel “at which time a boy with a thing in his hand pointed to it, signifying a prophet as I think, sang, standing on the turret…and then all did kneel down, and then rising up went and met the sacrament, and so then went singing together into the church.” While *Doctor Faustus* represents figures of Roman Catholic power rather than English parish activity, the singing friars, the Latin, and the ecclesiastic props and costumes of the scene could evoke nostalgic memories as specific as Martin’s.

Faustus is a damned soul who torments these ambivalent religious figures: the only rite that can be performed on his behalf is the rite that excludes him from the Catholic community. The excommunication ritual is the result Faustus intentionally seeks in Rome, bastion of the highest (Catholic) religious power on earth. He *wants* to be officially excluded:

Bell, booke, and candle, candle, booke, and bell,

---

Forward and backward, to curse Faustus to hell.
Anon you that heare a hogge grunt, a calfe bleate, and an
Asse braye, because it is S. Peters holy day. (3.1.184–7)

His sing song request indicates his desire to tempt the very notion of ritualized religious
efficacy by prompting Roman friars to perform an excommunication rite. The words of the
rite they perform are conflated with those used for exorcism, implying that Faustus’ desire to
be cursed to hell is related to the fact that he is possessed by devils.

The sung dirge quotes the “Maledicate Dominus” (May God curse him) from the
excommunication service:

*Enter all the Friers to sing the Dirge.*
Come brethren, lets about our businesse with good devotion.
*Sing this.* Cursed be hee that stole away his holinesse meate from the table.
*Maledicate Dominus.*
Cursed be hee that stroke his holinesse a blowe on the face. *Maledicate Dominus.*
Cursed be he that tooke Frier Sandelo a blow on the pate. *male,* &c.
Cursed be he that disturbeth our holy Dirge. *male,* &c.
Cursed be he that tooke away his holinesse wine.
*Maledicate Dominus.*
*Et omnes sanctis Amen.* (stage direction after 3.2.87, 3.2.88–100)

Even the ridiculous accusations are sounded to the tune of real rites, tunes sung in England
as recently as the 1550s for official use, and long a part of England’s ecclesiastic structures
(clip 3). The parody of the outlawed ritual may not seem satiric to all audience members.
Suzan Last suggests that the play’s comic elements are parodic but not necessarily satiric;
parody for her is “warmer” than satire. Certainly some audience members could interpret
the scene as satiric, but others might feel the parody to be warmer, more sympathetic to
Catholic ritual itself.

---

262 In this clip from the 1964 movie *Becket*, Becket and his prelates excommunicate the Archbishop of York; the
clip begins with their singing of the excommunication rites.

263 Suzan Last, “Marlowe’s Literary Double Agency: *Doctor Faustus* as a Subversive Comedy of Error,”
Some audience members would have believed that rites like the one being represented were efficacious in their purpose. If melodies, and the Latin words, have force when performed by religious figures, then in the play-world at least, Faustus is really excommunicated. For many in the audience, ritual still held real power. The difference between parody and reverence—in Marlowe’s play and in all representation—is not always distinct. In a *New York Times* review for the 2011 musical *Book of Mormon*, an irreverent send-up of the modern day LDS church and its ecclesiastic history, Ben Brantley describes the complex relationship between represented ritual, a parody that is “warm” rather than satiric, and (music) theater:

But a major point of ‘The Book of Mormon’ is that when looked at from a certain angle, all the forms of mythology and ritual that allow us to walk through the shadows of daily life and earth are, on some level, absurd; that’s what makes them so valiant and glorious. And by the way, that includes the religion of the musical, which lends ecstatic shape and symmetry to a world that often feels overwhelmingly formless.  

Indeed, the creators of *The Book of Mormon* as well as Marlowe and his collaborators need not see the absurdities of religious belief and theatrical production as cancelling their community functions. Brantley’s recently made connection between religion and theater points to its early modern antecedent. In late sixteenth century England, the relationship between religious rituals and the newly emerging ritual of professional theater attendance was one that both playwrights and anti-theatrical Puritans exploited again and again.

Excommunication rituals may seem inane to some, but there is something direct and honest about their performative quality that Marlowe perhaps admired. Marlowe’s friend and fellow spy Richard Baines reported that Marlowe had found Catholicism to be the best possible religion. “If there be any god or any good Religion,” the playwright is reported to have said, “then it is in the papistes because the service of god is performed with more

Cerimonies…[and] all protestantes are Hypocrickall asses.”265 The representation of “Cerimonies” in Doctor Faustus is not wholly inconsistent with Marlowe’s reputed remark. The mockery of prelates suggests that Catholic rituals’ blend of absurdity and meaning is not unlike the sacred and profane performances enabled by the theater where Marlowe earned much of his living. Even meaningless ceremonies create order out of formlessness.

Ironically, the ceremony itself is one of anti-community; it affirms an ecclesiastic group’s coherence by excluding an unseen other from the fold. But the excommunication of the anti-church, anti-God Faustus does not undermine the ritual and its logic. In many ways, it is the logical ritual to be performed in this play: many would agree with a church that wanted to exclude Faustus.

The ritual is a theatrical performance, a quotation, and as such it is ambiguous as to what these sounds have the power to do. Using Derrida to revise Austin, Daniel Gates suggests that performatives are created through belief, through an authorizing, credulous social context.266 In performance, not only Faustus’ belief or unbelief but also the audience’s makes a difference: for those who still believe in the efficacy of traditional religious rites, Faustus is excommunicated.267 Beckwith has argued that dramatic performance may demonstrate the hollowness—the merely performative quality—of religious rites that were


267 Frank Romany and Robert Lindsay raise a similar point, thinking about the magic of the scene as a sort of religion: “Elizabethan audiences probably enjoyed Faustus’ pope-baiting as a liberating defiance of an exploded religious solemnity. Yet there is something troubling here. Magic, in sixteenth-century eyes, was an inverted religion, and, when Faustus and Mephistopheles are anathematized, though the ‘beat the friars, and fling fireworks among them’ (8.99 stage direction), they do also leave. It is not quite clear how much spiritual power the old religion still commands.” “Introduction,” in Christopher Marlowe: The Complete Plays, ed. Frank Romany and Robert Lindsay (London: Penguin Book, 2003), xxiv.
still being performed, at least in late medieval England. But when Doctor Faustus re-presents a ritual that has been banished from England’s ecclesiastic structure (and when that ritual makes some narrative sense), the rite may be rehabilitated. Re-performance affirms that the represented ritual has social power and cultural cache, if not spiritual efficacy.

At the same time, anti-ceremonialists in an audience could read the parody as satiric, seeing the prelates’ absurdity as merely absurd. Paul Whitefield White points out that the scene mocks not only papist superstition but also the related evils Puritans associated with English bishops, so that this anti-prelate scene could “resonate with Puritans.” Puritans frequently assaulted the Papist notion that musical rite was the best way to communicate with God (as opposed to prayer). In Northbrooke’s words, Protestants must:

> take heede that in Musicke bee not put the whole summe and effect of godlynesse, and of the worshipping of God, which among the Papistes they doe almost everywhere thinke that they haue fullye worshipped God, when they haue long and much sung and piped.

By Northbrooke’s logic, the play’s parody has shown that papists sing to God only to be heard by devils.

To those who thought like Northbrooke, the presence of devils at a papal gathering would seem expected, their hellish company furthering the image of Catholicism as demonic promoted by Puritans. In this sense, Doctor Faustus may be seen by some as aiding in reform, a goodly function Thomas Nashe had suggested for the theater in his defense of it.

---


270 Northbrooke, *Spiritus est vicarious*, 84.

Perhaps that is why the play escaped censorship and continued to be performed and printed: it could be read as in service of official religion. But the play—and as we all but know from a few biographical details, Marlowe himself—cannot be contained by one ideological reading.

As Bakhtin has explained, parody is dialogic, incorporating not only alternative, subversive voices but also the ideologies and voices of the original that is parodied. Parody gives power to that which is worthy of being represented, and in the case of the theater, performed. Greenblatt writes that in Doctor Faustus as well as Tamburlaine, “the blasphemy pays homage to the power it insults… Such acts of aggression are spectacular, but they are ultimately bound in by the orthodoxy against which they revolt.” In this scene, the actors revolt against and pay homage to the former orthodoxy, Catholicism, even as they revolt against and pay homage to the current orthodoxy, Protestantism (which has defined itself by means of such parodies on Catholicism). The parody is also parodied. That is, the religious ritual may be seen as deflated, by some, but the scene may also satirize the idea—an old cliché by the late sixteenth century—that Catholics are in the devil’s service.

By the late sixteenth century, the Puritanical associations of traditional religion with devils and witchcraft were well known. While the association clearly continued to exert power over some—it persisted throughout the early modern era—the gig was up for many who were weary of the exaggerated claim. The ruse was exploited to authorize the Puritanical witch hunts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that haunt England’s past as well as America’s, and to further ostracize recusants, as if the religion that had served England for hundreds of years had always been Satanic. Reginald Scot’s 1584 Discoverie of

---

272 Bakhtin, The Dialogic Imagination, 364.
Witchcraft had exposed the fallacy of the church and the state’s frequent conflation of black magic and traditional religion to assert a Protestant agenda. In Emily Bartels’ analysis, both Scot’s text and Marlowe’s play “address and subvert the demonization of magic,” and its association with Catholicism. Scot exposed the witch craze as a “manipulation of the powerless by the powerful.”

Scot not only defends natural magic as able to “set forth the glorie of God,” but also he attacks the witchmongers who pray on the poor and Catholic underclasses and invent dangers for a fictional dark magic that is really just “old wives fables.” The craze had created an ignorant hysteria: “Good Lord! How light of credit is the wavering mind of man! How unto tales and lies his ears attend all they can!”

Scot and Marlowe both expose that while profane entertainments may threaten people’s “chaste ears,” filthy lies invented by those who created the notion of aural chastity can be equally corrupt.

At the start of the fourth act, Faustus continues visiting the world’s most powerful people when he conjures a show for the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V. Faustus’ fame as a magician has spread, and the Emperor requests to see Faustus’ “rare effects of Magicke” by asking him to revive the Emperor’s hero, Alexander the Great (4.1.4). In the A-text, the trick is staged as a simple show and tell: Mephistopheles appears on stage escorting Alexander the Great and his paramour, who are inspected to Charles’ satisfaction. In the B-text, the scene has been expanded to include a musical dumb show. The dumb show resembles the sort of neoclassical drama popular in England during the 1560s, 70s, and 80s, plays like Thomas Norton and Thomas Sackville’s Gorboduc (1561). By this point, Faustus has


276 Ibid., 96.
already staged, witnessed, or discussed representations of morality drama, farce, and lyrical music, and this scene adds neo-classical drama to the list of sixteenth-century entertainments with which Faustus engages.

The Emperor is heralded by a sennet (again, the sound of power), and Faustus calls attention to the trumpet’s ritualistic significance when he sets the scene for the arrival of the classical paragon of military and political might:277

Mephosto away.
And with a solemne noyse of trumpets sound,
Present before this royall Emperour,
Great Alexander and his beauteous Paramour. (B 4.1.80–3)

Trumpets not only sound of military might, but they were also spoken of as weapons in several early modern accounts. A trumpet sound suggests “the glitz of aristocracy while alluding to the intimidating power that lay behind it.”278 Faustus has become a consummate showman, calling for the sounds that will flatter both living and dead emperors.

Explaining that the Emperor must not question Alexander and his paramour (who are unspeaking shadows rather than resurrected sentient beings), Faustus requires acoustic control over the upcoming performance: “Your grace demand no questions of the king,/But in dumbe silence let them come and goe” (B 4.1.95–6). As promised, the show begins with the solemn (that is, ceremonious) music of the trumpet, which apparently accompanies the entire dumbshow:

Senit. Enter at one the Emperour Alexander, at the other, Darius; they meete, Darius is throwne down, Alexander kils him; takes off his Crowne, and offering to goe out, his Paramour meetes him, he embraceth her, and, sets Darius Crowne upon her head; and coming backe, both salute the Emperour, who leaving his State, offers to

277 Militaristic sounds are parodied soon after this scene in the B-text, when a Devil’s drumming accompanies Mephistopheles and Faustus’ ambush of Benvolio’s army: “Faustus strikes the dore, and enter a devill playing on a Drum, after him another bearing an Ensigne: and divers with weapons, Mephostophilis with fire-workes; they set upon the Souldiers and drive them out” (stage direction after B 4.3.105).

278 Marsh, Music and Society, 14.
embrace them, which Faustus seeing, suddenly staies him. Then trumpets cease, and
Musicke sounds. (stage direction after B 4.1.102)

The Emperor is so enamored with the show that he tries to join it, and Faustus, the magician
turned theatrical producer, changes the acoustics from blaring trumpets to something more
melodic, a song to which the shadows can continue to move about the stage in a formalized
procession. Faustus must warn the Emperor that these are shades rather than Alexander and
his paramour themselves: “My gracious Lord, you doe forget your selfe,/These are but
shadoes, not substantiall” (4.1.103–4). Anticipating Shakespeare’s Puck, Faustus’ meta-
theatricality reminds the Emperor that this musical dumb show was a magical conjuring. Music has both pulled the Emperor into feeling the show to be real and made the
presentation overtly theatrical. Faustus’ real music, real actors, but fake Greeks remind the
audience of the insubstantiality of the theater itself: the actors playing Alexander and his
paramour are actual flesh and blood, they are no more resurrected Greeks than the
Emperor’s conjured spirits are in the reality of the play.

