

CAMERON HUNT McNABB

Hocus Pocus and the Croxton *Play of the Sacrament*

This article addresses how heresy and parody intersect in the Croxton Play of the Sacrament through its religiously and verbally dissenting characters. The play's highly theatrical depiction of a host miracle both enforces and undermines its emphatic endorsement of the real presence. The play ameliorates this tension by the privileging of words over deeds, aligning the transformative power of the consecratory words with the transformative power of believers' confessions at conversion wherein both words and actions enact a transubstantiation, thus manifesting the real presence of Christ. The play's language becomes a moral marker and the vehicle for the heretics' dissent (and descent) but also, when the Jews convert, the means of their reconciliation.

The modern catch phrase 'hocus pocus' derives from a seventeenth-century magician, who used the corrupt Latin phrase to distract his audience from the illusion of his trick.¹ The recorder of the phrase calls *hocus pocus* 'a dark composure of words' deployed to intentionally 'blinde the eyes of the beholders, to make his Trick pass the more currantly without discovery'.² The term's association with magic suggests its role in eliding the boundaries between the real and illusory, a dichotomy crucial to medieval discussions of the real presence. A disbelief in transubstantiation casts the priest's consecration as a magic trick, as *hocus pocus*, not a sacramental tenet. Jonathas, of the Croxton *Play of the Sacrament*, believes just that — 'be þe myght of hys word make yt flessh and blode — / And thus be a conceyte þe wolde make vs blynde' (202–3).³ As the magician does when he utters 'hocus pocus', Jonathas argues that 'be þe myght of [the priest's] word' parishioners are made 'blynde' to the transubstantiation trick, spurring on him and his fellow Jews to disprove the real presence. They parody the consecration and put the host through a series of tests, but when it miraculously survives all of the tortures,

Cameron Hunt McNabb (cameronhuntmcnabb@gmail.com) is an assistant professor in the English department at Southeastern University.

and Jesus bursts out of an oven, the audience learns that the Jews' parody of the liturgy, not the liturgy itself, is the real hocus pocus.

In a stage world, though, where all is hocus pocus — the magic of theatre manipulating fake hosts, fake clergy, and even fake heretics — how can the real presence be made real? Ultimately, the Croxton *Play* finds that words alone can accomplish this feat. The play situates power in the priest's and bishop's words, which represent and enforce the ecclesiastical structures of the church; however, the play also situates power in its heretics' words, which enact confessions and subsequent conversions (themselves mediated by those very same ecclesiastical structures). While language thus serves as the vehicle for the protagonists' dissent (and descent), it also enables their reconciliation: the Croxton *Play* aligns the transformative power of the consecratory words with the transformative power of believers' confessions of faith, wherein both enact a transubstantiation and make manifest the real presence of Christ.

Much of the scholarship on the Croxton *Play* addresses its reliance on blatantly illusory staging to prove a doctrine criticized as illusion, that the bread and wine are not really bread and wine. Scholars such as Sarah Beckwith, David Lawton, and John Parker are skeptical and often highly critical of the play's antithetical project of creating 'one illusion [that] would ... demonstrate the truth of another illusion, in other words, by pretending to puncture its illusions'.⁴ Beckwith even contends that 'the play can do nothing but intensify that doubt in the very act of alleviating it'.⁵ In these readings, then, the host becomes 'an unstable sign' and a 'mere stage prop' because 'having the host on stage implies that the host *can be staged*'.⁶ According to these arguments, the mimesis of the miracles always fails precisely because it shows that miracles can be inauthentically reproduced.

Other scholars, however, have shown more clemency concerning the play's theatrics, arguing that they ultimately serve to overcome the audience's doubt. David Bevington, Richard Emmerson, and Gail McMurray Gibson find the play's theatricality orthodox, particularly in connection to its endorsement of the real presence. Bevington emphasizes that 'the acceptance of dramatic miracle in the *Sacrament* play is therefore synonymous with the acceptance of the doctrine of transubstantiation, not abstractly but vividly and immediately', and Emmerson suggests an analogue between Chester's *Antichrist* and the Croxton *Play*, as both rely on 'miraculous use of divine power to confront doubt' about the real presence.⁷ Gibson acutely observes that the 'miracle of stagecraft' performs a reverse transubstantiation, turning the physical Christ who has just spoken to the audience back into the host that will be processed

before them at the play's conclusion.⁸ For these scholars, suspended disbelief leads to imminent belief.

The Croxton *Play* does resolve the tension, which Beckwith and others highlight, inherent in its false presences to enact the real presence; however, it does not do so through theories of mimesis or representation, as scholars like Emerson and Gibson suggest. The play instead resolves the tension by a simple shift in terms, upholding conversion as the ultimate transubstantiation, the ultimate miracle. Within this framework, the miracle of conversion, a miracle the play clearly intends the audience to experience, trumps even the most fantastic of staged host miracles; thus, by aligning transubstantiation with conversion, this framework makes belief in the less immediately accessible miracle, the real presence itself, much more palatable. Lawton hints at such a connection, only to dismiss it as pointless given the play's heavy dependence on illusory theatricality:

The pattern of doubling and exchange extends to the move from transformation, Host into Christ, to conversion, Jew into Christian. It would not be hard to mount a structural case for the equivalence of these two processes; but the transformation is inherently problematic if its purpose is to persuade doubters of the truth of transubstantiation, for it depends entirely on an egregious theatrical illusion. What makes this illusion credible is that the Jews are persuaded, indeed converted, by it — they are its guarantors in the world of the performance. But there is nothing here that asks us to overlook the fact that we are watching a play.⁹

The conversion of the Jews does not underwrite the possibility of transubstantiation, however, as much as the audience's (presumed) prior conversions. The audience's own experience of such a transformation makes them the guarantors of the play. The Jews' staged conversions only serve as reminders for those experiences.

In both of these transformative miracles — transubstantiation and conversion — the common element is the efficacy of language, especially the spoken word. The ecclesiastical language of the priest and bishop that effects transubstantiation parallels the ecclesiastical language of the Jews' and Aristorius's confessions that endorses their conversions. The Croxton *Play* affirms the efficacy of such language by emphatically demonstrating 'þe myght of [the priest's] word' (202) and the commandments of Christ to the Jewish converts through his 'woordys of grete favore' (945).

