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ABSTRACT

This thesis is comprised of a study and edition of The Resurrection of Our Lord, a sixteenth-century Protestant play which survives in fragmentary form in Folger Library MS V. b. 192. Though previous editors were tempted to attribute the play to Bale, it is probably an example of the parish drama that flourished in England during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

The thesis sets forth several contexts for The Resurrection of Our Lord before turning to analysis of the play itself. First, a study of parish drama draws on evidence of single-subject biblical plays, particularly the Easter plays of four churches in the Thames valley, to illustrate possible auspices for the play's production. Second, analysis of biblical drama in the Reformation period examines the ways reformers taught Protestant doctrine through traditional dramatic forms. Finally, a survey of the English resurrection play tradition places the play in its generic context. This tradition originated in the tenth century with the liturgical quem quaeritis tropes, and included cycle plays as well as free-standing dramas which were performed in schools, churches and households. It extended well into the sixteenth century with Protestant interpretations such as Nicholas Grimald’s Christus Redivivus and The Resurrection of Our Lord.
The Resurrection of Our Lord probably began as a traditional resurrection play which was then adapted to a rapidly changing religious milieu. Much of its doctrinal teaching emerges in the lines of its expositor figure, Appendix, whose very name suggests added material. Passages addressing lay access to vernacular scripture, the significance of the Eucharist, and the nature of spiritual manifestations reveal affinities with Zwinglian theology and indicate that the play took its present form between 1535 and 1543.

In order to meet the needs of textual scholars as well as generalists interested in the play's historical, theatrical and religious significance, the edition provides both an old-spelling text and a facing-page version in modern-spelling. Together, this edition and study demonstrate how the early political and religious reformations in England affected the Bible not only on the page, but also on the stage.
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I. Introduction

The Resurrection of Our Lord is the editorial title bestowed by J. Dover Wilson and Bertram Dobell on a Protestant biblical play of the sixteenth century, fragments of which survive in Folger Shakespeare Library MS V. b. 192. Beyond its division into two parts, "The First Dayes Playe" and "The Seconde Dayes Playe," little is certain about its production auspices. From 1912, when Wilson and Dobell brought it to public attention in their Malone Society edition, until the late 1990s, the play received limited critical notice. Those studies which did mention the play often focused on the question of authorship, speculating whether its doctrinal speeches identified it as a lost play by John Bale. Its didactic quality, along with its perceived liminal position between the "medieval" mystery plays and the Renaissance achievements of Shakespeare and his contemporaries, may have led some scholars to disregard the play, while the incomplete condition of the text and its unknown provenance may also have dampened scholarly interest.

For the last twenty-five years, however, changes in our understanding of early English drama have been creating a climate more favourable to the

1 J. Dover Wilson and Bertram Dobell, eds., The Resurrection of Our Lord, MSR (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1912). See pp. 176-84 below for a description of the manuscript.
study of texts like The Resurrection of Our Lord. These changes are largely due to the work of the Records of Early English Drama project. Documents published in REED volumes are broadening our awareness of the many types of performances taking place across the realm. In light of this information, it is no longer possible to regard the civic cycle as the paradigmatic form of early English biblical drama. Evidence of single-subject parish plays, particularly the Easter plays of four churches in the Thames valley, provides valuable insight into a widespread parish performance tradition which I believe to lie behind The Resurrection of Our Lord. Through REED’s work we are also becoming aware of a longstanding genre of resurrection drama in England which extends from the tenth to the sixteenth century. Alexandra F. Johnston’s article on these records is one of several in recent years that has brought The Resurrection of Our Lord back into scholars’ awareness.

The information contained in REED volumes has also done much to break down the periodization between “medieval” and “Renaissance” drama, revealing striking patterns of continuity in dramatic texts and practices. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan note the influence of this research in their choice of title for their recent essay collection, A New History of Early English Drama:

---

4 A full discussion of this tradition is provided on pp. 6-25 below.
We intend *early* in much the same sense as it has been used by the Records of Early English Drama, which considers the beginnings of dramatic performance in England to 1642, when Parliament ordered the theaters closed. . . . *Early* also works to erase the sharp distinction between *Medieval* and *Renaissance* that has traditionally been used to mark a period boundary. "Renaissance" scholars have too often posited the "Middle Ages" as a unique cultural phenomenon, thereby reenacting the humanist bias against the prehistory of the Renaissance itself, as humanism claimed to invent itself in its rediscovery of classical culture. The culture called the "Renaissance" was more continuous than this self-interested narrative allows. With regard to drama, for example, the Corpus Christi plays, apparently that most quintessentially "medieval" dramatic form, were performed in Kendall well into the seventeenth century.6

One might also substitute the word "Reformation" for "Renaissance" in the passage above. Records of early performances manifest the resilience and adaptability of theatrical traditions in the face of changing religious and political policies.7 Plays which teach reformist doctrine through traditional

---


7 This information complements findings in reformation historiography as well. Despite their differing positions, the work of A. G. Dickens, Eamon Duffy and revisionists Christopher Haigh and Patrick Collinson has shown us that official implementation of new religious policies, as well as the degree to which subjects embraced or opposed them, varied region by region, and even town by town.
dramatic forms have come to the forefront in current discussions of theatre and propaganda in the Tudor period, and Paul Whitfield White has provided new editions of two such plays, The Life and Repentance of Mary Magdalene and The Historie of Jacob and Esau. White's most recent contribution to this scholarly dialogue presents The Resurrection of Our Lord as a key example of positive Protestant engagement with biblical drama.

A new study and edition of The Resurrection of Our Lord is a natural and timely outgrowth of these advances in scholarship. Wilson and Dobell's Malone Society Reprint provides a good transcription of the text, but its brief introduction is now dated, and no explanatory notes are provided. The present edition attempts to correct these shortcomings. It is aimed at a wide variety of readers: textual scholars as well as generalists or scholars from other disciplines whose primary interest is the content of the play and its historical, theatrical or religious significance. The introductory study draws on the

---


11 Scharff presents his dissertation as a companion study to the Malone Society edition, but the pamphlet has never been translated, and is not widely available.
scholarship outlined above to set forth several types of contexts for *The Resurrection of Our Lord*. A study of parish performances in England illustrates possible auspices for its production, analysis of reformist involvement in biblical drama provides historical background, and a survey of the English resurrection play tradition places the play in its generic context. Analysis of the play itself highlights its relationships to theological and legal controversies of the 1530s and 1540s, and identifies Zwinglian affinities in its doctrinal teaching. Though provenance remains uncertain, the manuscript description does provide new information about previous ownership. In order to provide a text which is accurate and accessible to different kinds of readers, I have produced both an old-spelling edition and a facing-page modernization, accompanied by apparatus, textual and explanatory notes. Together, this introductory study and dual-text edition demonstrate how the early political and religious reformations in England affected the Bible not only on the page, but also on the stage.
II. Parish Drama

During the last quarter of the sixteenth century, William Lambarde (1536-1601), lawyer, antiquarian, chorographer and local historian, compiled his *Alphabetical Description of the Chief Places in England and Wales*, a topographical dictionary describing cities, towns and landmarks across the country. In his entry for Witney, a village just east of Oxford, Lambarde recalls with some distaste an annual performance of Christ’s resurrection:

In the Dayes of ceremonial religion they used at Wytnpage to set floorthe yearly in maner of a Shew, or Enterlude, the Resurrection of our Lord and Saviour Chryste, partly of Purpose to draw thyther some Concourse of People that might spend their Money in the Towne, but chieflie to allure by pleasant Spectacle the comon Sort to the Likinge of Popishe Maumetrie; for the which Purpose, and the more lyvely thearby to exhibite to the Eye the hole Action of the Resurrection the Priestes garnished out certein smalle Puppets, representinge the Parsons of Christe, the Watchmen, Marie, and others, amongst the which one bare the Parte of a wakinge Watcheman, who (espiinge Christ to arise) made a continual Noyce, like to the Sound that is caused by the Metinge of two Styckes, and was therof comonly called, Jack Snacker of Wytney.¹

¹ William Lambarde, *Dictionarium Angliae Topographicum et Historicum: An Alphabetical Description of the Chief Places in England and Wales* (London: Gyles, 1730) 459. The Alphabetical Description reveals Lambarde’s interest in the Anglo-Saxon language, as places
The exact auspices of this event at Witney are unclear, though Pamela Sheingorn has discussed it as a version of the Easter sepulchre ceremony.\(^2\) However, as a single-subject biblical play, organized as both a money-making entertainment and an expression of religious devotion, the performance bears more resemblance to the parish dramas that featured prominently in the lives of people all over England. Surveying the recent historiography on the parish in late medieval and early Renaissance England, historian Beat Kümin observes that the parish "has now clearly emerged as the main point of reference for the analysis of everyday devotional and social life."\(^3\) His comment could be extended to include "theatrical life" as well, as the work of editors of the Records of Early English Drama project and the Malone Society has shown. Across the realm, parishes sponsored plays and other paradramatic events such as Robin Hood games in their sanctuaries, churchyards, or in nearby locations, using these events to raise funds for church repairs or refurbishment.\(^4\) Widespread documentary evidence of

---


Easter plays in England indicates that the Resurrection was a popular subject for parish-sponsored productions. The developing picture of parish drama is transforming our view of the early English dramatic landscape, demonstrating that this form of theatrical activity was far more prevalent than the better-known civic "cycle" plays.

In his survey of England's physical and cultural topography, Lambarde offers a perspective on sixteenth-century performance practice which corresponds to current scholarship on parish drama. His entries for other towns take no notice of their dramatic traditions. Coventry's cycle, which R. W. Ingram describes as "a national and not merely a local event, . . . a sacred entertainment which drew people from all over England," receives no mention from Lambarde. He is similarly silent about the Chester Whitsun plays. The Witney event prompts the only discussion of religious drama in the Alphabetical Description, as Lambarde moves from censure of Jack Snacker's performance to more general criticism of churches' mimetic representations of the scriptures. His attention to the play and his use of it as a springboard to further discussion together suggest that the Witney Resurrection performance was a representative form of drama from the "Dayes of ceremonial religion."

---

5 Johnston, "Emerging Pattern" 3-23; see pp.18-20 and 80-82 below for further discussion of parish resurrection plays.
Evidence, Objectives and Auspices

Though references to parish drama can be found as early as 1348 and as late as 1656,\(^6\) most of the surviving records document performances in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries.\(^9\) Churchwardens' accounts provide much of the evidence for parish productions. Their frequently laconic entries may report receipts from performances, payments to players, or expenditures on such production elements as costumes, stages, or playbooks. Occasionally a very detailed set of accounts, like those for the Corpus Christi event at St. Mary the Virgin in Sherborne, Dorset, will include information about all of these aspects of the production;\(^10\) more often the churchwardens' notes afford a mere glimpse of a performance. Surviving accounts document parish performances in at least twenty-three of forty-one English counties: Somerset, Shropshire, Wiltshire, Bristol, Kent, Devon, Cornwall, Staffordshire, Sussex, Bedfordshire, London, Worcestershire, Essex, Suffolk, Northamptonshire, Norfolk, Dorset, Buckinghamshire,

---

\(^6\) John Wasson provides the earlier date and observes that nonprofessional plays in churches were presented until at least 1642; see "The English Church as Theatrical Space," *A New History of Early English Drama*, ed. John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan, foreword by Stephen J. Greenblatt (New York: Columbia UP, 1997) 35. In 1652, Stanton Harcourt parish players toured nearby towns with a production of *Mucedorus*; for a discussion and edition of the pamphlet documenting this production, see Alexandra F. Johnston, "It pleased the Lord to discover his displeasure": the 1652 performance of Mucedorus in Witney," forthcoming in a festschrift for Meg Twycross. David Klausner finds an even later reference to what may be a parish production in northwest Wales: a 1656 play which was announced from the pulpit in Dolbenmaen parish and staged in a private home. The distance between the parish and London may be one factor contributing to this late survival; traditional activities which Puritans fulminated against were more likely to survive in more isolated parts of the realm. I am grateful to David Klausner for bringing this instance to my attention.

\(^9\) Ian Lancashire, *Dramatic Texts and Records of Britain: A Chronological Topography to 1558* (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1984) xxiv. References to individual entries will be identified by entry number rather than page number, and distinguished with a #.

\(^10\) Hays, McGee, Joyce and Newlyn 266-70.
Oxfordshire, Hampshire, Yorkshire, Herefordshire, Lincolnshire, and Berkshire. Records also survive for performances organized by Welsh and Scottish parishes. Even this widespread evidence gives only a partial record of parish dramatic activities, as many churchwardens' accounts are incomplete, and some have not survived at all. Additional information comes to us through the records of ecclesiastical court cases, accounts of individuals like Prior William More of Worcester, civic documents, and personal letters.

The parish plays described in these sources are part of a larger body of customary activity, which included church ales, Hocktide gatherings, and summer games. These events were both a source of pride and a means of income for the parish. Of the various types of activities, plays afforded a smaller profit margin, since the production expenses had to be deducted from any income. In some cases the play's intangible value might be as

---

11 Drama-related churchwardens' accounts from nine of these counties, many previously unavailable in print, have now been published by the Records of Early English Drama project in city or county collections; volumes for other cities and counties are in progress. Entries from seventeen of the counties listed above are found under the heading "Accounts, Churchwardens" in Lancashire's index. Other items indexed under "Churches, Und-raising for profit or restoration" also document parish performances; see Lancashire 480, 503.
12 Lancashire #1592, #1645; the REED volume for Wales, edited by David Klausner, is forthcoming.
important as its receipts. Anne L. Brannen finds that the elaborate 1511 St. George play at Bassingbourn, Cambridgeshire, one of several activities undertaken by parishioners to raise money for a statue of their patron saint, was not their most effective means of fund-raising; however, the play did express the parish’s connections to the king, its devotion to the saint, and its status among neighbouring parishes.¹⁶ In the southwest, Sherborne’s Corpus Christi plays also represent a dramatic articulation of parish identity and pride. Chafing against the authority of Sherborne Abbey for over a hundred years, the parish won a victory at the dissolution of the monasteries when it purchased the Abbey building and moved its services into this structure. Sherborne’s Corpus Christi play began in celebration of the move, and Rosalind Conklin Hays describes the play in its various incarnations as “an expression of different versions of community at different stages in the town’s history.”¹⁷ The dramatic endeavours of these two parishes, Bassingbourn and Sherborne, in widely separated parts of the kingdom, illustrate the significance a play could have beyond the churchwardens’ yearly balancing of the accounts.

Nonetheless, an important objective in a parish play was to make money. In 1534, parishioners at Braintree, Essex, presented a play of “Placy Dacy als St Ewe Stacy,” or “Placidus or St. Eustace,” a production specifically

intended as a fund raiser for their church building. Accounts for a play one year later at Boxford, Suffolk record its substantial profit of £18 19s 5d, even after the supervising property player and other performers had been paid. Parish authorities at Tewkesbury Abbey could only dream of such gains; hoping to finance a stone battlement at the top of the abbey tower, they presented three stage plays in the church and sponsored a grain market with substantially inflated prices. Their losses on this project came to £21 4s, an enormous amount. The entrepreneurial churchwardens had realized some profit through their theatrical resources, however, by leasing out their players' apparel between 1567 and 1585. The Braintree parish also brought in some income this way, as did the parishes of Ashburton, Devon (1542-47) and St. John Baptist in Peterborough, Northamptonshire (1468-74).

Like the Tewkesbury performances of 1600, many parish plays took place inside the church. Recent studies by Paul Whitfield White and John Wasson have corrected critical neglect of the church as a fifteenth- and sixteenth-century playing space. As a performance venue, the interior of

---

18 John C. Coldewey, *Early Essex Drama: A History of its Rise and Fall, and a Theory Concerning the Digby Plays*, diss. U of Colorado, 1972 (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI, 1973) 21-22. Other productions specified as fund-raisers include a play for the “church works” at St. Andrew's, Holborn between 1503-07 (Lancashire #967); a performance c. 1486-93 at St. James in Pulloxhill, Bedfordshire (Lancashire #1309); and one in the early 16th century at Steyning, Sussex (Lancashire #1417).


22 Lancashire #397.


24 Lancashire #1298.

the church had much to recommend it. A fairly open space, since few
churches had pews before the late sixteenth century,\(^{16}\) it was protected from
the weather and allowed some control over admission. These features made
it attractive to visiting players, whether they were an amateur group from a
town or parish, or a professional company under noble patronage. So
popular was this playing space, that John Wasson argues that "far more than
half of all vernacular plays of the English Middle Ages and Renaissance were
in fact performed in churches."\(^{27}\) In some cases parishioners erected stages in
the church. In 1547, Sherborne parish players performed "before the ij lowe
alteres" on a stage made of boards or scaffolds.\(^{28}\) The resurrection plays at
Kingston-on-Thames in 1520 and Thame in 1522 took place in the church,
the former on a purpose-built stage.\(^{29}\) At St. Laurence, Reading, payments to
the under sexton in 1508 "for caryng & recaryng of bordes to the church for
the pagennt of the passion on ester monday & for swepyng of the church at
the same tyme," along with similar entries in subsequent years, tell us that a
temporary stage was constructed for that play as well, most likely in the
sanctuary.\(^{30}\)

\(^{16}\) Wasson, "English Church" 28.
\(^{27}\) Wasson, "English Church" 25.
\(^{28}\) A record for 1543 simply says that the boards were in the church but it seems likely that
their positioning in the nave did not change in 1547; see Hays, McGee, Joyce and Newlyn,
\textit{Dorset and Cornwall} 259, 261.
\(^{29}\) Surrey RO KG 2/2/1, 1503-38, p. 100, and Oxfordshire Archive MS DD Par. Thame c. 5, 1443-
1524, f. 76. I am grateful to both Sally-Beth MacLean and Alexandra F. Johnston for allowing
me access to their unpublished work in Surrey, Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire.
\(^{30}\) Berkshire RO D/P 97 5/2, pp. 35, 74, 85.
Parishes also took advantage of performance spaces outside the church itself. Alternate venues included the churchyard, a space used by the Bungay, Suffolk parish in 1566\textsuperscript{31} and by the Sherborne parish in their revivals of the Corpus Christi play between 1571 and 1576.\textsuperscript{32} East Harling churchwardens recorded an interlude played at the church gates in 1452; these gates were probably those of the churchyard as well. St. Laurence, Reading, which had no churchyard because of its close proximity to the great Benedictine abbey, staged at least one play in the marketplace, and used an open space next to the abbey wall, known as the "forbury," for others.\textsuperscript{33} Much further afield was the 1553 play at Henwick Hall, Worcestershire, staged for the benefit of All Hallow’s Church, Worcester.\textsuperscript{34}

The Henwick Hall event illustrates just one of the many ways performances extended beyond parish boundaries. Costumes and playbooks circulated among parishes, and players travelled to perform at neighboring churches. Sometimes our only insight into the productions of a parish comes from the documents of another church altogether, through payments for a touring performance or costume rentals.\textsuperscript{35} Bassingbourn received impressive support and collaboration from its neighbors on its Saint George

\textsuperscript{31} Galloway and Wason 143.
\textsuperscript{32} Hays, McGee, Joyce and Newlyn, \textit{Dorset and Cornwall} 38, 267, 269, 270.
\textsuperscript{33} Berkshire RO D/P 97 5/2 pp. 106, 28, 30. Johnston and MacLean discuss the location of the "forbury" in "Reformation and Resistance" 187.
\textsuperscript{35} Ian Lancashire has compiled an invaluable list of known parish and town playing companies, which includes their visits to other locations, as well as any records of home performances. See Lancashire Appendix 1-A, "Companies Identified By Place-Names" 349-73.
play, collecting £3 19s 10d in "seed money" from twenty-seven nearby parishes. Further evidence of inter-parish influence and association comes from Kent. Not only did the parishes of Lydd and New Romney host each other's players for over a hundred years, but in the 1520s and 30s they also employed the same consultant on large productions. James Gibson notes that one Richard Gibson, a New Romney resident who was Yeoman of the Tents and Sergeant-at-Arms for Henry VIII, conferred with the New Romney playwardens about the costumes for their Passion Play. From 1526 to 1534 the Lydd churchwardens also sought the advice of a Mr. Gibson, whose assistance with the new St. George play may have involved some rewriting, as the churchwardens frequently bore the old playbook to him in London. On at least one occasion he advised the churchwardens on apparel for the production, and his post as Sergeant-at-Arms would have made him a valuable expert on the martial aspects of a St. George play.

Further west in the Thames valley, the churches of St. Laurence, Reading, and St. Mary, Thame, may have been linked in a similar manner. Approximately twenty miles apart, the two parishes both had busy dramatic calendars, featuring single performances of Three Kings of Cologne plays, as well as repeated resurrection plays. Between 1533 and 1537, one Master or Sir Laborne was paid twice for work on the St. Laurence resurrection play.  

36 Brannen 56.  
39 I have discussed the nature of Laborne's work below, p. 22.
Laborne, who seems to have been a priest, appears nowhere else in the churchwardens' accounts, nor is he mentioned in the records of the borough of Reading. However, F. G. Lee’s history of the parish of St. Mary, Thame indicates that one Edward Daiborn (sic) became vicar of Thame in 1546. Three years later the will of Edward “Laybourne or Leiborn,” vicar of Thame, was proved in the Westminster Consistory Court. Might this have been the same Laborne who worked on the resurrection play at Reading? The coincidence is suggestive, given the similarities between the two churches' dramatic records. The 1499 record for the Reading Three Kings of Cologne play precedes that of Thame by twenty-four years, so the scribe who wrote the “parcelles” (or parts) of “the iiie kinges Colen & herod” for Thame in 1523 might easily have used the Reading play as a copy-text. Both parishes were located in abbey towns, and the demise of these foundations coincided with the ends of both parishes' dramatic endeavors. The presence of a Sir Laborne/Vicar Leiborn in both parishes is a provocative addition to this list of correspondences. Further examination of his will and of the histories of both parishes may shed more light on both Edward Leiborn and the network of theatrical activity that connected English parishes.

40 He was collated on 27 November 1546, upon the presentation of George Heneage, Prebendary of Thame and Dean of Lincoln. See F.G. Lee, The History, Description and Antiquities of the Prebendal Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Thame (London: 1883) 142. Julia Carnwath, to whom I am indebted for this reference, notes that she has found numerous errors in Lee's readings, and assumes that Daiborn is another. 41 Edward Laybourne or Leiborn was “[p]robably of St. John’s College, as he leaves his books to St. John’s, and to the poor scholars of Cambridge.” John Venn and J.A. Venn, eds., Alumni Cantabrigienses, pt. 1, vol. III (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1924) 57.
42 Oxfordshire Archive MS DD Par. Thame c. 5, 1443-1524, f. 76v.; Berkshire RO D/P 97 5/2 1498-1626, p. 3.
Subject Matter

Some of the favorite subjects for parish performance have now become evident. Saint plays were one popular genre. Dramas celebrated St. George at Bassingbourn and Lydd, and the hero sometimes appeared in paradramatic summer games. In addition to the Saint Eustace production mentioned above, dramas on St. Swithin and St. Andrew took place in St. Michael's, Braintree in 1523 and 1525. The parish at Bethersden in Kent mounted a three-day play honoring St. Christina in 1519-21,\textsuperscript{44} the dramatic records of St. Mary's, Thame, include "box ludi" of Fabine and Sebastian in 1489,\textsuperscript{45} and the parish at Ashburton, Devon, featured St. Rosomonus, who was particularly revered in that county, in its 1555-56 Corpus Christi production.\textsuperscript{46}

Like the civic cycles, parish productions often dramatized episodes from the Bible. However, unlike the civic playmakers, parishes favored smaller-scale single-subject pieces, such as the play of Jacob and his sons performed by St. Mary's, Thame, for Pentecost 1481,\textsuperscript{47} or the Three Kings of Cologne plays mentioned above. Further north in Lincolnshire, the Holbeach parish also dramatized this subject, for the churchwardens sold the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[43] Coldewey 21-28.
\item[44] Lancashire #374.
\item[45] Oxfordshire Archive MS DD Par. Thame c. 5, 1462-1567, f. 44v.
\item[46] Wasson, Devon 28. St. Rosomonus is likely a miswriting for Romanus, which is in turn "the name wrongly given by medieval hagiographers" to one Rumon, a monk and bishop identified with the West Country. He was the patron saint of several Cornish towns, including Tavistock, which held a fair in his honor from 1114. See "Romanus" and "Rumon", Oxford Dictionary of Saints, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed., ed. David Hugh Farmer (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987) 375, 377.
\item[47] Oxfordshire Archive MS DD Par. Thame c. 5, 1462-1567, f. 47v.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
costumes of Herod and the three Kings in 1547. The character of Herod also figured in the 1537-38 Ashburton Corpus Christi play. The churchwardens of St. Laurence, Reading, paid for costumes for Adam and Eve (1506-07) and twice note a pageant of "caym" or Cain (1511-12, 1515-16); these entries may document three productions of one play, or two different plays drawn from Genesis. Either Protestant sensibilities or simple prudence may be reflected in the subject matter of some parish plays during the second half of the sixteenth century. These plays dramatized Old Testament subjects which did not involve impersonation of the Godhead. A cast list from Donnington on Bain, Lincolnshire, which includes "Holofernes" suggests a play of Judith in 1563-65, while the Sherborne Corpus Christi play portrayed the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, complete with a statue of Lot's wife created from a peck of meal. Both of these stories were popular among Protestant dramatists, and these examples at the parish level reflect a general shift from New Testament to Old Testament subject matter that is also evident in in sixteenth-century biblical drama written for other auspices.

Yet of all the biblical subjects presented by parishes, the Resurrection appears most frequently in documentary evidence. Parish enactments of this story built upon and extended a longstanding legacy of resurrection drama in

---

48 Lancashire #777. The parish also sold coats for the apostles and the "Dracon," costumes which suggest performances of the life of Christ and/or the Apocalypse.
49 Wasson, Devon 24.
50 Berkshire RO D/P 97 5/2 1498-1626, p. 31, 88, 106.
52 Hays, McGee, Joyce and Newlyn, Dorset and Cornwall 267.
53 For further discussion of this trend see pp. 55-56 and 59-65 below.
England; their contribution to this tradition is discussed more fully below.⁵⁴ Productions took place at St. Saviour’s, Dartmouth (1494),⁵⁵ St. Mary Magdalen, Taunton (c. 1504),⁵⁶ Rye, Sussex (1522),⁵⁷ and at Witney, if the antics of “Jack Snacker” were, in fact, a parish enterprise. Witney is not far from the Thames valley, an area particularly rich in records of resurrection drama, as Alexandra F. Johnston and Sally-Beth MacLean have demonstrated.⁵⁸ Four parishes in the region report Easter plays on the subject. St. Mary’s, Henley and All Saints, Kingston-on-Thames document single performances, in 1511 and 1520 respectively,⁵⁹ while accounts of St. Mary’s, Thame, and St. Laurence, Reading, reveal frequent Easter productions. Five performances of Thame’s resurrection play are recorded from 1515 to 1539⁶⁰ and Reading had a string of performances from 1507 to 1509,⁶¹ as well as a revival in the 1530s which culminated in a final, two-day 1538 performance.⁶² The 1538 entry may refer to two different performances of the same text, or to a resurrection play divided into two parts like the texts of the Shrewsbury Fragments, the Bodley e. Museo plays Christ’s Burial and

⁵⁴ See pp. 80-82 below.
⁵⁵ Wasson, Devon 62
⁵⁷ Lancashire #1346.
⁵⁹ Johnston and MacLean, “Resistance and Reformation” 181.
⁶⁰ Oxfordshire Archive MS DD Par. Thame c. 5, 1462-1567, ff. 73v, 76, 77; Oxfordshire Archives MS DD Par. Thame b. 2, 1527-1912, pp. 6, 10, 27, 45.
⁶¹ Berkshire RO D/P 97 5/2 1498-1626, pp. 29 (1506-07), 35 (1507-08), and 74 (1508-09).
⁶² Berkshire RO D/P 97 5/2 1498-1626, p. 208.
Christ's Resurrection,\textsuperscript{63} and The Resurrection of Our Lord.

Until recently, studies of early English drama have largely overlooked these and other single-subject biblical plays. Large-scale, multi-episode civic undertakings like the cycle plays of Chester, York and Coventry have captured more critical attention. However, single-subject plays like those performed by the parishes had a wider currency in the period, and may represent the materials used by compilers of the N-Town and Towneley manuscripts.\textsuperscript{64}

The Towneley compiler seems to have divided freestanding plays into even smaller episodes. The Isaac and Jacob plays, unique to the cycle, exemplify this subdivision. As early as 1896, Bernhard Ten Brink argued that the two plays form one drama, originally "produced independently without [reference] to any cycle of mysteries."\textsuperscript{65} A. W. Pollard disagreed, saying, he "[could not] conceive on what occasion or by whom, an isolated play on Jacob and Esau could come to be acted in the vernacular."\textsuperscript{66} However, the records of parish drama bear witness to many isolated biblical plays which could have been collected into one manuscript by an enterprising compiler. The most recent editors of the Towneley plays, Martin Stevens and A. C. Cawley, credit

\textsuperscript{63} I follow the most recent editors of these plays, who title and number them separately, though they are "two parts of one religious drama or acted meditation"; see Donald C. Baker, John L. Murphy and Louis B. Hall, Jr., eds. The Late Medieval Religious Plays of Bodleian MSS Digby 133 and E. Museo 160 EETS os 283 (Oxford: Oxford UP 1982) lxxv.

\textsuperscript{64} For the argument that N-Town and Towneley represent "patchwork" compilations of plays from various sources, see Martin Stevens, Four Middle English Mystery Cycles (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1987) 89. Alexandra F. Johnston has argued for the centrality of single-subject plays to our understanding of early English drama, most recently in "The continental connection: a reconsideration," The Stage as Mirror: Civic Theatre in Late Medieval Europe, ed. Alan E. Knight (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1998) 7-24.