The Emperor, however, demonstrates the real power of all such shadows, that is, of
magical, theatrical, and religious imagining: “O pardon me, my thoughts are so
ravished/With sight of this renowned Emperour,/That in mine armes I would have compast
him” (B 4.1.105–7). To “satisfie [his] longing thoughts at full,” the Emperor would have
wished to speak to them, but he is pleased by his ability to locate the wart on the paramour’s
neck (B 4.1.109, a detail included in the A-text as well). This visual treat is not all that pleases
the Emperor, however. Lacking the ability to produce dialogue, Faustus has created a
ravishing show by using music—the very thing that had ravished him—to delight his royal

279 Puck’s epilogue: “If we shadowes have offended,/Thinke but this (and all is mended)/That you have but
slumbered heere/While these visions did appeare./And this weake and idle theame,/No more yeelding but a
dreame.” *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* (Epilogue.1–6).
patron. Music has distracted the Emperor from his desire to hear speech. In their frequent use of music, magical and theatrical tricks have much in common.\textsuperscript{280} Like other early modern magicians and theater artists, Faustus has learned that music can be used to manipulate a receptive audience.

That magic is the domain of both devils and dramatists has been pointed out by Huston Diehl, and the self-consciousness of this play \textit{qua} play is particularly apparent in Faustus’ conjuring of Alexander and his paramour.\textsuperscript{281} In representing theatrical experience as something that can be conjured, as something that can be made more effective and satisfying through music, the play addresses anti-theatrical, anti-artistic viewpoints that object to the performed arts of theater and music on the grounds that they resemble occult practice. The theater is like magic in its ability to conjure new worlds and new identities, which, it was said, is an act of hubris that puts artists in a blasphemous rivalry with God the creator. Similar complaints extend to narrative ballads and artful song. Diehl points out that despite these assaults on phantasmic practice, theater \textit{about} magic flourished in the late sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{282} It seems more likely, though, that the theater explored magic’s imaginative possibilities \textit{because} of this kinship. The anti-theatrical criticism that links theater with magic points out a helpful, creatively rich possibility for playwrights. In a similar vein, attacks on both sacred and profane music reminded playwrights of music’s particular charms and powers.

Attacks that criticize Catholic and High Anglican services and drama reveal the attachments many had to aurally and visually rich experience. William Prynne rails against

\textsuperscript{280} For more on the connections between the arts, see Phillip Butterworth, \textit{Magic on the Early English Stage} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

\textsuperscript{281} Diehl, \textit{Staging Reform}, 76. Diehl focuses on spectacle, but sound is equally crucial to the play’s self-consciousness.

\textsuperscript{282} Ibid., 168.
“ravishinge Musicke” in both the theater and church.\textsuperscript{283} Philip Stubbes iterates a frequent concern that the anti-sensual, non-aesthetic Protestant services are far less popular than the theater: “And those that will never come at Sermons will flow thither [to the theater] apace.”\textsuperscript{284} Repeated assaults against human-created sounds and images and their ability to, like magic, ravish the senses point at the same time to the continued popularity of theatrical and musical art. For most theater patrons and churchgoers, though, the ability to be ravished by an experience—sensually or spiritually—was precisely the appeal.

In \textit{Doctor Faustus}, the ontological stakes of theatrical song and spectacle (and its Catholic counterparts) are raised by the fact that shows \textit{are} performed by the devils, quite literally. Marlowe is perhaps at his most subversive when the action suggests an agreement with the Puritans’ bizarre claims about devil-priests and devil-playhouses: “Stage playes,” says Prynne, “are the very Devils own peculier pompes, Play-houses his Synagogues; Players, his professed Masse-priests and Choirsters; Play haunters his devoted servants…”\textsuperscript{285} The musical spectacle commissioned by the Holy Roman Emperor (and the real Charles V was famously opposed to the Protestant Reformation), \textit{is} both Catholic, in its way, and is conjured by the Devil’s magic. The joke, of course, is that anyone Puritanical enough to believe the point that Marlowe’s conjured show suggests could not be in attendance at a performance of \textit{Doctor Faustus} without endangering their soul and exposing their hypocrisy.

\begin{itemize}
\item Or in Northbrooke’s objection: “[They say that] Playes are as good as Sermons, and that they learne as much or more at a Playe, than they doe at Gods worde preached. God be mercifull to this Realme of Englande, for we begynne to haue ythching cares, and lothe that heavenly Manna, as appeareth by their flowe and negligent comming vnto Sermons, and running so fast, and so many, continually vnto Playes.&c,” \textit{Spiritus est vicarious}, 66.
\item \textsuperscript{285} Prynne, \textit{Histrio-Mastix}, 529.
\end{itemize}
Faustus’ final delight in stagecraft comes from the conjuring of another classical figure, this time not for a famous patron’s benefit, but for his own lascivious pleasure. The meta-theatrical conjuring of Helen, accompanied by music (in both texts), again associates the theater with magic. As with the Emperor’s dumb show, Faustus demands sonic control so that the music and the spectacle of her supposedly peerless beauty can be fully effective: “Be silent then, for danger is in words/Musicke sounds, and Helen passeth over the Stage” (5.1.25 and stage direction after 5.1.25). A boy actor would have played Helen, and again music is used to distract the auditor from potential disappointment. The boy may not have a face that could launch a thousand ships, but the halo of sound accompanying his entrance begins to make up for his lack of millihelens.\(^{286}\)

The conjuring of Helen is another act of imagination, and its tonal accompaniment reinforces the sense to which this beauty, like the she-devil of 2.1, is at root a demon. If a popular tune were played at this moment, perhaps a well-known dance song, the moment would suggest Helen’s tawdry similarity to any seductive woman, or boy for that matter. If the musicians played a more slow and mysterious, maybe minor, melody, the music would enhance the unreality of the trick. Either a popular or odd tune would in different ways call attention to the tricksiness of the moment, to the fakeness of Faustus’ show.

Affective music, as is discussed above, was often labeled “ravishing,” a term which suggests that its sexual and spiritual qualities are related. Any kind of tune, bawdy or mysterious, would suggest both sexuality and at the same time the divinity that is being forsaken for dark magic. Faustus forsakes heaven’s ravishing harmony for a purely sexual ravishment. The power of music to captivate Faustus and enhance this lewd scene points

\(^{286}\) One millihelen is the amount of beauty required to launch one ship. The word was possibly coined by Isaac Asimov, http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=milli-Helen
simultaneously to music’s danger and to its power, a power that some would see as contingent on context. Perhaps music is always a vain and lascivious delight, as the Puritans claimed, but perhaps, as Thomas Wright and other musical theorists speculated, music makes bad man worst and good men better.  

In addition to musical (and visual) ravishment, of course, Faustus experiences tactile delight; he kisses Helen upon her re-entrance (5.1.93). When he cries that “Her lips suckes forth my soule, see where it flies,” he quotes Baldassare Castiglione’s idea that souls unite with kissing (5.1.94). It was commonly held that kissing shared this property with music: both were able to draw souls out of their body. For the writer of In Praise of Musick, music is “that thing which is most excellent in man, dividing as it were his soule from his body, and lifting vp his cogitations aboue himselfe.” Again, Marlowe calls on learned and popular traditions only to subvert them. Faustus’ soul is not drawn upward through Helen’s music and kiss. When Faustus exclaims that “heaven be in these lips,” the opposite is true, for the lips’ sweetness is not heavenly, and probably not even earthly (5.1.96). Kissing the demonic shade, Faustus commences the final sequence leading to his destruction. As the Old Man reports, Faustus “excludst the grace of heaven” by embracing false Helen’s false heaven (5.1.110). In the play’s final moments, the sounds of hell will drown out and even obliterate all of these delights.

287 Thomas Wright, The Passions of the Minde in Generall (1604), ed. Thomas O. Sloan (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971), 163–71. So while Wright and others insisted that music makes bad men lusty but elevates the noble mind, Puritans claimed that the opposite was true. Their sentiment is parodied by the Duke in Measure for Measure: “musick oft have such a charme/to make bad, good; and good to provoake to harme” (4.1.14–15).


290 In Praise of Musick, 152.
In both the A- and B-texts, Faustus describes the reason for his damnation as an inability to sound forth prayer and listen to God. Explaining to the scholars why he never told them of his plight or allowed anyone to pray for him, he says, “Oft have I thought to have done so, but the divell threatened to tear mee in pieces, if I named God, to fetch both body and soule, if I once gave eare to divinitie: and now tis too late” (5.2.46–9). The B-text further dramatizes the centrality of sound in one’s salvation or damnation, adding a final return of the Good and Bad Angels. They enter and emphasize the importance of listening to the right sounds:

Good: Oh Faustus, if thou hadst given eare to me,  
Innumerable joyes had followed thee.  
But thou didst love the world.  
Bad: Gave ear to me,  
And now must taste hels paines perpetually. (B 5.104–8)

The sounds of the last twenty-four years have tested Faustus, and he has chosen to ignore the Good Angel’s homiletic messages in favor of the sensual delights of “vaine pleasure” (5.2.40/B 5.2.68).

For this he has lost “eternall joy and felicitie,” and in the B text, heaven’s joys are briefly heard and witnessed, only to be withdrawn (5.2.41/B 5.2.70). The stage directions and the Good Angel’s speech indicate the stagecraft:

Musicke while the Throne descends.  
Good: O thou hast lost celestiall happinesse,  
Pleasures unspeakeable, blisse without end.  
Hadst thou affected sweet divinite,  
Hell, or the Divell, had had no power on thee.  
Hadst thou kept on that way, Faustus behold,  
In what resplendent glory thou hadst set  
In yonder throne, like those bright shining Saints,  
And triumph over hell, that hast thou lost. (B stage direction after 5.2.110; 111–20)
Bevington and Rasmussen explain that the throne would have been let down from above by means of a winch, cord, and pulleys, and that Faustus and the audience would see the gilded throne surrounded by saints, who were either painted or portrayed by mute actors.\textsuperscript{291} The scene also calls on the long theatrical tradition of representing heaven by means of music; the effect is used in the Digby Mary Magdalene when Mary ascends into heaven, for example (chapter 1). But whereas the sounds and visual representation of heaven are most often staged in the context of a character’s triumphant ascension, Doctor Faustus’ staged heaven tantalizes Faustus with what he will never have, beginning his torture. The man who has throughout the play been able to conjure and listen to music at will is for the first time unable to control sound.

The trope of hearing angels’ song at one’s death was not only a theatrical tradition. In the late sixteenth century, many real people expected to hear singing angels beginning at the moment of their death. When Sir Philip Sidney died in 1586, he called for earthly music “to fashion and enfranchise his heavenly soul unto that everlasting harmony of angels, whereof these concords were a kinde of terestriall echo.”\textsuperscript{292} The staged music of Doctor Faustus, in Thomas Wright’s words, should “resembleth in a certain manner the voyces & Harmonye of Heaven.”\textsuperscript{293} The audience could understand that the earthly performance, even if it falls short, signifies the “everlasting harmony of angels” they hope to hear upon their deaths. But the effect is ironic, for Faustus is destined to not hear these songs for long.

The tantalizingly brief angel’s song emphasizes the disastrous consequences of Faustus’ choices. At the same time, the performed music may not live up to the sublime beauty that would make a virtuous life worthwhile. The impossibility of representing angels’

\textsuperscript{291} Bevington and Rasmussen, Doctor Faustus, 46.
\textsuperscript{293} Wright, Passions of the Mind, 206.
song points to the impossibility of knowing what real angels’ song—if it exists—even sounds like. In theatrical representation, heaven’s music may buttress or undermine the play’s plot, depending on an audience member’s willingness to suspend disbelief. This test of credulity at the final moment is consistent with the play’s continued meta-theatrical examination of the theatrics of religious belief. Christians of all denominations hoped for angels’ song at their deaths; heaven’s music transcends earthly debates about ecclesiastic, profane, and magical music on earth. Puritans, Catholics, and Anglicans have in common a desire for this music at the end of life, but its ironic re-presentation may cause one to wonder about their access to such music.

Seventeenth-century accounts of Restoration performances of Doctor Faustus attest to the play’s potential to be sonically overwhelming (as well as to its ability to generically transform). “None made such a great noise as his comedy of Doctor Faustus with his devils and suchlike tragical sport, which pleased much the humors of the vulgar,” writes William Winstanley in 1687.294 The B-text certainly lays the foundation for a noisy play, and no scene is louder than the spectacular sequence of Faustus’ final descent into the hellmouth. As soon as the Good Angel finishes her speech about Faustus’ lack of access to heaven’s joys, the stage direction reads: “Hell is discovered” (stage direction after B 5.2.120). Likely, a curtain was drawn to reveal a gaping jaw, as per theatrical and manuscript depictions of hellmouths, and out of this jaw came violent noises representing Faustus’ future torments.

While the sounds (and sight) of this theatrical hellmouth may have frightened some, accounts of it as “pleasing” suggest that the representation did not always produce existential fear. Representing the horrors of hell with the tools of early modern theatrics certainly stretches the capacities of these tools. The hellish sounds—thunder, screaming, drumming,

whatever—were not likely to terrify all audience members into fearing a similar fate for themselves. In representing the sounds of heaven and hell—those entities that religion and magic seek to understand—the play pushes hard on the abilities of earthly music-making. In questioning the efficacy of human music to even approximate divine mysteries, the scene also throws a shadow of doubt on all human knowledge and practice aimed at such things.