The Croxton *Play* differs from its Continental analogues by reconciling the Jews through conversion rather than punishing them as heretics.¹⁰ Some scholars view this conversion critically, as a kinder prequel to Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*.¹¹ But, regardless of the cultural contexts informing the author's choice of such events, the Jews within the play convert of their own accord, 'a voluntaristic act which displays the depth of their contrition, and makes their confession valid'.¹² Ann Eljenholm Nichols keenly notes that 'the full play title focuses on the conversion through miracle';¹³ indeed, the text titles itself 'þe Play of þe Conuersyon of Ser Jonathas þe Jewe by Myracle of þe Blyssed Sacrament' (80 sd). Modern scholarship has dropped the first part of the title, shortening it to the *Play of the Sacrament*, placing emphasis on the host miracles rather than the miracle of the *conversion* of Jonathas *through* the sacrament.¹⁴ Both of the text's references to its title also use the singular 'myracle' (80 sd, 1007 sd), indicating a singular event like the conversion, rather than the plural, which would be more appropriate if the referents were the host-miracles themselves. The title's linking of conversion and the transubstantiated sacrament stresses the play's goal of reintegration rather than punishment through the adoption of orthodox belief in the real presence, a goal played out physically during the play's healing of Jonathas's hand and its concluding host procession.

Tellingly, Christ's first words to the Jews are 'O Mirabiles Judei, attendite et videte / Si est dolor sicut dolor meus' [O you strange Jews, behold and see if any sorrow is like My sorrow] (717),¹⁵ which he then partially translates into English as 'Oh ye merveyflows Jewys' (719). As Parker notes, the word *mirabiles* is a non-biblical addition to the passage from Lamentations that follows.¹⁶ The authorial addition highlights that the play's true miracle lies in the conversion of the Jews. Christ also relegates Jonathas's physical healing of his hand as secondary to his spiritual healing brought through conversion:

Thow wasshest thyn hart with grete contrycion;
 Go to the cawdron — þi care shalbe the lesse —
 And towche thyn hand to thy saluacion. (775–7)

This healing miracle recapitulates Jonathas's internal, miraculous healing through conversion and further highlights the play's association of conversion with the transubstantiated host. Jonathas rejected the host earlier by chopping it off, along with his own hand, but now the two — host and Jonathas — are reconciled, both spiritually and physically. The play equates the

miracle of the real presence and the miracle of conversion quite graphically here on the stage.

The host procession that follows offers another moment of this conflation, for it is the procession of the bishop with the Jews that causes the priest to speculate on the impetus:

Sum myracel, I hope, ys wrowght be Goddys myght;
 The bysshope commyth processyon with a gret meny of Jewys;
 I hope sum myracle ys shewyd to hys syght. (843–5)

The priest bookends his observation of the Jews' conversion and declaration of faith in the procession with references to the assumed miracle, and the procession itself imparts and reiterates the miracle of conversion to the audience. The host procession reminds the audience that the transubstantiated host that goes before them is a reflection of their own transubstantiated selves.

Jonathas's healing and the host procession that follows physically illustrate the *Play's* juxtaposition of transubstantiation and conversion; however, the play also focuses on the verbal underpinnings of the two, as the medium of words enacts both substantial transformations. This exploration of transubstantiation and conversion speaks directly to the play's historical context and original audience(s) — the 'gaderyng that here ys' (73) — who were immersed in the contemporary conflict between the orthodox church and the spreading Lollard heresy. The *Play* confirms the transformative power of ecclesiastical utterances, which transubstantiate the host by 'þe myght of [their] word' (202); but it also confirms the power of the laity's confessions and subsequent conversions, which the play casts as 'woordys of grete favore' (945).

'This Gaderyng That Here Is'

The Croxton *Play* survives in a unique manuscript, as part of a compilation of Irish origin. The text sets its own *terminus post quem* by claiming that the events enacted were 'don in the forest of Aragon, in the famous cite Eraclea, the yere of owr Lord God Mccccxj' (1007 sd). The manuscript's watermark dates to 1546, however, furnishing an approximate date for the play's transcription. The roughly one hundred years of interim provide an enclosed, if broad, period within which its composition, production(s), and transmission were likely. While some scholars simply accept the text's 1461 date, most

scholars posit windows of time between the last quarter of the fifteenth century and the first quarter of the sixteenth.¹⁷

The text's concluding note that 'IX may play yt at ease' may suggest that the play travelled;¹⁸ however, its East Midland dialect and the internal allusions to East Anglian geography — such as the injunction to 'Inquyre to þe colkote, for ther ys hys loggyng, / A lytyll besyde Babwell Myll' (620–1) — suggest a limited range of circulation within East Anglia. As the banns record, the play was performed, at some point, to 'thys gaderyng that here ys' at 'Croxston' (73–4), near Bury St Edmunds. The abbey offered a particularly appropriate environment for a miracle play because it boasted its own host miracle in 1464, when, despite extensive fire damage to its main church, the abbey's hosts survived, unharmed.¹⁹

The Croxton *Play's* late-medieval dating and East Anglian provenance provide crucial context for its theological discussions, as it circulated in a region battling Lollardy, whose primary points of doctrinal dissent were disbelief in the real presence and advocacy for an English translation of the scriptures. As Gibson notes, in the fifteenth century Lollardy 'was rampant in East Anglia'.²⁰ As John A.F. Thomson observes, East Anglian Lollards were particularly radical in some of their beliefs, and persecution of them persisted throughout the fifteenth century.²¹ Moreover, heresy trials in Norwich in the 1430s prosecuted fifty-five supposed heretics, 'the largest number of accusations in a single campaign recorded in the fifteenth century'.²² The region's numerous trials also point to a reactionary impulse in such a heresy-thick atmosphere: a resort to and reinforcement of the church's structures and a call to repentance and conversion as means of preserving orthodoxy. For many fifteenth-century Lollards, the outcomes of both these approaches were the same, for repentance and conversion meant an acceptance of the doctrinal and ecclesiastical systems of the church. The conflict unfolding in East Anglian ecclesiastical courts was also transpiring in the Croxton *Play*, which stages the transubstantiated host as a mirror for believers' transubstantiated selves.