\textsuperscript{66} George England and A.W. Pollard, eds., The Towneley Plays, EETS es 71 (London: Oxford UP,
the Wakefield Master with compilation of the manuscript, but have little to say about the origins of these two plays, commenting: "if they are adaptations from elsewhere, they were carefully edited to fit their context." Towneley 26 and 28, Resurrectio Domini and Thomas of Inde, also appear to come from a single Easter play, split into two parts and separated by the interpolated play 27, Peregrini. Cawley and Stevens identify Peregrini as "an intruder in the narrative sequence, though some editorial effort seems to have been made to assimilate it." Their emphasis on the editorial achievement of the compiler tends to overshadow the disparate elements which preceded that individual's work. However, attention to single-subject biblical plays like those presented in parishes across England can only increase our appreciation of compilations like the Towneley manuscript, and provide a clearer understanding of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century theatrical culture.

The Reformation and Parish Drama

The religious changes of the first Henrician reformation challenged parishes whose existing plays conflicted with new doctrinal teaching. Parishioners could either continue with their traditional productions in defiance of the religious and political climate, or employ what Beat Kümin has called "subtler strategies of adaptation, evasion or concealment." The

1897) xxiv.


68 See pp. 98-103 below for further analysis of the Towneley resurrection sequence.

69 Stevens and Cawley 617.

70 Kümin, "Introduction," Parish in English Life 13.
likelihood that a parish would conform to official doctrine might be influenced by the church’s “proximity to Protestant urban authorities,” by the influence of Catholic or Protestant local landowners, or by the possibility that a remote parish might escape the attention of ecclesiastical authorities. Donnington and Sherborne are two parishes that may have adopted “subtler strategies” in their choices of Old Testament subject matter. Another is St. Laurence, Reading, which appears to have altered its Easter drama to accommodate the shifting doctrines of the English church. As I noted above, between 1533 and 1537 Master Labome was paid for his work on the already-existing Easter play. In 1533-34 Labome received 8s 4d “for reformyng the resurreccon play” (emphasis mine), and two years later the parish paid him again to recopy the book, allowing 9s 10d for his labor as well as for the paper and binding. At least one revision is indicated here, and possibly two. The didactic speeches in The Resurrection of Our Lord may be the result of a similar process of revision, though the modifications to this play probably were made after 1535, several years after Sir Labome’s endeavors at Reading. Revisions at the parish level correspond to the surviving texts and records of the Chester, York and Coventry cycles, which reveal citizens’ efforts to adapt their biblical drama to reformist sensibilities.

Other parish plays may have originated as promotion for the Protestant

---

71 Johnston and MacLean 179.
72 Berkshire RO D/P 97 5/2 1498-1626, p. 194.
74 For a discussion of evidence for the play’s date, see pp. 121-25 below.
75 I consider the impact of the reformation on these cycles and other scriptural plays in “The Reformation and Biblical Drama,” pp. 26-65 below.
cause. The phenomenon of parish performance lent itself well to Cromwell’s propaganda campaigns, and Paul Whitfield White argues that, “contrary to widespread opinion, parish drama was on the *increase*, not in decline, in various parts of the realm in the sixteenth century.”\(^7^6\) The careers of several Protestant playwrights coincided with their careers as parish clergy. Nicholas Udall, playwright and master of Eton College, was also vicar of Braintree from 1533-37, and while there is no evidence that Udall resided at Braintree during this time, it is nonetheless possible that the parish performed works by its absentee vicar.\(^7^7\) At least one of the parish’s plays was performed during his tenure, and its title, “Placy Dacy als St. Ewe Stacy,” suggests the same rhyming playfulness of his surviving drama *Ralph Roister Doister*\(^7^8\). As curate of Thornton in Suffolk, John Bale appears to have presented a play about the Harrowing of Hell.\(^7^9\) By 1537 he had attracted Cromwell’s favour as a writer of comedies, and soon after led a professional company under his patronage.\(^8^0\) Cromwell’s patronage of Bale may have prompted another Suffolk clergyman, Thomas Wylley, vicar of Yoxford, to offer his own compositions

\(^7^6\) White, *Theatre and Reformation* 135.
\(^7^8\) Coldewey notes this similarity, but argues that Udall could not have been involved with this play, or indeed with any of the early saints’ plays in Braintree; see Coldewey 28.
\(^7^9\) Our knowledge of this production comes from Bale’s holograph answer to various accusations brought against him when Bishop Stokesly arraigned him for heresy in 1536. The document is now in the Public Record Office; an abstract of it appears in *L & P XI*, #1111, 446-7, and Honor McCusker provides a full transcription: To the “second artycle” against him, Bale insists that he “never denyed, descendit ad inferna, to be an artyle of ye crede,” but did argue against literal interpretations which presented Christ’s battle with the devils, “as yel se yt sett forth in peynted clothes, or in glasse wyndowes, or lyke as [he himself] had befor tyme sett yt forth in ye cuntre yer in a serten playe” McCusker 7.
\(^8^0\) Peter Happé, “Introduction,” *The Complete Plays of John Bale*, ed. Peter Happé, vol. 1
Writing to Cromwell in 1537, Wylley describes four plays, three of which address religious issues. One of these plays had already earned Wylley a reputation amongst his peers:

The most part of the prystes of Suff. wyll not reseyve me ynto ther chyrchys to preche, but have dysdayned me ever synns I made a play agaynst the popys conselerrs, Error, Colle Clogger of Conscyens, and Incredulyte. That, and the Act of Parlyament had not followyd after, I had be countyd a gret lyar.82

Wylley’s own church would have provided convenient auspices for such productions, but it sounds as if he had little hope of playing in neighboring parishes, where his reformist views were not appreciated.

Archbishop Edmund Bonner’s 1542 injunction against “common plays, games, or interludes” in churches or chapels in his London diocese signals a decline in official tolerance for parish drama.83 Performances outside and inside Bonner’s jurisdiction are still recorded well after 1542, but parishes were also affected by increasing restrictions on performances that dealt with religious topics. These restrictions, discussed in greater detail below, culminated in Elizabeth’s 1559 proclamation against religious plays.84

Nonetheless, some parishes, like the wealthy West Riding parish of Methley,

---

81 Paul Whitfield White discusses Wylley in some detail, arguing that he may have been “master Hopton’s priest" whose troupe of boys played before Cromwell in 1537; see White, Theater and Reformation 69, 102-03 and 215 n.11.
82 White, Theater and Reformation 69. For a modernized version of the letter, see L & P XIIi, #529, 244.
83 L & P XVII #282, 156-7.
84 See pp. 32-37 below.
still found material for performance. For four days in the summer of 1614, the parish presented Canimore and Lionley, a play which appears to have been a "knightly romance" rather than a biblical or saint play. This subject matter and the play's surviving doubling scheme evince influence from the public theatres of the day.⁸⁵

While the example of Canimore and Lionley perpetuates the tradition of dramatic fund-raising and entertainment, it reveals a break with the devotional or doctrinal impulses which had once characterized parish productions. Spread chronologically across three centuries and geographically across the length and breadth of England, Scotland and Wales, parish productions had long been loci for parishioners' financial, communal and spiritual concerns. The subject matter, place and occasion of performance, and other features of productions had varied by parish, but documents also indicate patterns of inter-parish collaboration and influence. By the time Methley produced Canimore and Lionley, increasing government involvement in parish activities, and general efforts to regulate religious drama had taken their toll on parish productions in most parts of the realm. The production of scripture-based drama was particularly conflicted during the early Tudor period, and the parish was just one of many auspices affected by policies regarding biblical plays, as we shall see.

III. The Reformation and Biblical Drama

The sixteenth century saw a radical, if often haphazard, change in the accessibility of the Bible to laypeople, as Latin scripture gradually became available in English translation. Yet from the changes in parish play content outlined above, it is clear that political and religious reformations in England ultimately had a less positive impact on biblical performances. Tension between late sixteenth-century Protestantism and scripture-based drama also manifested itself in the disappearance of the great civic cycle plays.

For many years, one widely-accepted explanation for this latter phenomena—the decline and death of a vital and beloved dramatic form—has been that Protestant governments systematically suppressed the cycle plays due to concerns about their popish elements. This argument, put forth in detail in Harold Gardiner’s Mysteries’ End,¹ has since come under critical scrutiny, first by Bing D. Bills and Alexandra F. Johnston, and more recently by Richard K. Emmerson and Paul Whitfield White.² The work of these scholars has led to a more nuanced understanding of reformation attitudes toward biblical drama, one which resists the tendency to read the later Puritan antitheatricalism of writers like Stubbes and Gosson backward

into the early Tudor period, and which underscores positive Protestant engagement with biblical drama. Important elements of this engagement are reformers’ reflections on and regulation of scripture-based drama, their involvement in existing civic cycles and their compositions of new biblical plays. All of these factors contribute to the religious and political moment that produced The Resurrection of Our Lord.

Lollard and Reformist Perspectives

Though production of biblical plays originated in a culture dominated by the Catholic church, dramatizations of scripture still had adherents among those believers who rejected other aspects of that institution. The teachings of John Wycliffe, the fourteenth-century critic of both clerical practice and accepted doctrine, anticipate reformist dogma in many ways, and the Lollard movement that Wycliffe’s teachings inspired extended into the sixteenth century, when it was subsumed into the larger reformist movement emanating from the Continent. Wycliffite remarks about the York Pater Noster play reveal some sympathy towards biblical drama, as Alexandra F. Johnston has noted.3 The author of De Officio Pastoralis holds up the play as an argument for English translations of the Bible: “herfore freris han tauȝt in England þe Paternoster in Englisȝe tunge, as men seyen in þe pleye of Yorke and in many opere cuntrueys sîpen þe paternoster is part of matheus gospel, as

---

clerkes knowen, why may not al be turnyd to English trewely as is pis part?"\(^4\)

Yet Lollards are frequently cited as opponents of biblical drama on the basis of another text, *A Treatise of Miraclis Pleyinge*, which appears alongside other Wycliffite writings in an early fifteenth-century manuscript.\(^5\) The Treatise, which was probably composed sometime between 1380 and 1425,\(^6\) is divided into two parts, the first of which contains fairly orthodox views on the sacraments and the priesthood (275-77). In the second part of the text more identifiably Lollard opinions emerge. These include criticism of the clergy for being religious in pretense but not in deed (537-41) and a determination to see civic funds spent on charity instead of worldly frivolity (598-99). Both sections, however, are highly critical of performances of Christ’s life. The very idea of “playing” God’s word troubles the author, who reasons, “sithen thes miraclis pleyeris taken in bourde the earnestful werkis of God, no doute that ne they scornen God as diden the Jewis that bobidden Crist, for they lowen at his passioun as these lowyn and japen of the miracls of God” (133-37). The author also criticizes more emotional responses to Passion plays, on the basis of Christ’s rebuke to the women who wept at the Crucifixion:

“myche more they ben reprovable that wepen for the pley of Cristis passioun,

---


\(^5\) The treatise is found in British Library MS Additional 24, 202, on fols. 14'-21'. Clifford Davidson, ed., *A Treatise of Miraclis Pleyinge*, EDAM Monograph 19 (Kalamazoo, MI: Western Michigan UP, 1993) 1. All quotations will be taken from this edition and identified parenthetically by line number.

\(^6\) Davidson, *Treatise* 1.
leavinge to wepen for the sinnes of hemsilf and of theire children” (308-10). In the second half, the author compares plays on Christ’s life to the behaviour of the Israelites around the golden calf; the activity is marked by “grete sinne biforne,” “grete foly in the doinge,” and “greet venjaunse aftir” (585-89).

While these categorical denunciations do indicate that some Lollards felt antipathy towards biblical drama, the text also points toward a less hostile perspective. The author addresses his more heterodox second section to “an half frynde” (386) who still sees value in dramatizing Scripture. He “wil not leevyn the forseid sentense of miraclis pleyinge but and men schewen it him by holy writt opynly and by oure bileve” (388-90). As Nicholas Davis observes, the author’s attempts to confirm his friend in the antitheatricalism of their mutual “bileve” is “one of the stronger pieces of evidence that some Lollards were prepared to look favourably on a popular, public religious drama.”

At least one sixteenth-century figure with Lollard sympathies strongly supported the popular biblical drama of his city. This was William Pisford, mayor of Coventry in 1501, and a member of a family associated with the Lollard cause. In his 1518 will, he left a gown and cloak to the “paionde of the same Crafte I am of my self ... to be kept to serve theym in their said paionde the tyme of the playes.” In addition, he left another gown to the Tanners “to the same vse.” His is the only known play-related bequest in the

---

8 Ingram, Coventry 576 n.247.
9 Ingram, Coventry 113.
Coventry wills.\textsuperscript{10} The teachings of continental reformers no doubt found a more receptive audience among those English believers who had already supported the native challenge to orthodoxy presented by Wycliffe and his followers. These continental reformers, too, often defended performance of scripture. Biblical plays presented no problem to Luther, as long as they were presented with reverence and received in the proper spirit. He approved the dramatization of bible stories by schoolboys, for example, in a letter to Nicholas Hauptmann: “Nam & ego non illibenter viderem gesta Christi in scholis puerorum ludis seu comediis latine & germanice, rite & pure compositis, repraesentari propter rei memoriam, & affectum rüdioriubus augendum.”\textsuperscript{11} (“For I also would not unwillingly see stories of Christ in schools of young boys, plays of Latin and german comedies, fitly and purely composed, to be represented on account of the memory of the thing, and because of the effect of the thing performed on the less sophisticated”).\textsuperscript{12} The salutary effects of biblical performance on impressionable minds which Luther notes later influenced the curriculum of English schoolmasters like Thomas Ashton of Shrewsbury and Ralph Radcliffe of Hitchen.\textsuperscript{13} Luther also

\textsuperscript{10} Ingram, Coventry xxxvii.
\textsuperscript{11} Martin Luther, Letter to Nicholas Hauptmann, April 2, 1530, letter 1543 of D. Martin Luthers Werke, vol. 5, Kritische Gesantausgabe (Weimar: Hermann Bohlaus Nachfolger, 1969) 272. Hauptmann, a close friend of Luther, was pastor at Zwickau in 1530.
\textsuperscript{12} I am grateful to Abigail Ann Young of the REED project for her assistance with this translation.
\textsuperscript{13} Some details of these schoomasters’ productions are given below, pp. 54-55. Joseph E. Gillet identifies Erasmus as another supporter of biblical plays for youth, quoting the humanist as follows: “Es wäre gut/ wann man alle Biblische Historien zu Schauspielen machte/ und die Jugend sich darinn öffentlich üben liesze; maszen solches oftmals mehr als eine übereilte
prefaced his 1534 translations of Judith and Tobit with speculation about these books' theatrical merits. Suggesting that the Jews might have "dramatized literature like this, just as among us the Passion and other sacred stories are performed,"14 he noted that the scriptural stories corresponded to classical dramatic genres: "Judith presents a good, serious, heroic tragedy, and Tobit presents a fine, delightful, devout comedy."15 His reverence for the word of God, epitomized in the motto "sola scriptura," did not prevent the reformer from an appreciation of its suitability and potential effectiveness as dramatic material.

As the first Henrician Reformation proceeded under the guidance of Thomas Cromwell, the Chancellor recognized the value of religious drama as a propagandistic tool. Many of the plays he supported were no doubt polemical interludes such as those that Thomas Wylley had offered,16 or those suggested by Richard Morison, whose treatise, An discourse touching the reformation of the lawes of England, argued that plays could help
promote anti-papal sentiment among "the ignoraunt people." Cromwell also made canny use of biblical drama through his patronage of Bale, whose output included Old and New Testament plays. With the Chancellor's approval and financial support, Bale poured new wine of Reformation rhetoric into old bottles of biblical drama. Qualified endorsement for such plays also appeared in the 1534 Acte for thadvancement of true Religion and for thabbolishment of the contrarie, which restricted theatrical interpretation, though not the representation, of God's word:

[I]t shalbe lawfull to all and everye persone and persones to set foorthe songes, plaies and enterludes, to be used and exercysed within this Realme and other the Kinges Domynions, for the rebuking and reproching of vices, and the setting foorthe of vertue; so allwaies the saide songes plaies or enterludes meddle not with interpretaciones of Scripture contrarye to the doctryne set foorthe or to be sett furthe by the Kinges Majestie[.]

As long as plays promoted the royal understanding of scripture, the government did not proscribe them. However, the proviso "or to be set forth" accommodated the fluctuations in the royal doctrinal position which

---


18 An analysis of one of Bale's reformist contributions to biblical drama, Johan Baptystes Preachinge, appears below, pp. 57-59.

characterized Henry's reign.

The 1549 Act of Uniformity passed under Edward VI provided a similar check for religious plays. It instituted fines for anyone who, in "interludes, plays, songs, rhymes, or by other open words," spoke "in the derogation, depraving or despising" of the King's new Book of Common Prayer, but it did not address the issue of scriptural subject matter.²⁰ Martin Bucer, the German theologian appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge in 1549, took up the issue in his treatise, De Regno Christi, a New Year's gift to the young king in 1551 which expressed support for biblical drama in terms similar to Luther's. In the chapter, "De Honesti Ludi," or "Honest Games," Bucer observes that young people's performance of comedies and tragedies constitute a "useful form of entertainment, honorable and contributing toward an increase in piety," and that these plays might be "staged for the people."²¹ Acknowledging that many sources may provide plots for dramatists, Bucer nonetheless focuses on biblical stories, such as the quarrel between the shepherds of Abraham and Lot, and "Isaac's seeking, finding and marrying his bride, Rebekah."²² Both of these stories earn Bucer's stamp of approval as topics for comedy; we might even term the latter a romantic comedy. He also promotes the scriptures' "abundant supply of material for tragedies" as much more suitable for Christians than 'the godless

²² Bucer 350.
fables and stories of the pagans." However, Bucer refrains from recommending episodes from Christ’s life as suitable dramatic material, a silence which suggests discomfort with representations of the Godhead.

Some parts of Bucer’s treatise probably found a receptive audience in the young King, for Edward himself had composed a play on a religious subject. His “Comediam de meretrice Babylonica” had been performed at court Christmas revels three years earlier. Since parish plays went into decline under Edward, it would seem that the auspices for these biblical productions were more objectionable to the King than the subject matter itself.

On the basis of official statements, Elizabeth’s policy against religious drama would appear to have been the strictest of the Reformation period. Though Mary had prohibited plays which dealt with controversial doctrine, her successor’s proclamation was far more sweeping. In May 1559 Elizabeth issued a proclamation forbidding licensure not only to plays promoting unorthodox interpretation or controversial doctrine, but also to any production

---

23 Bucer 351.
24 Heinrich Bullinger’s arguments against any visual representation of God or Christ in image or human form probably inspired his criticism of Passion plays in his Decades, which were also presented to Edward. In a discussion of the Old Testament ceremonies, which “figured” Christ’s sacrifice on the Cross, the Swiss theologian notes that “this manner of representing our redemption and salvation did please God, by sacraments, rather than by pictures, colours, or by stage-plays; which are at this day greatly set by, although scarce godly, by no small number of trifling and fantastical heads”; see “The Ceremonial Laws of God,” Decades, ed. Thomas Harding, vol. 2, PS 10 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1850) 194. For Bullinger’s iconoclastic statements, which inform his pronouncement on biblical drama, see “Of God’s Law and of the Two First Commandments of the First Table,” Decades, vol. 1, PS 9 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1849) 224-31.
wherein either matters of religion or the governance of the estate of the commonwealth shall be handled or treated, being no meet matters to be written or treated upon but by men of authority, learning and wisdom, nor to be handled before any audience but of grave and discrete persons: all which parts of this proclamation her majesty chargeth to be inviolably kept.\textsuperscript{25}

Though the proclamation acknowledges that the prohibited subject matter is suitable for some individuals, it nonetheless insists that its prohibitions be "inviolably kept." No biblical play would have met the restrictions on content that it set forth.

Yet it appears that the ecclesiastical and state authorities were slow to demand compliance with this proclamation. Though a recent study of Tudor drama states that the proclamation "effectively brought an end to the polemical interludes, as well as the religious cycles and Catholic moralities,"\textsuperscript{26} performances of biblical drama continued for decades after this piece of legislation. The last performances of five major civic cycles postdate the Act by five to twenty years; Coventry's Corpus Christi play was the last cycle to disappear, seeing its last production in 1579.\textsuperscript{27} Twenty years is hardly an


\textsuperscript{26} Howard B. Norland, \textit{Drama in Early Tudor Britain: 1485-1558} (Lincoln NB: U of Nebraska P, 1995) 130.

\textsuperscript{27} Norwich's cycle was last performed in 1564. York continued to present its Corpus Christi play until 1569, when it was suppressed by Archbishop Grindal, and Chester's Whitsun plays suffered the same fate in 1575. Matthew Hutton's letter forbidding any plays representing the Godhead at Wakefield is dated 1576.
"effective" period of time for conformity to a royal proclamation, unless the proclamation was not enforced, and it is difficult to imagine the civic audiences as "grave and discrete." Elizabeth was clearly aware that plays touching religion were still taking place in her kingdom, for biblical dramas formed part of her entertainment on two occasions in the 1560s. King's College presented Udall's play *Ezechias* for her enjoyment at Cambridge on August 8, 1564,28 and two years later Coventry welcomed the Queen with the pageants of the Tanners, Drapers, Smiths and Weavers.29 Despite the official position on biblical drama, there seems to have been considerable tolerance for such plays during the early years of Elizabeth's reign.

The evidence that influential members of the reformist cause like Luther, Morison and Bucer advocated, or at least allowed, biblical drama does not alter the fact that others were strongly against it. Morison argued that plays and other entertainments "are to be born withal, though they payne and vexe some ...[and] though som thynge in them be to be misliked,"30 a statement which acknowledges the offense that some zealous believers found in religious plays (including biblical plays). Reformist concerns about subject

---


29 Ingram, *Coventry* 234. One account notes that the Queen "passed by" the pageants, which may indicates that they were *tableaux vivant*, presented on the guild wagons. The records do not explicitly state that the pageants were those of the Corpus Christi play, but the records generally offer descriptions of pageants for royal entries which differed from the regular guild offerings. The fact that these pageants are not described suggests that their content was well known. We do not know the episode which the Tanners presented in the Corpus Christi play, but the Drapers portrayed Doomsday, the Smiths the Crucifixion, and the Weavers the Presentation in the Temple and the Dispute with the Elders. If the sequence given in the record is correct, Elizabeth would have seen the plays in a strange order.

30 Anglo 178.
matter and tone, while not immediately fatal to biblical drama, did affect those who were writing, producing and performing the plays. Plays already in existence, like the civic cycles, were revised to bring them into line with changing religious policy, and the official attitudes toward these plays, together with the various processes of adaptation used in cities across the country, suggest something of the circumstances behind the changes made to traditional Easter drama in *The Resurrection of Our Lord*.

**The Reformation and Cycle Drama**

The last performance of the York cycle took place in 1569, within a decade of Elizabeth’s proclamation, though citizens pressed for performances as late as 1580. Official attention to the city’s religious drama, the Creed, Pater Noster, and Corpus Christi plays, may have been more intense due to the history of Catholic rebellion in the North. York’s support for the Pilgrimage of Grace in 1537 cannot have endeared the city to Henry VIII; Alexandra F. Johnston and Margaret Rogerson observe that the city council “gave its tacit consent” to the uprising “when it allowed the leaders of the rebellion to enter the city to be blessed by the archbishop.”\(^{31}\) Elizabeth faced similar problems in the Northern Rebellion of 1569, and Edmund Grindal, who ultimately suppressed the religious drama at York, had been transferred to that see so that his rigorous Protestant views might control the Catholic element there.\(^ {32}\)

\(^{31}\) Alexandra F. Johnston and Margaret Rogerson, eds., *York*, vol. 1, REED (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1979) x.

\(^{32}\) M. Creighton, “Grindal, Edmund” *DNB*. 
York City Council records reveal measures to curtail some of the Catholic aspects of the city's religious drama during the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth. In 1548 the Mayor and Council determined that the Corpus Christi cycle would be played, "Certen pagyauntes excepte / That is to say / the deynge / of our Lady / assumpcion of our Lady / and Coronacion of our Lady." In 1554 the council reinstated the Marian pageants, only to prohibit them again in 1561. With Elizabeth's accession and the return to a national Protestant church, the council had to acknowledge the suppression of the Corpus Christi feast, and from 1561 productions of civic religious drama took place on officially-sanctioned feast days.

Despite the council's attempts to repackage York's civic religious drama in a form acceptable to Protestant mores, local ecclesiastical authorities committed to Puritanical modes of reform, Archbishop Grindal and Dean Matthew Hutton, opposed the productions. In 1561, the council's description of the proposed Corpus Christi play, "thystories of the old & new testament," accentuated the cycle's narrative, rather than its doctrinal content, and the council also sought official opinion on another possible production, the Creed play, from Dean Hutton. After perusing the text, Hutton...

---

34 Johnston and Rogerson, York, vol. 1, 310, 331-32.
35 In 1561 the council proposed a performance of either the Creed or Corpus Christi Play on St Barnabas' Day (June 11); though the burgesses still planned to conduct the Corpus Christi procession on the eve of the festival, the records indicate that they would "goe about in semely sadd apparell & not in skarlet." The 1569 Corpus Christi play took place on Tuesday after Whitson; Johnston and Rogerson, York, vol. 1, 333, 340, 355.
36 Alexandra F. Johnston discusses the key roles that these two clergymen played in the demise of York's religious drama; see Johnston, "The City as Patron," forthcoming.
responded:

as I finde manie thinges that I muche like because of thantiquitie, so see I manie thinges, that I can not allowe, because they be Disagreinge from the senceritie of the gospell, the which thinges, yf they shuld either be altogether cancelled, or altered into other matter, the wholle drift of the play shuld be altered.\textsuperscript{38}

Unable (or unwilling) to revise the play himself, Hutton counseled the burgesses to abandon their performance, warning "the learned will mislike it and how the state will beare with it I knowe not."\textsuperscript{39} His words prompted the civic leaders to further cautions, for they rejected a plea from the commons to present the Corpus Christi play, unless "the book thereof shuld be perused / and otherwaise amendyd / before it were playd."\textsuperscript{40} These fears must have been aylayed, or perhaps some alterations had been made, by 1569 when the next (and last) performance of the Corpus Christi play took place. After this production, Grindal received the text to correct, and the council did not honor any more requests from the commons for further performances. It appears that the archbishop simply kept the text, which reappeared a century later, in the possession of the Fairfax family.\textsuperscript{41} Either Grindal or Hutton (or both) may have been responsible for some of the depredations inflicted on the

\textsuperscript{38} Johnston and Rogerson, \textit{York}, vol. 1, 353.
\textsuperscript{39} Johnston and Rogerson, \textit{York}, vol. 1, 353.
\textsuperscript{40} Johnston and Rogerson, \textit{York}, vol. 1, 354.
\textsuperscript{41} The signature "H: Fairfax's Book 1695" appears on one of the flyleaves of the manuscript. See Richard Beadle, ed., \textit{The York Plays}, York Medieval Texts, 2\textsuperscript{nd} series (London: Arnold, 1982) 13.
manuscript; pages which would have contained potentially inflammatory doctrinal material, such as the institution of the Last Supper, have been ripped out entirely.42

Dean Hutton’s 1576 orders for the suppression of a Corpus Christi play at Wakefield also give some insight into the sort of things he could “not allowe” in the York Creed play. Within the Wakefield play were “many things vsed which tende to the Derogation of the Maiestie and glorie of god the prophanation of the Sacramentes and the maunteynaunce of superstition and idolatrie,” wrote Hutton, and he charged the citizens that in the said playe no Pageant be vsed or set furthe wherein the Maiesty of god the father god the sonne or god the holie ghoste or the administration of either the Sacramentes of Baptisme or of the lorde Supper be counterfeyted or represented / or any thinge plaied which tende to the maintenaunce of superstition and idolatrie or which be contrarie to the lawes of god or of the Realme.43

---

42 Chester Scoville and Kim Yates observed this systematic mutilation in the course of their work on a modernization of the cycle for the 1998 Toronto performance.

43 A. C. Cawley, ed., Appendix I, The Wakefield Pageants in the Towneley Cycle (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1958) 125. A few of the plays in the Towneley collection which are related to Wakefield may represent parts of that town’s cycle, though the collection as a whole cannot be attributed to the town. Cawley and Stevens identify post-Reformation alterations to the Towneley plays in their facsimile edition; these include deleted references to the papacy, the sacraments, and to Marian devotion; see A. C. Cawley and Martin Stevens, eds., The Towneley Cycle: A Facsimile of Huntington MS HM I, Leeds Texts and Monographs, Medieval Drama Facsimiles 2 (Leeds: University of Leeds, School of English, 1976) xiii. Aside from these changes, the Towneley plays do not appear to have been thoroughly “vetted,” unlike the performance texts of York and Chester. Numerous references to saints in The Second Shepherds’ Play, for example, remain untouched, even though the line “Our lady hym save” was emended to read “Our lord him save” (795).
The letter contains no accusation of "popish" elements; as Peter Womack has observed, the sacraments it mentions are those of the Protestant church.

Hutton upholds Elizabeth's proclamation, and outlaws all religious drama, rather than simply Catholic religious drama. Even the most diligent efforts on the part of the York council would not have been able to eradicate the representation of the Godhead from the Corpus Christi play.

The cycles of Chester and Coventry persisted later into the century, though the factors behind their survival may have varied. Chester also lay within Grindal's diocese, but distance between York and Chester seems to have fostered a sense of independence, or even defiance, on the part of Protestant Cestrians. Coventry may have escaped early censure because the reforms imposed in the North by churchmen like Grindal were less desirable in the south, where Puritanism threatened the equilibrium of Elizabeth's moderate Protestantism.