Perhaps the most effectively chilling sounds of the final scene are those that represent the earthly sound of clocks. These acoustic markers of temporality strike out Faustus’ final hour on earth in both the A and B texts. After the scholars leave (in the A-text, or the angels in the B-text), “the clocke strikes eleaven” (stage direction after 5.2.64). In the midst of a last desperate plea to the learned classical traditions that underwrite his magic (this time he calls on Pythagoras’ idea of metempsychosis), Faustus hears it again:

Ah, halfe the houre is past: The watch strikes.
Twil all be past anone.

The bell tolls for Faustus to mark his unique pact that ends at midnight, but it also resembles the contemporary sound of mortality. The ringing of a passing bell before a parishioner’s death is a practice that survived into the seventeenth century: the single ring of the church bell produced a fellow feeling of mortality among all who heard it. Writes John Donne, “[n]ow, this Bell tolling softly for another, saies to me, Thou must die.”295 The sounds of the watch bells evoke not only man’s inevitable movement through time towards death, but also the sound of mortality itself. Heaven and hell have been exposed as un-representable, unknowable, but death—the animator of religious and magical practice—is a certainty.

Faustus’ fate in the play has more certitude, as the character is certainly destined to his theatricalized hell. But if damnation is real, the cause of it is also unknowable, and Faustus struggles with this. He doesn’t know whether to assign agency for his impending

doom to his parents (and by extension the creator of his prenatal soul), to himself, or to the Devil:

Curst be the parents that ingendered me:  
No Faustus, curse thy selfe, curse Lucifer,  
That hath deprived thee of the joyes of heaven:  
*The clocke striketh twelve.*  
O it strikes, it strikes, now body turn to ayre,  
Or Lucifer will beare thee quick to hel:  
*Thunder and lightning.*  
Oh soul, be changed into little water drops,  
And fal into the Ocean, nere be found:  
My God, my God, looke not so fierce on me: *Enter divels.* (5.2.113–120)

The three clock bells and the sound of thunder accelerate Faustus’ descent, acoustically assuring him and the audience of Faustus’ upcoming destruction. Faustus, like Shakespeare’s Richard II (who also hears discordant sounds before his death), wasted time, and now doth time waste him.²⁹⁶

Faustus’ final indecision about whom to curse for his destruction iterates the play’s central, horrible unknowable: we do not know what dooms or saves us, and whether we are destined for heaven, hell, or neither. Do our choices and deeds (as per Catholic and Anglican theology) damn or redeem us, or has God already chosen our fate (as per the Calvinist, Puritan-favored doctrine of the elect)? The play’s dealings with the question of free will versus pre-destination have been debated at length.²⁹⁷ But in theatrical presentation, this question takes more a nuanced form than advocating for one or another theology. This play

²⁹⁶ Before his death, Richard hears music outside his prison cell: “Musicke do I heare?/Ha,ha? Kepe time: How sowre sweete Musicke is,/When time is broke/…I wasted Time, and now doth Time waste me” (5.4.45–7, 54).

²⁹⁷ For an account of critical responses to the predestination versus free will question in *Doctor Faustus*, see Bruce Brandt, “The Critical Backstory,” in *Doctor Faustus: A Critical Guide*, ed. Sara Munson Deats (London: Continuum, 2010), 32–3. Critics have read the play’s texts as Calvinist, Anglican, or as dramatizing the tension between the two. Some stress the interplay between Calvinist and Anglican readings, and still others suggest that the A text is Calvinist and the B text is Anglican. Alan Sinfield suggests that Faustus is predestined to hell, but that the play condemns the God who sends them there, and several others suggest that the play is deliberately ambiguous. Alan Sinfield, *Literature in Protestant England, 1560–1660* (London: Croom Helm, 1983).
engages with not only the pre-destination versus free will debate, but also contentious discussions over the powers of drama, of music, of religious ritual, and of magic. Lusty songs, magical spells, stage plays, dances, sermons, Masses: all have the ability to do things when performed. Does sin or salvation lie in the act of doing? Or in hearing? Or in believing what is heard? The earthly and extraterrestrial sounds of the play—evocative of sacred and secular practice—echo with the horrors of bottomless uncertainty.

The play is deliberately ambiguous on the question of sonic efficacy, leaving audiences (and later, critics) to consider what power church rites, bawdy music, and the mysteries of harmony have on people and their souls. Can these sounds lead mortals to the music of eternal bliss, or to the clamor of damnation? Is it possible to know what those afterlife locations sound like, or if they even exist as most have imagined? The hermeneutic openness of the play’s represented sounds gives the audience a frightening amount of power to think what they will, thus presenting them with an interpretive crux similar to the one Faustus himself has when giving his life a final examination.

The fact that critics have seen Doctor Faustus as asserting the orthodoxy of Calvinist Protestantism, of critiquing that theology, or of undermining all religious authority suggests that contemporary audiences would have also had divergent responses. I agree with Last that “folly is in simple interpretation.”298 It is deeply problematic to assign any one ideological standpoint to this play, or to suggest that audiences would have a unified interpretation. The play has presented multiple genres of sounds and images, the mere consumption of which may or may not be sinful. Its final horrible noises may have the power to frighten an auditor into renouncing the indulgences Faustus has enjoyed in hopes of saving himself, or the play may make an audience member laugh at the religious mindset that endorses such a

298 Last, “Marlowe’s Literary Double Agency,” 40.
worldview. But auditors, like Faustus, are likely to waver in their conclusions, and doubt that their interpretation of eschatological truth is the right one is the very point of the play.

*Doctor Faustus'* use of philosophy, as critics have pointed out, is especially indebted to hermeticism, that hybridized brand of academic thinking that influenced the natural magic practiced by Agrippa, Ficino, and Pico. Hermeticism draws its ideas from classical sources, occult traditions, Hebrew writings, and Christian theology, and some early modern adherents hoped that its fusion might suggest solutions for the sixteenth century’s religious schisms.299 In addition to quoting Hermetic ideas, the play uses classical literature, Puritanical tracts, traditional religious ritual, and other forms of contemporary natural and black magic to reflect the muddled complexity of sixteenth-century philosophical and religious thought. This inclusiveness might make any one worldview briefly seem validated. But ultimately, competing truths destabilize the idea that there is knowable truth. Religion, magic, science, art—all are epistemic projects with unprovable efficacy.

The play’s hybridized complexity does not suggest a solution to religious warring by asserting the compatibility of myriad ideas, but rather exposes the potential hollowness of all truth claims. Music’s role in church services and religious rituals, its potential to corrupt souls, the science behind its harmonious efficacy: all of these issues were debated with the same stakes. People wanted to predict the movement of the soul in the afterlife. In representing various kinds of music and questioning the earthly and unearthly powers of sound, the play questions the projects of religion and magic themselves.

*Doctor Faustus* presents anyone who thinks their fate is certain with the dilemma Shakespeare’s Lafew warns of in *All’s Well That Ends Well* (1604–5): “we make trifles of terrours, ensconsing our selves into seeming knowledge, when we should submit our selves

299 For more on this idea, see Duxfield, “Doctor Faustus and Renaissance Hermeticism,” 108.
to an unknowne feare” (2.3.1–5). Marlowe’s play exposes that philosophical and theological knowledge is only ever “seeming.” The play’s numerous representations of religious, theatrical, musical, and magical cultures appeals to various viewpoints in its diverse audience, revealing that competing claims to truth only make sense in terms of each other. Hard-line religious ideologies are necessarily compromised, reliant on other viewpoints to have power or even make sense. Thus these viewpoints are inherently hypocritical in any form that does not admit to its contingency.

The sounds of Doctor Faustus perform and reinforce the terrors of “unknown fear,” ringing with the discordant sounds of diverse pleasures, rites, and theologies. Lafew is not the only Shakespearean character to carry this epistemic crisis into the seventeenth century. Other characters, including Richard II for example, deal with the unknowability of any theological truth.300 Doctor Faustus has annihilated the very notion of knowable truth, and the process of calling truth into question is what allows for the listening necessary to bring about compromise. Certainty must be hollowed out to make room for the entertainment of other ideas. In Shakespeare’s very late play, The Winter’s Tale (1611), Leontes must undergo a crisis of faith before he can hear other voices. In that play, diverse sounds and deliberate ambiguity lead not to unresolved discord, but to the fragile harmony of a reconciled community.

300 In the same famous speech before his death, Richard II laments the theological contradiction: “thoughts of things Divine, are intermixt/With scruples, and do set the Faith it selfe/Against the Faith: as thus: Come little ones: & then again,/It is as hard to come, as for a Camell/To thred the posterne of a Needles eye” (5.4.12–16).
CHAPTER 4:  
MAKING MUSIC AND DIVINITY IN THE WINTER’S TALE

When a gentleman named Ruggerio tells his friend about Leontes’ reunion with his daughter Perdita, he suggests that the joy of the moment exceeds the sort of music that the ballad-mongering Autolycus had performed throughout the play’s previous act: “such a deale of wonder is broken out within this houre, that Ballad-makers cannot be able to expresse it” (5.2.23–25). Indeed in the play’s final scene, the popular ballads and dances of Bohemia are replaced with the solemnity of the instrumental music Paulina cues to reanimate Hermione’s statue: “Musick; awake her: strike” (5.3.98). While critics have often noted The Winter’s Tale’s handling of visual iconography and iconoclasm, this play is equally interested in the affective powers of aural art, and in music’s ability to convey tonalities beyond the meanings expressed by language and spectacle. Countering Puritanical attacks against theater, music, and traditional religion that continued into the reign of King James, the music of The Winter’s Tale (1611) suggests the vitality of man-made art and celebrates the interdependence of myriad forms of the sacred and profane.

301 Ross Duffin points out that “Rogero” is the name of a contemporary ballad tune, to which is set a song about a jealous husband; he thinks the reference is intentional. Shakespeare’s Songbook (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2004), 342–5. All references are to The Norton Facsimile of the First Folio of Shakespeare, ed. Charlton Hinman (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1996).

Two types of music accompany the play’s movement towards the reconciliation of the jealous king Leontes with the wife and daughter he had thought dead. There is the popular music of act 4—the songs sung by Autolycus and the shepherds and the masque-like dances they stage—and the seemingly miraculous instrumental music of act 5. The theater is uniquely able to juxtapose these profane and divine musics, both of which are needed to bring harmony to a family and country marked by their deafness and silence in the play’s first three acts.

Situating the music of *The Winter’s Tale* in its Jacobean religious and social contexts—which include Puritan opposition to papist liturgy and festive music, the rising popularity of the masque, and the growing field of acoustics—helps one hear how the play’s music collaborates with other performance tools to project an urgent call for religious and artistic freedom. Although *The Winter’s Tale* is set in a classicized, pre-Christian past, the play’s music and religious allusions refer to contemporary English practice. This hybridized setting—references to Delphos and ancient Bohemia alongside indications of Whitsun and Puritans and representations of contemporary ballad tunes—allowed the play to avoid censorship for being overtly topical in its treatment of spiritual issues. Censorship of controversial religious material—long promoted and officially the law since 1606—encouraged Shakespeare, in Arthur Marotti’s words, “to use indirection and ambiguity in handling both general and specifically topical religious subject matter.”303 The classicized *Winter’s Tale* is more open in arrangement and oblique in topic than, for example, Marlowe’s *Doctor Faustus*, with its morality structure and direct handling of religious doctrine (chapter 3). The generically inclusive *Winter’s Tale*—which is a fantastical hybridization of romance, pastoral, tragedy,

---

comedy, and masque—performs irreverent music and dance as well as subtle dramatic
scenes probing the painful psychological depths of jealousy and forgiveness.

As one of several late Shakespeare plays that used a considerable variety of music to
tell its story, *The Winter's Tale* exemplifies the hybridized dramatic form called musical
theater.\(^{304}\) *The Winter's Tale* was written after the King’s Men had taken over the former
Dominican priory Blackfriars, and Andrew Gurr explains that inheriting Blackfriars’ “new
music consort brought the largest single alteration to the King’s Men’s practices.”\(^{305}\) The
King’s Men began to pay their band in 1609, and the consort’s skilled instrumentalists
became the highest paid production personnel.\(^{306}\) The success of this “more fully articulated
field of sound” led the King’s Men to retrofit their outdoor venue, the Globe, with a
curtained music room above the stage.\(^{307}\) Stage music and song soon became “what
differentiated the King’s Men at the Globe from other amphitheater companies.”\(^{308}\) In
addition to playing at the Globe and at Blackfriars, *The Winter's Tale* played before King
James’ court an unprecedented six times.

Despite this popularity, *The Winter's Tale* withstood attacks on several grounds.
Chapter 3 cites examples of the anti-theatrical and anti-music propaganda continuously
directed against both the professional theater and the popular entertainments represented

---

\(^{304}\) Peter Ackroyd goes so far as to call Shakespeare the begetter of musical theater, though of course as this
dissertation has shown, there are many earlier examples. Ackroyd, *Shakespeare: The Biography* (New York: Anchor
Books, 2005), 358.


\(^{306}\) For more on the development of music in adult playing companies and the building of music rooms in early
seventeenth-century English theater, see Christopher Marsh, *Music and Society in Early Modern England*
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 132.

\(^{307}\) The phrase Bruce Smith uses to describe the acoustic changes in Shakespeare’s plays after the move to
Blackfriars, in *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-Factor* (Chicago: Chicago University
Press, 1999), 221.