This socio-religious context also provides a nexus of interpretation for the play's Jewish protagonists, who have long been the focus of critical attention, in part because their presence is curious given England's official expulsion of Jews in 1290. This ostensible historical absence has led some scholars to read them as mere stand-ins for contemporary Lollards, while others proffer a spectrum of anti- and philo-Semitic characterizations based on contemporary depictions of Jews, both from within England and from the Continent.²³

Lawton more clearly articulates this somewhat simplistic approach — ‘it is ... a logical error, and nothing more, to argue that if Jews in the play stand for heretics they cannot also stand for themselves.’²⁴ Miriamne Ara Krummel collapses this critical history by identifying the Jews as an ‘Everythreat’, representing ‘all heresies that pose a threat to the medieval Christian hegemony’, including both Judaism and Lollardy,²⁵ and her framework considers the dramatic possibility of multiple significations. While the play’s protagonists are certainly Jews, and signify as such, they can also simultaneously signify as Lollards. Critics need not pick and choose the play’s heretics — there are enough to go around.

Heresy — Jewish, Lollard, or otherwise — clearly pervades the play. What qualified as heresy, and hence heretics, vacillated throughout the medieval period, and the word itself accommodates such fluidity. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines ‘heresy’ as ‘theological or religious opinion or doctrine maintained in opposition, or held to be contrary, to the “catholic” or orthodox doctrine of the Christian Church’ and hypothesizes its first use in 1225 in the *Ancrene Rule*.²⁶ As the *OED*’s definition suggests, heresy is not simply disagreement with or criticism of orthodoxy, but rather a doctrine that is maintained despite its explicit opposition to orthodoxy. Heresy, like orthodoxy, is officially defined; thus, heresy and orthodoxy are symbiotic because their respective definitions necessitate an opposite.

Fifteenth-century heresy, however, was not merely confined to opposing ‘opinion or doctrine’ but became reified in specific actions. Archbishop Thomas Arundel’s *Constitutions* (1409), which outlined heresy in response to the rise of Lollardy, emphasizes that heresy is found in both ‘word and deed’.²⁷ Arundel takes great pains to delineate these unauthorized ‘deed[s]’, and, in fact, all thirteen of the constitutions forbid specific actions.²⁸ The Croxton *Play* itself is highly attuned to matters of heresy, and it provides a nuanced discussion of heterodoxy, from multiple perspectives, rather than simply coding it generically as anything dissenting from orthodoxy. Surprisingly, the play’s heretics put the word into currency first, only to have it redefined by orthodoxy at the play’s conclusion.

Arundel’s preface associates contemporary heretics with ‘Pagans, Jews, and other infidels, and wicked miscreants’ through whom ‘the reverend holy mysteries ... [are] profaned’,²⁹ and this becomes true for Aristorius and the Jews within the play. The first reference to heresy comes from Aristorius, who fears that if he is caught stealing the host, ‘to þe biysshope þei wolde go tell þat dede / And apeche me of eresye’ (301–2). He fears his heretical ‘dede’,

his disrespectful treatment of the host, will be reported to the bishop. The sincerity of his claim is doubtful, as he appears to have both the priest and clerk in his pocket, and his more likely motivation is to use the suspected danger as a bargaining chip to raise the price of the host. But his fear, genuine or otherwise, demonstrates how the church's system of authority structures heresy within the play — Aristorius does not fear retribution or damnation from God but rather the bishop and the ecclesiastical structures which 'apeche' heretics. His fear returns (perhaps more earnestly) in the concluding scene, when the bishop leads the procession of the host: he confides to his priest, 'For an heretyke I fear he wyll me take' (857), again fearing the ecclesiastical bishop, not God himself. He even admits, 'I were worthy to be putt in brennyng fere' (907), more likely alluding to the earthly punishment for unrepentant heretics than eternal damnation.³⁰ This disclosure again stresses the authorized channels dealing with heresy, as Aristorius attempts to absolve himself by first confessing to the priest, then seeking absolution from the bishop, and finally performing penance during the host procession. The Jews also discuss heresy, but they reappropriate the term into their own theological paradigm: Jason, amid expounding the Christian doctrine of the incarnation, assures 'Ageyns owr law thys ys false heresy' (415). Jasdon similarly confirms the Christian heresy of Christ's resurrection: 'And syth how he styed by hys own power; / And thys, ye know well, ys heresy full playn' (423–4). This dramatic irony, of course, conveys the orthodox doctrine while simultaneously confirming the Jews as heretics.

The term's signification finally solidifies when Jesus, who speaks only at the play's conclusion, fixes the notion of heresy in the expected orthodox terms, such as a denial of Christ's sacrificial death on the cross (724, 733), failing to keep his commandments (729), and rejecting his divinity (730). Jesus also calls the Jews' disbelief in the real presence 'blasphem(y)' (731). Then, the bishop, not Christ, explicates orthodoxy in his concluding sermon and procession. The replacement of Christ by the bishop on stage and the transubstantiation of Christ back into the host to be carried in the bishop's procession both emphatically reiterate the play's casting of heresy in ecclesiastical terms. In each of the above references to heresy, the heresy is mediated through orthodox channels — Aristorius fears the wrath of the bishop, the Jews evoke their 'law' to define heresy, and Jesus calls them to repent of heresy by confessing before the bishop, a task Jonathas confirms he will do: 'The bysshoppe wyll I goo fetche to se owr offenses / And onto hym shew owr lyfe, how þat we be gyilty' (796–7). The bishop's arrival at the play's

conclusion authorizes the reconciliation of the Jews, Aristorius, the priest, and ultimately the audience.

‘Þe Myght of Hys Word’

The Croxton *Play* assumes orthodoxy (and thus heresy) is rooted in the ecclesiastical structures of the church, and it combats the Jews’ anti-sacramental, anti-ecclesiastical attack through those very structures. While the play deliberates on a number of Christian doctrines, the central focus is undoubtedly on the real presence, particularly the role priests’ words play in it. The play’s heretics signify as such primarily because of their disbelief in transubstantiation, and the play’s prologue makes this explicit:

For þat þe dowghtys þe Jewys than in stode—
 ...
 Was yff þe Sacrament were flesshe and blode;
 Therfor they put yt to suche dystresse. (69, 71–2)

Jonathas confirms his own disbelief within the play, confiding in the audience that

Þe beleve of thes Cristen men ys false, as I wene;
 For þe beleue on a cake — me thynk yt ys onkynd.
 And all they seye how þe prest dothe yt bynd,
 And be þe myght of hys word make yt flessch and blode —
 And thus be a conceyte þe wolde make vs blynde —
 And how þat yt shuld be he þat deyed upon the rode. (199–204)

Jonathas not only denies transubstantiation but also the power implicit in the priest’s words to effect such a change, casting the consecration as a kind of hocus pocus. He challenges not just the theological doctrine but also the ecclesiastical power structures that underwrite it. Masphat also expresses his heretical doubt a few lines later, when he asserts, ‘That was neuer he that on Caluery was kyld, / Or in bred for to be blode yt ys ontrewed als’ (214–15). Lastly, Masphat’s summation of their intent speaks to a disbelief in the real presence, as he says ‘We wyll not spare to wyrke yt wrake, / To prove in thys brede yf þer be eny lyfe’ (459–60). The Jews’ disbelief in transubstantiation, and particularly their objections to the priest’s power to enact it, clearly signify their heretical status.