In the case of the Chester cycle, an impressive body of five full play manuscripts remains, though all postdate the last performance of the cycle by at least fourteen years. In contrast, only two Coventry plays are extant, one of which survives only in the nineteenth-century edition of Thomas Sharp. These texts, and other related documents, provide an important perspective on reformist revisions, and Protestant

---


45 Womack 97.

46 For an account of the surviving plays' textual history, see Hardin Craig, ed., *Two Coventry Corpus Christi Plays*, 2nd ed., EETS os 87 (Oxford: Oxford UP 1957 (for 1952)) ix-xi. All quotations from the Coventry plays will be taken from this edition and identified parenthetically in the text.
involvement in the plays’ production.

Chester’s records reveal a community which made and remade its civic religious drama as the city’s social, religious and political contexts changed—a process that David Mills has recently called “recycling the cycle.” In the early sixteenth century, documents announcing this production express Marian devotion and connect the cycle to monasticism and the papacy. The biblical plays began as a Corpus Christi production like the civic cycle drama of York, but sometime before 1521 performances began to take place at Whitsun instead. Our most detailed source of information about the content of the pre-Reformation cycle, the Early Banns, may have been composed to advertise this change. Among the plays promised is the Assumption of the Virgin, presented by the “wyffys of this towne,” and the final stanza of the Banns extends Mary’s blessing to the listeners. Ten years later William Newhall, the city clerk, wrote a

47 The following discussion of biblical drama in Chester owes much to Mill’s recent study, Recycling the Cycle: The City of Chester and its Whitsun Plays, SEED 4 (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1998). Mills provides a penetrating and lucid account of the Chester Plays from their origins to the present day, which is illuminated by his intimate knowledge of the city, of the civic documents related to the drama, and of the cycle manuscripts.


50 Clopper, Chester 37.

51 Clopper, Chester 39.
proclamation which continued to emphasize the plays’ links with the Catholic church. The Proclamation identifies the author as a monk, Henry Francis, who obtained & gate of Clement, then beyng bushop of rome, a ioo0 daiez of pardon & of the Busshop of Chester at that tyme beyng xlth daiez of pardon graunted from thensforth to every person resortyng in pecible manner with gode devocion to here & se the sayd playes from tyme to tyme asoft as they shalbe plaied within this Citie.52

Though Newhall includes a reference to mayoral leadership in the first cycle production, any civic authority behind the plays takes second place to that of the pope. Disturbers of the play will suffer Clement’s curse, the Proclamation warns, as well as imprisonment and fines “at maister mairis pleasure.”53

The respect for a monk and for papal authority evidenced by the 1531 version of the Newhall Proclamation could not have contributed to the plays’ reputation later in the decade. By 1539 the Proclamation was revised to eliminate any mention of its Catholic history. Mayor John Arneway, previously credited as the original producer, now received full credit for originating the cycle.54 This change seems to have satisfied any objectors for thirty years.

52 Clopper, Chester 28. In quotations from this version of Newhall’s Proclamation I have incorporated the missing readings from BL Harley 2013 which Clopper prints in footnotes.
53 Clopper, Chester 28.
54 Clopper, Chester 33.
The tide turned against the plays in the early fifteen-seventies, though it is by no means clear that the division between their supporters and opponents corresponded to the division between traditional Catholics and Protestants. Lawrence Clopper argues instead that the records indicate that "the struggle over whether to produce the plays was a struggle between two, perhaps more, Protestant factions, and that these groups had very firm ideas about what was and was not appropriate in the representation of religious subject matter."\textsuperscript{55} In 1572 Mayor John Hanky determined that the plays would go forth, but the annals record some civic resistance: "the whole Playes were playde though manye of the Cittie were sore against the settinge forthe therof."\textsuperscript{56} One of those strongly opposed to the performance was a Puritan named Christopher Goodman, whose letter-book illuminates the controversy.\textsuperscript{57} In a missive to Henry Hastings, the Puritan earl of Huntingdon who was Lord President of the Council of the North, Goodman informed the nobleman of the upcoming performance, and the general opposition among "our Preachers."\textsuperscript{58} Both the earl and Archbishop Grindal subsequently sent letters to the Mayor and to the Bishop of Chester, and Goodman transcribed Grindal's letter into his book. Having been "credibly informed" that the plays contained "sundry absurd & gross errours & heresies joyned with profanation & great abuse of god's holy word," Grindal

\textsuperscript{55} Clopper, "Lay and Clerical Impact" 103.
\textsuperscript{56} Clopper, Chester 97.
\textsuperscript{57} For a detailed discussion of this unpublished document, see Mills, Recycling the Cycle 146-51.
\textsuperscript{58} Qtd. in Mills, Recycling the Cycle 147.
suspended performances until the texts could be "perused corrected & reformed by such learned men as by us shall be thereunto appointed & the same so reformed by us allowed." The directive implies that the Archbishop intended to follow the same course of action that he had at York. Nonetheless, the plays went on as scheduled, with the annals providing the justification that the "Inhibition...sent from the Archbishop to stay them...Came too late." Goodman's letter book indicates, however, that he had delivered the letter before the production. The apparent disregard for Grindal's prohibition would not be forgotten.

Despite the clear opposition of locals like Goodman and regional secular and ecclesiastical authorities, Chester presented its plays once more, in 1575, taking some measures to either outwit or mollify zealous objectors. Thirty-three of forty-five council members supported Mayor John Savage in the decision, and it is unlikely that all of these supporters were Catholic. The late vote, which took place on May 30, may have been intended to minimize the chances of official interference. By scheduling the performance for Midsummer, the council completely separated the plays from any church festival. Furthermore, the text was to be revised, "with such

59 Qtd. in Mills, Recycling the Cycle 147.
60 Clopper, Chester 97.
61 Clopper, Chester 103-04.
62 Goodman drafted a letter to the mayor regarding the performance, and seems to have written to Grindal again as well. Mills summarizes his objections to the play, which resemble those of the author of the Treatise of Miracles Pleynge. Goodman protested that civic funds "would be better spent remedying the wickedness and sin in the city. And the plays will provoke the wrath of God upon the citizens"; see Mills, Recycling the Cycle 150-51.
correction and amendement as shalbe thought Convenient by the said Maior."63 One annal confirms that some plays were left out "which were thought might not be Iustified for the superstition that was in them."64 The earliest version of the Late Banns also dates from this performance. Clearly Post-Reformation in tone, they may also represent the council's efforts to distance the plays from their suspect Catholic past. They deflect many of the criticisms which had been levelled at the plays, with a self-conscious emphasis on history and biblical authority.

The purported history of the cycle occupies six stanzas of the Late Banns. Instead of Henry Francis, they identify Ranulf Higden as the cycle playwright. Though Higden was also a monk, he was respected as a historian for his massive Polychronicon; and his supposed authorship conferred a distinguished scholarly pedigree upon the plays. In addition, the Late Banns present Higden as a proto-reformer engaged in a brave effort to bring the vernacular scripture to the laity.

These storyes of the testamente at this tyme you knowe
In a common englishe tonge neuer reade nor harde
yet thereof in these Pagiantes to make open showe
This Moncke and noe moncke was nothinge affrayde
With feare of burninge. hangeinge. or cuttinge of heade,
To sett out that all may Deserne and see

63 Clopper, Chester 104.
64 Clopper, Chester 110.
And parte of good belefe.65

This portrait of the playwright as purveyor of the gospel is complemented by the familiar reference to John Arneway’s leadership in the first production. Mills observes that the history offered by the late Banns, “is not a collaboration between the institutions of church and city but a conspiracy between a subversive monk and a forward looking mayor to defy the edicts of the Roman Catholic church.”66 Through the purported association of the mayor and Higden, the plays could shed their association with superstition and ignorance, and become instead a symbol of Chester’s learned, early and unique civic godliness. Descriptions of individual plays highlight the continuity of this longstanding tradition; references to “custom” distinguish the Fall of Lucifer (Tanners), the Presentation in the Temple (Mercers) and The Temptation of Christ (Butchers), while the Resurrection is “Not altered in menye poyntes from the olde fashion.”67

In their recital of the plays’ content, the Late Banns also insist on the authority of the bible story. Non-scriptural episodes are portrayed as harmless digressions for amusement’s sake, rather than corruptions of God’s Word; Higden used the scriptures, “Interminglinge therewithe onely to make sporte / Some thinges not warranted by anye wrytte / Which glad the hartes he

---

65 Clopper, Chester 240. The full text of the Late Banns is contained on 240-47.
66 Mills, Recycling the Cycle 143.
67 The first two plays are presented according to “custom,” and the Butchers have “accustomable vsed” their pageant wagon for performances; Clopper, Chester 241, 243, 244, 245.
woulde men to take hit."\textsuperscript{68} Plays firmly grounded on the biblical narrative are scrupulously distinguished from those with little scriptural basis, like the Harrowing of Hell pageant:

\begin{quote}
As oure belefe is: yat Christe after his passion
Decended into hell. but what he did in that place
Though oure author sett forthe after his opynion
yet creditt yow the bewte lerned. those he dothe not disgrase
we wishe yat of all sortes the beste you imbrace.\textsuperscript{69}
\end{quote}

Furthermore, the banns insist on fidelity to the Scriptural narrative in plays with particular sacramental or doctrinal significance, such as the Baker’s Last Supper. The Banns admonish guild members, “see yat with the same wordes you vtter / As Criste himselfe spake them to be a memorall / Of yat deathe & passion within playe after ensue shall.”\textsuperscript{70} The Passion sequence also requires sober performance from the five crafts involved in its production, because, “in this storye consistethe oure chefe faithe.”\textsuperscript{71} The insistence on biblical sources and responsible representation seems calculated to answer Grindal’s 1571 criticism of “great abuse of god’s holy word” in the plays.

The effort was not sufficient for the authorities, and the Privy Council summoned Savage to London to account for the production, and also for Hanky’s insubordination four years earlier. The Council sent a certificate to

\textsuperscript{68} Clopper, Chester 240.
\textsuperscript{69} Clopper, Chester 245.
\textsuperscript{70} Clopper, Chester 245.
\textsuperscript{71} Clopper, Chester 245.
Savage in London confirming that both the 1572 and 1575 plays had been undertaken with the consent of the entire governing body, and Savage returned, but the incident had its effect, and no more Whitsun plays took place in Chester. However, since the Coventry plays survived four years longer than Chester's despite the former city's closer proximity to London, it seems that the suppression of Chester's plays resulted from Grindal's own dislike for biblical drama, and a need to discipline the provincial city that had so blatantly ignored his archepiscopal directive. As Peter Womack notes, "the suppression of the urban drama is not a purely doctrinal question, but a doctrinal question in a determining political context." 

A reference to the Coventry Corpus Christi play appears as early as 1392, but few of the surviving guild records extend back further than the late fifteenth century. The evidence that has come down to us indicates that the cycle included only ten plays, all on New Testament subjects. Pamela King observes that "the Coventry cycle as we have come to recognize it is in any meaningful sense a product of sixteenth-century texts and records, its distinctiveness a product of conformity to the economic auspices of those days." The city's declining fortunes, a result of its dependence on the cloth

---

72 Clopper, Chester 112.
73 Womack 97.
74 Ingram, Coventry 3. The source for this reference is Sharp's Dissertation, as the original document has not survived. A manuscript of 1407 provides the next earliest reference; however, Ingram believes that the play was performed "at least as early as the 1380s"; Ingram, Coventry xvii.
trade, made production of the plays a heavy burden. The cycle involved fewer guilds than did those of the more prosperous cities of York and Chester, but Coventry's guilds collaborated more frequently, and presented longer, multi-episodic pageants.

Coventry boasted a strong Protestant community. It had been a stronghold of Lollardy from the fifteenth century, and a century later civic resistance to Mary's reign was so strong that the queen had to forcibly impose a Catholic mayor upon the city. Yet reformist antagonism to Catholic doctrine apparently did not extend to the Corpus Christi plays. John Careless, martyred under Mary for his Protestant beliefs, provides an example of a zealous Protestant who had reconciled his religious convictions with participation in the pageant of his guild, the Weavers. Foxe tells us that Careless suffered imprisonment in Coventry for two years, and "he was there in suche credite with his keeper, [that] upon his worde he was let out to play in the Pageant about the city with othere his companions. And that done, keeping touch with his keeper, he returned agayne into prison at his house

76 The financial strain caused by the Corpus Christi play was significant enough that Mayor William Coton wrote to Cromwell in 1539 asking for support in efforts to cut back production expenses; see Ingram, Coventry 148-49. The classic study of Coventry's sixteenth-century economic struggles is Charles Phythian-Adams, Desolation of a City: Coventry and the Urban Crisis of the Late Middle Ages (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1971).

77 See Acts of the Privy Council, ed. J. R. Dasent, ns, vol. 5 (PRO 1892; New York: Kraus, 1974) 218. The council wrote to the Mayor and alderman "to cause sum Catholike and grave man to be chosen to thier Maiour for this yere comyng, and for that the Quenes Majestie is advertised that John Fitzherbert, Richard Whestler and oone Colman, of the saide citie, are Catholike and honest persones, they are required to give thier voyces to oone of them to be Maiour."

78 Careless was not executed, but he died in prison. Foxe included him in his martyrology "for that he was for the same truth's sake a long time imprisoned, as also for his willing mind and zealous affection he had [for martyrdom] if the Lord had so determined it"; John Foxe, The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe; With a Life of the Martyrologist, and Vindication of the Work, ed. George Townsend, vol. 8 (1843; New York: AMS, 1965) 163.
appointed. 79 Paul Whitfield White remarks on Foxe's "matter-of-fact" attitude toward "a man he memorializes as a Protestant saint acting apparently in a play cycle that commentary, from the seventeenth century onward, has associated with medieval Catholicism." 80 Indeed, Foxe finds more novelty in the prisoner's temporary release for the performance than he does in the fact that Careless participated at all.

Not only does Careless' story point to an underrecognized Protestant toleration for biblical drama, but it also raises fascinating questions about the impact that the prisoner's participation might have had, given the circumstances. We do not know what role Careless took in the Weavers' pageant of the Presentation in the Temple and Christ's Disputation with the Doctors, but it is not difficult to imagine how the participation of a local prisoner of conscience might have charged these episodes with further significance. If he took a role in the first half of the play, he would have represented a witness to the infant Christ, the Word Incarnate, an ideal role for a Protestant who took "the word of God for [his] warrant." 81 An appearance in the disputation with the young Christ would have placed him among the high priests, one of whom declares in the extant 1535 text:

Now, lordyngis, lystun to me a whyle,

Wyche hathe the lawis vndur honde,

And thatt no man fawll in soche perell

---

79 Foxe 170.
80 White, "Reforming Mysteries' End" 125.
81 Foxe 164.
Agenst any artyccull for to stand;
For the comen statute of this lande
Woll that all soche personys schulde be tane
And in the face of peple ooponly slayne. (857-63)

Careless' participation in this scene no doubt would have resonated with some members of the audience who knew that the prisoner had taken a stand against the “artycculls” of religion that the current “lawis” supported, and that he could conceivably be “ooponly slayne” for his actions. A feature as simple as the known views of performers would have been enough to put a new, Protestant light on a seemingly straightforward play.

Protestant intervention in the Coventry plays also extended to textual changes. Ingram cites evidence of frequent revision, often on a pageant-by-pageant basis. By March of 1535, one Robert Croo had “corrected” and “translated” the two plays that survive, a task which suggests not only recopying, but also revision into a new language, the rhetoric of reformers. Pamela King finds in Croo’s additions to the Shearmen and Taylors’ pageants “a preoccupation with Lutheran or Zwinglian ideas, far from the confident sacramentalism which pervades the plays in the York Register, and closer, as one would expect, to the intellectual constructions evident in the Chester Pageants.”

Changes to the Drapers’ Doomsday play after Elizabeth’s

---

82 R. W. Ingram, “‘To find the pleyers and all that longeth therto’: Notes on the Production of Medieval Drama in Coventry,” The Elizabethan Theatre V, ed. and intro. George Hibbard (Toronto: Macmillan, 1975) 27, 31-34. See also pp. 91-92 below.

83 Craig 31, 70.

84 King 25.
accession also suggest a self-conscious Protestantism. In 1561 the “wormes of Conscyence” were added, and the play was prefaced by the “playing of the protestacyon.”

Perhaps the latter was a defensive manoeuver to justify questionable aspects of the play; the suppression of Coventry’s popular Hocktide play in 1561 may have made the guildsmen particularly sensitive to potential criticisms of their Corpus Christi pageant. No document like Chester’s Late Banns reveals a full-scale reformist vision of the Coventry Corpus Christi play, however. Since pageants were revised independently, without the kind of textual controls found at York and Chester, the Coventry cycle could have presented an eclectic doctrinal message. Yet this very potential for diversity and ambiguity in performance, along with the endorsement of “godly” men like Pisford and Careless, may serve as a useful corrective to the “popish” image of civic biblical drama.

New Compositions

Protestant concerns informed new biblical plays written during the Reformation, as well. In many cases, reformist sensibilities coloured the

---

85 Ingram, Coventry 217.
86 Ingram, Coventry 215.
87 This surprisingly large body of drama has captured the attention of a number of scholars in the last forty years. Lily Campbell, Murray Roston, and Ruth A. Blackburn survey the terrain and offer detailed commentary on many individual plays; see Campbell 141-260; Roston, Biblical Drama in England (London: Faber, 1968) 49-109; and all of Blackburn’s book. Naomi Pasachoff discusses Jacob and Esau (attr. Udall), Godly Queen Hester (anon.), A Looking Glass for London and England (Lodge and Greene), with an appendix on The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna (Thomas Garter) in Playwrights, Preachers and Politicians: A Study of Four Tudor Old Testament Dramas, Salzburg Studies in English Literature 45 (Salzburg, 1975), and Paul Whitfield White has edited both The Life and Repentaunce of Mary Magdalene and The Historie of Jacob and Esau in Reformation Biblical Drama.
dramatists' choice of material. The stories selected coincide only in part with those of the medieval cycles, though older forms did continue to influence playwrights.

The familiar cycle play or Passion play format found champions in several dramatists committed to the new religion. Best known of these is John Bale, who listed nine plays on the ministry, passion and resurrection of Christ in his 1548 *Summarium*.\(^ {88}\) One of these, *De Baptisme et temptatione*, which Bale describes as a comedy, has come down to us as two separate plays: *Johan Baptystes Preachyng*e and *The Temptation of Our Lord*. Though both of the episodes occur in the mystery cycles, editor Peter Happé observes that Bale's plays are far longer than any of the extant cycle pageants, since they incorporate so much doctrinal teaching.\(^ {89}\) Michael O'Connell terms this Protestant tendency the "textualization of God's body, the turning of the incarnation (and the devotions and ritual practices associated with it) from expression in physical and material ways to predominantly textual and verbal modes."\(^ {90}\) We do not know if such discursive and didactic impulses marked the 1561 production of a three-day Passion Play which took place in the Shrewsbury Quarry.\(^ {91}\) However, both Bale and Calvinist schoolmaster

---

\(^{88}\) Happé, "Introduction" 8-9.

\(^{89}\) Happé, "Introduction" 12-13.

\(^{90}\) O'Connell 63. This kind of treatment of biblical material may explain why the 1575 Chester plays were performed over four days rather than three, despite the omission of controversial pageants.

\(^{91}\) J. Alan B. Somerset, ed., *Shropshire*, vol. 1, REED (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1994) 207 and vol. 2, 661-62. The length and subject matter of this production appears only in an antiquarian work, *Escutcheons of the Bailiff*. However, references to Ashton in contemporary records indicate that he was responsible for three plays between 1563 and 1569; see Somerset, *Shropshire*, vol. 2, 378-80.
Thomas Ashton who oversaw the Shrewsbury production, found ways to negotiate concerns about the ludic embodiment of the Godhead that so troubled the Lollard author of the *Treatise*, as well as Henrich Bullinger, and Elizabeth’s ecclesiastical commissioners.

Other Protestant playwrights turned increasingly to the Old Testament and the apocrypha for subject matter. A survey of extant texts and the titles of lost plays collected in Harbage’s *Annals* indicates that stories about the Davidic dynasty, Jonah, and Susannah and the Elders were particularly popular between 1539 and 1600. These stories allowed playwrights to avoid representation of either the sacraments or the Trinity; the Old Testament God could be portrayed as a disembodied heavenly voice, as the Chester Late Banns indicate:

not possible it is these matters to be contruyed
In such sorte and cunninge & by suche players of price
As at this daye good players & fine wittes could devise
ffor then shoulde all those persones that as godes doe playe
In Clowdes come downe with voyce and not be seene

---

92 Plays dealing centrally or peripherally with the house of David include *Absalom* (1540, Thomas Watson, St. John’s, Cambridge), *The Two Sins of King David* (1562), *Sapientia Solomonis* (an adaptation of Sixt Birck’s Latin play, presented at Trinity College Cambridge in 1560, and by the Westminster boys for Elizabeth in 1566) and *The Love of King David and Fair Bethsabe with the Tragedy of Absalom* (George Feele, 1587). Plays about Jonah and Susannah appear among the many productions that Ralph Radcliffe’s students took part in during the 1540s at his school in Hitchen. Harbage finds titles for both subjects among the play lists of 1656-61 as well, and two further texts survive: Thomas Garter’s *Most Virtuous and Godly Susannah* (1569) and *A Looking Glass for London and England* (Robert Greene and Thomas Lodge, 1590). See Alfred Harbage, *Annals of English Drama* 975-1700, rev. S. Schoenbaum (London: Methuen, 1964) 28-29, 36-37, 40-41, 52-53, 54-55.
ffor noe man can proportion that godhead I saye
To the shape of man face, nose and eyne.\textsuperscript{93}

Murray Roston maintains that Protestants were also attracted to the heroic qualities of the Old Testament characters, identifying with their struggles as God's chosen people. "Instead of searching in the Old Testament for stories whose validity lay in their adumbrating the New," he observes, "[the Protestant playwright] now searched for those which seemed to parallel his own personal history, those which he felt were being relived by him in a later generation."\textsuperscript{94} Tudor rulers drew on this sense of "postfiguration" to craft their public image; members of Henry VIII's court identified him as a second Moses, or a new David or Solomon,\textsuperscript{95} and Davidic imagery carried over into Elizabeth's iconography as well.\textsuperscript{96} This association of Old Testament and Tudor rulers is one factor behind the popularity of Davidic themes in the drama.\textsuperscript{97}

If Protestants read themselves backward into Old Testament history, they also took advantage of biblical stories to speak directly to contemporary audiences. Like the moral interludes of the sixteenth century, Protestant biblical drama functioned as a vehicle for propaganda, a means to express and promote doctrinal and political issues of the period. The examples of three

\textsuperscript{93} Clopper, Chester 247.
\textsuperscript{94} Roston 71.
\textsuperscript{96} King, "Henry VIII" 89, 92 n. 28.
plays, Bale’s *Johan Baptystes Preachynge* (1538) Thomas Garter’s *The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna* (1578), and Lodge and Greene’s *A Looking Glass for London and England* (1588), illustrate the diverse audiences that Protestant biblical drama could reach, and the various reformist agendas that it advanced at different points in the sixteenth century.98

Unlike mystery plays about the same character, *Johan Baptystes Preachynge* presents John’s encounter with Christ as a culminating episode within a larger portrayal of the Baptist’s preaching career. John’s message to and impact upon the common people, as well as the conflict between his teachings and those of the church establishment, represented by a Sadducee and a Pharisee, equal the baptism itself in their significance. Bale’s interest lies less in John’s sacramental role than in his exposition of the gospel and the doctrine of justification by faith (70-73). Furthermore, the playwright is eager to defend the superiority of this “newe lernynge” (207, 253) to corrupt religion that depends on “pestylent tradycyons” (231). The culmination of the play continues these emphases, as Christ expresses the centrality of faith (419-20), and Pater Caelestis charges the audience to eschew “mennys tradycyons” in favor of his Son’s words (441-45). Messages like these no doubt set off the “small contentacion of the prestes and other papists” which erupted when Bale staged this play and two others at the Ossory market cross, his response

---

to the accession of Mary Tudor.\textsuperscript{99}

Though the story of John the Baptist comes from the New Testament, Bale’s interpretation seems to spring from a sense of identification similar to the “postfiguration” discussed above. The play is just one example of Bale’s attraction to this figure. The playwright also lists a fourteen-book life of the Baptist among his literary works; his notebooks, too, reveal an interest in the Baptist which Peter Happé has called “compulsive.”\textsuperscript{100} Initially this interest may have sprung from legends which associated John the Baptist with the playwright’s own Carmelite order. However, the play, which postdates Bale’s conversion to Protestantism, contains a harsh repudiation of the founders of the various English orders: “Heare neyther Frances, Benedyct nor Bruno, / Albert nor Domynyck, for they newe rulers invent” (488-89). Though John’s years of isolation and his ascetic lifestyle resemble certain aspects of the cloistered life, the playwright will not allow us to see the Baptist as a proto-Carmelite. The “waye that Johan taught,” insists Bale, is not identified with clothing, long prayers, isolation and diet, but rather with purification by faith and with the word of God (472-78).

John’s position as forerunner of the Word incarnate must have appealed to Bale, whose propagandistic plays advanced the cause of an English Bible. The Pharisee who describes his sect as “interpretours the holy scriptures to treate” parallels those conservative churchmen who resisted lay

\textsuperscript{99} Bale records the fracas in \textit{The Vocacyon of Johan Bale to the bishopricke of Ossorie in Ireland} (Wesel 1553) fols. 24 r-v; qtd. Happé, “Introduction” 7.
\textsuperscript{100} Happé, “Introduction” 8 n.26.
access to vernacular Bibles (230). The Baptist, and Bale himself, in his role as Baleus Prolocutor, come down squarely on the other side of this issue. John prophesies that "Abiectes of the worlde in knowledge wyll excell / The consecrate Rabyes by vertu of the Gospell" (82-83), while Bale calls on his audience to "beare [their] good intent/ Towards [Christ's] Gospell and godlye testament" (34-35). In fact, exhortations regarding the "Gospell" occur no fewer than twelve times in the play. Bale has cleverly co-opted one traditional means for lay acquisition of scriptural knowledge—the mystery play—to promote a direct experience with the Bible itself.

Printed in 1578, Thomas Garter's "comedy" The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna also exhorts the audience to read the Bible, but knowledge of "God's books" here is presented as a means to know the consequences of the wicked behaviour displayed by two magistrates in the play (1131). Found in the apocryphal book of Daniel, the story of Susanna and the two lascivious elders who falsely accuse her of adultery when she refuses to submit to their desires was a popular subject for dramatization in England and in Germany. Cheri A. Brown notes that Susanna had served as "a model of chastity, an example of virtue rewarded, a prefiguration of the Virgin, and a symbol of the sufferings of the Church" before German Protestant dramatists used her to illustrate "the covenantial relationship between man and God."

Through this story of a slandered woman, and the prophet Daniel's

---

101 The play existed (and perhaps was played) by 1568-9, for Thomas Colwell entered it in the Stationer's Register in that year; see Evans, "Introduction" v.
102 Cheri A. Brown, "The Susanna Drama and the German Reformation," Everyman and
rectification of a miscarriage of justice, Garter addresses several issues that English Protestants in the mid-sixteenth century would have found pertinent: the jurisdictional struggles between lawyers of common and civil law, and Catholic antagonism towards Elizabeth. Heather Kerr has demonstrated that Susanna’s trial, tainted by the false witness of the two wicked magistrates, illustrates problems endemic to civil law trials, while Daniel’s corrective cross-examination represents a common-law approach to the matter. The question of jurisdictional preeminence would have had a certain significance to English Protestants eager to retain their national and religious identity in the mid-1560s, for Catholic countries like Spain and France relied on civil law, while common law was based on native English custom. The possible predominance of civil law in England carried connotations of foreign, Catholic influence.

A clearer Catholic threat to the realm may lie in the “bloody”-gowned elders, Voluptas and Sensualitas, who slander Susanna (529). M. Lindsay Kaplan links the costumes of these characters to the red robes of Cardinals, and suggests that Susanna “might be a figure for England’s latter day chaste defender of the faith, Queen Elizabeth.” Accusations of sexual immorality dogged Elizabeth throughout her reign, and her position as a woman in


104 Kerr 188.

authority made her susceptible to gender-based criticism from Catholic sources as well.\textsuperscript{106} Another possibility which Kaplan does not consider is that the sexual threat posed by the elders would have spoken to the concerns of English subjects who feared that their Queen would take a Catholic husband and thus betray the Protestant country she was “wedded” to.

We do not know the original auspices for Susanna’s performance,\textsuperscript{107} but the printed text was designed to appeal to acting troupes. Its title page claims that “Eyght persons may easily play it,” and outlines a scheme for the sixteen roles. This doubling scheme and the relative simplicity of the staging demands are characteristic of plays performed by travelling professional companies, as Bevington has noted.\textsuperscript{108} In its promulgation of a Protestant perspective on legal and diplomatic questions, The Most Virtuous and Godly Susanna would have suited the repertories of touring companies patronized by Protestant noblemen.