\(^{308}\) Gurr, *The Shakespearian Playing Companies*, 368.
within the play. Pamphleteer Stephen Gosson attacked music in the theater in particular for the way it “rather effeminate[s] the minde as prickes unto vice, then procure[s] amendement of maners as spurres to virtue.”\(^{309}\) Popular music, including both the ballads and country dances re-presented in *The Winter’s Tale*, were extra-theatrical musical targets. Puritans found Autolycus’ industry morally reprehensible, and worried that the renewed popularity of ballads made the songs spiritually dangerous to all kinds of people. In 1595, Nicholas Bownd branded ballads as Catholic in subject matter and suggested that they threatened official religion with their ability to drown out Psalm singing:

> For as when the light of the Gospell came first in, the singing of ballades (that was rife in Poperie) began to cease, and in time was cleane banished away in many places: so now the sudden renewing of them, and hasty receiving of them every where, maketh me to suspect, least they should drive away the singing of Psalmes againe.\(^{310}\)

Regarding country dancing, Phillip Stubbes asks “what clipping, what culling, what kissing and bussing, what smooching and slavering one of another, what filthie groping and uncleane handling is not practised in those dancings?”\(^{311}\) Against these protests, *The Winter’s Tale* not only represents profane entertainments, but also suggests their powerful role in the (re)creation of community.

Whether performed in public or private, the play’s audience was religiously and economically diverse. Blackfriars provided a particularly interesting audience of known Catholic recusants, and indeed this enclave of “cultural inclusiveness” included London’s most fashionable center for Masses.\(^{312}\) Thinking of the early Jacobean population in terms of


categorical Catholics and Protestants—or even recusants, Anglicans, and Puritans—oversimplifies the “great muddled middle” of Englishmen and women who, as historians like Eamon Duffy and Christopher Haigh have shown, created a spectrum of religious identity rather than discrete ideological camps. Everyone on that spectrum had different, often changing ideas about the role of music in spiritual life. Recusant Catholics continued to practice underground masses and partake in traditional festivities, and many Anglicans continued to defend the retention of music in the church while Puritans worked to ban or restrict it.

By 1611, however, church music had changed irrevocably for everyone outside the Chapel Royal and a few Cathedrals. The Reformation had diminished England’s liturgical music in the parishes; the “bare ruined choirs” of Shakespeare’s sonnet 73 were aural as well as architectural losses. Debates over the spiritual efficacy of music—laid out in chapter 3—continued as services became more Puritan in form. By 1611, parish music was largely restricted to congregational singing of Puritan-approved metrical psalms, in English, unaccompanied, and without harmonies or polyphonic lines (the Puritans protested any music that obscured hearing the word of God in plain English). Next to the complex

---


315 The sonnet begins:
That time of yeare thou maist in me behold
When yellow leaves, or none, or few doe hange
Upon those boughs which shake against the could,
Bare ruin’d quiers, where late the sweet birds sang.
chants sung by trained clerics, these participatory songs sound amateur, unartful: compare for example track 12 with tracks 1, 5, and 10. However, congregations enjoyed the chance to partake in even this impoverished form of musical worship. This compromise between those who wanted no music at all, like Thomas Becon, and Anglicans like Richard Hooker or Thomas Wright who wanted Anglicized traditional musical rites, helped transform England into a Protestant nation.

The rise of hymnody threatened specialist music, as trained choirs singing accompanied complex harmonies were replaced with the sounds of untrained parishioners singing *a capella* melodies of questionable merit. One Jacobean commentator explained the attack on choirs and the musically structured services that had long served England well: “dvers preachers being set a work by the humours of the aforesaid reformers…in their sermons did perswade the people from the reverent use of service in song.” But even as the Puritans won the music battle in parish churches by the late sixteenth century, Elizabeth I employed such musical luminaries as Thomas Tallis and William Byrd to compose for the

---

316 William Prynne, for example, argued that “Modest and chaste harmonies are to be admitted by removing as far as may be all soft effeminate music from our strong and valiant cogitation, which using a dishonest art of warbling the voice, do lead to a delicate and slothful kind of life.” Prynne, *Histriomastix* (London: 1633), 275, http://eebo.chadwyck.com.

317 “Congregational rendition of Psalm 29 to the ‘Low Dutch’ Tune,” on CD accompanying Marsh. Marsh explains that this low Dutch tune was recommended for this text by Richard Allison in 1599. The Dufay Collective renders all the note values equal in accordance with congregational practice, and also has a parish clerk “line out” the congregation by informing them of the words they are about to sing. Marsh, *Music and Society*, 553.


choirs and musicians of the high Anglican Chapel Royal. While Puritans protested polyphony in popular and secular music alike, complex madrigal styles from the continent inspired the contrapuntal work of Tallis and Byrd.

Byrd, a staunch Catholic, is a particularly interesting artistic figure, writing English anthems for official use as well as works like a polyphonic cycle of mass propers, the Latin *Gradualia*, which was published amidst anti-Catholic frenzy following the 1605 Gunpowder Plot (track 13).\(^{320}\) There are accounts of men being arrested for possessing the score for this religiously subversive but sublimely beautiful liturgy. Byrd himself remained protected by Elizabeth and then James, but fellow Jesuit artists like priest-poet Robert Southwell were less fortunate: Southwell was hanged, drawn, and quartered in 1595 for treason.\(^{321}\)

The dangers of owning Byrd’s clandestine liturgical music and the martyrdoms of Southwell and others demonstrate the high stakes of consuming and creating art that was perceived as in conflict with the Church of England. In spite of this (and in some ways, because of it), music and poetry functioned as powerful religious, affective, and political forces in early modern England. The theater represents both music and poetry, asserting the power and validity of complex, professional arts against the repression of artists in churches, and the continued attacks against man-made art in sermons and treatises. In *The Winter’s Tale*, Shakespeare represents controversial musical entertainments alongside an indirectly coded

\(^{320}\) “Alleluia: Cognoverunt,” on *William Byrd: Gradualia, 1607*, Ensemble Plus Ultra, dir. Michael Noone, Musica Omnia compact disc 0302. The *Gradualia* consists of music for the Catholic mass, including the introit, gradual, Alleluia, offertory, and communion, enabling prohibited Catholic worship to take place in private households. He also writes music for contentious feasts, like those dedicated to Mary, All Saints Day, and Corpus Christi. He particularly selects texts that give hope to the persecuted. For selected translations, see Robert Miola, ed., *Early Modern Catholicism: An Anthology of Primary Sources* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 312–3.

spiritual music; these performed sounds assert that the popularity and sacred efficacy of music precedes any contemporary debates.

Against the backdrop of these religious battles over music, Englishmen like Francis Bacon, Thomas Wright, and Thomas Morley were using the Neo-Platonist theories of Pico, Agrippa, and Ficino discussed in chapter 3 to create more scientific understandings of music’s affective power and spiritual—or magical—properties. Despite increasingly scientific approaches to music, the notion, popular since classical times, of the music of the spheres continued to hold in popular imagination. Drawing from popular culture as well as classical and learned ideas about musical efficacy, Shakespeare’s play offers a polyphonic, hybridized assertion of the efficacy and importance of human art.

**Sicilia’s Silences**

When Archidamus notes the “great difference betwixt our Bohemia, and your Sicilia” at the start of *The Winter’s Tale* (1.1.4–5), he may well be marking the acoustic contrast between the countries. Leontes’ Sicilia, in the first three acts, prescribes no performed music. Gina Bloom has pointed out that Leontes is deaf to others, “too distracted by his own internal monologue of suspicion to listen to the many voices that insist on Hermione’s innocence.” Leontes is more affected by what he sees than by what he hears; in addition to ignoring the truth of these voices, he cannot apprehend music’s veracities. In the first three acts, Leontes rejects music on both practical and theoretical grounds. When he

---

322 See for example Shakespeare’s *Merchant of Venice*, when Lorenzo says to Jessica:

 сит Jessica, looke how the floore of heaven
 Is think inlayed with patterns of bright gold,
 There’s not the smallest orbe which though beholdst
 But in his motion like an Angell sings,
 Still quiring to the young eyed Cherubins:
 Such harmonie is in immortall soules. (4.1.63–8)

suspects that Hermione is sleeping with his friend Polixenes, he invents an unchaste version of his wife’s study of practical music, that is, the art of learning to play instruments and sing. In ignoring the oracle, he rejects the authority of divine music, the mathematical science that explores music’s resonances with the universe, the mysteries studied by classical writers and by early modern magicians and church music defenders.\(^\text{324}\) With its varied sonic textures, the play later insists on an acoustic epistemology, the knowledge of which (partially) redeems Leontes from the damage his deafness incurs in the first three acts.

Leontes’ first pangs of irrational jealousy are felt as rhythmic, discordant frenzy: “my heart daunces,/But not for joy; not joy” (1.2.109–110). A few lines later, he perverts the image of his wife playing the virginals—a harpsichord-like instrument frequently played by upper-class women in early modern England—to frantically interrupt his own thoughts about his son’s fatherhood. Leontes imagines his wife’s hands intimately playing on those of Polixenes: “still Virginalling/Upon his Palme?” (1.2.124–5). Virginals were almost always associated with women. Even though men played them as well, there was a notion that “real men did not play the virginals.” As such, the turning of Polixenes’ hand into the instrument itself suggests a subversion of sexual norms.\(^\text{325}\) Songs for the virginals—unlike the music in the play’s later acts—were associated with the refinement of the chaste gentlewoman who studied the instrument and gave it its name. The practice was contained, controlled, domestic. For an example of this cultivated sound, listen to track 14.\(^\text{326}\) For Thomas Nash, lascivious lower-class London women were characterized by the fact that they were not

\(^{324}\) Thomas Morley’s 1597 *Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Music*, which is dedicated to William Byrd and which remained popular for two hundred years, makes the commonly-held distinctions between “practical” and “speculative” or divine music. *Plain and Easie Introduction*, ed. R. Alec Harman (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1973), passim.

\(^{325}\) See Marsh, *Music and Society*, 18 on the gendering of virginals and other early modern instruments.

\(^{326}\) This song is a mid-seventeenth-century courtly dance composed for a wealthy young woman by a virginalist who might have been her teacher. “Almain” by Thomas Strengthfield, on CD accompanying Marsh. Ibid., 527.
taught “what belongs to a Needle, Violl, Virginall, or Lute.” In Leontes’ eyes, the dignity of his upper class, musically trained wife has been violated.

Leontes’ jealousy, in its early moments, sounds like a tuneless, joyless dance and song. He has an almost Puritanical association of music with seduction, equating both popular dance and instrumental pastimes with salaciousness and infidelity. Leontes’ mind, his family, and his country have fallen out of tune, and the metaphorical dissonance of Sicilia resembles the popular early modern sense of discord as social and political unrest. For example, in 2 Henry VI, the king expresses his anguish in musical terms: “How irkesome is this Musick to my heart?/When such strings jarre, what hope of Harmony?” (2.1.54–55).

While the first act perverts popular musical pastimes to demonstrate the discord of Leontes’ world, the play’s third act features Leontes’ rejection of divine music, that mathematical science capable of unlocking the hidden powers of the universe. Leontes is unwilling to accept the authority of ceremonial, “un-earthly” sounds in the highly classical scene in which he hears the oracle’s pronouncements. The reports on the oracle in act 3, scene 1 suggest that music had been heard at Delphos. J.H.P. Pafford suggests that music is “sensed as having been in the background at the pronouncement of the Oracle,” and certainly Dion and Cleomenes’ dialogue supports this notion. Dion reminisces, “O, the Sacrifice,/How ceremonious, solemne, and un-earthly/It was i’th’ Offring” (3.1.6–8).


328 The word “discord” is popular in plays about political unrest, and occurs five times in 1 Henry VI. Another effective use of the metaphor can be found in Ulysses’ speech in Troilus and Cressida: “Take but degree away, untune that string/and hark what discord follows” (1.3.109–110). For a history of this metaphor, see John Hollander, The Untuning of the Sky: Ideas of Music in English Poetry, 1500–1700 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 245–266.


“Solemn” is often used in Shakespeare’s late plays to cue offstage music of mysterious origins: for example the invisible music in The Tempest is thrice called “solemn,” and “solemn music” is similarly used twice in Cymbeline and once in Henry VIII.\(^\text{331}\) That the oracle is also ceremonious suggests that it staged a sort of classical musical rite powered by mathematical proportions of sounds in affinity with the universe’s spheres.

Cleomenes describes the oracle’s truthful pronouncement itself as acoustically overwhelming:

\begin{quote}
But of all, the burst
And the eare-deaff’ning Voyce o’th’Oracle,
Kin to Joves Thunder, so surpriz’d my Sence,
That I was noth. (3.1.8–11)
\end{quote}

The music of the spheres had strong associations with the ancient philosophies of Pythagoras and Plato and Cicero, and remained a commonplace idea in Jacobean England, especially among defenders of music’s (Christian) spiritual efficacy.\(^\text{332}\) When seventeenth-century pamphleteer John Taylor described church music in Germany, he noted that the voices and instruments “all strike up together, with such a glorious and delicious harmony, as if the Angellicall musicke of the Sphears were descended into that earthly Tabernacle.”\(^\text{333}\) Taylor is typical in Christianizing the music of the spheres to include heavenly angels: see also Lorenzo’s speech to Jessica in Merchant of Venice, quoted above.