But the Jews are not the play's only heretics. Lauren Lepow views Aristorius as a Lollard, finding a pun on his vow to 'amende myn wyckyd lyfe' (973) as referring to his 'Wycliffe life', a vow that Jonathas makes as well, 'owr wyckyd lyuyng for to restore' (965).³¹ Aristorius is a fair-weather Christian at best, and from the opening scenes, he, like the Jews, is clearly irreverent towards the ecclesiastical structures of the church, using the clerk as his errand boy and duping the priest out of the host. Most tellingly, he is also guilty of commodifying the host by inserting it into a material economy. Jonathas places an opening bid for the host at twenty pounds (282) but ups it later to forty (309), bypassing the expected price of thirty pieces of silver. Even heresy, apparently, is subject to inflation. But Aristorius holds firm at his price of one hundred pounds, repeating the price twice before Jonathas understands that it is not a negotiation. Aristorius becomes an anti-model of a Christian merchant, more akin to Jonathas, who is 'chefe merchaunte of Jewes' (196).³² For analogues of a materialized host, there certainly remained a long tradition of host desecration tales involving Jews, but this threat was also a local, contemporary concern: for instance, the Sparke brothers, in their 1457 East Anglian trial for Lollardy, discuss the host in purely economic terms. They were questioned on their assertion that

Item, quod triginta panes huiusmodi pre Vno Vendeuntur obolo, Vbi tamen christus venditus erat pro triginta denariis; Et quod huiusmodi fictione sacramentum propter auariciam sacerdotum erat primitus adinuentum.

[Thirty breads of this sort are sold for one halfpenny, but Christ was sold for thirty pence. The sacrament after this fashion is therefore a figment devised to enrich priests.]³³

The Sparkes argue that the host is purely material (selling for the market price of one halfpenny) and that its supposed spiritual value is only a tactic to inflate its price. Aristorius's similar disregard for the host's spiritual qualities and his own reduction of the host to a commodity questions its 'sacred immunisation' to the material world.³⁴ The Croxton *Play* stages the possibility of a material exchange of the sacrament but shows another economy within which the host is indeed immune to exploitation: an economy of words.

The banns first speak to such an economy when they emphasize the transubstantiating power given to priests:

Thus be maracle off þe Kyng of Hevyn,
 And by myght and power govyn to þe prestys mowthe,
 In an howshold wer conuertyd iwys elevyn.
 At Rome þis myracle ys knowen welle kowthe. (53–6)

Here the *Primus Vexillator* attributes the miracle and the subsequent conversions to *both* God's power *and* the power of the priest's words. The consecration scene takes place offstage, reserving the mimetic recitation of its liturgy for the play's heretics. The play does not debase the liturgy by earnest mimesis but instead codes the mimesis as parody. Whereas Jonathas initially casts the priest's consecration as hocus pocus, used to obscure the absence of transubstantiation from the congregation, the play in turn casts Jonathas's parodic consecration as the real hocus pocus, attempting to obscure the real presence from the audience.

When Aristorius hands the host over to Jonathas, he confirms that it has been 'sacred newe' (379) by the priest's 'skyll' (363), and the play's ensuing action unequivocally demonstrates its real presence. Jonathas himself details the source and continuation of priests' powerful words:

And thys powre he gaue Peter to proclame,
 And how the same shuld be suffycyent to all prechors;
 The bysshoppys and curatys saye the same,
 And soo, as I vnderstond, do all hys progenytors. (405–8)

This verbal consecratory ability, first instituted by Jesus and continued through priests, sharply contrasts with the Jews' own mock consecration.

Underscoring the doctrine of the real presence and the play's endorsement of the clergy is an emphasis on confession, another logocentric sacrament.³⁵ As Cecilia Cutts notes, 'the duty of auricular confession to a priest ... by the fourteenth century had become firmly and inseparably attached to the Sacrament of the Eucharist' and this tenet, she finds, 'is almost as strongly stressed as the Eucharistic doctrine itself' in the play.³⁶ The banns describe the Jews' conversions as both induced by the sacrament and confirmed by the priest through the sanctioned, authorized act of confession:

The Holy Sacrement sheuyd them grette fauour;
 In contrycyon thyr hertys wer cast
 And went and shewyd ther lyues to a confesour. (50–2)

One vexillator reiterates the importance of confession when he directly addresses the audience, admonishing them ‘with all your myght / Vnto youer gostly father shewe your synne’ (65–6). Christ himself commands confession as well, when he directs the Jews to ‘Ite et ostendite vos sacerdotibus meis’ [Go show yourselves unto my priests] (765).³⁷ The priests mediate between the penitent and Christ, so Christ’s command in the play to confess to them rather than directly to himself is extremely significant, for it undergirds the orthodox church’s sacraments and clerical structures. The church used this very biblical passage, ‘Go shew yourselves to the priests’ (Lk 17:14), to rebuke Lollards during heresy trials,³⁸ likely because the heretical sect vehemently denied any man’s power to forgive and absolve sins: ‘For no man but God assoyles of synnes, but if we clepe assoylunge schewyng of presetis þat God hymselfe assoyled’.³⁹ Thomas Hoccleve accuses the Lollard Sir John Oldcastle of a similar objection — ‘Thow seist “confessioun auriculer / Ther needith noon”’, and in his corresponding marginal note he cites the exact verse Christ speaks in the Croxton *Play*: ‘Scriptum est “Ostendite vos sacerdotibus”’ [The Scripture is ‘shew yourselves to the priests’].⁴⁰ Thus, conversion and confession are intrinsically linked, and, at the play’s conclusion, the Jews demonstrate their own conversions when they echo Christ’s commandment on confession. Jonathas says, ‘The bysshoppe wyll I goo fetche to se owr offens / And onto hym shew owr lyfe, how þat we be gylyt’ (796–7), and Masphat relates, ‘In contrycyon owr hartys he cast / And bad take vs to a confessor’ (946–7). Indeed all of them submit to the ecclesiastical structure when they confess to the bishop, seeking ‘generall absolucion’ (930).