In A Looking Glasse for London and England by Thomas Lodge and Robert Greene we find an example of late biblical drama for the professional

\textsuperscript{106} Kaplan 80-81.
\textsuperscript{107} Citing the “confused identity of the speakers, the careless shifting of speakers” and “the stoning to death of the judges on the stage,” Lily Campbell suggests that the play was never performed; see Campbell 221. However, both disparities in speech headings and the cryptic quality of stage directions are practically bywords in early English drama, and provide little evidence that a play was not performed. A review of the 1986 production by the Joculatores Lancastrienses does not suggest that these purported obstacles posed any problems in performance. It is worth noting, however, that only two roles were doubled in the production, rather than the sixteen that the play’s doubling scheme suggests; see David Mills, rev. of The Comedy of Virtuous and Godly Susanna, dir. Meg Twycross, Joculatores Lancastrienses at Rufford Old Hall, England, Medieval English Theatre 8 (1986): 67-71.
\textsuperscript{108} David Bevington, From Mankind to Marlowe: Growth of Structure in the Popular Drama of Tudor England (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1962) 63. He argues that the staging of the play differs from the known practices of troupes, and criticizes the doubling scheme as “far from expert” but these issues do not eliminate the play from the ranks of the popular repertory.
London stage. Several aspects of its dramaturgy reflect its intended auspices; in its special effects and setting in a far-off Eastern land, *Looking Glasse* recalls its contemporary, Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, parts I and II. Through a retelling of the story of Jonah, the play's action focuses on the cities of Nineveh and Jerusalem. Intermittent choric interjections by the prophet Oseas continually remind the audience that the city onstage is a mirror in which London can view itself. Like Nineveh, London is in danger of God's judgement unless it repents.\(^9\) Carried to Nineveh by an angel, Oseas receives instructions to "Note then . . . all their grievous sins, / And see the wrath of God that pays revenge" (16-27). When Oseas has recorded all the Ninevite's sin, the angel will return him to Jerusalem, where he can warn his own city of the consequences of spiritual torpor. While the angel does reappear in the play to carry Oseas away, we never see his report to Jerusalem dramatized onstage. His warnings to London, however, which punctuate the action of the play, repeat the themes that the angel has given him for Jerusalem. In effect, Oseas transforms London into Jerusalem, and addresses the audience as citizens of both cities.\(^10\)

---

\(^9\) A brief examination of the STC turns up several sixteenth-century sermons which link England's capital with Nineveh. Henry Smith, preaching to London sometime before his death in 1591, gave a series of sermons on Jonah's calling, rebellion and punishment (STC 2275.3). In 1570, Johann Brentz's *Neues from Ninive to Engelande, brought by the prophete Ionas*, was published (STC 3601). John Hooper's sermons before Edward VI, *An oversiglhte and deliberacion uppon the holy prophet Ionas*, published in 1560 and 1570 (STC 13763-65), have been proposed as a possible source for Lodge and Greene; see Pasachoff 69-74. Whether or not the playwrights drew on these specific sermons, the association between London and Nineveh clearly was current in the capital in the late sixteenth century.

\(^10\) As early as 1392, a pageant for the entrance of Richard II into the city portrayed the capital as the New Jerusalem; see Lawrence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP 1995) 242. Later expressions of this link appear in Nashe's 1593 pamphlet, *Christ's Teares over Jerusalem* (STC 18366) as well as in *London's Warning*, by
In their dramatization of the city in spiritual crisis, Lodge and Greene incorporate several problems of interest to London citizens. The character of the Usurer brings the play into a larger urban discourse about moneylending for profit, a discourse inspired in part by the 1571 act which lifted the legal ban against usury. London citizens would have heard of the evils of this practice from their pulpits; as Helen C. White notes, “usury is the burden of more sermons and passages in sermons on social wrongs of the time than any other single factor in contemporary life.”

In addition, the vivid physical characterization of this figure in pamphlets suggests that there was a ongoing dialogue between pamphlet page and public stage.

In the disobedient apprentice Adam we have another character who seems to have stepped out of the sixteenth-century capital and into Assyria. Quick to quarrel, drink and cause trouble, he is a typical representative of the unruly element of London society. The usual suspects in civil disorder were “apprentices, youths in their late teens and early twenties, and journeymen,” and these individuals were the most likely to be singled out for warnings and restrictions by the civic authorities. In his refusal to deny himself carnal pleasures, he suggests the “old Adam,” the stubbornly

---

*Jerusalem: A Sermon preached at Pauls Crosse,* authored by Francis White and printed in 1619 (STC 25386).


unregenerate human soul; appropriately, a representative of the ungovernable segment of London’s population symbolizes the internal rebellion which stands in the way of true repentance. The play’s representation of London as a city in need of spiritual purification is particularly enhanced by this dramatization of the capital’s insubordinate elements.

The concluding scenes of *A Looking Glasse for London and England* go beyond a general message of religious renewal. Nineveh’s ruler Rasni swears “My court and city shall reformed be” (5.5.66, emphasis mine), describing this transformation in very weighted terms. Jonah’s subsequent description of Elizabeth as “the pillar of [God’s] Church / Against the storms of Romish Antichrist” (5.5.91-94) underlines the Protestant emphasis of the play. The story of Jonah was a favorite of reformers; Tyndale made a point of translating the book early in his work on the Old Testament and Calvin’s sermons on it were translated and published twice in London during the latter half of the sixteenth century. As the Reformation progressed, the city’s relationship with this vehicle for Protestant propaganda shifted. Manley argues that “(w)ith the national consolidation of religion with political regime in the Reformation . . . London became less and less an alien Babylon or Nineveh and more and more a likeness of Jerusalem, the accepted if not unambiguous symbol of the nation’s identity.”

Looking Glasse enacts this transformation, and preaches not only reformation of the spirit, but the

\[114\] Manley 113.
Reformation of London, and thus represents an exercise in spiritual self-identification for the city.

Clearly there was much more Protestant involvement in biblical drama than is generally understood. The concerns and objections of some ardent reformers like Goodman and Lambarde notwithstanding, playwrights continued to write, and actors continued to present plays based on the Old and New Testament, as well as the Apocrypha, using familiar forms to put forward new doctrine and national religious policy. Instances of civic drama, parish plays, school performances like those at Cambridge, Shrewsbury and Hitchen, and professional productions on tour or in London theatres demonstrate a wide range of theatrical alliances between biblical content and Protestant doctrine.
IV. The English Resurrection Play from the Tenth to the Sixteenth Century

A popular dramatic form which eventually incorporated the doctrinal changes of the sixteenth century was the resurrection play. Just as William Lambarde's attention to the Witney event reveals the pervasiveness of parish performance in England, it also highlights this dramatic genre which flourished in England from the twelfth to the sixteenth century. Evidence for the popularity of Easter drama, which comes from records of performances as well as from surviving play texts, has been marshalled by Alexandra F. Johnston, who demonstrates that dramatizations of the Resurrection have "the longest history of any vernacular Biblical plays from the medieval and early modern period."¹ Appearing in the tenth century, the earliest mimetic representations of the Easter events were ritual components of the Holy Week liturgy, and this Latin liturgical drama, masterfully documented by Karl Young,² continued to influence the shape of English resurrection plays for centuries. Playwrights also drew directly on the resurrection accounts in the Gospels, often harmonizing the disparities in the four accounts to provide a comprehensive, if occasionally illogical, narrative.³ The biblical drama of

¹ Johnston, "Emerging Pattern" 5. This section owes much to the argument Johnston presents in this article. I have expanded the argument to provide a fuller context of the Easter play tradition as it pertains to The Resurrection of Our Lord, and have pushed her conclusions further at several points, particularly in my discussion of the N-Town resurrection play.
² Karl Young, The Drama of the Medieval Church, vol. 1 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1933).
³ For example, the synoptic gospels describe the visit of the three Marys to the sepulchre, where an angel (or two angels) announce the Resurrection (Matt. 28:8, Mark 16:1-8, Luke 24:1-8). John tells us that Mary Magdalene visited the tomb alone, found it empty and ran to tell Peter and John that the body was missing. After they ran to the tomb to confirm her report, Mary continued to grieve by the sepulchre. Angels asked her the reason for her sorrow, as did the risen Christ, whom she mistook for the gardener until he called her by name (John 20:1-16). Efforts to harmonize this material with that of the synoptic gospels often resulted in a Mary Magdalene who was unaccountably despondent even after she had heard the angel's
France, which developed in a slightly different fashion than that of England, also seems to have influenced some resurrection playwrights.

Ten dramatic texts of the Resurrection survive from England, falling into two broad categories: plays which closely follow the structure of the liturgical drama, and plays which add more "historical" material from the gospel narratives to the traditional liturgical episodes. These categories do not correspond to the chronological order of the plays, a fact which reveals the error of an evolutionary approach to resurrection plays. The first kind of text often retained its connection to Easter week, and Johnston notes that this type of English Easter drama "is associated exclusively with worshipping communities—religious houses, secular households that kept chapels, and parishes." The latter type of text often appears within a larger sequence of biblical plays, divorced from its traditional performance time of Easter week.

The following pages will outline the Latin Holy Week rituals which preceded and coexisted with vernacular representations of the Resurrection, trace the structures, episodic contents and emphases of the English resurrection play as they appear from texts and documents, and place The Resurrection of Our Lord within this generic context.

A. Latin Liturgy and Resurrection Rituals

Three Holy Week ceremonies included mimetic elements relevant to
later resurrection plays. The depositio on Good Friday represented the burial of Christ, while the elevatio and visitatio sepulchri on Easter morning celebrated his resurrection through the angel’s announcement to the three Marys at Christ’s empty tomb. The earliest English account of these ceremonies comes from the tenth-century Regularis Concordia, a rule written by St. Ethelwold for Benedictine monasteries. According to St. Ethelwold’s instructions, the priest was to perform the depositio by wrapping the cross in a cloth and placing it in a sepulchre structure. Monks kept vigil by the sepulchre until the elevatio just before Matins on Easter Sunday when the cross was removed and carried in procession to the high altar. Verses that recalled the Harrowing of Hell also found their way into later examples of the elevatio. 

While the depositio and elevatio involved the mimetic actions of burying and raising the cross, these movements still accompanied the established liturgical antiphons. The visitatio sepulchri differed from the other two ceremonies in that it developed from a trope, new dialogue added to the authorized liturgy. Four monks presented this ceremony during Matins on Easter morning. Three portrayed the three Marys, walking towards the sepulchre “pedetemptim ad similitudinem quaerentium quid”

---

5 For the Regularis Concordia’s texts of the depositio and elevatio, see Young 132-34. David Bevington also prints and translates the depositio in Medieval Drama (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973) 16.
6 Young 149-77.
7 Young defines the trope “in its broadest sense” as “a verbal amplification of a passage in the authorized liturgy, in the form of an introduction, an interpolation, or a conclusion, or in the form of any combination of these”; see Young 178.
The fourth, who had slipped in quietly to sit by the sepulchre, represented the angel, and asked “Quem quaeritis” (“whom are you seeking?”). The trio’s reply “Thesum Nazarenum” (“Jesus of Nazareth”) led to the response “Non est hic. Surrexit sicut predixerat: ite, nuntiate quia surrexit a mortuis.” (“He is not here, he has risen as he foretold, go, announce that he has risen from the dead.”) The Marys followed this command, announcing to the choir, “Alleluia, resurrexit Dominus” (“Alleluia, the Lord has risen”), and other anthems accompanied the ritual display of the empty sepulchre and abandoned shroud.

Since the visitatio sepulchri was a new composition, it could be expanded to include other characters and scenes. These additions always enlarged upon events after Christ’s emergence from the tomb. Pamela Sheingorn observes that the moment of Resurrection itself remained “liturgical in character” while “the Holy Women’s witness . . . successfully carried the entire Resurrection message.” Their testimony was frequently dramatized through another trope, the victimae paschali sequence, which could easily be turned into a dialogue with Peter and John. A Dublin visitatio of the fourteenth century includes this trope, elaborating it further to include the apostles’ race to the tomb.

---

8 Quotations of the Latin text are taken from Young 249; English translations are from Bevington 27-28.
10 Young 271.
11 Young 347-50. For the purposes of this discussion of various resurrection plays, I have regularized character names to the following: Mary Magdalene, Annas, and Caiaphas.
appearance, the *hortulanus* encounter between Christ and Mary Magdalene formed part of a twelfth-century representation at Eynsham Abbey, a Benedictine house in Oxfordshire. A narrative recounting the vision of one of the Eynsham monks tells us that the brother awoke from his deathlike trance on Easter morning, attended Matins,

> et, sicut in eadem ecclesia illa die annua consuetudine fieri solet, visibiliter exhibita representatione dominice resurrectionis, et angelice manifestationis mulieres ad sepulcrum alloquientes, ac regis sui peractos iam triumphos ipsis et per ipsas discipulis denunciantis, ac demum apparitionis ipsius Christi, dilectricem suam Mariam in ortolani effigie appellantis[.]

Or, as a translation of the late fifteenth century describes it, he remained in the church

> tyl the resurreccion of our lorde the whiche yerely in the same chirche is wont to be shewid vysebly and how the angel apperid and spake to the wemen at the sepulture of the victoriose resurreccion of ther kinge and also that they shuld tel to his disciplys his glorious resurreccion & at the laste til our lord apperyd to his welbelovyd mary mawdelen and named her maria in the figure of a gardner[.]

---

13 Adam of Eynsham, *A maruelous revelacion...to a monk of Euyshamme*, (London, William de Machlinia, 1485) 213. This printed text (STC 20917) is the earliest known English version of the monk's vision. A modernized translation is provided by Valerian Paget, *The Revelation to*
Two hundred years later, at the Benedictine nunnery in Barking, Oxfordshire, Abbess Katharine of Sutton oversaw a visitatio sepulchri particularly suited to the spiritual needs of the women under her care. Three sisters represented the Marys, and after the quem quaeritis exchange the ritual continued to focus on the women’s experience of the Resurrection. Appearances of Christ to Mary Magdalene and to all three Marys together were enacted before Mary Magdalene made her report to two clerics dressed as the apostles.¹⁴

A third liturgical drama for Holy Week was the peregrinus. Simple versions of this play portray only the post-resurrection appearances of Christ to Cleophas and Luke on the road to Emmaus, while more developed examples include his appearance to the disciples at Jerusalem and the episode of Thomas’ doubt.¹⁵ The play is more widely documented on the continent, where it was attached to the Easter Monday liturgy, but Prior Laurentius of Durham is recorded as the author of a peregrini in 1150,¹⁶ and twelfth-century statutes from Lichfield Cathedral also contain provisions for performances of this matter, along with a shepherds’ play and visitatio sepulchri.¹⁷

These plays had a large influence on extra-liturgical drama, as we shall see, and they did not disappear in the wake of vernacular performances.

¹⁴ Young 381. Clearly the element of personal identification was important to Abbess Katharine, who also designed a Harrowing sequence for an elevatio in which all the nuns remained shut in one chapel until the priest’s words, “Attolite portas,” freed them to process to the sepulchre. See Young 166-67.
¹⁵ See Young 451-83.
¹⁷ See Young, vol. 2, 522.
Various types of representations of the Resurrection, ritual, liturgical, and vernacular, coexisted well into the sixteenth century. The sepulchre vigil was one of the last ceremonies to disappear as the English church was purged of "Popish" rites; until the death of Henry VIII, parishes were still providing fire and refreshment for those who "watched" the sepulchre until Easter morning.\textsuperscript{18} In his 1570 translation of Thomas Kirchmeyer's Regnum Papisticum (1553), Barnabe Googe offered English audiences sarcastic commentary on the depositio and elevatio, and noted that these might be accompanied by dramatic performance:

In some place solemne sights and shows, & Pageants fayre are playd
With sundrie sorts of maskers braue, in straunge attire arrayd
As where the Maries three doth meete, the sepulchre to see,
And Iohn with Peter swiftly runnes, before him there to bee.
These things are done with iesture such, and with so pleasaunt game,
That euen the grauest men that liue, would laugh to see the same.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{18} See Sheingorn, Easter Sepulchre 60-62 for a description of sixteenth-century sepulchre observances. Ronald Hutton observes that "after Easter 1548 there is only one, very doubtful, mention of the existence of the custom anywhere in England as long as Edward lived"; see Hutton 84. For an account of Cranmer's attacks on the sepulchre in 1547, see Eamon Duffy, The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580, (New Haven: Yale UP, 1992) 461-62.

\textsuperscript{19} Thomas Naogeorg [Kirchmeyer], The Popish Kingdom; or Reign of Antichrist, written in Latin verse. Translated by B. Googe, Theatrum Redivivum (New York: Johnson Reprint Corp, 1972) 54.
Googe's tract reminds us of the simultaneous existence of Latin and vernacular varieties of performance, and also points to some of the correspondences between the two forms, correspondences that were clearest in resurrection plays sponsored by religious communities.

B. Extra-Liturgical Easter Drama

Despite their existence independent of the liturgy, the resurrection plays produced in cathedrals, parish churches, monasteries, and other religious establishments tended to be a part of the Holy Week observances, and retained the episodic content of the quem quærítis and peregríni plays. Evidence from Lincoln Cathedral and Wells Cathedral in Somerset illustrates points of contact between the resurrection drama of these churches and the liturgical calendar. At Lincoln, a play of St. Thomas was performed during Easter week between 1321 and 1369. The Lincoln accounts document purchases of bread and wine for the play, which suggests that the Emmaus episode was included in the performance. Gaps in the surviving records prevent us from knowing any more about the Lincoln play until 1383, when the chapter accounts mention a resurrection play during Easter week. At Wells, accounts from 1407-18 document expenses for an Easter week performance which featured Christ as well as two pilgrims. In 1418-19 the cathedral invested in blue mantles "pro iij Marijs ad pascha ad Matutinae"

---

20 Kahrl 24.
21 Kahrl 25.
("for the three Marys at Easter at matins"), a representation which might have been either a *visitatio sepulchri* or an extra-liturgical performance.\(^{23}\) Fifty years later the *quem quaeritis* segment had certainly taken on a dramatic life outside the Matins liturgy, as the cathedral had wigs of hemp and coifs made for the three characters "ludentes nocte pasche" ("playing on the night of Easter").\(^{24}\)

As we have seen, the paradramatic Easter ceremonies of the church established a three-day structure which divided the burial from the Easter Sunday *quem quaeritis* and presented the Emmaus and Thomas episodes on Easter Monday. Two surviving texts of English Easter drama show close parallels with the liturgical structure and emphases. The first is the text known as the *Shrewsbury Fragments*, a title which refers to the manuscript's home in the Shrewsbury School library, while the second is the pair of plays *Christ's Burial* and *Christ's Resurrection*, found in Bodley e. Museo MS 160.\(^{25}\)

The *Shrewsbury Fragments* consist of parts and cues for one actor in three plays: the third shepherd in an *Officium Pastorum*, the third Mary in an "*Officium Resurrectionis in die pasche,*" and Cleophas in a *peregrini* play for Easter Monday.\(^{26}\) Cleophas' words, "We saw him holl, hide and hewe; /

---

\(^{23}\) Stokes and Alexander, vol. 1, 243; vol. 2, 835.


\(^{25}\) The fragments appear on ff. 38r-42v of MS Shrewsbury School VI; see Norman Davis, ed. *Non-Cycle Plays and Fragments*, EETS ss 1 (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1970) xiv. Davis prints the fragments on pages 1-7 of this collection. For *Christ's Burial* and *Resurrection*, see Baker, Murphy and Hall 141-93. All quotations will be taken from these editions and identified parenthetically in the text.

\(^{26}\) No titles appear in the manuscript for the first and third plays, though the *peregrini* play is to be played "feria secunda in ebdomada Pasche"; see Davis, *Non-Cycle Plays* 3-4.
perefore be still, and stint 3oure strife" (72-73), as well as the later refrain, "Frater Thoma, causa tristicie, / Nobis tulit summa leticie!" (80-81), indicate that the episode of Doubting Thomas was also included in the Easter Monday play. The aforementioned twelfth-century statutes from Lichfield Cathedral provide for an identical set of pageants, and other material in the Shrewsbury manuscript also supports an association with Lichfield. The Shrewsbury Fragments may thus provide a witness to the kind of performance going on in cathedral chapters like Lincoln and Wells, where plays of the Resurrection as well as of the peregrini were taking place.

In addition to the liturgical structure, the Shrewsbury Fragments marry other liturgical influences with material from non-liturgical sources. Norman Davis observes that many of the Latin phrases which appear in the macaronic text are "identical, and others nearly so, with corresponding passages in wholly Latin liturgical texts." Music accompanies several of these Latin verses, recalling the antiphons of the Mass. However, Cleophas' command to Luke to hold Christ tightly so that he will remain with them overnight is derived from traditional exegesis of the struggle between Jacob and the angel, while verbal parallels between the Shrewsbury Officium Pastorum and the York shepherd's play further illustrate the fragments'

---

27 A poem in honor of St. Chad on ff. 23v to 25v indicates that the manuscript originated in a location where this saint was venerated, and Lichfield was a major site for his cult; see Davis, Non-Cycle Plays xiv-xxii.
28 Davis, Non-Cycle Plays xvi-xvii.
relationships to non-liturgical drama.\textsuperscript{30}

In the e. Museo manuscript we have a much later example of liturgically-patterned resurrection drama. The plays' most recent editors argue that the manuscript was written after 1518 and that it likely comes from the Carthusian house of Kingston on Hull in Yorkshire.\textsuperscript{31} Its author began his project as a devotional poem, but changed course some fifty-five lines into the work, inserting the rubric: "This is a play to be played, on part on Gud Friday afternone, and be other part upon Ester Day after the resurrection in the morowe."\textsuperscript{32}

The action of the two plays corresponds fairly closely to the episodes celebrated in the depositio and the quem quaeritis, for the playwright limits his focus to the actions and reactions of Christ's followers from His death until the apostles' race to the tomb. Christ's Burial expands the depositio material. Joseph of Arimathea and the three Marys recount the events of the Passion until Nicodemus arrives, and the group removes the body from the cross. John enters with the Virgin, who mourns her son in a pieta. Nicodemus and Joseph entomb the body and depart, expressing certainty about the coming resurrection. The break which divides the script for Good Friday from that of Easter Sunday at this point nods to the liturgical tradition, as does the content of Christ's Resurrection. Despite its title, this Easter play

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{30} Davis, \textit{Non-Cycle Plays} xvii-xviii.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Baker, Murphy and Hall lxxi-lxxiii.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Baker, Murphy and Hall 142.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
does not portray Christ's emergence from the tomb, but rather opens after the event with a lament by Mary Magdalene who is on her way to anoint her Lord's body in the tomb. Following the *quem quaeritis* sequence, Peter repents at length and is comforted by John and Andrew. As in the Barking *visitatio*, Christ appears to Mary Magdalene and to the two other Marys, who then report their news to the apostles.

The stage directions reveal a direct debt to the liturgical tradition. As the three Marys go to tell the other disciples of the Resurrection, they sing the trope "*Victime paschali laudes immolant Christiani.*" The stage directions then indicate that their announcement to the disciples takes the form of the Latin liturgical drama, using the remainder of the *victime paschali* sequence. After this interlude, an equivalent scene is included in English, beginning with Peter's address, "How is it now, Marye, can ye telle/ Any newes which may lik vs welle?" (CR 692-93). Repetition of the Latin verse "*Scimus Christum*" at the end of the play also reveals its close connections to the church drama.

The Bodley e. Museo playwright combines these elements of the liturgical drama with the poetry of affective piety. His debt to sources such as the *Meditationes Vita Christi* of pseudo-Bonaventure, and the resulting tone of the plays have led their most recent editors to argue that they "are clearly not a throwback to the origins of drama in the liturgy, or in any sense a

---

33 Baker, Murphy and Hall 190. The editors print the entire sequence according to the Use of York in their footnotes; see 229 n.691.
development from them, but rather, the dramatization, on an ancient analogy, of contemporary meditational materials." This assessment seems to overlook the inclusion of the Latin sequence, which brings the drama closer to the liturgical tradition than mere analogy. Furthermore, since the rituals of the depositio, sepulchre watch, elevatio, and quem quaeritis were still going on in the sixteenth century, any liturgical connection, analogical or more direct, need not be exclusively an "ancient" one. With these cautions in mind, we can still appreciate the distinctly meditative qualities of Christ's Burial and Resurrection. Characters repeatedly encourage their audience to contemplate the sufferings of Christ, calling attention to the wounds on his body (CB 85-108, 266-321). The pieta, with Mary's lament, provides a final enumeration of the indignities wrought on Christ's body (CB 611-791).

The planctus spoken by the Virgin, Mary Magdalene and Peter are so violently emotional that the characters must be reminded that the Resurrection will follow, (or, in Mary Magdalene's case, that it has already occurred). In Christ's Resurrection, both Mary Magdalene and Peter lament their failings in lengthy consecutive monologues that model contrition. Mary Magdalene's continuing sorrow even after she has seen the angel, a typical feature of resurrection plays resulting from gospel harmonization, here has a unique motivation. Remiss in "dewty" and "diligence," she did not keep watch at the sepulchre. Had she "waytid wisely with humble

---

34 Baker, Murphy and Hall lxxxviii-lxxxix. For the play's connections to Pseudo-Bonaventure and other meditational treatises, see xc-xcii.
affiance,” she would have been rewarded with a sight of the Resurrection (204-09). Peter, who enters “fleins amare” (“weeping bitterly”), expresses a like remorse for his own lack of steadfastness:

Fulle of wo maye I bee, sorowfulle and pensyve,
Complenynge and wepinge with sorow inwertlee,
And wep bitter teres alle þe days of my life!
My vnstabille delinge is euer in myn ee.
I saide I wald not leve my master for to dee;
He said I shuld forsak hym or þe cok crow thris.
But I was presumptuose, vnware, and vnwise! (358-64)35

Physically overcome by his grief, he must be reminded by Andrew and John that they “shalle haue gud tidinges! This is þe thrid day!” (403). Furthermore, they assure him that their “gude master is mercifulle and graciose withalle” (437), and will forgive his failings. Peter’s exemplary penitence prompts John to remark, “This gret contrition of your hart, dowtlesse, / To God is plesant sacrifice” (406-07). Balancing the emotional outbursts of these mourning characters is a certainty of Christ’s imminent resurrection, an almost ahistorical assurance which heightens the meditative value of the plays.

Like the plays of the cathedrals and monasteries described thus far,

35 Peter’s repentance may show the influence of the French dramatic tradition, as the editors have noted: “The planctus of Peter presents an interesting problem, for though the tears of Peter are an ancient theme, and there is some treatment in the French drama, we have been unable to find elsewhere anything remotely parallel to this extensively developed episode.” Baker, Murphy and Hall xcii. But see Peter’s lament and Christ’s appearance to him in Chester 18/401-12 and Appendix 1D 60-80, as well as The Resurrection of Our Lord, 436-499, and discussion of the latter episode, pp. 126-32 below.
English parish plays of the resurrection were closely connected to the liturgical year. Records cited earlier specify Easter-tide productions at Dartmouth, Rye, Taunton, Witney, and four Thames valley parishes in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. During the first decades of the sixteenth century, St. Laurence, Reading presented its play on Easter Monday. It is likely that one of the two performances during “easter weke” in 1538 also was given on this day. The St. Mary’s, Thame Easter performance also involved two days, though the factors governing this division may have been practical rather than liturgical. The play itself took place on Easter Tuesday. In 1522 and 1530 payments were made for bread and ale not only for the performance, “the Recitac’ions of” the play itself, but also for a related activity, a “shewing” or “show,” of the play on the preceding Tuesday. This event may have been a rehearsal, or a dumb-show or tableaux-vivant given as advance publicity. Tuesday was market day in Thame, so many potential audience members in town for the day could have been attracted by a “teaser,” and reminded to return the following week for the Easter Tuesday performance.

Parish plays contained the traditional liturgical scenes, and sometimes

36 See above, pp. 18-20.
37 Berkshire RO D/P 97 5/2 1498-1626 p. 208.
38 Oxfordshire Archives, MSS DD Par Thame, c. 5, f. 76 and MSS DD Par Thame b. 2, p. 10.
41 The Banns for the Chester cycle and for the N-Town plays illustrate similar advance notice for a biblical production on a larger scale. I have addressed the Chester Banns above, pp. 42, 46-48. For discussion of the N-Town Banns, see p. 96 below.
drew on the biblical narrative for additional episodes. Liturgical emphases are evident in the records of the Taunton play, produced by the church of St. Mary Magdalene, which featured its patron saint in a performance of the hortulanus episode. In her 1504 will, Taunton parishioner Agnes Burton bequeathed two mantles "vnto the said Sepulcre service there . . . to thentent of Mary Magdalen play." However, records for two of the Thames valley parish plays indicate that they went beyond the liturgical material to provide some representation of the resurrection moment. A donation to St. Laurence, Reading in 1506-7 for "rosyn to the resurreccyon play" refers to a special effect for that moment. In his study of early theatrical pyrotechnics, Phillip Butterworth notes that "one of the simplest methods of producing an effect of lightning is to cast a powder such as rosin into or over a flame to produce a flash of fire." Perhaps the "fire pan," which the churchwardens purchased in 1520-21 along with other items for the Easter celebration, held the flame that the rosin was cast into. The Kingston-upon-Thames parish of All Saints' employed different technology, paying nine pence in 1521 for "a skin of parchment and gunpowder for the play on easter day." With these items, parishes could recreate the bright light that blinded the soldiers when Christ rose.

Records of parish drama thus indicate a mixture of devotional

---

42 Stokes and Alexander, vol. 1, 227.
43 Berkshire RO D/P 97 5/2 1498-1626, p. 29.
45 Berkshire RO D/P 97 5/2 1498-1626, p. 137.
46 Surrey RO KG 2/2/1, 1503-38, p. 100.
impulses, practical business sense, and a historical approach. The plays' fidelity to Easter week production, and their single-subject natures both reveal a debt to the Latin church drama, but in their deviation from liturgical episodic content they resemble the resurrection performances found in the French tradition and in the English "cycles."