The sounds of the Delphic oracle thus refer not only to the play’s classical setting, but also to contemporary discussions regarding the ability of music to enable divine communication. Leontes is unable to accept the efficacy and veracity of this extraterrestrial

\begin{footnotes}
\item[331] Alan Dessen and Leslie Thomson find thirty-five uses of “solemn music” in early modern drama. A Dictionary of Stage Directions in English Drama 1580–1642 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 206.
\item[333] John Taylor, All the Workes of John Taylor the Water Poet, vol. III (London: Spenser Society, 1869), 571.
\end{footnotes}
authority, but the oracle sounds the truth: that Hermione and Polixenes are innocent, Camillo is true, Leontes is jealous, his baby is his own, and he shall be heirless “if that which is lost, be not found” (3.2.132–3). Against the deaf king who denies the efficacy of ceremonial music, the play asserts its potential veracity and universal resonances. This assertion of music’s divine power echoes with debates between contemporary Anglicans, recusant Catholics, and Puritans regarding music’s spiritual power.

Many critics, most recently Phebe Jensen, have noted that Leontes rages against images in the first three acts of the play. But Leontes is equally unreceptive to created sounds. Leontes is iconoclastic, anti-theatrical, and anti-festive, as Jensen claims, but he is also tone deaf. In Sicilia, dance music has lost its joy, domestic entertainments have been perverted, and not even the solemn sounds and “ear-deaff’ning Voyce o’ th’Oracle” affect the King’s dangerous convictions (3.1.9). In the last two acts, however, ballads and joy-full country dances replace visions of practical music distorted and depressed by jealousy.

Leontes gets a second chance at accepting the efficacies of divine music when the oracle’s prophecy is finally fulfilled. For civil and familial harmony to finally come to Sicilia, the joy of Autolycus’ Bohemia must return to Sicilia along with Perdita, and Leontes must hear the grace-full harmonies of Paulina and Hermione’s benevolent magic.

“SONGS FOR MAN, OR WOMAN, OF ALL SIZES”

If, as was likely the case, pre-show and inter-act music was played by the King’s Men’s consort, the contrast between the music-less world of Sicilia and the musical world of

334 Jensen writes, “in the play’s first three acts, Leontes’ diseased iconoclasm exaggerates the extreme Reformation position against both images and festive sport.” Phebe Jensen, Religion and Revelry in Shakespeare’s Festive World, 197. This idea can also be found in her article version of the chapter, “Singing Psalms to Hornpipes: Festivity, Iconoclasm, and Catholicism in The Winter’s Tale,” Shakespeare Quarterly 55, no. 3 (Autumn, 2004): 282.

335 It could be said that Sicilia lacks music and joy as conspicuously as the Von Trapp household before Maria (herself a sort of resurrection of the Captain’s first dead, musical wife) revives the family with the sound of music.
the contemporary London theater would have been marked.\textsuperscript{336} When music is at last played within the Bohemian scenes of act 4, the noisy acoustic world of England’s rural and local present is brought into the play. Suddenly, the offstage musicians are playing bagpipes, pipes, and tabors, actors are singing, and some of them are likely playing instruments onstage, too.\textsuperscript{337} The act’s human-made music rehabilitates the silence and joylessness of the first three acts.

The leader of Bohemia’s musical revelry is Autolycus, a thieving, peddling ballad seller. 1611 Globe patron Simon Forman was famously struck by Autolycus when he saw the play, writing “beware of trustinge feined beggars or fawning fellows.”\textsuperscript{338} Critical opinion of this character ranges from confused dismissal to privileging him as a sophisticated meta-character. He has been shrugged off as superfluous, as “more caricature than character”; he has been called representative of his environment, “the epitome of the country fair huckster;” and he has been seen as a relic of earlier theatrical traditions, the play’s vice figure.\textsuperscript{339} W.H. Auden, who agrees that Autolycus is a sort of vice figure, focuses on his music-making and suggests that he has a good voice, singing for courage to make it through

\textsuperscript{336} German patron Frederic Gershow, who visited Blackfriars in 1602, wrote: “For a whole hour preceding the play one listens to a delightful musical entertainment on organs, lutes, pandoras, mandores, viols, and flutes…” The translation by Dr. C.W. Wallace is printed in Morrison Boyd, \textit{Elizabethan Music and Musical Criticism} (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1962), 201. Prynne protested this new practice, seeing that the London theaters were too associated with “amorous, obscene lascivious lust-provoking songs…melodiously chanted out upon the Stage between each severall Action.” Prynne, \textit{Histrio-mastix}, 261.

\textsuperscript{337} The clown’s servant mentions all three instruments, which were likely used in the scenes, 4.4.183–5. For more on actors’ musical training, see David Lindley, \textit{Shakespeare and Music: Arden Critical Companion} (London: Arden, 2006), 100–2.


his hard life on the road. Autolycus does possess vice-like character traits, but within the play’s narrative, he functions as the opposite of a vice, moving the protagonists he encounters towards reconciliation. Indeed, Autolycus is essential to the play’s redemptive final acts, swapping clothes with Florizel so he can travel safely with him and Perdita to Sicilia, where even Autolycus himself is redeemed and perhaps a bit reformed. Stephen Orgel suggests that not only is he the “essential entertainer” with his songs, jokes, and tricks, but also the “figure closest to the playwright.” It is Autolycus’ theatrical/artistic skills—his stories, his feigning, his singing—that move the play towards its conclusion. Orgel writes that “art subverts error and misuses in the end,” and indeed, one must take Autolycus seriously as artist, and as an integral part of the musical Bohemian spring that begins to thaw out the winter of the play’s first three acts.

Act 4, scenes 3–4 feature a mixture of what Auden labels “called-for and impromptu songs,” and Autolycus provides or contributes to most of this music (all but the dances). Many types of popular folk music are represented in these scenes: narrative ballads, three-men songs, and peddler’s cries. Such folk songs are far less common than art songs in Shakespeare’s plays, and so their abundance in *The Winter’s Tale* demands attention.

340 “His is a tough life, with hunger and the gallows never very far away, and he needs all the courage he can muster,” writes the great poet, in what is still one of the best essays written on Shakespeare’s music. W.H. Auden, “Music in Shakespeare,” in *The Dyer’s Hand and Other Essays* (New York: Random House 1948; 1962), 523.

341 Autolycus’ final words are in answer to the Clown’s request that he be a good man: “I will prove so (Sir) to my power” (5.2.163).


343 Ibid., 52.


Additionally, as several cultural historians and musicologists have recently asserted, ballad melody creates extra-textual meaning. Paying attention to the known and probable melodies of Autolycus’ songs reveals that the sonic hermeneutics of the scene are complex and self-aware, providing a conscious assertion of the artfulness of this popular entertainment.346

The role of Autolycus was likely first played by the clown actor Robert Armin, who had replaced Will Kempe; Armin was a known singer and originated other musical roles like Feste in *Twelfth Night*. Tiffany Stern’s work has revealed that Armin (if it was he) would have learned his part in isolation, revealing his voiced and bodied performances of the solo songs in limited group rehearsals (there may have been just one) and the actual performance.347 The actor playing Autolycus is thus particularly visible in this role: Autolycus and Armin share an ability to entertain, to improvise.348 The Autolycus actor represents ballad performances, calling attention to himself as singer, actor, and artful entertainer. Against protests that equated actors with street singers—Gosson complained that many actors had begun their careers as “common minstrels”—Armin points out and celebrates the singing actor’s kinship with England’s real Autolycuses.349 Autolycus simultaneously reminds the audience of the power of charismatic actors and of the power of the ballads sung and sold outside the theater.350


With his ballad selling and singing, Autolycus represents one of early modern England’s most popular art forms. By 1600, there were between 600,000 and three million ballads in circulation, by one scholar’s estimate. As Smith points out, these ballads were bought, sold, and sung a mere fifteen feet from the Globe stage, but their form was an old one even then. Ballads served and continued to perform a number of social functions, both affecting and reflecting their society. They told tall tales, as in Autolycus’ ballad about the singing fish, and were politically and religiously charged, praising the Reformation’s progress or lamenting the decline of traditional religion; they were a source of sensationalist news and a useful tool of propaganda. Mopsa’s credulity regarding their inherent truth attests to their communicative power. “Pray now buy some: I love a ballet in print, a life, for then we are sure they are true,” she implores the Clown (4.4.258–9). All of these ballad types are mentioned by Autolycus and those who speak of him. In the play, he sings five ballads—a bawdy springtime song (a reverdie), two romanticized but mischievous strolling songs, and two peddler’s songs—and also performs a relatively mournful three-part song with the shepherdesses Mopsa and Dorcas. The acoustical properties of these songs—their melodies, instrumentalization, and delivery—was as varied as their subject matter, creating a self-

---

350 Bruce Smith suggests that Autolycus meta-performs ballads, giving performances of ballad performances. That is, if Autolycus’ ballads are meta-ballads, then all representation of song or dance on the stage is a meta-performance. Smith, *Acoustic World*, 169. As the ballads are not about ballads, I prefer to call these songs represented performances. I find it more useful to reserve the “meta” prefix for songs that are actually about music.


353 Autolycus brags: “Here’s another ballad of a Fish, that appeared vpon the coast, on wensday the fourescore of April, fortie thousand fadom aboue water, & sung this ballad against the hard hearts of maids: it was thought she was a Woman, and was turn’d into a cold fish, for she wold not exchange flesh with one that lou’d her: The Ballad is very pittifull, and as true” (4.4.274).

To hear a tall tale ballad, listen to track 15, “Miraculous Newes from the Cittie of Holdt in Germany.” For a Protestant ditty, listen to track 16, from the patriotic “Successful Commander,” which begins: “You true-hearted Protestants pray now attend.” For a Catholic lament, listen to track 17, “Weep, weep,” which cries “The Christian faythe and Catholick/is every where detested,/the holy service, and such like,/of all degrees neglected.” All are from CD accompanying Marsh.
conscious, aurally rich performed representation of musical art that was open to
improvisation by their singer-actor. The myriad forms and moods created by these songs
suggest their role in reflecting and creating the community that consumes this music.

Autolycus enters, at the start of 4.3, singing a “picaresque ballad of underworld cant”
directly to the audience.\(^{354}\) It is a musical soliloquy about the sort of lusty revitalization men
feel “[w]hen Daffodils begin to peere.” The melody is now unknown, but its lyrics and
placement at the very start of the play’s lengthy musical sequencing means that it was
probably upbeat, like Ross Duffin’s suggested setting taken from the contemporaneous
Fitzwilliam virginal book (track 18).\(^{355}\) After singing three stanzas (this is what the text
prescribes at least), Autolycus interrupts himself to give character information: “I have serv’d
Prince Florizell, and in my time wore three-pile [expensive velvet], but now I am out of
service” (4.3.13–14). He answers his sorrowful tale of unemployment by returning to song
again:

But shall I go mourn for that (my deare)
the pale Moone shines by the night,
And when I wander here, and there
I then do most go right… (4.3.15–18)

A melody for this song does not survive either, but the switch from the sunny scene of
“Daffodils” to the moonlit night when vagabonds, like Autolycus himself, were safe to
wander suggests that perhaps a more mysterious minor key would be appropriate (track 19).
The standardized meter of these songs means that Armin or any actor could change the
melodies whenever he wanted, substituting the newest fashionable tune for an old one, and
perhaps playing with audience expectation for the tune by using different words. The scene


\(^{355}\) All of Autolycus’ song settings come from the CD accompanying Ross Duffin, *Shakespeare’s Songbook*, and
are sung by Paul Elliott.
ends with “Jog On,” a contemporaneously popular song, the merry and major tune of which is known (track 20).

There was a predominance of both Dorian and Ionian modes in early modern ballad tunes. These classical distinctions refer to what we now call minor (Dorian) and major (Ionian) scales. Early seventeenth-century music theorist Charles Butler suggests that tunes in the Dorian mode incite the listener to “sobrieti, prudence, modesti, and godlines.” Ionian songs, on the other hand, stimulate “honest mirth and delight.” Autolycus’ many tunes employ both modes, demonstrating both the character and actor’s versatility and the effectiveness of music itself in affecting multiple passions and emotions.

In act 4, scene 4, the audience hears Autolycus capitalize on another use of balladry: marketing. “Lawne as white as driven Snow” is a peddlers’ ballad, and the ditty is clearly effective, as that poor sucker the Clown immediately buys ribbons and gloves for his dear Mopsa. The scene’s most musically complex vocal song was likely an original melody by Robert Johnson, a composer associated with the Lord Chamberlain’s household and then with the King’s Men; Johnson wrote songs for The Tempest and likely collaborated with Shakespeare on The Winter’s Tale. The Dorian melody survives and it is (to most critics’ ears) surprisingly mournful (track 21). The representation of complex three-part singing performed by a ballad monger and two shepherdesses challenges the notion of the rustic simplicity of country art. The song slows down the frantic scene, exposing the potential emotional weight of music. The lyrics are dark: a deep man’s voice orders both of the competing women to “get you hence” and refuses their treble questioning, “wh[ither?], o


357 Lawn is a type of fine linen. This tune is discussed in more detail below.

358 For example, Seng thinks that it is so funereal that it must be a joke, Vocal Songs in the Plays of Shakespeare, 245.
Autolycus might not have been ironic when he said that the song is merry and popular with women: “Why this is a passing merry one, and goes to the tune of two maids wooing a man: there's scarce a Maide westward but she sings it: 'tis in request, I can tell you.” (4.4.286–9). “Merry” can simply mean “musically pleasing” in 1611, and any time spent listening to modern-day country music demonstrates that women and men are still pleased by songs of scorned love.\(^{359}\) Autolycus exits the scene with another peddlar’s ballad, “Will you buy any Tape?,” which Duffin suggests might be sung to the same tune as his other exit song, “Jog on” (track 22).\(^{360}\) If that were the case, the choice demonstrates the ease with which familiar melodies can be put towards commercial ends, a strategy still used today in radio and television advertising.