‘Woordys of Grete Favore’

While the Croxton *Play* endorses ‘þe myght of [the priest’s] word’ (202) in consecration and absolution, it also endorses the might of the laity’s word in confession and conversion. To elucidate such power, the play stages a complex soundscape among its heretical figures, one that begins in a register of liturgical parody but moves ultimately to one of penitential confession. Amid its fantastic menagerie of severed limbs, bleeding hosts, and bursting ovens, the text’s focus remains didactic. The proportion of verbal instruction to grotesque stage action is very high, emphasizing words above deeds as an avenue for conversion. For instance, the Jews deliberate Christian doctrine for eighty-three lines before they initially stab the host, and the stabbing itself only spans a mere eleven lines (though staging of the scene can obviously

vary in length). These preliminary speeches, in which the Jews parodically speak regarding orthodox doctrine, recapitulate the play's ideological concerns regarding language.

Scholars such as Mikhail Bakhtin and C.L. Barber have demonstrated the prevalence of parodic structures in medieval culture, and these structures inform the Croxton *Play*. Critics have long recognized the play's parody of the passion. The Jews put Christ through a 'new passyoun' (38) by stabbing the host five times, nailing it to a post, boiling it in oil, and baking it in an oven. Their torment is certainly parodic overkill, beating a dead host, so to speak. But the Jews parody in more than deed. Their verbal parody interrogates the relationship between words and meaning by taking signifiers out of their original contexts and forcing them to change significations. Parody thus inherently disrupts the univocity of words and meaning by demonstrating that all words and all meaning are subject to the contexts within which they are placed. Their words demarcate the boundary between orthodox and heterodox biblical language within the play, a boundary shored up by the play's insistence on the real presence as verbally dependent.

In the rising action, before the climactic torment of the host, the Jews parody both the words and the actions of the consecration liturgy. After Jonathas receives the host from Aristorius, he remarks, 'Now in thys clothe I shall the cure / That no wyght shall the see' (383–4). The stage directions then indicate that he 'shall goo to þe tabyll' and 'lay the Ost on þe tabyll' (384 sd, 392 sd). Both of these actions — wrapping the host in cloth and placing it on a table — mimic a priest's actions during consecration. The Sarum Missal instructs priests during consecration to 'reverently ... replace [the host] before the chalice', returning it to the altar.⁴¹ The missal also provides instructions regarding when to cover and uncover the host (and paten).⁴² The staging of this scene could be even more parodic, as the scene prior depicted Aristorius and the priest dining at a table on 'lyght bred' and 'wyne' (342, 339).⁴³ The bishop, moreover, concludes the host procession when he 'entre[s] þe chyrche and lay þe Ost on þe auter' (865 sd), indicating a possible third use of the table space — first, as the site of material bread and wine; second, as an altar for a parodic consecration; and lastly, as the home of the restored host. The visual cues of the parody are quite clear.

Then, following this highly suggestive staging, Jonathas introduces a parodic liturgical register, focusing primarily on the consecration liturgy:

They say þat þis ys Jhesu þat was attaynted in owr lawe
 And þat thys ys he þat crwcyfyed was.
 On thes wordys ther law growndyd hath he
 That he sayd on Shere Thursday at hys sopere:
 He brake the brede and sayd Accipite,
 And gave hys dyscyplys them for the chere:
 And more he sayd to them there,
 Whyle they were all togethere and sum,
 Syttyng at the table soo clere,
 Comedite Corpus meum. (395–404)

In this scene, Beckwith reads Jonathas as ‘a grotesque priest’,⁴⁴ and his recitation clearly mimics the actual liturgy:

Who, the day before he suffered, took bread in his reverent and holy hands, and lifting his eyes to heaven ... to you his own omnipotent Father, giving thanks to thee, he blessed, he brake ... and gave it to his own disciples, saying, Take and eat ye all of this, for this is my body.⁴⁵

Somewhat incongruously, Jonathas retains the Latin phrases for the words of Christ, ‘Accipite’ [Take] and ‘Comedite Corpus meum’ [Eat, {this is} my body], during the parodic consecration, while delivering the rest of the liturgy in English. This reservation, while possibly an authorial decision to maintain orthodoxy in the volatile East Anglian religious landscape, reproduces the aural quality of the liturgy and adds force to the parody by highlighting the disjunction between the Latin passages quoted, supposedly demonstrating reverence to Christ by leaving his words in Latin, and the imminent host desecration to come. The reverence is only a parodic reverence, and the consecration actually intends to demonstrate the real absence rather than the real presence. This disconnect between parodic and real priest and parodic and real presence manifests in the ensuing stage action, when the bleeding host sticks to Jonathas’s hand and both are nailed to a post. On the one hand (so to speak), Jonathas’s presence merges with the real presence, but on the other hand, he splits this merger by leaving both host and hand dangling on the post.

Jonathas’s companions, too, join in on the parody of the divine office, as they each in turn delineate a parodic creed. They cover all major points of Christian doctrine and echo the Nicene Creed in structure, content, and

even sound, but they are careful to qualify each tenet as ‘heresy full playn’ (424). As with Jonathas’s mock consecration, the Jews’ simultaneous recitation and rejection of the doctrine reminds the audience of the power of these words when spoken in earnest but also the potential corrupting of them when spoken in disbelief. Jason begins by explaining the incarnation, followed by Jasdon, who expounds on Christ’s resurrection, both crucial doctrines addressed early in the Nicene Creed. Next, Masphat describes the sending of the Holy Spirit and Christ’s ascension:

When þe Holy Gost to them come,
 They faryd as dronk men of pymente or vernage;
 And sythen how þat he lykenyd hymself a lord of parage,
 On hys fatherys ryght hond he hym sett. (425–30)

The verbal echo to the Creed is strong, with the allusion to Christ sitting at the right hand of the Father mirroring the Creed’s line, ‘He ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father.’⁴⁶ Structurally, this line in the Creed follows its affirmation of the incarnation, resurrection, dispensing of the Holy Spirit, and ascension, a sequence the Jews’ own discussions of those doctrines mimic. Lastly, Malchus describes the last judgment:

How they that be ded shall com agayn to Judgement,
 And owr dredfull Judge shalbe thys same brede,
 ...
 To turn vs from owr beleve ys ther entent —
 For that he sayd, iudicare uiuos et mortos. [to judge the living and the
 dead] (434–40)

The parody here reaches its peak as Malchus even quotes the Nicene Creed: ‘Et iterum venturus est cum gloria iudicare vivos et mortuos’ [And he will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead].⁴⁷ This direct reference concludes the performance of the Jews’ parodic mass.