C. "Historical" Resurrection Plays

The resurrection plays which depend primarily on the biblical narrative rather than the liturgy open up their theatrical worlds to include characters outside the band of disciples. Typically these are the high priests, Pilate, the Centurion and the soldiers who guard the sepulchre, though Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus also appear in some plays. Key differences between the "historical" resurrection plays appear in the relative culpability of the high priests and Pilate, the treatment of the resurrection moment, and the number and elaboration of post-resurrection appearances. Many of these treatments of the resurrection story such as those of the French drama, the Cornish Ordinalia, the civic cycles of Coventry, Chester and York, and the N-Town and Towneley manuscripts, are distinguished by their placement in a larger sequence of biblical episodes. Furthermore, these episodic productions usually took place under civic or other secular auspices rather than in a parish, cathedral, or chapel.47

47 Johnston, "Emerging Pattern" 19.
Continental Influences

The extent of the French impact on the English dramatic tradition is still being explored. Rosemary Woolf and Lynnette R. Muir have discussed similarities between the French and English biblical drama, and, more recently, Alexandra F. Johnston has demonstrated the likelihood that reports of French productions crossed the channel.\(^{48}\) English merchants, travellers, and noblemen with properties in France could easily have seen performances of the plays, for the Burgundy region, home to several surviving texts, was a common destination for fifteenth-century English merchants, while cities like Paris, home of the *Passion Sainte-Genevieve* (ca. 1380) and the great four-day *Passion* of Arnoul Greban (ca. 1450) were English possessions for almost twenty years following after Henry V's 1415 victory at Agincourt.\(^{19}\)

Often embedded in large Passion plays, the surviving French resurrection texts span several centuries, from the *Passion du Palatinus*, which dates from the end of the thirteenth century, to the sixteenth-century *Resurreccion du Jesuschrist* by Eloy du Mont.\(^{50}\) In addition to the events of Holy Week, some Passion plays included Old Testament episodes and scenes from the nativity, ministry and Ascension. These versions were performed

\(^{19}\) Johnston "Continental Connection" 13.  
over several days. Plays which spanned four or more days, such as the Passion d'Arras, Greban's play, and the seven-day Passion d'Auvergne, followed the traditional liturgical division, breaking after the Deposition to present the Resurrection on the following day. Jean Gray Wright identifies and analyzes episodes and details shared among the plays in her thorough diachronic study of the Resurrection in early French drama. Some of these episodes were incorporated in English dramas as well, in analogues that suggest cross-Channel cultural currents, or use of similar source material (or both). These include the pieta after Christ is taken from the cross, a sympathetic portrayal of Pilate, the imprisonment of Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, their subsequent divine release from prison which parallels the Harrowing of Hell, the expansion of Christ's teachings on the road to Emmaus into a sermon, and additional post-resurrection appearances to the Virgin, to all three Marys, and to Peter.

The twelfth-century Anglo-Norman play La Seinte Resurreccion, which survives in manuscripts from Paris and Canterbury, is an early

---

51 Jean Gray Wright, Themes of the Resurrection in Medieval French Drama, (Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta, 1935).
52 See Wright 41-49 for this theme in the Passion de Semur and Passion d'Arras; see also Resurrection du Jesuschrist 896-984.
53 See Wright 61 and Resurrection du Jesuschrist 1469-1651.
54 See Wright 52-55 for this theme in the Passion d' Arras and Passion de Greban.
55 See Wright 55-58 for this theme in the Passion d'Arras and Passion de Greban.
56 See Wright 133-34 for this theme in the Passion d'Arras and Passion de Greban.
57 See Wright 134-35 for the appearances to the Virgin in Passion de Greban; for appearances to the three Marys in the Resurrection de Ste. Genevieve, Passion d'Arras and Passion de Greban; and for appearances to Peter in Passion d'Arras and Passion de Greban. All three types of post-resurrection appearances also occur in Resurrection du Jesuschrist, see 2534-679, 3100-54, 3292-351.
example of historically-based resurrection drama. Its incomplete text dramatizes episodes from Joseph’s request for Christ’s body to the setting of the guard before it breaks off. As a result, we do not know if the full text was a single-day production, or if the Resurrection and following episodes were part of a second day’s performance. The stage directions at the beginning of the performance specify mansions for hell, the three Marys, Galilee and Emmaus, indicating that the Harrowing and at least three post-resurrection appearances were part of the play. Its treatment of the Longinus episode portrays Pilate negatively, but also illustrates cross-Channel influence. Pilate imprisons Longinus in order to silence his witness to Christ’s power. Since later French plays showed the incarceration and miraculous freeing of Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, it is likely that a similar release of Longinus took place in the missing portion of this Anglo-Norman play.

A. C. Cawley has suggested that La Seinte Resurrection, or a text like it, was the play performed next to Beverly Minster in Yorkshire’s East Riding. Appended to a life of the minster’s patron saint, St. John of Beverly, is a narrative of a miracle that accompanied a resurrection play sometime between 1188 and 1213. The performance was not part of the Easter season, and instead took place “ut tempore quodam aestivo intra septa polyandri

---

58 Paris BN MS Fr 902, and London BM Additional MS 45103 (w). For the Anglo-Norman text and an English translation, see Bevington 122-36.
ecclesiae Beati Johannis, ex parte aquilonari" ("one summer, within the
grave-yard of the church of the Blessed John, on the north side"). There,
"larvatorum (ut assolet) et verbis et actu fieret representaio Dominicae
resurrectionis" ("the resurrection of the Lord was presented by masked
persons (as usual) in both words and action"). The scribe's phrase "ut
assolet" ("as usual") may mean that the players' masks were a performance
commonplace, or that the play itself was a recurring event. We would have
no record of this production had a curious boy not fallen from the triforium
of the church where he had climbed in order to get a better view. Landing on
the floor of the nave below, he appeared to be dead, but miraculously revived,
providing a witness to the Resurrection inside the church which
accompanied the dramatic witness outside.

Another play connected to the French tradition, the Middle Cornish
Ordinalia, dramatizes the Resurrection within a larger biblical context. For
many years, scholars have accepted the arguments of David C. Fowler, who
demonstrated from references to place names and from Cornish sound-
changes that the plays came from the town of Penryn, c. 1375, and that they

---

61 Both the Latin narrative, as published by James Raine in 1879, and a translation by Diana
Wyatt are printed in an Appendix to Badir's article; see Badir 38-41.
62 Badir 40.
63 The Cornish Ordinalia; A Medieval Dramatic Trilogy, ed. and trans. Markham Harris
(Washington D.C., Catholic U of America P, 1969). All quotations from the play are taken
from this modernized translation, and identified by page number in footnotes. For the Cornish
text (and an older translation), see The Ancient Cornish Drama, ed. and trans. Edwin Norris, 2
were probably written by a canon of Glasney Collegiate Church. More recently, Gloria Betcher has argued that the ravages of the 1349 plague outbreak in Penryn would have made a performance of the large-scale Ordinalia virtually impossible, and she suggests that the plays might have originated instead in or near Bodmin, between 1395 and 1419.

The Ordinalia follows the structural and episodic pattern of the French Passions in many respects. Spanning three days, it consists of as many plays: the Ordinale de Origine Mundi, Passio Nostri Domini Ihesu Christi, and Ordinale de Resurrexion Domini. Old Testament episodes begin the sequence, which culminates with the Ascension. These affinities with the continental tradition, and the play’s linguistic distance from English drama, may suggest that the Ordinalia stands outside the English resurrection play tradition. Reacting against a view that the plays are a Cornish equivalent of the English civic cycles, Ordinalia scholars like Brian O. Murdoch have emphasized the Cornish works’ disconnection from English drama:

The language of these plays is not English, nor are they adaptations of English plays. In content, structure and staging there are considerable differences between the Cornish works and the English plays with which they most readily invite

---

comparison.66

However, the plays did not exist in a Cornish vacuum. English lines do appear in the *Ordinalia*; among these is a haunting lyric sung by the three Marys as they approach the tomb: "ellas mornyngh y syng mornyngh yr cal / our lord ys deyd that bogthe ous al."67 In some areas of eastern Cornwall, English was already widely spoken by the late fourteenth century, and trade with other parts of the country would have brought English speaking residents of west-country counties to Cornish towns like Bodmin.68 We know that performances of the Resurrection were taking place in the West Country churches and cathedrals of Somerset and Devon.69 These factors argue that the Easter sequence in the *Ordinalia* should also be considered as one representative of the resurrection play tradition in England. As Betcher urges, we should "accept the idea of the drama as appealing to a diverse audience from throughout Cornwall and beyond its shores."70

Although its Easter episodes appear in the context of a larger biblical drama, the *Ordinalia* still divides its narrative according to liturgical tradition, after the burial of Christ's body, which includes a *pieta* like the Bodley e. Museo *Burial* and some French plays. Rubrics separate the *Ordinale de Resurrexione Domini* into three episodes: the Resurrection, the *Mors*

---

67 Harris 266 n.5.
68 Betcher 448.
69 For references to the plays at Taunton in Devon and at Dartmouth and Wells in Somerset, see pp. 19, 74 and 81 above.
70 Betcher 449.
Pilati, and the Ascension. The high priests are notably absent from the resurrection playlet, leaving Pilate, who is all too aware of the resurrection prophesies, as the major villain of the piece. His centrality prepares for his grisly death in the next section of the play. Pilate imprisons Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus, but angels release the men after the Spirit of Christ has harrowed Hell. When the soldiers report the Resurrection, Pilate's harangue is shortened by the embarrassing discovery that his own prisoners, Nicodemus and Joseph, have also disappeared.

The Resurrection itself takes place as angels sing "Christus resurgens." While the actor playing Christ does not speak, stage directions imply some physical improvisation on his part, for after Christ emerges from the tomb the directions generously grant that "he shall go wherever he pleases." Later comments from the soldiers refer to the bright light that accompanied the moment, and also reveal the scene's debt to iconographic tradition. The second soldier complains "I felt his foot on my back as he came out of his grave," a gesture which symbolized victory over the secular world, while the third soldier observes that Christ was carrying a "banner with a cross on it."

Post-resurrection appearances in the *Ordinalia* include Christ's encounters with his mother, Mary Magdalene, the disciples, and Thomas. The Marys expect to find Christ risen, and the apostles accept their report with alacrity, with the exception of an extremely stubborn and hostile Thomas,

---

71 Harris 191.
72 Harris 193.
who departs in disgust. Christ subsequently appears, and though all the 
disciples are present, the scene emphasizes Peter's repentance:

   Peter: Lord of heaven and earth and our Savior, forgive my trespass 
      which has brought me such great sorrow. I repent my denial to 
      the bottom of my soul, imploring your mercy from a full heart. 

   Jesus: You shall obtain forgiveness, Peter, through the power of the 
      Holy Ghost, for your repentance is perfect. And even as I 
      redeemed you at so great a price, do you fortify your brethren in 
      the true faith.\textsuperscript{73}

A brief treatment of the Emmaus episode follows, in which Luke and 
Cleophas display a confidence in the Resurrection similar to that of the 
Marys, though they do not recognize Christ.

   By characterizing most of Christ's followers as hopeful and quick to 
accept the Resurrection, the play underscores Thomas' change of heart. A 
hardheaded realist, he contradicts each disciple who speaks of the miraculous 
event. His criticism of Magdalene as a sinner whose report cannot be trusted 
provokes her to remind him that she is a \textit{repentant} sinner. The exchange 
between Peter and Christ provides another example of humility, penitence, 
and faith to set against Thomas' doubt. This progression of repentant 
resurrection witnesses contrasts with Thomas' reiterated disbelief, and gives a 
strong sense of climax to his eventual encounter with Christ. After this 
meeting, Christ blesses his apostles and rubrics declare, "And so ends the

\textsuperscript{73} Harris 209-10.
Resurrection of Our Lord."  

Civic Cycles

Information about the resurrection play as it appeared in civic cycles comes primarily from the cities of Coventry, Chester and York. No text of the Coventry play survives, but we can ascertain some of its features from the records of the Cappers' guild, which was responsible for the play from 1534 until the cycle's last performance in 1579. Recurring payments to singers suggest musical accompaniment of the resurrection moment, while payments to those responsible for keeping "ye wynd" indicate that some kind of windlass allowed divine characters to descend and ascend. Payments to actors reveal that the pageant included a scene between the high priests and Pilate, the watch on the sepulchre, the Harrowing of Hell, the *quem quaeritis* episode, and possibly an appearance to the Virgin. By 1552, the pageant had expanded to contain the *peregrini* material, as well, and the guild had to invest in the "castell of emaus" and "makyng new of ye plea bok." The

---

74 Harris 220.
75 Before 1534 the pageant was the responsibility of the Cardmakers and Saddlers; the Cappers began to contribute towards its expenses in 1531, and effectively took responsibility for the pageant three years later, when detailed records for its expenses begin to appear in their accounts; see Ingram, *Coventry* 139-40. For a detailed examination and interpretation of the Cappers' records, see Ingram, "To find the pleyers" 17-44.
76 The guild consistently reimbursed players for the roles of Pilate, four knights, two bishops, God (which presumably is Christ), the spirit of God, a demon, two angels, Mary Magdalene, and two "syde Maryes." The Virgin's role disappears in 1547. Two other curious roles appear in some years: the Mother of Death, and the Dead Man, both of which appear to be doubled with God's role; see, for example, Ingram, *Coventry* 139-40 (for 1534) and 275 (for 1576).
77 Payments to these participants are consistent over the life of the pageant; see, for example, Ingram, *Coventry* 150 (for 1539), 185-86 (for 1550) and 223 (for 1563).
78 Ingram, *Coventry* 191.
Cappers’ play thus erased the traditional boundaries between discrete liturgical episodes, and consolidated all of the Easter narrative into one pageant.

In contrast, the Chester and York civic cycles both divide their Easter narrative into multiple pageants, breaking the overarching narrative at traditional liturgical points. In Chester, the burial and resurrection sequence thus encompasses four plays: the Passion, Harrowing of Hell, Resurrection, and the Emmaus play, which also includes the Doubting Thomas episode.\textsuperscript{79} From at least 1531, Chester presented its cycle over three days in Whitsun week, breaking like the Cornish \textit{Ordinalia} before the resurrection play, presented on the third day.

The Chester Pilate bears a resemblance to his Cornish cousin, already aware of the possibilities of further trouble from Christ. “I dread yett lest hee will us greeve” (25) he worries, and later admits, “Forsooth, this I hard him saye: / that hee would ryse the thyrd daye” (18/102-03). Though the high priests are present in this play, it is still Pilate who initiates a discussion about the “parrell” that might ensue from the Crucifixion (18/34, 48).

The event which Pilate so fears, the Resurrection, retains visual and musical traditions in its dramatic development, but also incorporates a short speech by Christ. Stage directions include the angelic anthem “\textit{Christus resurgens},” and insist on the same iconographic pose alluded to in the

\textsuperscript{79} R. M. Lumiansky and David Mills, eds., \textit{The Chester Mystery Cycle}, 2 vols., EETS ss 3 and 9 (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1974 and 1986). The editors number these pageants XVIA-XIX. All quotations will be taken from this edition and identified by play and line number.
Ordinalia: "Jesus resurgens et pede eos milites quatiat." (18/153+SD). Christ's address to the audience is a departure from the French and Latin traditions, and provides an opportunity for instruction from Christ's own mouth. He briefly refers to the price he has paid for mankind, but focuses primarily on the Eucharist, giving a Protestant emphasis to the sacrament. In the version provided in extant manuscripts, Christ explains that the bread "becomes [his] fleshe through [man's] beleeffe / and doth release [our] synfull band" (18/176-77). Since all of the extant Chester manuscripts postdate the suppression of the cycle, it is impossible to tell when this Protestant phrasing was introduced. It may have been part of revisions undertaken for the 1575 staging. Certain earlier versions of the play referred instead to transubstantiation; according to the complaints of Christopher Goodman in 1572, the play asserted that the bread "becomen is [Christ's] fleshe / throgh wordes 5 betwyxt the prestes handes."  

Though one of the surviving manuscripts terminates the resurrection play awkwardly in the midst of the hortulanus sequence, two others complete the pageant. These manuscripts, both from the Harley collection, incorporate virtually every scene used in the liturgical drama, resulting in the most comprehensive resurrection play in the English tradition. The quem quaeeritis sequence is followed by Mary's report to Peter and John, and their

---

parenthetically in the text. For consistency's sake, I have converted the play numbers into Arabic numerals.

80 See the discussion of the Chester cycle in the 1570s, pp. 44-49 above.
81 Mills, Recycling the Cycle 182.
82 The two manuscripts are BL Harley 2013, copied in 1600 by George Bellin, and BL Harley 2124, which dates from 1607.
race to the tomb. Christ appears to Mary Magdalene, to the three Marys together, and then to Peter, an unusual inclusion in the English tradition.

The peregrini pageant also combines a number of episodes from the Easter Monday liturgical drama into one play. The Emmaus scene includes some elaboration in Christ’s reference to the prophesies of the Messiah; as in the French drama, he reminds Cleophas and Luke of the burning bush as a symbol of the virgin birth, and reminds them of Isaiah’s prophesy. Their return to the disciples, his appearance to the entire group, and a brief treatment of the Doubting Thomas episode round out the play.

The York cycle portrays fewer resurrection episodes than either the Ordinalia or Chester, and divides the material into four pageants: Resurrection, Christ’s Appearance to Mary Magdalene, the Supper at Emmaus, and the Incredulity of Thomas. The high priests approach Pilate with their concerns about grave robbery and request watch for the sepulchre. As in the Latin and French drama, Christ rises without speaking, accompanied by angel song. The cycle is unique in assigning an individual play to the hortulanus episode, but contains far less elaboration in its treatment of the Emmaus episode than does the Chester cycle. The Thomas episode is also rather brief, but does involve an introductory planctus from Thomas, and a short debate about the possibility of Christ’s resurrection between Thomas and the leading apostles: Peter, James and John. York’s

---

83 The pageants are numbered XXXVIII-XLI in Beadle’s edition. For consistency’s sake, I will refer to them with Arabic numerals.
resurrection sequence influenced that of Towneley, but the latter bears far more structural similarities to single-subject resurrection plays, as we shall see.

Play Collections

As noted above, recent scholarship on the Towneley and N-Town plays argues that these collections are compilations and syntheses of pre-existing and purpose-written plays. Study of the resurrection play forms in either manuscript is complicated by the scribes' re-arrangement of source plays into new structures. Alan Fletcher has questioned the scholarly attempts to tease out "original" forms in compilations like N-Town; he argues that "seeking to excavate earlier textual structures, though informative, is finally an unachievable task and one indifferent to the possibility that the compilation they have been built into might have a structure of its own, whether planned or fortuitous." However, by treating the manuscripts as palimpsests, we can appreciate both the "original" form of the resurrection play and the structure (or structures) that the compiler cast it into; both are part of the resurrection play tradition.

The N-Town manuscript has been called a "library" of plays, and Peter Meredith has attempted to isolate two of the larger components in his

---

84 See pp. 98-99 below.
editions of the Mary sequence and the two-part Passion play. The resurrection sequence is particularly interesting, because it comprises three approaches to the genre: an "original" series of pageants described by the Banns, the play that results from the scribe’s efforts to synthesize the Passion play with the episodes immediately following, and a later adaptation of the material into what appears to be a free-standing production.

The Banns at the beginning of the manuscript indicate where breaks occurred in one long play cycle, though the cycle mentioned in the Banns often differs from the scribe’s compiled text. However, the Banns do provide a witness to one dramatic version of the Resurrection. Joseph obtains and buries the body, and the watch is set in the thirty-second pageant of the Banns. Christ’s Harrowing, begun in pageant 31, is completed in pageant 33, and he rises, and appears to his mother. The next pageant includes the quem quaeritis section, the Marys’ report to the apostles and the race of Peter and John. Another pageant includes the hortulanus, while the Emmaus and Thomas episodes each are contained in pageants of their own.

This order is not the one followed by the scribe, who appears to have pieced together material from the end of Passion Play II with other texts, masking, or at least downplaying, the fissures between the various sources. Peter Meredith has suggested that the romance and octave stanza forms which begin to appear at the end of the Passion sequence show the scribe’s use

---

of "a different kind of copy, in all likelihood the pageant material reflected in the proclamation." 87 These forms predominate from the second part of the setting of the watch through the rest of the resurrection episodes, so it seems likely that they were copied from the Proclamation play sources with minimal alteration. In the Emmaus and Thomas sequence, however, some alteration may have occurred, or the scribe may have relied on a source different from the collection described by the Banns. While the Banns divide the material into two individual pageants, the text as we have it is one "self-contained and complete Easter play that might have been played by a parish during Easter Week." 88

Beyond these traces of previous texts, we have evidence that a later reviser also was interested in the resurrection plays as freestanding productions. Meredith and Kahrl note that "[a]ll his alterations are in the direction of prompt copy, suggesting that these groups of plays were produced separately at some time after the copy was made. He seems to have tried to set up the resurrection plays as two self-contained units to be put on in two separate days." 89 The beginning of the first day corresponds to the resurrection plays of the other cycles; "incipit hic" marks Caiaphas' cautionary words to Pilate about setting a watch. "Finem prima die" marks a unique break, however, after the resurrection and the report of the soldiers, but just before

87 Meredith, Passion Play 245-46.
88 Johnston, "Emerging Pattern" 18.
the *quem quaeritis* sequence. This episode begins the second day, the end of which appears to correspond to the end of the appearance to Mary Magdalene. In dividing the resurrection itself from Christ's subsequent appearances, the reviser flouted the liturgical association of both events with a single day—Easter Sunday. However, his division does separate the historical/biblical material from those episodes treated in liturgical drama. The Emmaus/Thomas play, which shows some signs of his attention, may have been presented as a third play in his newly-created resurrection sequence.

Though the presence of freestanding plays in the N-town manuscript has been noted for some time, efforts to discern individual texts in the Towneley collection are more recent. Alexandra Johnston has discerned pre-existing resurrection plays within their embedded positions in this collection. I would like to build on her comments, suggesting an alternative form for the Towneley compiler’s source materials.

As the Towneley resurrection sequence stands, it contains three pageants, entitled *Resurrectio Domini*, *Peregrini* and *Thomas of Inde*. *Resurrectio Domini*, like other plays in the Towneley collection, is related to its counterpart in the York Cycle with which it shares some three hundred lines. The two plays may be revisions of a common original. Passages contained only in Towneley include a six-stanza opening rant by Pilate (1-36), part of the Centurion’s speech (51-75), a brief exchange among the soldiers as they arrange themselves at the tomb (218-29), Christ’s long resurrection

---

90 Stevens and Cawley 600.
speech (230-350), and a hortulanus episode, which ends the play (580-659). The first and last stanzas of Christ’s speech echo parts of the address to the audience in Chester, and retain the emphasis on transubstantiation that Goodman noted in earlier versions of that pageant. Within this frame, however, the complaint draws on a fifteenth-century lyric, “Thou Sinful Man that By Me Goes.” Rosemary Woolf relates the lyric analogue to the medieval imago pietatis, and speculates that the Towneley staging might have drawn on this image, “in which a half-length Christ as Man of Sorrows emerges from the tomb, perhaps supported by angels.” If Woolf is correct, the stage picture of the Towneley Resurrection would differ significantly from that at Chester, where the stage directions proscribed an iconographic posture of dominance.

The titles of the next two plays, Peregrini and Thomas of Inde, refer to Easter Monday appearances. The latter play contains Mary’s report to the disciples, Christ’s appearance to all the apostles, and finally presents its eponymous doubting subject as something of a dandy in an extensive argument with all of the disciples, who are identified here by number, rather than name. After seeing and touching Christ, Thomas casts away his

---

93 A curious feature of the Towneley resurrection group is its inclusion of Paul among the apostles.
94 Chester Scoville offers insight into the development of this episode in “The Rhetoric of the Saints in Middle English Biblical Drama,” diss. U of Toronto, 2000, 46-59. He describes the play as a “debate whose rhetoric is precise, argumentative, progressive, and doomed to deliberate failure,” and argues that it demonstrates the importance of “physical, panegyric, pathetic proof”; Scoville 59.
"gyrdill gay and purs of sylk / And cote" (601-02), begging for mercy. The play concludes with a speech from Christ that forgives his disbelieving apostle and looks forward to the General Resurrection at Doomsday.

Despite the titles, the breaks between plays as they appear in the manuscript vary somewhat from the pattern that had been established by liturgical plays. Mary’s report to the apostles was an elaboration on the Easter Sunday quem quaecritis, while the liturgical presentations of peregrini and Thomas took place on Easter Monday. The Peregrini play in the Towneley manuscript also breaks a natural progression from the hortulanus episode to Mary’s report to the apostles at the beginning of Thomas of Inde. As Stevens and Cawley note, Play 28 picks up directly from the end of Play 26, the Resurrection, when Mary Magdalene prepares for her meeting with the apostles.

Play 27 is, consequently, an intruder in the narrative sequence, though some editorial effort seems to have been made to assimilate it.95

Johnston argues that the hortulanus sequence in Resurrectio Domini and Thomas of Inde comes from a single play based on the Easter narrative from the Gospel of John. The Towneley compiler split this play into two parts, and inserted a peregrini pageant based on the account in Luke, which “then can be seen as a ‘stand-alone’ Easter play on this episode to be played on Easter

95 Stevens and Cawley 617.
Monday as a supplement to the liturgy of the day." An error in rubrication provides further evidence that Resurrectio Domini and Thomas of Inde draw on the same dramatic text, for the rubricator mistakenly repeated the title "Resurrecio domi" at the beginning of the Thomas play. A sixteenth-century hand has corrected this title to conform to the explicit on f. 117r, which reads "Thomas of Inde." 

It is also possible that the Towneley compiler inserted Peregrini into a two-part Easter play that followed the traditional liturgical division. The first day's play would have extended from the beginning of Towneley 26 to the end of Mary's scene with the Apostles. Johnston's analysis suggests that the hortulanus and the episodes that follow it come from a different source than the material shared between Towneley and York. Certainly there is some awkwardness in the transition into the Magdalene episode. A new ten-line stanza form interrupts the six-line tail-rhyme stanza used uniformly for the first part of the play, and Mary's request for the body of Christ appears in both verse patterns (585-90, 589-95), suggesting awkward incorporation of duplicate material. However, the play returns to the tail-rhyme stanza, metrically uniting the hortulanus to the earlier episodes shared with York. Another six-line form begins Play 28, and Cawley and Stevens see this continuity as further evidence of a link between the Resurrection and the report of Mary to

---

96 Johnston, "Emerging Pattern" 19.
98 The rubricator was probably be the main scribe; see Cawley and Stevens ii.
Another awkward transition after Mary’s last words to the Apostles points to a break in the narrative, and to the end of the first play. Her announcement of the Resurrection at the beginning of play 28 meets with over fifty lines of disbelief. Peter responds initially with the rebuke “Do way, woman, thou carpys wast!” (7), and Paul supports him with misogynistic fervour. When Mary insists her story is true, Peter mocks her:

I dar lay my heede to wed,
Or that we go vntill oure bed,
That we shall here anothere. (56-58)

However, at line 65, the stanza form changes, and so does Peter’s attitude:

Waloway, my lefe deres!
There I stand in this sted,
Sich sorow my hart sheres,
For rewth I can no red.
Sen that Mawdleyn witnes beres
That Iesus rose from ded,
Myn ees has letten salt teres,
On erthe to se hym trede. (65-72)

Since Peter has expressed only derision for Mary’s announcement, his description of the sadness that has seized him “sen that Mawdleyn witnes beres” is rather abrupt. Stevens and Cawley explain this “inconsistency” as

---

99 Stevens and Cawley 617.
the result of "careless editing of the two originally disparate parts." The lament would work more effectively as the opening of an Easter Monday play on Thomas. Perhaps the explicit accurately reflected the title of the play the scribe was copying by the end of Towneley 28.

Christus Redivivus

Nicholas Grimald's Christus Redivivus is something of an anomaly within the resurrection play genre: a Latin play that is not part of the liturgical drama. Instead the play melds the biblical account with classical elements. Written around 1540 when the author was at Brasenose College, it is one of the earliest surviving examples of humanist biblical drama composed by university students in the sixteenth century. In his dedicatory epistle, Grimald explains that the young men of Brasenose encouraged him to complete the play, already a work in progress, "quô & suos excitarent animos, & civibus imaginem quandam uitæ spectandam exhiberent" ("that they might stimulate their minds, and that they might give some representation of life to the citizens"). We do not know if the play ultimately received an Oxford performance, but it was popular in Germany, where editions

---

100 Stevens and Cawley 619.
101 For other examples of university biblical drama, see pp. 36 and 55 n.92, above.
102 Nicholas Grimald, "Epistola Nuncupatoria," The Life and Poems of Nicholas Grimald, ed. L. R. Merrill. Yale Studies in English 69 (New Haven: Yale; London: Oxford UP, 1925) 98-99. Since Grimald's play is known by its Latin title, I have also referred to his dedicatory epistle by its Latin title. All quotations from the play are taken from this edition and identified by page number in footnotes; English quotations are also from Merrill's translation, which appears on facing pages with the Latin text.
103 Though Merrill states that it was presented, and assumes that this production took place at Easter, he acknowledges that no records of a university performance survive; see Merrill 58, 61.
appeared in Cologne (1543 and 1548) and in Augsburg (1556). The latter publication probably coincided with an April production at Augsburg’s St. Anna gymnasium. Several recensions later, Grimald’s play also served as a base for the Oberamammergau Passion Play.

The popularity of Christus Redivivus in Germany is partly attributable to its incorporation of classical and humanist learning as well as reformist ideas. Well aware of the classical expectations that drama should observe the unities of space and time, Grimald defends his dramaturgical variations in his dedication:

Ac si quis miretur, uel quòd plurium dierum historiam atque diversa tempora, in unam & eandem actionem coëgerim, uel quòd funestum & perluctuosum principium, tam plausibilem sortiatur exitum: eum intelligere debere, me autorem sequi M. Actium Plautum, cuius præter alias, Capteiei & compluribus interiectis diebus agi fingatur, & ex initio mesto in lœtum etia finem transeunt.