As the clown’s amazed servant reports, Autolycus “hath songs for man, or woman, of all sizes” (4.4.193). His contrasting melodies; the songs’ stories of springtime sex, of trickery, of lost love; and his sung promises of fine clothing and decoration point to the vitality of music’s variety. These musical scenes represent popular music in all its capacities to narrate, mock, charm, sell, inform, deceive, and mourn. Both the tunes and the clothes Autolycus sells offer possibility to their buyers: textiles and ballad texts alike can deceive and also charm, as the play demonstrates.

Music’s abilities to do these things were precisely what bothered Puritans. Popular ballads were “wanton,” the “snares of unclennesse” in Miles Coverdale’s preface to his settings of *Goostly Psalmes and Spiritual Songs*.\(^{361}\) To “H.S.,” balladry “poisons the world”


\(^{360}\) Duffin, *Shakespeare’s Songbook*, 471.

because it can “tickle up the ears of people.” Autolycus himself explains popular music’s incredible efficacy when he describes its ability to stupefy the listener so much that they can be unwittingly pick pocketed. He explains that his enterprising Clown practiced a ballad “till he had both Tune and Words, which so drew the rest of the Heard to me, that all their other Sences stucke in Eares: you might haue pinch'd a Placket, it was senselesse” (4.4.603–6). The representation of balladry does not merely valorize the art form, it points out the potential dangers of popular music. In agreeing with Puritanical concerns about music’s abilities to seduce and distract, Autolycus points out that power is power: if music can deceive, it also can enchant.

Balladry’s pairing of the religious and profane, the powerful and the lowly, concerned many besides the Puritans. Marsh explains, “the rhetoric of the Puritans against balladry exerted at least a measure of persuasive force over those who shared neither their ecclesiological principles nor their temperamental intensity.” Puritans and non-Puritans objected to ballads on other grounds, too: those who wrote, sold, bought, and performed them were condemned as lower-class, and the financially advantaged or morally righteous pointed out their associations with crime, alehouses, and ribald sexuality. The playwright Henry Chettle, who may have been in the business of printing ballads, nonetheless stigmatizes ballad-sellers who travelled “in every corner of Cities and market Townes of the Realme singing and selling of ballads…and with-drawing people from christian exercises, especially at faires markets and such publike meetings.” Ballads were frequently associated with the poor, who sang them for recreation as well as for distraction during their hard

362 H.S. To the Mucissioners, the Harpers, the Minstrels, the Singers, the Dancers, the Persecutors (London, 1658), 8, http://eebo.chadwyck.com.

363 Marsh, Music and Society, 268.

work, a fact that is valorized in a popular ballad (track 23). However, there are surviving collections of low-class ballads and catches that were printed for eager gentry and nobility. As Smith, Duffin, and Marsh have pointed out, even the most high brow of gentlefolk seem to have enjoyed this derided lowbrow entertainment. Representing this music on the stage, Autolycus calls attention to the community-forming function of popular music. All members of an audience mixed in social standing were likely to tap their toes and enjoy the familiar melodies.

George Puttenham’s complaint of 1589 reveals that perhaps the intertheatricality of the balladeer—the character’s visual and acoustic connections to other ballad characters—is of as much importance as the figure’s correlation to real balladeers: “the small & popular Musicks sung by these Cantabanqui [itinerant singers]…they be used in Carols and rounds and such light or lascivious Poems, which are commonly more commodiously uttered by these buffoons or vices in playes then by any other person.” Indeed, the itinerant singer is a common theatrical figure, and somewhat ironically, Autolycus descends from characters developed by early Protestant playwrights, the sort of people who later became anti-theatrical and anti-music Puritans. Early Protestant playwrights often used a singing peddler to represent a contemporized vice figure.

Autolycus’ similarities to morality vice figures stem from his fondness for women, his singing, his thieving and feigning, and his peddling. The vice figure of late medieval

---


366 For descriptions of these collections, see Marsh, Music and Society, 194–5.

Catholic morality plays had been appropriated by early Protestant playwrights. Protestant morality plays adapt medieval characters and plots, turning the devil’s vices into Catholic vices by mixing their sinful indulgences—a plethora of deadly sins and secular entertainments like ballads and dances—with Latin rite and other Popish practices. In John Bale’s 1538 *Three Laws* (analyzed in detail in chapter 2), God’s laws have been corrupted throughout history by an allegorical Catholic vice called “Infidelity” and his sin-provoking minions. Like Autolycus, Infidelity’s entrance is musical; he comes on stage singing a peddler’s song of broom selling:

Brom, brom, brom, brom, brom
Bye brom, bye, bye.
Bromes for shoes and powchernges,
Botes and buskyns for new bromes.
Brom, brom, brom. (ll. 176–180)

Like many Protestant reformers, Bale railed against Catholic practices of selling things—relics, indulgences, chantries—to souls who had been terrified into buying them in order to reduce time in Purgatory for themselves or their loved ones. Autolycus, too, sells items and songs; his wares as well as his technique for hawking them are described in detail. For his second entrance, he arrives “wearing a false beard” and singing “Lawne as white as driven Snow,” a peddler’s song advertising “gloves as sweete as Damaske Roses/Maskes for faces, and for noses,” as well as bracelets, necklaces, perfumes, and stomachers; “Come buy of me, come! Come buy, come buy!/Buy, Lads, or else your Lasses cry: Come buy!,” the song ends (4.4.219, 221–2, 229–30, track 24). The plea echoes Bale’s peddling vice by performing a dangerous link between entertainment and mercantilism.

368 Right before Autolycus enters in Act 4 Scene 4, the servant reports:
Why, he sings ‘em [ribbons, lawns, and other wares] over as they were Gods, or Goddesses: you would thinke a Smocke were a shee-Angell, he so chauntes to the sleeve-hand [cuff] and the worke about the square [cloth covering] on’t. (4.4.209–212)
Autolycus is also “genuinely disturbing in his ability to impersonate his betters, with no more than a change of clothes,” as Alex Davis puts it. In this way he also recalls disguised vice characters in Protestant plays like Bale’s King Johan or John Skelton’s Magnificence, as well as the more ambiguous Mephistopheles in Doctor Faustus (chapter 3). Anxiety about clothing, in a culture with sumptuary laws, was related to anxiety about disguise. Concern over sartorial shape-shifting mirrors worries about the Protean nature of musicians, able as they are to change moods and tones in an instant. As one who wears and sells material and auditory disguise, Autolycus demonstrates not only the dangers of disguise, as Protestant moralities do, but also that such deceit has its advantages. After all, Florizel and Perdita would not have made it back to Sicilia without the help of Autolycus’ clothing. Reversing the narrative function of the musical peddlers of earlier dramas, Autolycus’ overtly theatrical acting, costuming, and song are ultimately redemptive.

While his character has musical and sartorial debts to Protestant moralities, Autolycus’ function is not, as it is in those plays, to corrupt mankind into a life of papal sinfulness; he slips away from inhabiting any one ideological stance. He is (merely and crucially) a songman and a peddler of stories and new identities; he is an artist of tune and narrative as much as of deception. Noting the musicological fact (discussed in more detail below) that there is little difference between ballads and psalm settings suggests that even a pious patron might be drawn in by the familiar melodies. Melody moved more freely across social strata and the religious spectrum than lyrics, and the melodies Autolycus sings before religiously diverse audiences echo with traditional (and Catholic) sounds and

---


370 As is discussed in chapter 3 and below, the practice was fairly common, and not new. Many Christmas carols began as popular dances, and Franciscans and then Puritans took over ballad tunes and substituted rites and psalms for lascivious lyrics. See David Wulstan, Tudor Music (London: J.M. Dent & Sons, 1985), 73.
contemporary (and Protestant) ones. Autolycus’ diverse melodies and rhymes appeal to listeners across religious and economic boundaries. Along with the dances and other entertainments represented in Act 4, his ballads assert the social function of popular art forms in divided communities.

**BOHEMIAN RHAPSODIES**

Autolycus and his ballads are only one aural element of act 4, scene 4, *The Winter’s Tale*’s massive sheep-shearing festival and the longest scene in all of Shakespeare’s plays. The scene’s other examples of represented entertainments include the dance of the shepherds and shepherdesses featuring Florizel and Perdita, and the anti-masque dance of the twelve satyrs. This scene puts performed art—dance and instrumental music—on stage as conspicuously as the final scene theatrically represents visual art (and, as I will argue, a more spiritual music).

Bohemia in the spring looks and sounds like the English countryside, both the real, Jacobean countryside and that pastoral fantasy of the past popular in early modern poetry, romance, and drama. Perdita makes the Englishness clear in her reference to local Pentecost celebrations; when she decides that she will participate in the festivity she announces, “Me thinkes I play as I have seen them do/In Whitsun-Pastorals” (4.4.133–4). The Old Shepherd’s remembrance of his dead wife’s singing, dancing, and hospitality on this annual celebration mark the scene as a traditional springtime festivity: “upon this day, she was both Pantler, Butler, Cooke/Both Dame and Servant: Welcom’d all: seru’d all,/Would sing her song, and dance her turne” (4.4.53–69). The scene is reminiscent of Rogationtide (like Whitsun, a post-Easter holiday), when country parishes blessed newly planted crops by
ringing bells, processing, and feasting. Rogationtide had been suppressed under Edward VI, but after Mary had encouraged it, the tradition persisted through the reigns of Elizabeth, James, and Charles I. If the types of dancing at these springtime festivities were not standardized, they were always interactive, involving large groups of people moving together with simple movements (see clip 2). It would have been easy for London actors to replicate the sort of circle and square dancing choreography of country dances, which were becoming increasingly popular in urban settings. The shepherd and shepherdesses’ dance would have been noisy, filling the space with the full sound of the Kings’ Men’s consort, augmented perhaps by onstage actors playing tabors and recorders and also the sounds of the actors’ feet thumping the wooden stage.

As the scene represents country dancing, it simultaneously represents royal entertainments. Before the satyrs’ dance, the Old Shepherd’s servant introduces the twelve locals who have “made themselves all men of hair” in order to present a dance, proclaiming that “[o]ne three of them, by their owne report (Sir,) hath danc’d before the King” (4.4.321, 332–3). The reference is likely an in-joke, recalling the recent (1 January 1611) performances of Ben Jonson and Indigo Jones’ masque Oberon before the Jacobean court. The King’s Men likely took roles in the masque, so plausibly, the joke is made funny by its truth. John Long has further pointed out that the entire sequence of songs, dances, monologues, and dialogue in 4.3 and 4.4 structurally resembles Oberon. The dance would have been accompanied by the consort, of course, providing the audience with an opportunity to hear a fine ensemble

---

371 Smith calls Rogationtide a way that communities “formally marked their aural boundaries.” Acoustic World, 32.

372 For more on this dancing, see Suzanne Lord, Music from the Age of Shakespeare: A Cultural History (Westport: CT: Greenwood Press, 2003), 139.

373 Long, Shakespeare’s Use of Music, 69–70.
playing courtly instrumental music, a type of music newly popular with the rise of the printing press and increased attention from composers to non-vocal musical art forms.\(^{374}\)

This royal indulgence in country dances had both precedent and antecedent. Elizabeth I had enjoyed “a pleasant daunce with Taber and Pipe” on her visit to Sussex in 1591, and later Charles II held a ball at which were performed “country dances, the King leading the first which he called for; which was, says he, ‘cuckolds all a-row,’ the Old dance of England” (track 25).\(^{375}\) *The Winter’s Tale*’s representation of the sort of country dancing popularly performed in the court exposes the blurred distinctions between royal and peasant, town and country, and the aristocracy’s continued enjoyment of the low-brow entertainments they pretend to despise.\(^{376}\)

In this scene, irrepresible traditions of the past and the cosmopolitan trends of the present are performed by public/professional, civic, and royal musicians and actors. Depending on the performance venue, rural celebrations of community identity are either reproduced before the court, or the king’s private entertainments are brought to the economically diverse patrons of the Globe and Blackfriars. In theatrical performances, this mixture of secular and sacred, upper- and lower- class music can be juxtaposed, performed by and for heterogeneous audiences who are briefly and literally synchronized by their shared aural and visual experience. This scene’s dances reveal that there are only facile differences between the entertainments of court and of country parish, between the new and the traditional, the royal and the lower class. In addition to exposing the way in which a love

\(^{374}\) See Lord, *Music from the Age of Shakespeare*, 129.


\(^{376}\) In Marsh’s words, “In all periods, members of the self-styled social elite will tend to disparage the culture of their supposed inferiors while simultaneously espousing it with some degree of disquiet,” ibid., 21.
of dancing transcends class, the dances of The Winter’s Tale suggest a nostalgic religious aesthetic.