The Jews do not remain heretics, however, and, when their doctrinal beliefs convert to orthodoxy, their language converts as well, shifting the soundscape into a more solemn register and evidencing that they now serve Christ in both word and deed. Given the Lollards’ objections to the sacred role of Latin in the church, the *Play*’s use of the language as its litmus test for orthodoxy further confirms its endorsement of the traditional ecclesiastical framework of the church. The clearest demonstration of such transformation comes in the Jews’ employments of Latin, before and after their conversion.

Surprisingly, Jonathas is the first character to use Latin in the play, not the two vexillators, the priest, or the clerk. The Latin that Jonathas initially employs appears in his parodic consecration of the host, with 'Accipite' [Take] (399) and 'Comedite Corpus meum' [Eat, {this is} my body] (404).⁴⁸ Then Malchus wields a snippet of Latin in his discussion of judgment, quoting 'iudicare viuos et mortuos' [To judge the living and the dead] (440) from the Nicene Creed, and Jonathas concludes the doctrinal discussion with an allusion to 'Tinctis Bosra vestibus' [{Who is this that cometh from Edom} with dyed garments from Bozrah] (448).⁴⁹ Jonathas's first two phrases are the words of Christ, and the second two quotations are prophetic, casting the Jews as (ironic) prophets. But a completely different register, and indeed miraculous knowledge, of Latin introduces itself after the Jews' conversion. Lawton vaguely refers to this new register as the 'language of poetic penance',⁵⁰ but the words indicate more than mere penance. They indicate complete conversion, both spiritual and linguistic.

Jesus introduces this orthodox register of Latin in his first words after bursting forth from the oven: 'O mirabiles Iudei, attendite et videte / Si est dolor sicut dolor meus' [O you strange Jews, behold and see if any sorrow is like My sorrow] (717–18).⁵¹ This line not only reiterates the play's emphasis on the miracle of conversion but also marks the first sustained use of Latin in the entire play. Then, in turn, the Jews demonstrate their conversion verbally by echoing this orthodox Latin, quoting scriptural passages in refrain at the conclusion of each of their stanzas. Jonathas's first words after Jesus's entrance are 'Tu es protector vite mee; a quo trepidado?' [You are the protector of my life, of whom should I be afraid?] (741).⁵² This address is a far cry from the fragments of liturgy he invokes earlier, with the line significantly longer and more complex than his previous use of the language to signal clearly his conversion. Jason similarly concludes his confession with 'Lacrimis nostris conscienciam nostram baptizemus!' [With our tears may we baptize our conscience] (749) and Jason remarks, 'Ne grauis sompnus irruat' [May grievous sleep not seize us] (753).⁵³ Maspbat and Malchus, too, cry 'Miserere mei, Deus!' [Have mercy on me, Lord!] (757) and 'Asperges me, Domine, ysopo, et munadabor' [Sprinkle me with hyssop, Lord, and I shall be clean] (761).⁵⁴ This highly orthodox, systematic use of Latin, both biblical and liturgical, stands in direct opposition to the Jews' earlier parodic employment of the liturgy. After their conversion, the Jews quote five complete biblical or liturgical passages in Latin; before, they quoted fewer than a dozen words. Moreover, while those parodic quotations came from Christ

or prophets, the passages evoked here are all penitential and suppliant, drawing almost exclusively on the Psalms. Even the Jews' English passages evoke a biblical register, with allusions such as 'owt of dyrknes to lyght' (752) and 'forygyfe me my mysded!' (756).⁵⁵ Their concluding English lines also change register as an anaphoric chorus of 'Oh's exhibits their praise (742, 746, 750, 754, 756, 778, 780, 782).

Jesus confirms the orthodoxy of this speech model again by peppering his remaining stanzas with biblical passages — 'Ite et ostendite vos sacerdotibus meis' [Go show yourselves unto my priests] (765) and 'Et tunc non auertam a vobis faciem meam' [And then I will not turn My face from you] (769).⁵⁶ The bishop also joins this register, as his first words upon his entrance pick up the anaphora with 'Oh Jhesu' (806), and he also quotes Latin at length: 'Estote forte[s] in bello et pugnate cum antico serpente, / Et accipite regnum eternum, et cetera' [Be strong in battle and fight with the old serpent, and receive the eternal kingdom, and so on] (866–7).⁵⁷ By the end of the play, the Jews, Jesus, and the bishop all speak in the same unified, penitential register marked aurally by extended uses of Latin and liturgical phrases and devices.

Spoken words tellingly effect the miracles of the Jews' conversions, like the consecration of the host. Indeed, a host transforming into a boy and bursting from an oven has some persuasive appeal, but even the power originally instilled in it to perform such deeds arose from the priest's consecratory words. Ovens aside, as Masphat relates, their conversions stemmed from Christ's *words*, not his miraculous deeds:

There spake he to us woordys of grete favore
 In contrycyon owr hartys he cast,
 and bad take us to a confessor. (945–7)

His words cast their hearts into contrition, not his actions. Likewise, his emphasis on the external, spoken words of confession, to a confessor, reiterates the orthodox, ecclesiastical framework that undergirds conversion. Conversion will lead to more spoken words, as Aristorius proclaims that he will, in turn, 'teache thys lesson to man and wyfe' (975). The play itself recapitulates this theme, as its own text encourages both conversion and evangelism.