His play observes the unity of place, for the sets “can be reduced to one stage setting,” and “if anyone is surprised” at his handling of time and emotional

---

105 Civic documents attest to this production, as did a cast list and German arguments for each act, pencilled on the flyleaf of a copy of the Augsburg edition. Merrill prints the relevant civic accounts as well as the cast list and arguments in his edition, a fortunate inclusion, as von Rosador notes that the Augsburg copy was destroyed during the Second World War. See Merrill, 62-66, von Rosador 8.
106 For a discussion of the relationship between these two texts, see Merrill 67-89.
107 Merrill 108-110.
tone, he ought to understand that [Grimald] follow[s] Plautus, whose play, the Captivi, above all, is represented as taking place during the interval of several days, and passes moreover from a sad beginning to a happy ending."\textsuperscript{108} Other classical aspects of the play include oaths by Hercules,\textsuperscript{109} a reference to demons as "malè Erynnis," or furies,\textsuperscript{110} an appearance by the goddess Alecto, who counsels Caiaphas,\textsuperscript{111} and Mary Magdalene's request that the apostles trust her report of the Resurrection, "hæc ut folia Sibyllæ credite," or, as they would a Sybilline oracle.\textsuperscript{112}

Also classical in origin is the play's five-act structure. Grafting the Easter story to this framework, Grimald follows the liturgical models by reserving individual acts for the events of Good Friday and Easter Monday. His first act depicts Christ's followers mourning after the burial, and the last act centers on the Doubting Thomas episode. The central three, which contain events from the high priest's conference with Pilate to the bribery of the soldiers, roughly follow the action of historically-oriented resurrection plays like those of Chester and York, with the exception of a brief portrayal of the Harrowing of Hell. Grimald's own arguments, which open each act, emphasize additional points of division. The argument for act three, for example, tells the audience, "You have heard all the events of the two days;

\textsuperscript{108} Merrill 109-11.
\textsuperscript{109} See Dromo's oath, "meherculè", and Peter's, "hercle"; Merrill 138, 160. Peter's oath comes before he has fully acknowledged the Resurrection, and may indicate his lack of faith.
\textsuperscript{110} Merrill 154-55
\textsuperscript{111} Merrill 184-89
\textsuperscript{112} Merrill 176-77.
the third day dawns," calling attention to the biblical/historical time frame which tells us that the conference of the high priests and the setting of the watch happened on Saturday. These arguments are delivered by an expositor figure, who tells the audience at the outset of act one, "I shall be a spectator of the play with you."

Despite efforts of several critics, who have attempted to link Christus Redivivus to the resurrection sequence in the N-Town collection or to the Bodley e. Museo plays, Grimald's text does not appear to draw directly on any of the other extant English resurrection plays. Given the popularity of resurrection plays at the parish level and their appearance in cycle dramas at Coventry, York and Chester, it is likely that the playwright was aware of other dramas on his subject and may have even seen a performance. However, coincidences in episodic content with the historically-based plays may also be a result of common source material.

A clearer debt, though one that remains unacknowledged in Grimald's dedication, is owed to the humanist Nicolaus Barptolemaeus Lochiensis, whose play Christus Xylonicus (Christ Crucified) saw publication in 1529, 1537 and 1541. A reference in Christus Redivivus to "Christ, who died upon the

---

115 "Ego ubiscum una spectator ero fabulæ"; Merrill 118-19.
117 The 1529 edition was published in Paris, while the latter two editions appeared in Antwerp and Cologne, respectively. For discussion of the relationship between Christus Xylonicus and Christus Redivivus, see von Rosador 9 and F. W. Boas, University Drama in the Tudor Age (Oxford: Clarendon, 1914) 28-29.
tree,” or “Christus xylonicum,” invokes Barptolemaeus’ play, and prepares us for the subsequent appearance of Alecto.118 This character appears in the earlier play as a troublemaking goddess who tempts Judas to suicide; in Grimald’s play, she gloats, “Num tibi restim / Ipsa ferebam / Perdite Iuda?” (“Lost Judas, did not I myself bring thee rope?”) 119 Chronological continuity further unites the two plays: Christus Xylonicus concludes at the burial of Christ, while Christus Redivivus opens in the garden, shortly thereafter.120 Perhaps Grimald envisioned his play as a sequel to Barptolemaeus’ work.

Along with its determinedly classical and humanistic bent, the reformist teachings of Christus Redivivus distinguish it as a different contribution to the resurrection play tradition. John Bale, another reforming dramatist, praised the author for expressing his faith “tam scriptis quam viva voce,” or “as much as in writing as in speaking,” and noted that Grimald “salutatem in unico servatore Iesu sitam esse, ferventer & ostendit & docuit,” or “fervently showed and taught that our salvation is alone in Jesus our Savior.”121 In Christus Redivivus this teaching comes from Christ’s own lips in his commission to the disciples:

In omnes mundi regiones penetrabitis,

Et ubiq; gentium eritis rerum coelestium

116 Merrill 180-81.
119 Merrill 184-85.
120 Boas 29.
121 John Bale, Scriptorum Illustrium Maioris Britannie...Catalogus 701. Qtd. Merril 15-17 and tr. Merrill 17-19. However, Grimald’s commitment to Protestantism proved less than firm. Evidence suggests that he betrayed Protestant martyrs Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley and recanted when he himself was imprisoned; see Merrill 36-51.
Nuncij: ut (si fieri possit) unusquilibet
Me mortuum sibi, me rediuiuum sibi putet.
Nihil opus erit, uetustas ceremonias,
Aut uictimas retinere, aut sacrificia.
Qui uiuida nixus fide, persuaserit
Sibi, quòd gratis una & sola morte mea,
Delicta & scelera remittuntur omnia,
Doniq; signum huius aqua tinctus habuerit,
Et amori meo mutua responderit
Voluntate: is, quicunq; est, nil quidquam hæsitans,
Cœlum ut patriam nostro ex promisso uendicet.

Go ye, therefore, unto all the regions of the world; everywhere
shall ye be messengers of things celestial, so if it be that anyone
believe I died for him and lived again for him, there shall be no
need of old-time ceremonies, or observing burnt offerings and
sacrifices. He who, relying on a living faith, hath convinced
himself that by my death alone all his sins are freely remitted,
who, being bathed with water, has the sign of this gift, and has
answered my love with mutual affection, let him, whosoever he
is, from our promise claim heaven as his home, with no
uncertainty.\textsuperscript{122}

\textsuperscript{122} Merrill 210-11. Von Rosador identifies this passage as positive evidence for the play as
As Christ commissions his disciples to be messengers of the "living faith," the audience receives the same charge. The biblical sources for Christ’s charge and promise contain no reference to Jewish rituals and law; this repudiation of "old-time ceremonies" and "sacrifice" added by Grimald constitutes an attack on the Mass. Disciples and audience are thus instructed to spread a distinctly reformist doctrine. The commission counters Caiphas, who rehearses the bribed soldiers in the "correct" version of Christ’s disappearance: "dic mihi bona & Iudaica fide, / Iesus in busto cur non repertus est?" “Tell me in good faith, Jewish faith, why Jesus was not found in the tomb.”123 The question and practiced response resembles a catechism, an echo which suggests parallels between the high priests and Catholic clergy. Caiphas also praises the soldiers for not continuing in the "hærisi," or heresy.124 While most English resurrection plays include Pilate in this scene, Grimald all but excludes him from the action of Christus Redivivus. His dramaturgical decision emphasizes the priest’s culpability and downplays secular responsibility for the attempts to thwart and cover up Christ’s resurrection. A similar technique is present in the other Protestant resurrection play that survives, The Resurrection of Our Lord.

123 Merrill 192-93.
124 Merrill 192-95.
V. *The Resurrection of Our Lord*

A. Structure and Characterization

*The Resurrection of Our Lord* combines elements from both branches of the tradition outlined above. Like the liturgically-oriented *Shrewsbury Fragments*, the Bodley e. Museo plays, and, perhaps, the 1521 Easter play at St. Laurence, Reading, *The Resurrection of Our Lord* falls into two parts; running titles identify “The First Dayes Playe” and “The Seconde Dayes Playe.” However, its point of division differs from the standard established by plays on the liturgical model. The break between the two plays occurs within a pair of leaves which have been lost, but it is clear from the context that the first play should end with the bribery of the soldiers. The second play commences with Peter’s remorse and Christ’s appearance to him, and moves subsequently to the Emmaus and Thomas episodes. While the Bodley e. Museo plays, the Chester cycle, and several French plays include Peter’s repentance or his encounter with the risen Christ, these episodes typically appear as part of the resurrection sequence, rather than as part of the *Peregrini* material. Rosemary Woolf notes that “common tradition placed this appearance on Easter Sunday.”¹ By assigning this scene to “The Seconde Dayes Playe,” the play breaks this traditional (and liturgical) model. Johnston suggests that this choice, “in conscious defiance of the liturgical pattern,” might be related to the play’s incorporation of Reformation theology.²

The fragmentary nature of the manuscript makes it impossible to

¹ Woolf, *English Mystery Play* 408, n.278.
determine all of the scenes that were once part of the play. Losses at the beginning and end of the text pose particular problems, but the examples of other resurrection plays provide useful clues concerning the missing scenes. Paginated throughout in the scribe’s handwriting, the surviving text begins on page 17 with the high priests’ decision to talk to Pilate. Some, if not all, of the missing sixteen pages (eight leaves) must have contained opening scenes of the play. The play probably began with a prologue by Appendix, the expositor figure, whose speeches further subdivide the two day’s performances and offer commentary on individual episodes. Some introduction of Pilate must have taken place, to establish his character before his appearance with the Centurion on page 17. The play may have opened with Pilate’s concerns and his decision to send for the Centurion, and then shifted to the scene between the high priests. Alternatively, the lost leaves might have resembled the opening of Christ’s Burial or Christus Redivivus, dramatizing the burial and the departure of the Marys to buy spices before turning to conversations between the Jewish and secular authorities. Since Christ makes no mention elsewhere in the play of his descent into hell, and since reformers were rather wary of this doctrine, it seems unlikely that The Resurrection of Our Lord included this episode among its opening scenes.

We do not know how many pages are missing from the end of the play, but the text breaks off just after Christ appears to Thomas. Judging from

---

2 Johnston “Emerging Pattern” 16.
3 See p. 23 n.79 above for Bale’s reservations about this part of the Creed.
4 For the difficulty of collating the manuscript, see pp. 177-78 below.
the examples of the liturgical drama, and the freestanding Protestant *Christus Redivivus*, it seems likely that this appearance formed the final episode in *The Resurrection of Our Lord* as well. The play may have culminated with Christ’s words of blessing and an epilogue/dismissal from Appendix.

In some instances Appendix’s speeches make it easier to extrapolate what episodes have been lost through internal *lacunae*. We are missing Mary Magdalene’s report of Christ’s appearance, but a later comment by Appendix makes it clear that the audience would have seen this incident. After a gap in “The Seconde Dayes Playe,” the text resumes with Appendix’s interpretation of the appearance of Christ to the group of apostles, Thomas excepted. The following chart outlines the play’s episodic content and order; brackets identify lost (and therefore uncertain) material. Numbers in parentheses indicate the corresponding lines of text as numbered in the present edition.

I. “The First Dayes Playe”

A. [Introduction by Appendix]

   1. [Burial, departure of Marys, and/or initial scene involving Pilate]
   2. Council of the high priests (1-7)
   3. Conversation between Pilate and Centurion (8-61)
   4. High priests enter and request watch (61-148)
   5. High priests instruct soldiers; soldiers begin watch (149-206)
   6. Resurrection and soldiers’ response (207-42)

B. Commentary by Appendix (243-71)

   1. Three Marys enter and see empty tomb (272-89)
   2. Mary Magdalen tells Peter and John; race to tomb (290-303)
3. Mary's lament further, *quem quaeritis* sequence (303-69)

4. Appearance to Mary Magdalen (370-73)

5. [Mary Magdalen reports to apostles]

6. High priests bribe soldiers (374-424)

C. Commentary [Conclusion] by Appendix (425-35)

II. “The Seconde Dayes Playe”

A. [Introduction by Appendix]

1. Appearance of Christ to Peter (436-99)

B. Commentary by Appendix (500-27)

1. Appearance on the road to Emmaus (528-933)

C. Commentary by Appendix (934-71)


2. [Christ appears to gathering of apostles; eats fish and honeycomb]

D. Commentary by Appendix (1020-35)

1. Appearance to Thomas (1036-47)

2. [Lost material ?]

E. [Conclusion by Appendix]

The extant text shows affinities with many of the plays discussed thus far. In the Centurion’s report to Pilate, and the high priests’ request for a guard, the play resembles the resurrection dramas of Chester, York, and the Towneley manuscript. However, Pilate acquiesces reluctantly and disappears from the play at this point, leaving the setting of the watch, the sealing of the tomb, and the post-resurrection bribery to the high priests. Lois Potter notes that this characterization “suggests how the mystery cycles might have been rewritten to accommodate the new relationship between church and state. . . .
Pilate is depicted as a good governor, skeptical of the power of the priesthood and concerned only with putting down sedition.\textsuperscript{5} This assessment conveniently explains the similar characterization in Grimald's play, but overlooks the fact that the earlier French tradition also often featured a sympathetic Pilate.\textsuperscript{6} The Resurrection itself is also reminiscent of the French tradition and of the York play, for it occurs with no words from Christ. Yet it is hardly a silent event; a stage direction for "gonnes shott off and thunder" recalls the pyrotechnics used in the parishes of St. Laurence, Reading, and St. Mary's, Thame (206sd).\textsuperscript{7} Though the scene of Mary's report to the apostles is missing, later reflections by Peter and John suggest that her news met with a misogynistic disbelief like that evinced by the apostles in Towneley.

\begin{verbatim}
John: What misbeleife, <as> [was] in our hartes then
that we coulde never credit the wemen
but counpted their wordes (theirin) phantasticall
when onlye the fault, was in vs all

Peter: We thought, yf he rose from death agayne
\end{verbatim}


\textsuperscript{6} The French tradition drew in turn on apocryphal accounts of Pilate as a well-intentioned ruler who repented his part in the Crucifixion and became a Christian; in one text his crime of executing the innocent Christ leads to his own death sentence, but a voice from heaven proclaims his sanctity, and his decapitated head is received by an angel. The legends also circulated in Middle English; see \textit{Cursor Mundi}, vol 3, ed. Richard Morris, EETS os 62 (London: Kegan Paul, 1874) 1060-64, II. 18513-82, and \textit{The Middle English Harrowing of Hell and Gospel of Nicodemus}, ed. William Henry Hulme, EETS es 100 (London: Kegan Paul, 1908) 131-36, Additional MS, II. 1717-812.

\textsuperscript{7} Discussion of these parishes' special effects appears above, pp. 81-82. See also comments on staging below, pp. 155-56. All quotations of \textit{The Resurrection of Our Lord} are taken from the old-spelling text in the present edition. For editorial principles, see pp. 185-88 below.
that we had byne they, whom he first playne
woulde have shewed hym selfe to all throughout
and that was the thinge, lapped vs in such Doubt (986-93)
The reason for the disciples' change of heart in *The Resurrection of Our Lord*
is Christ's appearance to Peter (the analogues to which I have already mentioned). A lengthy sermon from Christ along the road to Emmaus represents an expansion of Luke 24:25-27 like that found in several French Passions, as well as in Chester and in the N-Town play, though much more elaborate. Similarities to Towneley and to the Cornish *Ordinalia* are apparent in the Doubting Thomas episode, in which all the apostles chime in with attempts to convince their colleague, and, when that fails, with criticisms of his obduracy. Finally, the play resembles *Christus Redivivus* in its incorporation of reformist doctrine, expressed through Appendix, and also in the long sermon on the road to Emmaus.

The Protestant emphases of the play tempted Wilson and Dobell to fit the play into the existing resurrection tradition by crediting it to John Bale, whose two plays “de sepultura et resurrectione Christi” have not survived. The editors acknowledged that such an attribution would be “unsafe” without further evidence, but some other scholars have persisted in attaching the play to the reformer. If the play resembled Bale’s other dramatic works in style and doctrine, this attribution would be more

---

8 Wilson and Dobell vii.
9 W.T. Davies includes the play in his Bale bibliography; Davies 210. Ruth H. Blackburn is more tentative in her comments about authorship, but says that the play’s “encouragement to
reasonable. In fact, *The Resurrection of Our Lord* exhibits little of the stridency typical of Bale’s plays; its “restrained and unpolemical tone” led Anna J. Mill to dismiss the possibility of Bale as its author. Its theology has affinities with that of Zwingli, while it is more difficult to distinguish the influence of specific theologians in Bale’s work. Furthermore, the structure of *The Resurrection of Our Lord* does not lend support to this attribution, for Bale’s title suggests a production divided along liturgical lines like the Bodleye Museo plays.

Given the widespread documentary evidence for single-subject biblical plays in parishes around England, and the correspondences between some churchwardens’ accounts and *The Resurrection of Our Lord*, it seems likely that the play was performed under parish auspices. The reformist emphases were probably the result of revisions to a traditional resurrection play, adaptations which fit it into a rapidly changing religious milieu. As noted above, these expansions on and additions to the play’s more traditional content suggest a process of reform like that undertaken by Master Laborne at St. Laurence, Reading. Theological material is rarely worked into conversations between characters, but instead emerges either in a long sermon by Christ at Emmaus or in the speeches of “Appendix,” whose very

---

read the scriptures and enter into the new life with faith is quite in [Bale’s] vein”; Blackburn 37.

10 Anna J. Mill, “The Miracle Plays and Mysteries,” *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1500*, vol. 5, ed. Albert E. Hartung, et al. (New Haven, Yale UP, 1975) 1355. Honor McCusker agrees that the play is unlike Bale’s other work; see McCusker 74-75.

11 Thora Blatt maintains that “Bale cultivates no close reading of the Continental reformer’s texts. . . his attitude is more national than theological”; Blatt 53.
name means added (and possibly extraneous) material.\footnote{12}{See OED \textit{appendix}, sb. 2: “An addition subjoined to a document or book, having some contributory value in connexion with the subject matter of the work; but not essential to its completeness.” This sense of the word is first attested in 1549.}

\section*{B. Appendix as Expositor}

His unusual name notwithstanding, Appendix fulfills a conventional role common in late medieval and early Tudor drama: that of the expositor figure. Other instances of this character type include Poeta, who appears in both the Digby \textit{Conversion of St. Paul} and the \textit{Killing of the Children};\footnote{13}{Both plays are included in Baker, Murphy and Hall; for \textit{The Conversion of Saint Paul} see 1-23, and for \textit{The Killing of the Children}, see 96-115.} Expositor, who provides interpretation in several Chester pageants; Contemplacio from the N-Town plays; Doctor from the Brome \textit{Abraham and Isaac};\footnote{14}{For the text of this play, see Davis, \textit{Non-Cycle Plays} 43-57.} and John Bale’s eponymous Prolocutor. It should be noted that many of these figures appear in free-standing Biblical plays, and even Contemplacio appears only in the Mary Play and in Passion Play I, segments which likely had an independent life outside the N-Town collection.

Hans-Jürgen Diller labels these characters’ mode of audience address as “edificational,” distinguishing it from the “histrionic” mode of characters like Nuntius and Preco in the Chester plays. The former usually stands out very clearly from the rest of the text and stylistically is also different from the dialogue: the result is that the ‘world’ of the play generally remains closed. Utterances are always to be taken at face value; they are in no way coloured by
the subjective attitude of the speaker, but give particularly clear expression to the objective content of the play.\textsuperscript{15}

Appendix's lines certainly fall into this category. Written in rhyme royal, they are structurally distinct from the rest of the dialogue, which is written in rhyming couplets. A late addition to the text, the character stands outside the closed world of the play in his reformist interpretation of traditional action.\textsuperscript{16}

Similarly, Diller notes that "it seems likely that this dramatic tenor" created by the Expositor figure in Chester 5, 6, 12 and 22 "owes its existence to a late revision."\textsuperscript{17} Heather Hill-Vasquez has argued convincingly for late reformist adaptation in another biblical play, the Digby Conversion of St. Paul. She observes that an interpolation dating from the 1530s and some speeches by the play's expositor figure, Poeta, create a new vision of Paul as a proto-reformer. As a result, the play falls within the Catholic saint's play tradition, but is able to "reveal, critique . . . and replace" the failings of Catholicism.\textsuperscript{18}

The doctrinal material in The Resurrection of Our Lord performs a similar function, subverting the traditionally conservative form of the Easter play.

Modesty topoi feature in the speeches of several expositor figures, and sometimes reveal reformist emphases. In the opening stanzas of the Digby Killing of the Children, Poeta reminds the audience that


\textsuperscript{16} Blatt also sees Appendix as "a late insertion made during the last recension of the play"; Blatt 25.

\textsuperscript{17} Diller 116.

\textsuperscript{18} Hill-Vasquez 2–19.
We be comen hedere as seruauntes diligent,

Oure processe to shewe you, as we can.

Wherfor of benevolens we pray euery man

To haue vs execused that we no better doo—

Another tyme to emende it if we can,

Be the grace of God, ifoure cunnyng be thertoo. (19-24)

At the end of the play, he apologizes for their “eloquens [which is] but rude” and “sympylle cunnyng” (553, 556). Another Digby play calls attention to the scriptural antecedent for the play through Poeta’s modesty *topos*. In The *Conversion of St. Paul*, the character recommends the original version of the story about to be played:

Honorable frendys, besechyng yow of lycens

To procede owur processe, we may [shew] vnder your correccyon,

The conuersyon of Seynt Paule, as þe Byble gyf experyens.

Whoo lyst to rede þe booke *Actum Apostolorum*,

Ther shall he haue þe very notycyon;

But, as we can, we shall vs redres,

Brefly, wyth yowur fauour, begynynge owur proces. (7-13)

If Heather Hill-Vasquez is correct, and Poeta’s speeches show evidence of Protestant revision, this passage may reflect the reformist emphasis on the authority of Scripture. German reformist playwrights were also struggling with the dual goals of fidelity to scripture and dramatic creativity. In his 1538
passion play, Joachim Greff used his expositor figure to express caution about extra-biblical elements introduced in the play, such as the appearance of four angels at the sepulchre. Similarly, Appendix's expression of modesty in The Resurrection of Our Lord contains a sense of unease about extra-biblical material:

Then where have we in scripture, but two words of ye matter the rest you must then attribute, vnto our invention and though about the thynge, we can noe more but smattter lett iudgement passe of vs, as we with good intention vpon the circumstances, have shewed our ymageputation yf it be to your lykyng, we be righte well apayed and soe I nowe commytt you, to the rest which shalbe played

(519-25)

This self-conscious rhetoric is just one several clues to the doctrinal emphases of The Resurrection of Our Lord. Several key passages in the text reveal the playwright/redactor's interest in theological controversies of the first Henrician reformation.

C. "doctryne Evangelicall": The Play as Protestant Propaganda

Wilson and Dobell suggested that the play was composed between 1530 and 1560 when, "under the influence of continental Lutherans like Melancthon, Martin Bucer, and Kirchmayer, a number of Protestant religious

---

19 Gillett 477-78.
plays were produced." This assignment is no doubt correct, though rather broad. Several passages expounding reformist views point to a more precise range of dates for the play's composition (or revision), and locate the play more specifically on the spectrum of Protestant belief. Many of the issues which separated reformers from conservatives, and even divided reformers amongst themselves, find expression in the text; these include lay access to vernacular scripture, apostolic succession, the significance of the Eucharist, and the nature of spiritual manifestations. A careful gloss of the term "heretik," a self-conscious defense of a scene between Christ and Peter, an explanation of the communion rite, and a comment on Christ's resurrected body reveal affinities with Zwinglian theology, and suggest that the play as we have it took shape between 1535 and 1543.

**Heresy and the Bible in English**

Appendix's gloss of the word "heretik" inverts an earlier dramaturgical tradition and refers to the debate which surrounded translation of the Bible in the first half of the sixteenth century. The passage concerned occurs after Christ has risen; in it Appendix comments on the high priests, or "Bishoppes," who have demanded a guard on Christ's tomb:

 Yet note in these Bishoppes, a right honest pretence
they had invented to have extinct Christes name
they made Pilate beleeve, that yf he were stolne thence

---

20 Wilson and Dobell vi.
yt woulde make a commotion, by means of his fame
woulde God their were non such now which doth plaie ye same
which diswayes ye people, for readinge of the scripture
lest it make them Heretikes vnlesse they have a Doctor
I woulde call them Heretikes, in my conceite rather
which can reade and may, and yet will not reade them
when the worde yt selfe, doth ravishe much better
then the words of them doe, which doe expounde ytt
theirfore I counself everie man, to seeke his owne profett
and as Christ is risen from ye deade, by his fathers power
so let vs rise from our oulde life, to walke anew manner

(257-70)

The bold way in which Appendix champions Bible reading, despite episcopal criticism, is noteworthy. This activity had been associated with the Lollard heresy, and still carried the taint of this association into the sixteenth century. Other early English plays addressed anxieties about Lollard activity rather differently. For example, the Croxton Play of the Sacrament puts Lollard denials of transubstantiation into the mouths of the Jews who steal and torture a consecrated host.21 As Gail MacMurray Gibson and others have observed, the Croxton play, which concludes with the conversion of the Jewish characters, functions as anti-Lollard propaganda, interrogating and

21 See The Play of The Sacrament, ll. 199-216, in Davis 64.
containing that heresy. In the the N-Town Passion Play 1, Jewish conspirators condemn Christ as an “eretyk” (26/170, 309), but these accusations are undermined by Christ’s insistent sacramental orthodoxy in the Last Supper scene. In fact, as Peter Meredith has suggested, it is “likely” that this passage and others form “a response to Lollard criticism of matters such as eucharistic belief and oral confession.” Where other plays distance sympathetic figures from potentially heretical activity, The Resurrection of Our Lord promotes it. Appendix also neatly inverts the accusation, arguing that those who refuse to avail themselves of the opportunity to read Scripture, those who “can and may, and yet will not read them,” are the true “Heretikes.”

This accusation suggests a more precise date of composition than previous editors have supplied. The reference to those who “can reade and may, and yet will not reade” the Scripture implies unrestricted access to English Bibles. Though Tyndale’s vernacular translations were covertly disseminated after 1526 (and Wycliffe’s had been in circulation from the end of the fourteenth century), it was not until 1535 that the crown authorized publication of Coverdale’s English Bible. It found a ready audience, and several editions had already sold out by the time the royally-licensed Matthew Bible appeared two years later. First in 1536 and again in 1538

---

23 Meredith, Passion Play 30-31. See also Lauren LePow, Enacting the Sacrament: Counter-Lollardy in the Towneley Cycle (Rutherford, N.J.: Associated UP, 1990), for a reading of that play collection as anti-Lollard propaganda.
24 David Scott Kastan, “‘The noyse of the new Bible’: reform and reaction in Henrician
Cromwell issued injunctions ordering churches to obtain copies of the new vernacular version. The 1538 injunctions required that every parish church have "one book of the whole Bible of the largest volume, in English, and the same set up in some convenient place . . . where parishioners may most commodiously resort to the same and read it." They also commanded priests to "expressly provoke, stir and exhort every person to read the same," though the clergy were to discourage arguments about interpretation and to "refer the explication of obscure places to men of higher judgment in the scripture." In his endorsement of Bible reading, Appendix enacts the first part of these instructions, but he blatantly disobeys the second part. Rather than referring his audience to "men of higher judgement in the scripture," Appendix argues that "the worde yt selfe, doth ravishe much better / then the words of them doe, which doe expounde ytt." He advises "everie man, to seeke his owne profett," encouraging the individual interpretation which made conservative clergy uneasy about lay access to scripture. Among the bishops opposing the vernacular Bible was Stephen Gardiner of Winchester. David Scott Kastan observes that Gardiner "regularly identified the disruptive social effects of the new Bible as its real threat, arguing, in terms precisely designed to stimulate the King's anxieties, that uncontrolled access to the Bible could 'beguile the people into refusal of obedience.'" Appendix

---


25 Bray 178.
26 Bray 178-79.
27 Kastan 61.
likens the Bishops who convinced Pilate that the theft of Christ’s body would cause a commotion, to those who “now plaie the same,” an apt comparison, as Gardiner and other conservatives warned Henry VIII of the disorder which would result from lay access to scripture. Predictions like theirs prompted the 1543 Acte for thadvancement of true Religion and for thabbolishment of the contrarie, which prohibited Bible reading among all the middle and lower classes. Appendix’s comments thus would make topical sense after 1535, when the laity first gained unrestricted access to the Bible, an access that was nonetheless threatened and in 1543 denied again to the vast majority of English people. After 1543, his comments would advocate a more difficult, not to mention dangerous, course of action.

Tu es Petrus?

Another significant passage occurs near the beginning of the second

---

28 See Bale’s similar treatment of Catholic prelates, discussed on pp. 57-59 above. Paul Whitfield White comments that this equation of “Pharisees with Catholic prelates” is “a recurring feature of early reformation polemic”; see “Reforming Mysteries’ End” 133. Patrick Collinson calls attention to a caption in Foxe’s Acts and Monuments inspired by Gardiner’s complaints about dramatic mockery. The caption, “Preachers, printers and players trouble Winchester,” appears next to a letter of 21 May 1547 in which Gardiner protests to the Lord Protector, “Certain printers, players and preachers make a wonderment, as though we knew not yet how to be justified, nor what sacraments we should have”; see Foxe, vol. 6, 31 and Patrick Collinson, The Birthpangs of Protestant England (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988) 103.

29 Statutes of the Realm 896. Though members of the nobility were allowed to read the Bible, the activity was prohibited to women below this class, along with any “artificers, pretises, jouomemen servingmen of the degrees of yeoman or under, husbandemen [and] laborers.” As noted above, this Act also prohibited theatrical interpretations of Scripture if they “meddled” with the royal doctrinal position; see p. 32 above.