While courtly dancing was defended and even praised by the upper class, country dancing was continuously derided by reformers like Stubbes, quoted at the start of this chapter, and Northbrooke and Prynne, quoted in chapter 3.377 Phebe Jensen, in a revision of C.L. Barber’s classic Shakespeare’s Festive Comedy, suggests that the rural traditions represented in 4.4—the country dancing, the singing, Perdita’s reference to Whitsun—assert the vitality and validity of traditions long called papist and backwards by reformers.378 Jensen cites numerous Protestant tracts that associate the practice and history of festive traditions like Whitsun with popish idolatry. There is an account of reformers pulling down a maypole as a “prophane and heathenish Idoll” in one parish, for example.379 Even James I, Jensen points out, “acknowledges the truth of the reformers’ charge that festivity encouraged popery” in his 1617 Declaration…concerning lawfully sports.380

Jensen argues that by representing traditions of festivity, Shakespeare aesthetically, if not theologically, aligns himself with old religion.381 But the scene also suggests an aesthetics that is, like the play, generically inclusive, catholic in the other sense of the word. Percy Scholes and others have shown that there was a disjunction between idealized proposals and

377 A typical defense of upper class dancing is Thomas Elyot, who said that in it “may be founden both recreation and meditation of vertue.” Elyot, The Book named the Gouerner, 79. For more on upper class promotion of music as edifying, and even resembling the movements of the planets, see Marsh, Music and Society, 354–5.


379 Jensen, “Singing psalms to hornpipes,” 285. She takes the account from public records in Wells, 1607.

380 Ibid., 285.

381 Jensen, Religion and Revelry, 5.
actual practice when it came to Puritanical attitudes towards music. Shakespeare puts a contemporary Puritan in this scene, one who represents the sort who compromised on music. The clown explains that the shearsers are “most of them means [tenors] and basses—but one Puritan amongst them, and he sings Psalmes to horne-pipes” (4.3.42–4). The practice of singing Psalms to profane tunes (and instruments) was common in early modern England, but it was a contentious issue. The less-than-inspiring psalm tunes composed during the early Reformation (like track 12) caused some Reformers to set psalms to popular ballads, in hopes that they would catch on in a more popular form. Nicholas Temperley documents known examples of these settings, which early on acquired the nickname “Geneva jigs.” Even when the tune was not borrowed wholesale, most Psalms sung in church since around 1559 had been set to ballad meter. For example, the majority of the tunes printed in Thomas Sternhold and John Hopkins’ extremely popular The whole book of Psalms collected into English meter (1578) are set in ballad meter and can easily fit Autolycus’ tunes. Many Puritans were concerned about this conciliatory practice, deriding any mix of scurrility with divinity, be it profaned psalms or the secular entertainments of traditional feast days.

Against calls to keep the sacred and profane separate, Shakespeare exhibits fascination and amusement with mixing the two, a practice that had been theatrically represented long before the fifteenth-century Wisdom (chapter 1). Mistress Ford laughs at

383 The compromise reminds Edward Naylor “of the old stories (all too true) of churchingers in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, who would sing the by no means respectable words of popular comic ditties to the solemn strains of the mass…or whatever well-known melody the music happened to be constructed on.” Shakespeare and Music (London: J.M. Dent and Sons, 1931), 84.
384 Temperley suggests that calling psalms “Geneva jigs” shows “not only contempt for their homely, popular character, but a recognition that they had some likeness to the jig proper,” which was closely related to the ballad. Nicholas Temperley, The Music of the English Parish Church (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 67.
both Falstaff and the tradition of profaned psalms in *Merry Wives of Windsor*; she “would have sworne his disposition would have gone to the truth of his words: but they doe no more adhere and keep place together, then the hundred Psalms to the tune of Green-sleeues” (track 26).385 The playwright’s interests in the complications that arise from religiously diverse communities creating sacred and profane art together are on full display in the fourth act of *The Winter’s Tale*. In the music of this play, Shakespeare and his company explore the productive overlap between the divine and the bawdy that creates and maintains communities of kings and ballad-mongers and sinners and moralists. England’s continued participation in such overlaps—singing psalms to secular instruments, making music with non-reformers, dancing on holy days—played a role in the Anglican Compromise, with its retention of musical rites. Since the early years of the English Reformation, discussed in chapter 2, reformers indulged in and could not entirely divorce themselves from musical experience. The joke about Puritans playing Psalms to hornpipes points to the affective—one might say irresistible—power of music as much as to the hypocrisy of religious fanaticism. As Steven Mullaney points out, Protestant attacks on traditional religion targeted not just idolatry, but also kinship and social memory in an effort to erase Catholicism’s residual cultural power.386 *The Winter’s Tale* remembers that past and asserts that kinship, while also acknowledging the myriad other perspectives, Protestant too, that make a community.

In terms of narrative, the sheepshearing scene proves important because the festival coincides with the day Polixenes dresses as a shepherd to spy on his son (also disguised) and

385 “Greensleeves,” from CD accompanying Marsh.

to witness and condemn his son’s relationship with Perdita. Perdita also figures into the scene’s negotiation of aural art and festivity. As Jensen points out, Perdita demonstrates throughout the scene that she has inherited her father’s anti-festive streak, opposing transformation, costuming, and hybridity.387 Her resistance to musical festivity is also important to mark.

Perdita was a baby without a real lullaby; perhaps that is why she is skeptical of music, and hesitates to “sing her song, and dance to her turne” as the Old Shepherd’s deceased wife once had on such days (4.4.58, quoted above).388 When, instead of dancing, Perdita enters into a debate about nature and art with the disguised Polixenes, she echoes Montaigne by stating that she is against the cultivated hybridization of flowers, or any effort on human’s part to improve nature: carnations and such flowers are “Natures bastards…and I care not to get slips of them” (4.4.83, 84–5).389 Perdita is herself, in some ways, a hybrid: a genetic mixture of Leontes and Hermione, birthed in nobility and raised in country poverty. When she at last succumbs to the music, she dances “featly,” like a country girl, but with a remove, like she is “too Noble for this place” (4.4.178, 158). Ignorant of her origins, of her own piedness, Perdita is resistant to interference with nature, but human artfulness ultimately reunites her with her true identity, and her father and mother.

Against Puritanical calls for natural purity, for unadorned churches and unaccompanied psalms, The Winter’s Tale iterates a trope of polyphony, of hybridized artforms. The play itself argues against Perdita’s view that human art is corrupting, and sides with Polixenes, who asserts that human art is natural, it can be that “which do’s mend


388 Before abandoning the baby Perdita, Antigonus laments “thou'rt like to haue/A lullabie too rough” (3.3.53).

389 Orgel points out that Montaigne’s essay “Of the Cannibals” argues that wild fruits have the most natural properties and we have “bastardized” them. Orgel, “Introduction,” 172.
Nature: change it rather, but/The Art it selfe, is Nature” (4.4.95–7). The ballads, songs, and dances of the Bohemian scene interrupt the stoic aurality of the play’s previous acts. Dancing reclaims its joy, and the fact that instrumental pastimes may be lusty is celebrated rather than scorned. Music’s ability to bring people together, and its active and ongoing creation through the collaboration of diverse groups of people, creates a complex and unresolved cacophony. The disguised characters return to Sicilia in distress, but the sonic and interpersonal disorder created by the theatrics of act 4—the disguised identities, the feigning, and most importantly the music and dance—are all necessary to bring about the literal and figurative harmonies of act 5.

**Resurrection and Reconciliation**

Music, along with Perdita, returns to Sicilia, where families and communities are restored. The reanimation of Hermione, her statue’s transformation into the living wife thought dead, is accompanied by music. The innocent, upper class, musically trained Hermione resembles another of Shakespeare’s falsely accused, Desdemona. Othello recalls that his wife, “an admirable Musitian…will sing the Savagenesse out of a Beare,” but all the audience hears her sing is a terrified lament before her murder (4.1.89). In the later Winter’s Tale, the wronged wife reappears to the sound of music, and melodies are redeeming rather than foreboding. The savageness of the bear remains—for no community is perfect—but the final acoustic mode of The Winter’s Tale is one of concordant redemption. This ambiguous music exceeds contemporary religious debates, combining a vaguely pagan setting and pre-Christian ideas with a Catholic aesthetics and with a rehabilitated idea of Protestant grace.

---

390 That is, humans are natural, and human art aids nature to become even more beautiful. Orgel quotes Puttenham’s similar argument from The Art of English Poetry that art is an “aide and coadjutor to nature.” Ibid., 172.

391 For a recording of Desdemona’s famous “Willow Song,” listen to track 27, from CD accompanying Duffin.
Paulina commands, “Musick; awake her: Strike!,” and Hermione is stone no more (5.3.98). Paulina’s line cues the play’s instrumentalists; the line sounds like the Clown’s call before the Shepherd’s dance, “Not a word, a word! We stand upon our manners/Come, strike up” (5.3.164–5). The Clown cued onstage actor–instrumentalists who were playing the parts of musical shepherds, and offstage musicians augmented their music. In the world of the play, then, the music makes sense—it comes from the shepherds. But when Paulina cues music in 5.3, she only cues the offstage musicians, for no actor in this scene would be holding or playing an instrument. Gurr’s research suggests that in public performance this music would have come from the music room above the stage of Blackfriars, or from the Globe’s retrofitted curtained music room in the balcony above the stage. So, in any public performance, the sounds cued by Paulina came from above the players’ and audience’s heads while the musicians were hidden from view: a staged acoustic miracle.

“Strike” (as opposed to the Clown’s “strike up”) is often a cue for stringed instrumentalists, who strike their strings with bows. It is possible that a consort of viols sounded at this moment, evoking the relatively recent English taste for wordless, stringed music that had been inherited from the Italian repertoire. Even if viols were not played here, the context all but requires a mixture of other bas (soft, for a chamber) instruments such as lute, harp, and flute as opposed to the hant (loud, for the outdoors) instruments such as tabor, pipe, and shawm/hautboy probably used in act 4. After the louder and more

---


393 A similar effect could have perhaps been staged at court, where no expense was spared.

394 This cue explained in more detail in Long, Shakespeare’s Use of Music, 91.


396 Whether the performance was indoors or outside, a combination of bas and hant instruments could be used.
varied sounds of act 4, the audience hears a simpler harmony, likely in the Ionian mode. The effect may be something like that in the beginning of the final all-strings movement concluding Gustav Mahler’s at times upbeat, at times frantic, at times mysteriously minor, 3rd symphony, which is his hymn to the natural world (track 28). For Mahler, that final movement is about God, as expressed through love. Not unrelatedly, Linda Austern explains that early modern playwrights often used human-made practical music to stand in for the divine music of the spheres. The Winter’s Tale’s final two acts thus present acoustic contrast: popular music is replaced with a music meant to be heard not only in terms of its own harmonies, but also as a gesture towards a cosmic harmony inaudible to humans.

Paulina’s music, defying the intellect to perform a seemingly celestial transformation of stone into corruptible flesh, calls on the long tradition that considers music as the most efficient means for allowing humans to contact the divine or to revive the dead, as mentioned above and in chapter 3. This idea of a mutuality between heaven and earth conveyed through musical harmony was well accepted. Throughout Shakespeare’s plays, music is referred to or accompanies moments involving miracle and death, for example the “Musicke of the Spheres...most heavenly Musicke” that Pericles hears when he is reunited with his lost daughter (5.1.229, 232), or the music Queen Katherine cues in Henry VIII when she imagines her death, “on that Coelestiall Harmony I go too” (4.2.80). Early seventeenth-century neo-Platonists continued to think that human music gathered its power from the way its harmonies replicate celestial patterns.

---


398 Austern, “‘Art to Enchant,’” 196.
Shakespeare calls upon these traditions when choosing to accompany the miraculous magic of the “dead” statue’s transformation into the living Hermione with music. This moment possesses emotional power not just because of its climactic status in the narrative; its music makes the moment literally resonate with intellectual and popular traditions of music’s divine mysteries. A few years before *The Winter’s Tale* was written, Thomas Wright published a treatise explaining the four reasons for music’s affective power. He called on a new scientific thinking in order to refute Puritanical attacks on music. For Wright, music is powerful because: it is in sympathy with the soul’s heaven-like proportions; God in his providence had given sound a spiritual quality; soundwaves physically affect the body, passing through the ears to the heart where they “beateth and tickleth it in such a sort, as it is moved with semblable passions”; and finally music affects men differently, provoking bad men to lust but lifting a good man to heaven.\(^3\) Wright’s defense engages contemporary debates about music’s spiritual efficacy while also calling on pre-Christian ideas that precede those debates. He thus uses new scientific thinking as well as classical tradition to counter Puritanical attacks. *The Winter’s Tale* dramatizes Wright’s arguments, combining ancient settings with contemporary musical arts and sciences. While the revival of Hermione suggests music’s heaven-like proportions and spiritual quality, the representation of so many musical forms throughout the play has somatically demonstrated music’s ability to tickle the heart in a variety of ways.

The musical miracle asserts music’s polymorphous spiritual power, advocating that purely instrumental music has spiritual efficacy. This music is not metrical Psalms, or in any way Biblical, but it has cosmic implications and social power. A recusant Catholic or high

---

Anglican in the audience could point towards the well-known Puritanical aversion to instruments and any music not subservient to clear biblical text. Calvin had objected to instruments and organs, and many Protestants continued to follow his lead. So in the theater, if not the Church, music could have affective and spiritual power on its own accord. Jensen, analyzing the scene’s visuals (especially the Mary-like statue), suggests that the staged miracle calls on Catholic aesthetics. But it is also true that the moment’s acoustics imply that in both ancient and recent times, music has had ceremonial and artistic power.