The church therefore intends its final incorporation of the play's heretics to be recapitulated in the audience as well. Bevington finds the bishop's final speeches 'profoundly ritualistic, deliberately confounding the distinction between dramatic performance and religious service'.⁵⁸ The bishop's Latin quotations become the site of both theatrical collapse and communal

reintegration, and the audience, vicariously and perhaps earnestly, experiences confession and conversion as well. Although there is scholarly debate as to the extent of audience involvement, many scholars speculate that the host procession within the play included the audience, as processions would have outside of the dramatic sphere, and medieval theatre practices, as we know them, show little concern for maintaining a fourth wall. The bishop's shift to direct address in the text is quite clear and his inclusiveness is emphatic:

Now folow me, all and summe,
 And all tho that bene here, both more or lesse,
 Thys holy song, O sacrum Conuiuium,
 Lett vs syng all with grett swetnesse. (838–41)

The bishop clearly invites the audience to participate in the procession and the song along with the characters. The two concluding hymns, the *Sacrum Convivium* and the *Te Deum Laudamus*, appear in contemporary processions, which further conflates the mimesis of the liturgical practice with the practice itself. The *Sacrum Convivium* serves as the antiphon of the Magnificat for the vespers of the feast of Corpus Christi and, more significantly, a processional antiphon for the feast of Corpus Christi. Sister Nicholas Maltman records the antiphon in full:

O sacrum convivium in quo Christus sumitur:
 recolitur memoria passionis ejus, mens impletur
 gratia, et futurae gloriae, nobis pignus datur, Alleluia.

[O sacred banquet in which Christ becomes our food, the memory of his passion is renewed, the soul is filled with grace and a pledge of future glory is given us.]⁵⁹

She views the play's action as 'a dramatization of the antiphon', with the procession as the text's high point.⁶⁰ The second liturgical song *Te Deum Laudamus*, continues this unification under the auspices of the liturgy, as it 'figured prominently in the Durham Corpus Christi procession' and concluded many liturgical dramas.⁶¹ Its placement in the play's final line serves as the segue between the staged and real moments of conversion and reconciliation. The song 'redefines audience as congregation'.⁶² These hymns invite the audience to join in the orthodox soundscape, particularly if the play's immediate audience suggests a possible signification to local Lollards, who were also heretics in need of conversion. Gibson notes that 'in at least one fifteenth-century heresy case, in Lincolnshire, the penance assigned to a convicted Lollard

was the take part in a Corpus Christi procession',⁶³ much like the one that punctuates the Croxton *Play*. The procession thus accomplishes a physical and verbal reincorporation of all heretics, staged or otherwise, by means of conversion through the sacrament.

The Croxton *Play* vividly demonstrates that the act of consecration is analogous to the consecrating act of conversion: both rely on spoken words, that the ecclesiastical structures of the church underwrite, to enact a substantive transformation. This juxtaposition endorses the orthodox church's stance against Lollardy's denial of transubstantiation and resistance to conversion. It also exposes the heretics' parodic words and deeds, wielded to disprove the real presence, as the real hocus pocus, and in turn offers other words — authorized and orthodox — as the primary tool for authentic transubstantiation of both hosts and heretics. For the Croxton *Play*, words can make the real presence real. Even in theatre.

Notes

My deepest thanks to Nicole Guenther Discenza, Sara Munson Deats, and David Bevington, who read drafts of this argument as a chapter of my dissertation *'Bite on Boldly': Staging Medieval and Early Modern Heretics*. Their feedback has been invaluable. All remaining errors are my own.

- 1 See 'hocus-pocus, n.', *Oxford English Dictionary (OED)* and John Parker, *The Aesthetics of Antichrist: From Christian Drama to Christopher Marlowe* (Ithaca, 2007), 241. Parker attributes the phrase to a corruption of the consecration liturgy 'Hoc est corpus meum' [this is my body]; *OED* cites this etymology as conjectural, however, based solely on a reference by John Tillotson in 1694 in one of his sermons: 'In all probability those common juggling words of *hocus pocus* are nothing else but a corruption of *hoc est corpus*, by way of ridiculous imitation of the priests of the Church of Rome in their trick of Transubstantiation'. *OED* offers another source for the etymology, from Thomas Ady's *Candle in the Dark* in 1655: 'I will speak of one man ... that went about in King James his time ... who called himself, The Kings Majesties most excellent Hocus Pocus, and so was called, because that at the playing of every Trick, he used to say, *Hocus pocus, tontus talontus, vade celeriter jubeo*, a dark composure of words, to blinde the eyes of the beholders, to make his Trick pass the more currantly without discovery.'
- 2 'hocus-pocus, n.', *OED*.

- 3 All quotations taken from *Non-Cycle Plays and Fragments*. Norman Davis (ed.), *The Croxton Play of the Sacrament*, *Early English Text Society* (Oxford, 1970).
- 4 Parker, *Aesthetics of Antichrist*, 126.
- 5 Sarah Beckwith, 'Ritual, Church and Theatre: Medieval Dramas of the Sacramental Body', David Aers (ed.), *Culture and History 1350–1600: Essays on English Communities, Identities, and Writing* (Detroit, 1992), 68.
- 6 David A. Lawton, 'Sacrilege and Theatricality: The Croxton *Play of the Sacrament*', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 33.2 (2003), 297, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/10829636-33-2-281>; Beckwith, 'Ritual, Church and Theatre', 75, emphasis mine.
- 7 David Bevington, *From Mankind to Marlowe: Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England* (Cambridge, 1962), 39; Richard Emmerson, 'Contextualizing Performance: The Reception of the Chester *Antichrist*', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 29.1 (1999), 99.
- 8 Gail McMurray Gibson, *The Theatre of Devotion: East Anglian Drama and Society in the Late Middle Ages* (Chicago, 1989), 38.
- 9 Lawton, 'Sacrilege and Theatricality', 297.
- 10 See Davis, *Croxton Play*, lxxiv and Lawton, 'Sacrilege and Theatre', 288.
- 11 See Miriamne Ara Krummel, 'Getting Even: Social Control and Uneasy Laughter in the Croxton *Play of the Sacrament*', Sandra M. Hordis and Paul Hardwick (eds), *Medieval English Comedy* (Turnhout, 2007) and, to a lesser extent, Lawton, 'Sacrilege and Theatricality'.
- 12 Beckwith, 'Ritual, Church, and Theatre', 71. See also Donnalee Dox, 'Medieval Drama as Documentation: "Real Presence" in the Croxton *Conversion of Ser Jonathan the Jewe by the Myracle of the Blissed Sacrament*', *Theatre Survey* 38.1 (1997), DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S004055740000185X>.
- 13 Ann Eljenholm Nichols, 'The Croxton "Play of the Sacrament": A Re-Reading', *Comparative Drama* 22.2 (1988), 127.
- 14 Dox, 'Medieval Drama', does use the play's full title and uses *Conversion* as her short title.
- 15 Translation Walker's.
- 16 Parker, *Aesthetics of Antichrist*, 132. See Lam 1:12.
- 17 See Cecilia Cutts, 'The Croxton Play: An Anti-Lollard Piece', *Modern Language Quarterly* 5 (1944), 45–60, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/00267929-5-1-45>; David Bevington, *From Mankind to Marlowe*, 49; Lawton, 'Sacrilege and Theatricality', 286; Michael Jones, 'Theatrical History in the Croxton *Play of the Sacrament*', *English Literary History* 66.2 (1999), 224, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/elh.1999.0016>; Gibson, *The Theatre of Devotion*, 34; and Nichols, 'The Croxton