30 After reaching this conclusion, I was pleased to discover that Paul Whitfield White also places the play “or at least this version of it...around the time of” Cromwell’s injunctions; see White, “Reforming Mysteries’ End” 132.
day's play. Here, Appendix provides a self-conscious defense for an extra-
biblical scene in which the risen Christ forgives Peter for his denial and gives him authority over the other apostles. A common feature in French Passion plays, the episode only appears within the English tradition in two manuscripts of the Chester cycle, where it is quite brief. The Chester editors suggest that the scene's "strong papal overtones perhaps provide one reason for [its] excision" from three other manuscripts, but its presence in any manuscripts of Chester, the cycle which is "probably the latest," and which presents itself as proto-reformation drama in its revised sixteenth-century Banns, provides an intriguing analogue to its Protestant setting in The Resurrection of Our Lord. Both plays refer to Peter's "sovereignty" or "preeminence", but also emphasize his repentance. In the fourteenth century, Wycliffe had also made this connection in an Easter sermon:

Men seyen hou þe gospel tellip hou Crist apperide speciali to Petre; not onely for Petre was capteyn, and was bedun to conferme his briþeren, but algatis for þis cause, for [he] synnede many weyes in denyynge of Crist, and þus he was nyʒ dispeyr, and þerfore Petre hadde moost nede to be counfortid bi talis of

---

31 For a summary of the encounters between Peter and Christ in the French tradition, see Wright 135. The Chester treatment of the episode only extends for 23 lines, as compared to the 62 lines of dialogue and 27 lines of exposition in The Resurrection of Our Lord. See Lumiansky and Mills, vol. 1, Appendix 1D 486-90.
Later the theme came into vogue among Elizabethan preachers; John Jewel’s homily of repentance presents Judas as an example of “sterile” Catholic penance, “in contrast to the reformed procedure . . . found in the fruitful repentance of St. Peter.”

Perhaps we should regard the supportive dramatizations of Petrine repentance and subsequent authority in both *The Resurrection of Our Lord* and the Chester cycle as early steps in the process that Karen Bruhn has called “The Reformation of St. Peter.” In fact, the issue of Petrine authority was not incompatible with some English reformist writings. In *The Resurrection of Our Lord*, Appendix’s apologetics, along with marginal notation in the manuscript, call attention to the encounter scene, which presents a moderate evangelical position.

The scene comes to us in fragmented form, as its beginning is part of the second *lacuna* in the text. Even without the first part of the episode, Christ’s appointment of Peter is clear:

```
but as for the Peter, amongst my Disciples all
I choise the heade, and governar principall
that yf they shoulde chaunce, to faulter in their faith
```
thou should oft confirme them, in the redye paith (460-63)

Jesus explains that he has had this plan for the apostle since Peter confessed him to be the Son of God, and that Peter’s remorse for denying Christ has prompted this appearance:

I came with my presence, thee here to comfort
that thou shouldst beleive me (the better) from hencefurth
therefore goe to thy fellowes, and tell them in their heavines
that I am nowe rysen, as thou canst beare witnes
for through the prerogatyve, of thy prehemynence
they will credytt thy wordes, with more confydence (472-77)

Lamenting his unworthiness and wondering at Christ’s mercy, Peter accepts the mantle of authority. He will tell the other disciples “howe our maister his rysen, and hath appeared to me / whom the better they will credytt, for my senioritie” (498-99). Marginal trefoil notations appear next to each of these passages, emphasizing the lines that refer to Peter’s preeminence.

No such encounter appears in any gospel narrative of the Resurrection, but the scene is based on brief references in Luke and I Corinthians. Appendix elaborates this point at length:

We nowe have noe scripture, doth teache vs such appearance
as we have made of Christ (to Peter) in this order
but that we gatherthis, even of the circumstance
both of St Luke his wordes, and of St Paules together
which both doth write that Christ appeared vnto Peter
but with what words, or when, or where, doubtles ye scripture shewes not, but that by conference of places, we coniecture

(500-06)

Appendix is referring to Luke 24:33-34, in which Cleophas and Luke return from Emmaus to Jerusalem. According to the Coverdale version, the two men “founde ye eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, which sayde: The LORDE is rysen of a trueth, and hath appeared vnto Symon.” In 1 Corinthians 15:4-5, Paul attests to this appearance as well, saying that Christ “was buried, and that he rose agayne ye thirde daye accordinge to the scriptures, and that he was sene of Cephas, then of the twelue.” The Catholic church cited these verses, as well as others, to support the Pope’s supremacy through apostolic succession. Yet the author’s inclusion of this scene need not indicate Catholic sympathies. Although reformers rejected papal supremacy, the English Church retained the episcopal system and maintained that its bishops still derived spiritual authority from the apostolic heritage.38 A comparison of The Resurrection of Our Lord with the Catholic Bodley e. Museo Christ’s Resurrection highlights some telling differences between the reformist and conservative positions on Peter’s status. In the e. Museo play, Andrew and John comfort the

37 The Holy Scriptures, faithfully and truly translated by Myles Coverdale, Bishop of Exeter (1535, London, S. Bagster, 1838). Unless otherwise noted, all subsequent biblical quotations will be taken from this reprint of Coverdale’s edition, and identified parenthetically by chapter and verse. I have silently lowered any raised letters and have expanded and italicized abbreviations.

despondent Peter and remind him of his preeminence. Peter "the most speciealli" hath "cause of comfurth" because Christ chose him "of his church pe hed" (438-40). Furthermore, Andrew recalls that Christ gave Peter "pe keyes of hevyn and of helle, / so to lowse and to bynd" (459-60). Peter is clearly the origin of papal supremacy, the head of the church, with earthly and heavenly power. In The Resurrection of Our Lord, however, the power "to bynde and loose synnes (by preachinge both twayne[])]" is only mentioned as an office belonging to all the apostles, given to them after Pentecost (1085). Peter is chief of the disciples, whose role is to comfort and support Christ's followers, a role which Wycliffe had recognized, as mentioned above.39 English reformers were willing to grant Peter this spiritual authority. Even Gardiner himself, in De Vera Obedientia, argues:

Notwithstanding for the authorities sake of them / which haue not misliked the worde of supremacie / I doo not so much refuse the worde selfe / but I flee to the interpretacion of the word / that it maye agree with the right propre meanyng of the Gospell / expressed in Christes dedes. Admitte / that Petre were chief / admitte he had the supremacie of Christe / what of that? was a kingdome / lordeship / or preeminence geuen him / with the supremacie? Because he was bidden to confirme his brethren in faiithe / was it geuen him / to beare rule ouer his

39 The Chester treatment of the episode also stresses Peter's ministry to his "subjects"; see Chester 18/86-93.
brethren / therefore?40

Whether or not Gardiner actually believed what he wrote in this tract (he later explained that he had written it “unwillingly”),41 he did express reformist doctrine as it stood in 1535, doctrine that would find fuller expression approximately twenty-five years later in John Jewel’s Apology for the Church of England. Jewel similarly argued for doctrinal succession, conceding Peter’s spiritual authority but questioning the Pope’s right to it.

For whereas some use to make so great a vaunt that the Pope is only Peter’s successor, as though thereby he carried the Holy Ghost in his bosom and cannot err, this is but a matter of nothing and a very trifling tale. . . . Yet notwithstanding, because we will grant somewhat to succession, tell us, has the Pope alone succeeded Peter? And wherein, I pray you? In what religioun? In what office? In what piece of his life hath he succeeded him? What one thing (tell me) had Peter ever like unto the Pope, or the Pope like unto Peter?42

After comparing the abuses of the papacy to the preaching ministry of the apostle, Jewel declares, “Unless therefore the Popes do the like nowadayes, as Peter did the things aforesaid, there is no cause at all why they should glory

so of Peter's name and of his succession." While the playwright's choice to dramatize and defend Christ's appearance to Peter is unusual in the English tradition, his treatment of this potentially volatile subject emphasizes the apostle's repentance as well as his pastoral role within the early church, a view of Peter's supremacy consistent with moderate reformist opinion. A stricter Calvinist influence on the portrayal seems unlikely, for Appendix excuses the "invention" and "imagination" that contributed to this scene (522, 525). "For hardline Protestants," notes Patrick Collinson, "'imaginings' was one of those words always qualified by the same adjective, in this case 'vain.'"

Sacrifice or Memorial

Central to the play's doctrinal position is its teaching on the sacrament of the Eucharist. Preoccupying reformers and conservatives alike both on the continent and in England, the eucharistic debates of the sixteenth century addressed such controversial issues as the relationship of the elements to Christ's flesh and blood, the necessity of communion in both kinds for all believers, the sacrificial nature of the mass, and its power to remit the sins of the living and the dead. Evangelical thought on these subjects drew on the

---

43 Jewel 130.
44 Collinson 97-98. Thora Blatt sees Appendix's excuses here as another reason to doubt Bale's authorship, arguing that "[Bale] is never apologetic, he is dogmatic and authoritative in his prolocutor speeches"; Blatt 26.
work of earlier theologians like Augustine and Ratramn of Corbie, and
presented a united front against several features of Catholic teaching. In
general, reformers rejected the idea of the Mass as a propitiatory sacrifice for
sin, and opposed the "carnal" doctrine of transubstantiation. However, they
were unable to agree about the nature of the eucharistic elements. While
Luther argued from Wittenberg for the "real presence" of Christ under the
form of the bread and wine, a doctrine sometimes referred to as
consubstantiation, Huldrych Zwingli in Zurich held that the elements were a
symbol of Christ's body and blood, and emphasized the memorial nature of
the Lord's Supper.46 Despite efforts to come to a consensus at the Colloquy of
Marburg in 1529, the Lutheran and Zwinglian contingents could only agree to
disagree. The teachings of both theologians filtered into England in the 1520s
and 1530s, influencing such early English reformers as Thomas Bilney,
William Tyndale and John Frith, all of whom were martyred for their
heretical views.47 Under Henry VIII, the official doctrine of the English

46 Dugmore 87-88. For one expression of Luther's position see The Babylonian Captivity of the
(Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1959) 28-35. Two treatises by Huldrych Zwingli give a clear
account of the Swiss reformer's eucharistic theology: On the Lord's Supper (1526) and An
Exposition of the Faith (1531), both in Zwingli and Bullinger, ed. G.W. Bromiley, Library

47 The impact of Zwingli's teachings in England has been overshadowed by critical attention to
Lutheran doctrine. Gottfried Locher provides an important corrective to this trend in
70. He notes that English bishops considered Zwinglian writings a threat as early as 1526 and
1531, and argues that the ban on these books indicates that heresy was being disseminated in
England; see Locher 350. Diarmaid MacCulloch more cautiously finds that Swiss reformers
were in contact with their English counterparts "at least from 1537, with the visit from
Rodolph Gwalter from Zurich to Oxford"; see MacCulloch, The Later Reformation in England:
1547-1603 (London, Basingstoke: MacMillan 1990) 69. Mediated through English figures like
Frith, Tyndale and Cranmer, Zwinglian ideas were available even to those who had no direct
church continued to insist on Christ’s corporeal presence in the bread and wine; so that “one’s eucharistic beliefs were in many of the Tudor years literally a matter of life and death.”

Given the serious consequences that could result from too-enthusiastic espousal of reformist doctrines on the Eucharist, it is hardly surprising that *The Resurrection of Our Lord* couches its treatment of the subject in cautious language. Significant passages appear in a sermon that Christ delivers to the Emmaus pilgrims. Luke 24:27 tells us that “he began at Moses, and at all the Prophetes, and expounded vnto them all scriptures which were written of him,” and the playwright uses this short reference as a springboard for over two hundred lines of instruction from the mouth of Christ himself. A recurrent motif throughout the sermon is the contrast of the carnal with the spiritual; this opposition works contextually to emphasize Christ’s fulfillment of prophecy, but also recalls reformist objections to transubstantiation. As the true Moses, Christ

delivered mankynde, out of the Devels thrall
and brought vs to the libertie, of the lawe Evangelicall
were god will be worshiped with a spirituall service
and not with a carnall, and bodilye sacrifice (624-27)

The adjective “Evangelicall,” which describes the new law under Christ’s Gospel, had been adopted by reformers to describe themselves and their

---

Bible-centered beliefs. Its use here gives additional weight to the opposition between “spirituall service” and “bodily sacrifice.” Just as the play previously drew a parallel between the Jewish high priests and Catholic prelates, it now identifies the law of the Old Testament as an orthodox doctrine of carnal sacrifice like the Mass. One hundred lines later, Christ refers to the royal priesthood of his “faithful elected” and to their sacrifice, which is of a different order:

this house ys his Church, of the faithfull elected
to God in his bloude, both kynges and Priestes consecrated
of his priestes in his Church, which ys his house spirituall
shalbe offered a sacryifice, of his bloude & bodye mysticall
renewynge so their bishops Death, with a thankfull
remembrance
which offered hym selfe once one the crosse for mans
deliverance
with this sacrifice he consecrate, ye newe testament verelye
that yt shoulde be a bonde of love betwene hym & vs eternallye
yf you doe not knowe this aske the twelve yt rather
what thinge yt was he institute, att the last supper
yf it were not of that Sacrifice, of his bloude and bodye
a communion of the electes, and a thankefull memorye (712-24)

The passage hints at many issues of the eucharistic controversy and reveals some awareness on the playwright's part of the conflicts between Lutheran and Zwinglian teachings, but avoids a clear articulation of either position. Its ambiguous reference to Christ's "bloude & body mysticall" leaves a loophole for conservative interpretations and would also be acceptable to Lutheran adherents to the doctrine of the real presence. The reference would have a different meaning for Zwingli who wrote in 1531 that the words "this is my body" had to be understood symbolically as "'This is the sacrament of my body,' or, 'This is my sacramental or mystical body,' that is, the sacramental and representative symbol of the body which I really assumed and yielded over to death."\(^{50}\) Emphasis in the passage on the memorial aspects of the Eucharist also suggest Zwinglian influence, and the play's language in lines 719 and 723 closely parallels the Swiss reformer's description of the "thanksgiving" that Christ "instituted . . . as a perpetual memory and pledge of his love for us."\(^{51}\)

References to the mass as a sacrifice (715, 718, 722) exemplify the play's delicate handling of a theological position considered heretical by orthodox authorities. Reformers rejected the doctrine of the mass as a propitiatory sacrifice; if the priest sacrifices Christ over and over again, argued Lutherans, and if this sacerdotal act can remit sins, then Christ's Passion has no meaning.\(^{52}\) Significantly, *The Resurrection of Our Lord* remains silent about

\(^{50}\) Zwingli, *Exposition* 265.
\(^{51}\) Zwingli, *Exposition* 264.
\(^{52}\) See Article XXIV of "The Augsburg Confession" (1530), *The Book of Concord*, tr. and ed.
the efficacy of the Eucharistic sacrifice in the forgiveness of sins. Instead, the play emphasizes Christ's unique offering of himself and our "renewal" and "remembrance" of that act. Zwingli cites Augustine to make a similar point:

'But that we might not forget that which once happened we are to keep it annually in remembrance of the Paschal feast. Is Christ slain again on these occasions? No: but the annual remembrance signifies or represents that which once happened, thereby recalling it as though we actually saw the lord present on the cross.' All these are the words of Augustine, and they make it plain that the sacrament is simply a recalling or representing of something which happened only the once.53

Across the Channel, this theology found expression in the writings of John Frith and Tyndale. Under confinement in the Tower of London in 1533, Frith wrote that the "hollye doctors" called the mass a sacrifice because it had "the name of the verye same thynge that yt doth represent & signifie," that is, the sacrifice of Christ's passion and death.54 Several years later Tyndale echoed his martyred friend, saying that the mass was "a sacrifice only because it is the memorial, the earnest and seal of that everlasting sacrifice offered once for all."55 A canny playwright could similarly defend the eucharistic discussion

---

53 Zwingli, Lord's Supper 233.
54 John Frith, A Boke made by John Frith...answeringe unto M mores lettur (Munster: C. Willems, 1533) sig. E4' (STC 11381).
55 William Tyndale, A Brief Declaration of the Sacraments (1536), Doctrinal Treatises and Introductions to Different Portions of the Holy Scriptures, ed. Henry Walter, FS 42 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1848) 371. Several decades later, the argument from Augustine which Zwingli had made was also used by Cranmer in response to Stephen Gardiner's criticisms. Cranmer
in *The Resurrection of Our Lord* to conservative authorities by pointing out its debt to Augustine.

The play’s studied eucharistic ambiguity is cast into sharp relief when it is compared to the orthodox language of the N-Town Last Supper. In the latter play, Christ explicitly advocates transubstantiation when he institutes the Eucharist. His prayer, “Of pis þat was bred is mad my body” (27/380) identifies the moment of consecration when the transformation of that element takes place, while his words to the disciples insist on his corporeal presence in the bread:

Bretheryn, be þe [vertu] of þese wordys þat [re]hercyd be,

Þis þat shewyth as bred to 3our apparens

Is mad þe very flesche and blod of me,

To þe weche þei þat wole be savyd must 3eve credens.

(27/381-84)

In this play, transubstantiation is a necessary doctrine for salvation. As noted earlier, this play’s strict sacramentalism counteracts its portrayal of Christ as a Lollard-like heretic. Yet *The Resurrection of Our Lord* does not follow this example. Its silence regarding transubstantiation and the propitiatory nature explains that authors like Augustine “call [the mass] not a sacrifice for sin, because that it taketh away our sin, which is taken away only by the death of Christ, but because the holy communion was ordained of Christ to put us in remembrance of the sacrifice made by him upon the cross: for that cause it beareth the name of that sacrifice, as St. Augustine declareth plainly in his epistle ad Bonifacium, . . . And in his book de fide ad Petrum Diaconum, and in his book De Civitate Dei, he saith: ‘That which men call a sacrifice is a sign or representation of the true sacrifice.’” See Thomas Cranmer, “An Answer to a Crafty and Sophistical Cavillation devised by Stephen Gardiner,” *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper*, ed. John Edmund Cox, PS (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1844) 351.
of the mass in a period when these issues were hotly contested by reformers suggests that the playwright did not wish to promote orthodox doctrine but was understandably reluctant to court martyrdom. Such fears would have been well founded; Foxe records that one Richard Spenser, a former priest who had become "a player in interludes" and had offended in "matter concerning the sacrament of the altar," was burned as a heretic in 1541.⁵⁶

**Ghosts and the Resurrection of the Body**

Related to the reformist and in some ways to the Zwinglian view of the Eucharist were theological questions of pneumatology (the existence of spirits) and what we might call "resurrection pathology" (the nature of the resurrected body). Christ's post-resurrection appearance to the apostles provides an opportunity for Appendix to discuss both of these issues. The scene itself has been lost, (as has the beginning of Appendix's exposition), but from its biblical source, Luke 24:36-49, and from extant dramatic analogues, we know that it would have included Christ's sudden appearance among his followers, their fear that he was a ghost, and his various proofs of his corporeality. Two points addressed in Appendix's discourse have disappeared with the missing pages, but we have "The thride" which "ys of spirites, yf their be such or noe" (1020).

Belief in ghosts was a controversial topic in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, "a shibboleth which distinguished Protestant from
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⁵⁶ Foxe, vol. 5, 443.
Catholic almost as effectively as belief in the Mass or the Papal Supremacy."\textsuperscript{57}

The pneumatological material of *The Resurrection of Our Lord* invokes traditional ghost beliefs in order to refute them with reformist doctrine. Traditional doctrine accepted ghosts as spirits in Purgatory, whose appearances on earth could often be traced to an unresolved problem that prolonged their suffering in the afterlife. An example is the thief in an exemplum from Mirk's *Festial* who returned from the grave to ask for post-mortem absolution for his crime.\textsuperscript{58} The "traditional ghost," explains John Bossy,

haunted people not places and demanded the fulfilment of obligations towards him from those whose duty it was to fulfill them. . . . What a ghost normally required was the saying of an adequate number of masses to ensure the salvation of his soul or the execution of some provision of his will whose neglect had upset the accommodation with the Almighty which he had reached on his death-bed; he also fairly often required the avenging of his murder.\textsuperscript{59}


\textsuperscript{59} John Bossy, *Christianity in the West 1400-1700* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985) 29; see also Jean-Claude Schmitt, *Ghosts in the Middle Ages: The Living and the Dead in Medieval Society*,
The stage picture of frightened apostles confronted with a visibly wounded Christ whom they suspect to be a ghost takes on a particular resonance in the context of traditional pneumatological beliefs. Though the audience already would have witnessed the Resurrection, Christ's mysterious presence evokes an uncomfortable possibility: this apparition might require vengeance for his unjust crucifixion. His subsequent reassurance lays such concerns to rest:

"Beholde my handes & my fete, it is even I my self. Handle me, and se: for a sprete hath not flesh and bones, as ye se me haue" (Luke 24:39). Several resurrection plays dramatize the incident, but a reformist insistence that ghosts are always diabolical delusions is unique to The Resurrection of Our Lord.

Since reformers believed neither in Purgatory nor in the efficacy of masses to remit sin, their understanding of spirits differed significantly from traditional beliefs. According to Protestant teaching, souls could not return to ask for help from the living, so spirit manifestations originated elsewhere, most likely in hell. Luther insists that they are "not the souls of men but simply devils who act and speak as if one could redeem them." In a similar

---


40 See, for example, Chester 19/168-215, York 41/19-96, Towneley 28/96-240.


vein, Tyndale glossed the appearance of Samuel’s ghost to Saul in 1 Samuel 28 as a diabolical spirit, despite the spirit’s accurate prediction and its resemblance to the dead prophet. Those suffering from melancholy were particularly vulnerable to the attentions of demonic visitors in ghostly shape.

From the lines of exposition which survive, the playwright seems to have taken Christ’s reassurance as an opportunity to caution his audience about popular ghost stories. According to Appendix, “Christ here doth deny” that supernatural apparitions, “hath fleashe or yet bone” (1021), though he acknowledges that ghostly manifestations do occur:

that therbe [spirits], Christ doth affirme, but not to beleue this tho

that they in fleshlye formes, Doe walke as many one

affirme that they have seene them, as they have rydde or gone

those be but lyinge spirites, Delusions of the Divell
to tempt vs in our faith, and drawe vs vnto evill (1022-26)

This attitude toward popular ghost lore differs significantly from that of medieval preachers like Mirk, who tells his audience of the “mony that
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63 See the marginal gloss to 1 Samuel 28c in Tyndale’s Old Testament, Being the Pentateuch of 1530, Joshua to 2 Chronicles of 1537, and Jonah, ed. David Daniell (New Haven: Yale UP, 1992). Luther also argues that the appearance of Samuel was a “spectre of the devil”; see “Misuse” 199. John Hooper’s criticized those “that seek help of damned spirits, or of such souls as be departed out of this world, as Saul did, I Reg. Xxviii.; or those that...resuscitate dead bodies, or call spirits departed unto the body again; which is nothing else but an illusion and craft of the devil to make men believe lies”; see John Hooper, “A Declaration of the Ten Holy Commandments of Almighty God” (1548, 1550), Early Writings of John Hooper, ed. Samuel Carr, PS 20 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1843) 326.

64 Prosser 110.
walketh aftyr that they ben ded and buryet yn holy plase (but that is of no waxynge of the fend, but of grace of God).”65 The five lines encapsulate Protestant pneumatological thought, denying the possibility of revenant souls, and identifying “spirits” as exclusively diabolical phenomena. Such “lyinge spirites” might prey on melancholy figures like the vulnerable grieving apostles. Thomas hints at such a possibility later, suggesting that the disciples “may be deluded / with some fancy or vision, which [they] have mistaked” (1088-89). However, Christ’s corporeality demonstrates the truth of his physical resurrection—and lays to rest any possibility that he is a devil sent to test the disciples.

This emphasis on Christ’s post-resurrection body is also linked to the play’s eucharistic theology. Key to the Zwinglian view of the Eucharist is the idea that Christ’s physical body, which corresponds to his human nature, can only be in one place; since scripture attests that he sits at the right hand of the Father, we cannot also consume his body in the Mass.66 In his treatise *On the Lord’s Supper*, Zwingli argues from Christ’s words, “Behold my hands and my feet,” that it was the express purpose of Christ to show that the body which had been raised was the same as that which had died. And that means that it was the same body which departed from them into

---


heaven, for immediately after it says: "And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them and carried up into heaven."67

Though we have no evidence that The Resurrection of Our Lord dramatized the Ascension, Appendix, like Zwingli, pays particular attention to ways in which Christ evinced his corporeality. By consuming roasted fish and a honeycomb "in sight of his Disciples" (1027), Christ gave a "playne Demonstration / of a right naturall bodie, after resurrection" (1032-33), a body which still participated in his human nature. The playwright distinctly privileges this reading of the scene over pointless eschatological speculation about our own immortal bodies. Christ's meal "argues not therfore, that our immortall bodyes / shalbe susteigned with meate, or other carnall tryffels / were generation ceasses, and althese worldlye studdies" (1028-30). In giving short shrift to such materialist preoccupations, the expositor follows the example of other "Renaissance polemicists" who "used [these speculations] to illustrate and condemn scholastic obscurantism."68 Instead of following figures like Aquinas in debates over the sensual capacity of resurrected bodies,

67 Zwingli, Lord's Supper 232. Cranmer follows Zwingli in this insistence that Christ "in his human nature, substantially, really, corporally, naturally, and sensibly" has ascended, and thus cannot be taken in the Eucharist; he set this point up in distinction to reformers like Bucer who, preferring Luther's model of consubstantiation, argued instead that Christ was substantially present in both heaven and earth. See Cranmer, "Answer" 89-90.
Appendix urges his audience to rely on the promise offered in the synoptic gospels: that “we shalbe, as the Angels, in all gloryes” (1031). This position accords with his earlier declaration that “the worde yt selfe, doth ravisse much better / then the words of them doe, which doe expounde ytt” (266-67), while his attention to Christ’s natural body augments the suggestions of Zwinglian eucharistic thought found in the Emmaus episode.

The subtle sacramentarianism presented in The Resurrection of Our Lord lends support to A. G. Dickens’ view that “the influence of Zwingli upon the earlier English Reformers still needs disentanglement.” However, to pigeonhole the text as a “Zwinglian” play would be to set an artificial limit on the influence of other reformers. As Dickens warns, “we must again be on our guard against attaching tidy ‘Lutheran’, ‘Zwinglian’, ‘Calvinist’, and other labels to these very eclectic Englishmen; we must beware of compartmentalising the torrent of doctrine which by 1530 was flowing into England.” As it forwards a range of current evangelical doctrines on vernacular scripture, the nature of Peter’s authority, and the Eucharist through a traditionally conservative dramatic form, the play subverts the orthodox system from within and reveals the complex relationships which existed between plays, politics and Protestants in the second quarter of the sixteenth century. A theatrical presentation of reformist teaching, it is a “transitional stage” in several senses between the
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71 Dickens 86.
Easter plays of the "dayes of Ceremonial religion" and the sensibilities of a writer like William Lambarde, who, looking back scornfully at the Witney Easter interlude from his superior perch of post-Settlement Anglicanism, concluded that the comfort of "true Faithe cometh by hearinge and not by seinge," and "is more than al the Spectacles in the worlde can bringe to Passe."\(^{72}\)

D. "here doe the women goe to ye sepulchre": The Play as Theatrical Event

No records of performance survive, so any discussion of staging in The Resurrection of Our Lord must be based on the information provided by the text itself, augmented with records of other parish performances elsewhere. As noted above, the division between the first and second day of performance falls after the Resurrection, but between two episodes traditionally associated with Easter Sunday: Christ's appearance to Mary Magdalene, and his appearance to Peter. It is likely that the "Firste Daye" of performances was Easter Sunday. The surviving portion of the "Second Dayes Playe" focuses on the encounter between Christ and the pilgrims to Emmaus, making an Easter Monday performance (like that of St. Laurence, Reading) appropriate. Indoor performance, which characterized resurrection plays in least two of the Thames valley parishes, is possible though not necessary for The Resurrection of Our Lord.

\(^{72}\) Lambarde 460.
Set and Staging

It is possible that the play was presented on a board and trestle stage, like the Corpus Christi play at Sherborne and the resurrection plays at All Saints', Kingston-on-Thames and St. Laurence, Reading; however, the text contains no explicit references to scaffolds or stages. Mary is cued to "loke / towards / Ierusalem" while lamenting Christ's death (310-12sd), and this stage direction might refer to a designated part of the playing area, or to the apse of the church, associated with Jerusalem in the traditional east-west ecclesiastical orientation. Other set requirements are minimal. Some representation of a sepulchre is called for, both by the general content of the play, and the specific stage direction, "here doe the / women goe / to ye sepulchre" (339-40sd). If the play was performed in a church, the players might have used the Easter sepulchre that was a feature of so many churches' architecture. Frequently this structure was built into the north wall of the chancel. Scenes in Pilate's court could have been played opposite the sepulchre where the sedilia, three recessed seats for the priests, were built into the south wall, conveniently located for Pilate, who invites the high priests, "Sitt you downe" (63).

Directions for entrances and exits suggest a single playing space. There is none of the bilocal staging that characterizes the N-Town Passion plays, or

---

73 See "Parish Drama" above, 7-8.
74 For a description of the forms this structure took, see Sheingorn, Easter Sepulchre 33-45. A catalogue of churches known to have had sepulchres is found on pages 77-368 and plates 27-55 illustrate surviving examples.
the Digby Conversion of St. Paul. However, some room for “travel” is required, as indicated in the stage direction for Cleophas and Luke’s return to Jerusalem. After they leave the space (“exeunt”), which has represented the inn at Emmaus, they “walke aside / and Peter /with the / Apostles / comes in” (980-83sd). It appears that the playwright wanted their return journey to be visible, even as Peter and the apostles were discussing the news of the Resurrection. This simultaneous action emphasizes the ironic gap between the pilgrim’s expectations—“befrighted” apostles who have “hartes anoied, freett with Desperation” (981, 930)—and the excited apostles they find upon their return. Performers could fulfill the demands of this stage direction by circling or walking through the audience on their way back to the playing space.