Music is one crucial part of the magic (as Leontes will call it) of Hermione’s sudden animation. As Gareth Roberts points out, “magic and its representation in the early modern period necessarily negotiated with Catholicism.” Much has been written about the way this magic does or does not affirm Catholicism (and indeed, whether or not the scene is magic at all). Julia Lupton argues that any Catholicism suggested in the scene is cancelled because the statue trick is a hoax; Huston Diehl similarly suggests that the forbidden rituals of Catholicism are demystified and contained in this scene. Marotti, however, argues that the scene is too ambiguous, too mysterious to debunk traditional religion. For Marotti, the scene is a “rehabilitation of magic and the visual” (and acoustic, I would add) in which Shakespeare remystifies what he demystifies.

400 See Scholes, Puritans and their Music, 335–6.


Debating whether or not the resurrection and its music are real miracles is beside the point in theatrical experience. The audience knows that Hermione is an actor, and they know that the invisible music comes from human musicians—the curtain was likely drawn for the pre-show and inter-act musical interludes. The tricks have been revealed, but as with a Penn and Teller show, they are no less amazing for that. Human art—practical music as opposed to celestial music, theatrical spectacle as opposed to miracle—does not cancel magic (or divinity). It rather assigns human agency in creating affective experience in collaboration with nature (and perhaps God’s heavens). Whether the sounds of the voice and viol resonate with God’s music or not is left to an audience member to feel and consider, as are the truths behind Hermione’s resurrection.

Leontes’ response to the statue’s transformation into his wife—“if this be Magick, let it be an Art/Lawfull as Eating” (5.3.110–11)—might be a plea for artistic and religious freedom: Let the statues and songs and plays we create in churches, homes, playhouses, and courts be lawful; let us marvel in our capacity to create things that affect others; let aesthetic experience be open to interpretation; in art let us hear and see our God or each other or both. Let Tallis and Byrd construct and perform complex music honoring their own faith traditions, and let us choose the music that is spiritually efficacious for us. Describing Autolycus’ relationship with his songs, the servant had said that he “utters them as he had eaten ballads” (4.4.187). Autolycus’ art seems so natural as to be a part of his very passion: let that scorned music, the play argues, be lawful, too. All arts—music, theater, dance, sculpture—are as vital to ancient Sicilia and Jacobean England as food, as natural as the humans who create and consume.

Early moderns often noted a kinship between leadership and musical ability. For Thomas Elyot, “the perfecte understanding of musicke is necessary for better attaynynge the
knowledge of a publike weale.‖⁴⁰⁵ Leontes needs music in his kingdom—Hermione’s playing, Perdita’s dancing, his singing subjects. Knowledge of these musical arts has perhaps made him a better king at the last. As John Taylor sums up the commonly-held metaphorical truth: “‘Tis Concord keeps a Realme in Stable stay. But Discord brings all Kingdomes to decay.”⁴⁰⁶ While the play presents plenty of discord, the music accompanying Hermione’s reanimation suggests a new concord, a new music, for Sicilia.

This tenuous harmony is not unlike the precarious unities binding Jacobean England together, with its recent history of civil and religious strife. Forgiveness and compromise, so crucial to the play’s plot, were also central to the creation of the fragile peace of 1611. The Gunpowder Plot of 1605 was a recent memory, as were the martyrdoms of many who died for traditional or reformed religion. That social and theological experiment—the Anglican Compromise—was still in its awkward and painful infancy. The Winter’s Tale’s representations of human musical creation assert a social, community-defining function for song, dance, and musical-magical sciences that soften (but by no means preclude) the smaller squabbles about how the Psalms should be sung or whether or not ballad-mongers are criminals. When a theatrical audience, or a church congregation, hears the same notes sung at the same time, they are bound into a shared experience, making it seem “as if the whole audience had but one heart and one mind.”⁴⁰⁷ The cosmological implications of the music accompanying Hermione’s reanimation convey the sense of a shared mystery transcending doctrinal and moral debates.

---

⁴⁰⁵ Elyot, The Boke Named the Governour, 24. The idea is also echoed, for example, in Praise of Musicke (1585).
The early modern theater was like the church not because, as the Puritans claimed, it shares Catholic ritual’s ability to deceive, but rather because its practitioners—through words, sounds, and sights—could produce the affective power of religious experience. *The Winter’s Tale* was performed on the anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot and also soon after the sudden death of James I’s son and heir. The idea that art has the power to reconcile communities and assuage grief is thus not only internal to the play itself but also a part of its performance history.

That human-made art has redemptive power is half the point. Forgiveness is also a human act: the grace of Hermione is a human creation, Leontes’ contrition an act of will. Sarah Beckwith has argued that the final scene restages mystery plays that present Christ’s resurrection, and that *The Winter’s Tale* replaced a Catholic model of forgiveness—priestly absolution through Christ’s Eucharistic body—with a forgiveness that takes the form of a reconciled community.\(^{408}\) For Beckwith, the resurrections of *The Winter’s Tale* and other late plays involve complex encounters with the characters’ pasts: the subject thought dead (Hermione) is the vehicle of redemption for the one (Leontes) whose actions had appeared to lead to irredeemable harm.\(^{409}\) The play rejects John Calvin’s exclusion of the human in his reformed version of grace, and shows that human forgiveness is, in Beckwith’s words, “rather the *medium* of grace.”\(^{410}\) Hermione, as has often been noted, is associated with grace throughout the play. Her first declaration of (human) love for Leontes, in her own words, was “grace indeed” (1.2.104). When she first speaks after animating, Hermione asks the gods to give her daughter their grace: “You Gods looke downe,/And from your sacred Viols

---


\(^{409}\) Ibid., 48–9.

\(^{410}\) Ibid., 64.
poure your graces/Vpon my daughters head‖ (5.3.121–3). Hermione’s initial acts of love, Paulina’s miracle or benevolent deceit, the bringing of Perdita back to Sicilia: all required human agency. People, not gods (or God) have orchestrated the final reconciliation, as constructed as a statue, as well tuned and tonal as a song.

The ambiguity of Hermione’s reappearance and the irrevocability of the deaths of young Mamillius and Paulina’s beloved Antigonus complicate the scene’s final reconciliation, yet the music of the scene establishes a tonality of concord, a harmony created out of discord. The music counters the plot’s irony, for its movement to reconciliation is all the more powerful for its narrative complexity. Early modern theories of harmony often required discordant sounds as well as sweet ones. For Charles Butler, “a Discord…in Musick” can “mak[e] the Concord following the sweeter.”

Like the play’s joining of popular balladry, courtly entertainments, and celestial music, harmony itself was defined for the early moderns as that which “joyneth and accordeth diverse thinges that seeme contrary, and maketh the high sound to accord with the low.” The play’s final resolution—binding its religiously and socially diverse audience in a shared musical temporality—suggests that divisiveness and diversity do not exclude the possibilities of forgiveness and reconciliation.

These reconciliations can also be understood as the complex hybridization of distinct forms. When Perdita calls humanly cultivated flowers “nature’s bastards” (4.4.83), her protest against botanical hybridity echoes the Puritanical resistance to human artistic interference with God’s nature, to mixtures of profane and sacred, to the piedness of most people’s piety. The play as a whole promotes the opposite view, one that sees human artistic

---

411 It is interesting to note the orthography of our modern word “vials” in the Folio, for it implies a pun on musical viols and the instruments of heaven.
413 Stephen Batman, _Batman upon Bartholomew, his Booke De Proprietatibus Rerum_. (London, 1582), 424.
collaboration with each other and with nature as munificent, as a form of grace, perhaps.

The bringing together of Catholics and Protestants to create the Anglican Church; of sacred
and profane music to create ballads and psalms tunes; of traditional festivities, moral dramas,
and masques to create Jacobean theater: all are acts of collaborative creation.
**EPILOGUE**

In a December 2008 lecture, Zadie Smith compared the multi-voiced flexibility of then-President-elect Barack Obama to Shakespeare’s facility in representing divergent viewpoints.\(^{414}\) She suggests that we cherish the “many-colored voice, the multiple sensibility” of artists while we condemn such equivocation in our politicians. We cherish Shakespeare, Smith suggests, “for his lack of allegiance.” He presents both sides of a thing, so that:

He has appeared, to generations of readers, as not of one religion but of both, in truth, beyond both. Born into the middle of Britain’s fierce Catholic–Protestant culture war, how could the bloody absurdity of those years not impress upon him a strong sense of cultural contingency?

Smith’s assessment of the Keatsian “negative capability” of Shakespeare’s plays, their ability to “speak truth plurally,” might well be applied to the work of Christopher Marlowe, and even to the musical plays of John Bale and the anonymous *Wisdom* and the Digby *Mary Magdalene*. For these playwrights, too, culture was contingent, and its relationship to truth difficult to ascertain. Perhaps all of these playwrights found that “in a country ripped apart by dogma, those who wish to keep their heads—in both senses—must learn to split themselves in two.”

The multiple voices of the theater, as this dissertation has shown, are more than merely verbal. The playwrights of these tumultuous periods of English history express the contingencies of their world through music, able as it is to mean many things to many

---

people at once. As Robert Browne, whose quotation begins this dissertation, wrote, even
tavern music “makes one merry, another mad,” and strikes in him “a deepe fit of
devotion.” Music is in some ways the ultimate theatrical tool of multi-valence. Theatrical
music encouraged East Anglians to recall the strength of religious hybridity; it allowed early
reformers to performatively advocate for the retention of church music; it called into
question longstanding beliefs about music’s power; and it suggested the tenuous harmony of
reconciled religious and social differences. The stakes and the absurdities of religious and
social strife led the playwrights and actors who represented those stakes and absurdities to
do so through music. Like words, music was contentious; but like words, music sang in
many voices. That is precisely its social power in the plays discussed here.

Smith suggests that through the glass of today, Shakespeare’s “negative capability”
looks like the perfect antidote to “ideological heroism.” The early years of the twenty-first
century have certainly demonstrated that polyvalence and ambiguous voicings are often
drowned out by univocal political posturing, but that is nothing new. The orientalizing of
religious alterity on display in the Digby Mary Magdalen is violently refigured in post-9/11
America, and the superstitions about witchcraft and magic that animate Doctor Faustus are
reborn in the demonizing of atheists, and the censorship of Harry Potter.

But against singular certainty, dramatic and musical re-presentations of today’s
innumerable voices are intricate, polyphonic. Musical performances, in theaters, arenas,
concert halls, and school auditoriums and on television and the Internet, continue to voice
complexity and urge divergent communities to recognize opportunities to compromise.

Compromise, be it political, social, or religious, is always itself compromised; it is as slow and

1977), 149.

416 She takes the phrase “ideological heroism” from Stephen Greenblatt’s Will in the World.
tortuous as Anglicanism or new legislation. But compromise continues to happen, and it continues to be mediated through people’s religious faiths, through music, and through theatrical entertainment.

“Tudor Musical Theater” asks what it means for cultural and ecclesiastic institutions to perform music during times of religious contention. Issues important to Tudor audiences—religious politics and their bearing on everyday life, popular representations of the sacred and profane, the efficacy and profanity of music—continue to be debated. The proper interplay between religious and secular music, the connotative force of melody, tone, and delivery, the source of music’s spiritual power: these things will probably always be argued by musicians and audiences. Can the rhythms and melodies of “Saturday night and Sunday morning” exert the same power over us, as Robert Browne thought they did? As the sound of music continues to perform sacred and social functions for people of diverse religious groups, the lines between efficacy and entertainment, between sacred and profane are as blurred now as they were for early moderns singing Psalms to ballad tunes.

Today’s musical entertainments continue to negotiate religious and social differences, and to form communities. For example, the popular, Emmy-winning television show “Glee,” a sort of post-Broadway meta-musical-comedy for the masses, re-presents American religious diversity, contemporary social-political debates, and spiritual musical efficacy in its October 2010 episode “Grilled Cheesus.” Extended social communities form on the Internet to share and comment on music of politics, faith, and dissent, songs like will.i.am’s election-propelling “Yes we can.”

417 The phrase comes from Don and Emily Saliers’ A Song to Sing, A Life to Live: Reflections on Music as Spiritual Practice (San Francisco: Jossey-Boss, 2005), passim. Don Saliers, a career church organist, and his daughter Emily Saliers, one half of the folk-rock duo The Indigo Girls, argue for the similarities between sacred and popular music from a practitioners’ standpoint.
At the same time, Puritan sentiments (to which the United States in part owes its existence) persist in protests against the profanity of lyrics or the bawdiness and violence of music videos. American (Christian) churches continue to debate the efficacy of old hymns versus traditional liturgical music versus praise songs played by bands with words projected onto big screens for a communal karaoke. The protests continue and the debates rage, but musicians sing and play on, sounding forth country ballads and religious anthems, hip-hop rants and celebratory sexual dance beats. All of this music is dialogized not only in the theater, but in movies, television shows, YouTube videos.

The audiences for today’s musical entertainments are more religiously and socially diverse than those of Tudor musical theater productions, but as was true in that time and place, we respond to these complex representations of our social and spiritual lives in ways that divide us, and also bring us together. As the cultural wars continue to expose our differences, young(ish) American of all political and class backgrounds sing along to pop music. Christmas carols and patriotic songs continue to both alienate some and unite others across apparent discrepancies. In twenty-first-century America, religion, music, and entertainment continue to be mutually constitutive forces. And the abundant musical voices heard today in theaters, churches, cars, and stadiums resonate with the harmonies and cacophonies of a long religious and theatrical past.
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