- “Play of the Sacrament”, 131. Cutts limits her scope to the late-fifteenth century, and Bevington and Lawton agree. Jones dates it more specifically to ‘somewhere around the 1480s’, while Gibson suggests the early-sixteenth century. Nichols relies on Ian Lancashire’s dating of 1461–1511 (131).
- 18 See Bevington, *From Mankind to Marlowe*, 49. Aside from the text itself, however, we do not have any evidence of the play’s performance history.
- 19 See Cutts, ‘The Croxton Play’, 55; Gibson, *Theatre of Devotion*, 36; and Dox, ‘Medieval Drama as Documentation’, 107.
- 20 Gibson, *Theatre of Devotion*, 30.
- 21 John A.F. Thomson, *The Later Lollards: 1414–1520* (Oxford, 1965).
- 22 Gibson, *Theatre of Devotion*, 30.
- 23 See Cutts, ‘The Croxton Play’; Gibson, *Theatre of Devotion*; Lauren Lepow, *Enacting the Sacrament: Counter-Lollardy in the Towneley Cycle* (Rutherford, 1990); Dox, ‘Medieval Drama as Documentation’; Beckwith, ‘Ritual, Church and Theatre’; and Elisa Narin van Court, ‘Socially Marginal, Culturally Central: Representing Jews in Late Medieval English Literature’, *Exemplaria* 12.2 (2000) 293–326.
- 24 Lawton, ‘Sacrilege and Theatricality’, 292.
- 25 Krummel, ‘Getting Even’, 179.
- 26 ‘heresy, n. 1a’, *OED*.
- 27 ‘From the Constitutions of Thomas Arundel’, Lynn Staley (ed.), *The Book of Margery Kempe* (New York, 2001), 187.
- 28 Items one through five and ten through eleven establish parameters for preaching, teaching, and education; items six and seven forbid reading heretical texts, including Wyclif’s English translation of the scriptures; and items twelve and thirteen specify the consequences of violating the constitutions. Items eight and nine do address more ideological prohibitions, such as asserting doctrine contrary to the church and disputing articles of faith; however, even these proscribed acts are grounded in activities, such as preaching and teaching. See ‘From the Constitutions of Thomas Arundel’, 189–96.
- 29 *Ibid.*, 188.
- 30 See ‘De Haeretico Comburendo’, *The Statutes of the Realm* (Buffalo, 1993), 127–8.
- 31 Lepow, *Enacting the Sacrament*, 31. Lepow notes that Thomas Netter also invokes this pun in his *Doctrinale Fidei Ecclesiae Catholicae contra Wicklevistas et Hussitas*, referring to Wyclif as ‘cognomento impiae vitae’ or ‘Wicked-Life’.
- 32 Aristorius’s and Jonathas’s opening alliterative catalogues of their riches demonstrate this parallel well. See lines 89–116 and 157–87.
- 33 Quoted in Beckwith, ‘Ritual, Church, and Theatre’, 69. Translation Beckwith’s.
- 34 Beckwith, ‘Ritual, Church, and Theatre’, 70.

- 35 Confession is also prerequisite before receiving the sacrament.
- 36 Cutts, 'The Croxton Play', 48.
- 37 For translation, see *The Croxton Play of the Sacrament*, ed. Greg Walker (Oxford, 2000), 213–3. See Lk 17:14.
- 38 See Cutts, 'The Croxton Play', 49.
- 39 Anne Hudson, *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford, 1988), 294.
- 40 *Hoccleve's Works*, Frederick J. Furnivall (ed.), Early English Text Society (1892), 11. Cutts notes this similar usage (49).
- 41 R.P. Blakeney (trans.), 'The Mass According to the Use of Sarum', from *The Book of Common Prayer, its History and Interpretation*, 2nd edn (1866), reprinted in Charles Wohlers, 'The Sarum Missal', *The Book of Common Prayer*, <http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/Sarum/index.htm>. The *Sarum Missal* was the most widely used missal in late medieval England.
- 42 Ibid.
- 43 Lawton also points out this parallel. See Lawton, 'Sacrilege and Theatricality', 287.
- 44 Beckwith, 'Ritual, Church, and Theatre', 75.
- 45 *Sarum Missal*. 'Qui pridie quam pateretur accepit panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas: et elevatis oculis in caelum ... ad te Deum Patrem suum omnipotentem ... gratias agens benedixit, fregit ... deditque discipulis suis, dicens, Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes. Hoc est enim Corpus meum'.
- 46 *Sarum Missal*. 'Et ascendit in caelum, sedet ad dexteram Patris'. Translation mine.
- 47 *Sarum Missal*. Translation mine.
- 48 Translations Walker's.
- 49 Translations Walker's. See Is 63:1.
- 50 Lawton, 'Sacrilege and Theatricality', 287.
- 51 Translation Walker's. See Lam 1:12.
- 52 Translation Walker's. See Ps 26:1.
- 53 Translations Walker's. Sister Nicholas Maltman, 'Meaning and Art in the Croxton *Play of the Sacrament*', *English Literary History* 41.2 (1974) 156, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2872502>. Maltman finds this an allusion to a liturgical Compline hymn sung during Lent.
- 54 Translation Walker's. See Ps 50:9.
- 55 See 1 Pt 2:9, Ex 10:17, and Ps 24:18.
- 56 Translations Walker's. See Lk 17:14 and Ps 26:9.
- 57 Translation Walker's. See Rv 20:2.
- 58 Bevington, *From Mankind to Marlowe*, 38.
- 59 Maltman, 'Meaning and Art', 151. Translation Maltman's.

60 Ibid.

61 Clifford Davidson, *Festival and Plays in Late Medieval Britain* (Burlington, 2007), 73.

62 Beckwith, 'Ritual, Church, and Theatre', 78. See Davidson, *Festival and Plays*, 72 also.

63 Gibson, *Theatre of Devotion*, 34.