Other directions indicate emotions or characteristics to be represented by the players’ movements. Examples include, “here let the / Centurione / and his souldiers / make signe / of valoure,” as Pilate defends his authority to the high priests (133-37sd), or “here [Cleophas and Luke] make gestures of / wounder a while” after Christ breaks bread and disappears (883sd). These directions remind us of the presentational performance style that early English drama often calls for. Though this aesthetic is often at odds with our modern taste or “realism,” recent stagings of cycle plays and moralities have demonstrated how effective this performance style can be.
Costumes

Information about costuming is sparse; much must be gleaned from dialogue. The Second Soldier refer to the angel’s apparel as “clothes as white, as ever was the snow” (210), and a stage direction for Christ’s appearance to Mary Magdalene specifies “Christ like / a gardiner” (369+sd-370sd).

Costumes for Annas and Caiphas probably reflected the play’s anachronistic reference to them as “Bishops,” as Paul Whitfield White has suggested. The N-Town Passion Play I may be an analogous example of this practice in biblical drama; in that play Annas is dressed “aftyr a busshop of pe hoold lawe in a skarlet gowne, and ouyr bat a blew tabbard furryd with whyte, and a mytere on his hed after pe hoold lawe.” (26/164sd). Meg Twycross has argued that the N-Town example should be interpreted as a medieval representation of Jewish costume, and that it “does not imply they are contemporary English bishops.” However, Twycross does note that in 1544 the Coventry Smiths purchased “a bysschops taberd of scarlet” from a sale of Holy Trinity Church, presumably for their pageant. The church’s sale is just one example of the many opportunities that players had to obtain copes, surplices, mitres and other elements of ecclesiastical garb, which were frequently sold off as parishes adopted less elaborate vestments that befit sober preachers of the gospel. Even before this change in the style of parish
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76 White, “Reforming Mysteries’ End” 133.
78 Twycross 37; Ingram, Coventry 170.
vestments occurred, ecclesiastical garments had become available with the dissolution of the monasteries. Reformation dramatists like Bale used this clothing to score polemical points in their portrayals of the Catholic clergy. In *King Johan*, for example the characters Sedycyon, Usurpid Powre and Privat Welth dress as a Monk, Pope and Cardinal, respectively (983sd). The colophon to *The Three Laws* specify a range of ecclesiastical costumes for five of the play's six vices. Sodomy is to be "decked ... lyke a monke of all sectes, Ambycyon lyke a byshop, Covetousnesse lyke a Pharyse or spyrituall lawer, False Doctryne lyke a popysh doctour, and Hypocresy lyke a graye fryre." Paul Whitfield White notes:

Implicit of course in this characterization of Catholic prelates as disguised Vices is the notion of them as actors. . . . the identification of the Catholic priesthood with mimicry was apparently widespread in the reformation. . . . Bale skillfully and extensively exploited the player/priest analogy and the theatrical qualities of Roman Catholic worship in both his prose works and his plays.

*The Resurrection of Our Lord* verbally incorporates the same theatrical analogy in Appendix's criticism of "those which doth now plaie ye same" (261). If its biblical villains were costumed in prelates' finery, a related
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81 White, Theatre and Reformation 34-35.
criticism would emerge, one suggested in Tyndale's Preface to “The Parable of the Wicked Mammon” (1527). Describing the offenses of the scribes and Pharisees, Tyndale adds, “which things all our prelates do, but have yet gotten them new names, and other garments and weeds, and are otherwise disguised. There is a difference in the names between a pope, a cardinal, a bishop, and so forth, and to say a scribe, a Pharisee, a senior, and so forth; but the thing is all one."82 By costuming the high priests in copes and mitres, players of The Resurrection of our Lord would visually establish two damning parallels, one between sixteenth century bishops and actors, and another between sixteenth-century bishops and the scheming Jewish high priests.

From the evidence of churchwardens' accounts, we can also speculate that the players in The Resurrection of Our Lord wore wigs and beards. At St. Mary, Thame, one Christopher Myxbury was responsible for the playing gear. He received 12d for “herys & for mendyng of heres” in 1513-14, and a payment in 1522 defines Mixbury's responsibilities as “taking care of garnaments & chavelers [or wigs] for the resurreccion played in the church of Thame.”83 St. Laurence, Reading also owned wigs, paying for “vi heads and beards” in 1506-7; this entry follows directly after a reference to the resurrection play.84 Aside from their value in creating spectacle these articles

83 Oxfordshire Archives DD Par Thame c.5, 1443-1524, f. 72, 77.
84 Berkshire RO D/P 97 S/2, 1498-1626, p. 29.
would have been particularly useful if the players were doubling roles.

Casting

The text as we have it contains thirty speaking roles; since one of these is "One of the Seniors," it is quite possible that we are missing lines from other Seniors. "The First Dayes Playe" requires 18 speakers, while only 15 characters have lines in "The Seconde Dayes Playe." Four characters appear in both plays: Christ (called Iesus in "The Seconde Dayes Playe"), Peter, John, and Appendix. The text gives no evidence of doubling, though it is likely that the same cast would be used for both days of the play. Paulus Scharpff suggests a more extensive doubling scheme, whittling the number of players down to twelve:

1. Thomas: Pilatus,
2. Peter: Centurione,
3. Andrewe: Annas,
4. John: Caiphas,
5. James: one of the Seniors,
6. The II. James: Lukas: The I. Angell
7. Phillipe: Cleophas: The II. Angell,
8. Bartholomew: The I. Souldier: Marie Magdalene,
9. Matthew: The II. Souldier: Marie Solome,
10. Symeon: The III. Souldier: Marie Jacobi,
11. Jude: the IV. Souldier: Marie Jose,
Scharpff's scheme assumes that only John, James and Andrew enter with Peter as Luke and Cleophas are travelling from Emmaus. It is true that these are the only three who speak in the text as we have it, but two folios have been lost which contain the end of Cleophas' account and Christ's subsequent appearance to the entire group of disciples. It is impossible to know if other apostles speak after Cleophas' entry, or if they enter only after the Emmaus pilgrims' final exit. Furthermore, the stage direction, "Peter / with the / Apostles / comes in" suggests that the entire group of apostles is onstage while Luke and Cleophas are visibly returning from Emmaus (980+sd-983sd).

Scharpff's scheme does suggest the unlikelihood of professional production of *The Resurrection of Our Lord* in the sixteenth century. Doubling schemes were important features for travelling professional troupes in this period, but David Bevington has demonstrated that these groups generally ranged in size from four to eight. With a minimum requirement of twelve players, *The Resurrection of Our Lord* would not suit the repertoire of many travelling companies. A parish (or school or community), however, would probably view the abundance of roles positively. On the analogy of modern church, school or community productions, a large cast is usually desirable; it allows many people to participate, and thus draws a larger audience of friends and family. Larger audiences mean larger revenues, an
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85 Scharpff 20-21.
86 David Bevington, *From Mankind to Marlowe* 71.
important point if the production profits are to fund additions to or reparations of the church fabric. Given these considerations, Scharpff’s scheme is a useful exercise, but probably would not have been used by those presenting the play in the sixteenth-century.

Special Effects

The “wounder” that Luke and Cleophas are to exhibit at the disappearance of Christ indicates that the dramatic realization of this moment entails some kind of special effect. The text provides little indication of how this disappearance should be accomplished, noting only that Christ “takes the breade, breake yt and / gives yt vnto them, and so sodenlye departeth” (880+sd). Similarly, the two sudden appearances of Christ among the gathered disciples require an element of surprise. While the first of these appearances occurs in a lost portion of text, James later reports to Thomas, “And that thou shouldst marvayle, a greate deale ye more / he came in the Doores shutt, never harde of before” (1070-71). The second appearance falls at the very end of the surviving text, but no stage direction accompanies it. All of these moments can be accomplished quite simply with a curtain backdrop. Christ simply steps backward behind the curtain when he needs to disappear, and emerges again when he is to enter despite closed doors.⁸⁷

Somewhat more complicated are the pyrotechnics that accompany the

⁸⁷ This method was used to great effect in the York Emmaus pageant when that cycle was staged in Toronto in 1977.
moment of the Resurrection: “the soldiers “fall / downe as / deade in /
hearing the gones shott / of & thunder / Iesus riseth / thowynge of Death”
(206-11sd). Spectacular fireworks must have been an expected feature of the
resurrection play genre. Other English and continental examples also call for
flashes of light and peals of thunder, either implicitly through dialogue or
explicitly through stage directions or records of production. The bright light
of the Resurrection was created with gunpowder at Kingston-upon-Thames
and with rosin at St. Laurence, Reading, and the “gonnes shott / of” in The
Resurrection of Our Lord may also have produced a lightning-like flash,
accompanied by “thunder.” The Third Soldier reinforces the impact of this
sound effect with his subsequent lines, “And I was soe feared, with the
earthquake & thunder / that I thought heaven & earth had gonne together”
(211-12).

Music

Though the resurrection sequences in the surviving cycle plays usually
involve music, The Resurrection of Our Lord does not call for any angelic
song as Christ rises; in fact, the words “and the angel” which follow on the
stage direction for gunfire have been deleted in the manuscript, paradoxically
calling a reader’s attention to the absence of the anthem “Christus resurgens.”

88 In addition to the light of the Resurrection moment, playwrights also contrived pyrotechnics
for Harrowing of Hell episodes. Phillip Butterworth gives examples from the Chester and
Coventry cycles, Mons and Paris in Theatre of Fire: Special Effects in Early English and
Scottish Theatre 7, 12, 37, 78 83-84, and 103.
89 See pp. 81-82 above.
The deletion in the manuscript may point to an ideological choice on the part of the reviser: perhaps the music was left out because its lyrics were in Latin, an unwelcome feature in a play that includes an argument for vernacular Scriptures among its Protestant passages.

The absence of music marks another point of similarity between the play text and the Thames valley parish records. Surprisingly little evidence of musical accompaniment appears in records for these parish plays; only St. Mary’s, Thame recorded payments to minstrels, and then only in 1530, when one minstrel played at both the shewing and recitations.90 Even St. Laurence, Reading, a particularly musical parish which frequently paid singers for the Palm Sunday liturgy, records no payments for resurrection play musicians.91

Modern Production

I know of no modern productions of The Resurrection of Our Lord, but further information about the staging of the play and its theatrical value will be determined by putting it to the test of performance. The modern-spelling edition contained in this thesis represents one step towards that goal; the next is to create a performance script by augmenting the existing text with material from other resurrection plays.

90 Oxfordshire Archives DD Par Thame b. 2, 1527-1912, p. 10.
E. "with what words, or when, or where": Language and Versification

*The Resurrection of Our Lord* is written in Early Modern English (eModE), and exhibits many linguistic features common in the middle to late sixteenth century. The language of the play gives little evidence for any distinct regional origin, but instead illustrates the linguistic influence of early English translations of the Bible. Analysis of morphology provides valuable information about characterization and onstage dynamics through the interplay of *thou* and *you* forms. Specialized vocabulary used by some characters also enriches characterization.

Orthography and Phonology

Typical eModE orthographic features of the text include the long medial *s*, *u* as a medial consonant, *v* as an initial vowel, and *i* used in most cases instead of *j*. *J* does appear as a capital letter, and in its minuscule form it replaces *i* as the final graph in roman numerals. The initial [th] morpheme in words like *the* and *that* is represented by either *y* or *th*.

---

91 For discussion of the parish's musical endeavors, see Johnston, "Emergence" 8-9.
92 I have also used the conventional abbreviations for Middle English (ME) and Modern English (ModE) in this section.
English spelling conventions were not fixed until the end of the early modern period, and the play contains varied orthographic choices for some words. ModE credit for example, is spelled "creadyt" (70) and "credytt" (378). Other words are spelled consistently, but that spelling differs from ModE morphology. One such example, the "suer" for sure, suggests the development of a glide [ə] between some vowels and subsequent /r/.94 Also of interest is the plural form of woman. Although women was a regular form for the plural by c. 1400,95 the scribe consistently writes "wemen," in two cases even correcting o to e (340, 984). Dobson notes that the lowering of ME /i/ to /e/, a phonological change which would inspire this spelling, is "[c]haracteristic particularly of Northern and South-western dialects".96 Though this word may be a clue to the regional provenance of the play, but it is much more likely that the playwright was following either the Tyndale and Coverdale translations of the Bible, both of which use the spelling.97

The rhyme scheme gives few clues about phonology, as it often rhymes a word on itself, or pairs words only by virtue of their unstressed suffixes such as -ed and -er. Other rhymes depend on assonance or consonance.98 Some awkward rhymes coincide with phonological peculiarities observed by eModE orthopaeists such as William Bullokar; for example, lines 94-95 rhyme "furth" with "mouth", a pairing which indicates the assimilatory loss of [r]

95 OED woman sb.
96 Dobson, vol. 2, 570.
97 See, for example, Matt. 28:5, Mark 15:40 or Luke 23:55.
98 Early rhyming dictionaries are similarly problematic as sources for phonological study, see Dobson, vol. 1, 422-3.
before consonants and consonant pairs such as s, sh, st, and th.99

Morphology

As is common in eModE, most nouns in The Resurrection of Our Lord have three forms: an uninflected base nominative form, a nominative plural formed with the addition of an -es morpheme, and a genitive, which is also often formed with the -es morpheme. An alternate possessive form known as the "his-genitive" was frequently used in eModE when a possessive noun ended in an s. This construction can be seen in the criticism: “For that thinge which of vs was felt, harde, and seene / will not sinke in Thomas his head, by noe meane” (1120-21). Appendix couples this form with the more typical -es inflection in lines 502-03: “the circumstance/ both of St Luke his wordes and of St Paules together.” Since the form “Lukes” would be pronounced with only one syllable, the his-genitive is used to make up the required metre.

EModE comparative adjectives could be formed with an -er or -est morpheme, or by using the intensifiers more or most. Examples of both kinds of adjectives appear in The Resurrection of Our Lord as in “the greatestt mysdoer” (540) or “a more playne figure” (829). Appendix combines the two forms into a double comparative for emphasis, asserting “the stronger and more perfecter, they made his resurrection” (252).

Some adverbs in the play lost currency after the early modern period. Efte (175, 945), meaning “again, back afterwards,” fell out of common use by

1600,\textsuperscript{100} and \textit{ywisse} (152) began to lose its meaning of "certainly" as early as the seventeenth century, when authors misunderstood the word as a past tense of "I wist", or "I know".\textsuperscript{101} Adverbs formed from adjectives often lack the \textit{-ly} suffix that now distinguishes them from their root word, resulting in such expressions as "your honour wondered att yt, and that marvelous sore" (47) or "yt ys not like, that he was an evill misdoer" (112).

Many of the personal pronoun inflections that characterize ME morphology did not survive in eModE texts like \textit{The Resurrection of Our Lord}. The play's third person singular and plural pronouns are the standard forms we use today, with the exception of \textit{hit}, the ME neuter singular form, which appears only twice: "he is in hit so pregnant" (101) and "hit att no time should fayl or alter" (465). The presence of this alternative along with the more common spelling \textit{it} evinces the gradual disappearance of the \textit{hit} form which took place during the 1500s.\textsuperscript{102} The distinct ME second person singular faded away in a similar manner. In ME, \textit{thou} and \textit{thee} were the second person singular nominative and accusative pronouns, and \textit{ye} and \textit{you} were the plural forms. During the sixteenth century it became more and more common to use \textit{you} for both plural forms,\textsuperscript{103} a development apparent in \textit{The Resurrection of Our Lord}, which uses \textit{you} exclusively for both.

The pronoun \textit{you} had another use in eModE as well: it could be used

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{100} Barber notes that it is "normal only in the earlier part of the Early Modern period"; Barber 181.
\item \textsuperscript{101} \textit{OED} \textit{ywisse} B. adv.
\item \textsuperscript{102} Barber 150.
\item \textsuperscript{103} Barber 149.
\end{itemize}
to show respect in addressing an individual, a practice analogous to Modern French usage of *vous*. The superior would then reply with *thou*. Other variables could also affect a speaker's choice of *you* or *thou*. *You* reflected (or created) a neutral, formal, or public atmosphere, while *thou* implied familiarity, intimacy, or private address. On a more extreme level, *thou* could indicate condescension or even contempt for the addressee. 

Furthermore, speakers might shift quickly between pronouns, practicing what Jonathan Hope has termed "micro-pragmatic" modulations based on their immediate circumstances and interaction. Analyzing the pronoun patterns in transcriptions of court records from the 1560's, Hope found that the speakers tended to use *you* as the "default" or "neutral" pronoun, whereas usage of *thou* was "almost always motivated in some obvious way."

The interplay of *thou/thee* and *you* in *The Resurrection of Our Lord*

---

104 In an influential study of pronouns of address, Roger Brown and Albert Gilman argued that the use of *thou* and *you* was determined by a "nonreciprocal power semantic" and a "solidarity semantic." In the first, those with power address the less powerful with *thou*, and receive *you* in return. In the second semantic, *you* carries a connotation of formality and *thou* implies intimacy, a bond which might be based on family ties, social class, or similar employment; see Roger Brown and Albert Gilman, "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity," *Style in Language*, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok (Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1960) 253-76. Kathleen Wales offers a valuable critique of Brown and Gilman, identifying additional factors which might influence pronoun choice; see "Thou and You in Early Modern English: Brown and Gilman Re-Appraised," *Studia Linguistica* 37 (1983): 107-25.

105 For a table outlining common conditions of usage for both pronouns, see Wales 116.


107 Hope 148. Of course it is likely that the speakers were somewhat more polite and formal in the context of an ecclesiastical court, but Bullokar also identified *you* as the normal form in 1586 (Wales 121 n. 22).
depends on a number of the variables noted above, and serves as a significant index for personal relationships and social or spiritual hierarchies among the characters. The soldiers, for example, give you to the authority figures who address them, but once they are alone, the Second Soldier reverts to the more familiar and private thou (193). The angels and Christ both address Mary Magdalene as thee, (350-51, 369-70) an appropriate expression given their divine status; in fact, Christ uses thee and thou almost exclusively in each of his surviving post-resurrection appearances. Mary’s reciprocal thou (372) reflects her failure to recognize the “Gardener” as Christ, and might have provided an effective dramatic contrast with her worshipful exclamation of “Rabboni,” or “Master,” when she recognizes her Lord; unfortunately, only a few lines of Christ’s appearance to her survive in the manuscript.

An intriguing modulation appears in the Emmaus sequence. Cleophas and Luke use the reciprocal you as they lament Christ’s suffering and death. When Christ appears to them as a fellow traveller, asking why they “walke soe sadde” (567), Cleophas replies using thou:

    All Ierusalem speakes of our talkynge
   and as thou were anewe come, and knewe nothynge
   dost thou of vs nowe, these thynges enquyer
   and knowest not these Dayes, what hath byne donne their

(568-71)

108 Note, however, that otherworldly creatures are always addressed as thou; see Roger Brown and Albert Gilman, “Politeness Theory and Shakespeare’s Four Major Tragedies,” Language in Society 18 (1989): 179.
Both his words and his choice of *thou* indicate his annoyance, or even outrage, at this stranger. However, after Christ expounds the prophecies of the Messiah to them, the two disciples express a new respect for the "good scoller / which did take soe good heed, to [Christ's] preachinge ever" (847-48). From this point on, they address him as an equal or superior, using *you*.

Peter's changing position within the group of apostles is also highlighted by the shifting pronouns of address given to him. Berating himself as a "periured person, vnfaithfull and witlesse" (480) he contemptuously terms himself *thou* in lines 481-88. Once he tells the apostles about his encounter with the risen Christ, we might expect them to address him with a respectful *you*. However, Andrew's uses *thou* instead.

Then Peter, we will all beleewe thee
for that thou sayest, he hath appeared vnto thee
for thou was in the same Doubt with vs
in like Dispaire, and Conscience scrupulous (994-97)

The apostles have not yet recognized Peter's preeminence; Andrew refers to him instead in terms of their shared experience and intimacy. Later, however, when Peter advises them to go to Galilee, the apostles submit using the *you* form. "We be readye (Peter) to doe what <thou> you will" (1046).

The scribe's correction of *thou* to *you* emphasizes the significance of the respectful pronoun at this point. Thomas also sets Peter apart from (and possibly above) the other disciples with his own pronoun choice: "*All* my fellowes : and you also (Peter) may be deluded" (1088). Later, in an attempt
to find common ground with Peter, he shifts to the more familiar *thou*:

**PETER:** dost thou (Thomas) beleeve, that I am Peter

which talkest with thee nowe, and whom thou dost heare

**THOMAS:** Why shoulde I not beleeve yt, when I do thee sey

in the same self likenes, wherin ever I knewe thee

(1092-95)

The shift may mark a moment of rapport in a scene otherwise marked by
disapproval on the apostles’ part and defensiveness on Thomas’ part.109

Patterns of verbal inflections in *The Resurrection of Our Lord* are
typical of eModE in the sixteenth century. In the present tense, the second
person singular *thou* takes a verb with the *-st* ending, while forms of *you*,
both singular and plural, take an uninflected verb. Verbs in the third person
singular appear with both the *-es* and *-eth* endings, though the former is
more common. Pilate uses both forms in very similar phrases within the
same speech: the Jewish law “ys a thinge pertaynes not, at all to [his] office,”
yet the Jews fear sedition “which thynge pertayneth, vnto [his]
administration.” (130, 142). The former suffix, originally a northern
inflection, was popular in colloquial speech and in poetry, and by 1500 was
“probably common in southern speech” as well.110 The southern *-eth* form
was often used in formal prose such as biblical translation. Several instances

---

109 Thomas consistently receives *thou* from Peter and the other apostles. Peter’s use of *you* at
1065 seems to be addressed to all of the apostles; he refers to his previous account of Christ’s
appearance to him, which they had all heard, and the lines immediately following appeal to
the other nine for help in convincing Thomas (1066-67).

110 Görlach 88.
of it in The Resurrection of Our Lord show that it was associated with scriptural diction. The angel’s words, “he goeth before you into Galiley” (346) quote Coverdale’s translation of Matt. 28:7 and Mark 16:7, and Christ uses the form when citing Old Testament prophesies in his sermon on the road to Emmaus (763-64, 797).

Among the typical uninflected third person plural verbs are a few instances of the -es ending. Examples occur at line 60, “but yonder commes the high Priestes,” and line 810-11 where the Pharisees “beleeve and teach . . . / that the Messias shall not Dye, and so makes ye prophetes lyers.” Another inflection of northern origin, it appears in the Scots, Northern England and North-East Midlands dialects of ME and surfaces in eModE further south, as well; there are several instances in Shakespeare’s plays. Barber notes that it is “seldom found in the early sixteenth century, and is commonest around 1600, when [-es] had displaced [-eth] as the singular ending.” Its occasional appearance in The Resurrection of Our Lord is thus consistent with a revision date of 1535-42.

Alternate past-tense forms of strong verbs, such as “brooke” (57) and “brake” (16, 891), occur together in the text, as do the familiar -ed endings on weak verbs. An unusual case of an uninflected past tense form occurs in lines 56, 483-84, 1028, and 1042, where see is used instead of saw; Thomas Pyles and John Algeo call this an alternative form “found in folk speech.” Other

---

111 For examples and a concise discussion of the form in Shakespeare, see Barber 169-70.
112 Barber 169.
uninflected past tense forms appear in the verbs *consecrate* (718) and *institute* (721). In these two cases the author may have been influenced by the past participle forms of the words, for past participles of weak verbs ending in *t* were often uninflected, particularly when the verb derived from a Latin past participle. Examples of this practice appear in line 319, “was not saucie,” and line 258, “to have extinct Christes name.”

**Syntax**

The play’s syntactical structure is sometimes complicated by the requirements of rhyme and metre, and the absence of full stops (see “Punctuation,” below) can result in ambiguous sentence boundaries.

**Noun Phrases**

Typical eModE constructions are the noun-adjective order, as in “governer principall” (461) or “lawe Evangelicall” (625), and the adjective-noun-adjective construction: “a faithful house and fair” (710). Determiners often co-occur with a noun, as in “this their Sabboth Day” (49). A more complex example incorporates the adjective-noun-adjective structure as well: “by means of that, his so shamefull death and cruell” (583).

**Verb Phrases**

The frequent use of auxilliary *do* is characteristic of eModE. In *The
Resurrection of Our Lord, as in other sixteenth-century poems and plays, it provides a convenient means to make up a metrical line. The perfect tenses of intransitive verbs of motion are formed with auxiliary be and a past participle, as in line 61 ("they are come") or "it was come to pass" (631), while most other perfect tenses are formed with auxiliary have. An unusual perfect construction appears in "he woulde never kicked" (121); this use of a modal auxiliary with the past participle was "not very common" but still "part of accepted usage" in eModE.  

Relative Pronouns

The pronouns used to introduce relative clauses are consistent with eModE usage of the early sixteenth century. Relative clauses in ME were introduced with which, that, or sometimes whom, if the pronoun was the object of the clause and referred to a person, and this practice continued into the first decades of the early modern period. Görlach notes that who was rarely used as a personal relative pronoun before 1550, and that which "predominated in all types of relative clauses in early sixteenth-century texts." In The Resurrection of Our Lord, who appears only once as a relative pronoun: "but such is the nature, of that his pittie / who ys the well and fountayne, of all mercye" (492-93). In this case, it is unclear if the pronoun is impersonal, referring back to the nature of Christ's pity, or

116 Barber provides examples from Dekker's Shoemaker's Holiday (1600) and the "good" quarto of Hamlet (1604) but notes that the construction was changed to include "have" in the 1623 quarto; see Barber 197.
117 Barber 210-11. For a thorough study of the subject, see M. Rydén, Relative Constructions in Early 16th Century English (Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1966).
118 Görlach 124-25.
personal, referring to Christ himself. *Which* is by far the most usual relative pronoun, used with a personal antecedent more than 50 times, and another 25 times with an impersonal antecedent.

**Contractions**

The usual sixteenth-century contracted form for *it is* reduced the pronoun, so that the two words were written 'tis. *The Resurrection of Our Lord* contains no examples of 'tis, but does contain an instance of the modern contraction *it's*: “for riches he had non, therefore yts great follye / to make all this busynes, about such beggerie” (195-96). This form did not become current in written English until the seventeenth century. Its presence in the play may reflect colloquial, spoken English, particularly since the character speaking is the same soldier who consistently uses the informal *thou* to his companions.

**Vocabulary**

One word appears in the play which is unattested in the *OED*: the verb *engawlme*, which Mary Jacobi uses at line 338:

*Yet* or we returne home, thus Dismayed

let vs goe to the place, were he was layed

and with our sweete oyntmentes his grave through <enbalme> [engawlme]

seynge we have not his bodye to enbalme (336-39)

---

119 Pyles and Algeo 203.
The word appears to an unusual spelling of the verb *gum*, which can mean "[t]o treat with aromatic gums as in . . . embalming a corpse."\(^{120}\) This verb is widely attested in ME, though the MED gives no instance of the spelling found in *The Resurrection of Our Lord*.\(^{121}\) Perhaps the playwright confused the meaning of this verb with the form of another, similar one; "engawlme" could easily be a metathesized form of the ME verb *engliemen* or *englamen*, "to cover with a sticky or viscous substance, or with filth or poison; to get thus covered, to stick or adhere."\(^{122}\)

Several specialized kinds of vocabulary appear in association with particular characters. Pilate uses words of public office and government such as "title" (28), "seditiousnes" and "seditione" (138, 141), and also shares a legal vocabulary with the high priests. The terms "reason" (97, 393), "conscience" (382, 383, 385, 398, and 400), "mischief" (98, 101, 386-87, 397), and "inconvenyence" (154-55 386, 397) all had distinct legal significance in early modern England, and these words recur in conversations involving Pilate, Annas and Caiphas, figures of the secular and ecclesiastical law. Reason and conscience were two of the guiding principles in jurisprudence, explored in depth by Christopher St. Germain in *Doctor and Student*, a popular legal textbook published eleven times between 1532 and 1598.\(^{123}\) While we may

---

\(^{120}\) *OED* *gum* v.\(^{1}\) 1.

\(^{121}\) *MED* *gomen*, v.

\(^{122}\) *MED*, *engleimen*, v. 1. a. and 1. b. The word survives today as *OED* *gum*, vb. 2. "To smear with a sticky substance; to daub (something sticky) on a surface."

\(^{123}\) Christopher St. Germain, *Doctor and Student*, ed. T. F. T. Plucknett and J. L. Barton, Selden Society 91 (London: Selden Society, 1974). The two dialogues in the text were written separately and published individually at first, but appeared in print together after 1532. The first edition of the first dialogue advertises its attention to "the groundes of the sayd Lawes
think of conscience as "merely the subjective sense of right and wrong possessed by a particular individual," sixteenth-century legal minds understood it quite differently. "What [was] good and what evil [was] not a matter of personal taste but [was] to be determined by revelation and by reason." Conscience was the application of this knowledge; "the art of translating [knowledge of good and evil] into specific rules of conduct to be followed in particular situations." Verbal contracts, in particular, were subject to the jurisdiction of conscience. The legal significance of these words is implicit in the soldiers' initial rejection of bribes from Annas and Caiphas: "your request (my Lorde) here in ys vreasonable / and concernynge good conscience, suerlye vntollerable" (381-82). The soldiers recognize the evil of the high priests' offers, and express the importance of acting on that recognition; they also fear that the contract will not hold up in court. However, Annas counters with his own legal terminology, arguing that the law requires men of "scrippulous conscience/ to suffer a myschiefe rather than an inconvenience" (385-86). While a mischief is a wrong borne by an

[and] conscience;" see Christopher St. Germain, A dyaloge in Englysshe, betwyxt a doctoure of dyuynyte and a student in the lawes of Englande (London: R. Wyer, 1530) title page. (STC 2156.) A brief account of the work and its publication history appears in S.E. Thorne, "Saint Germain's Doctor and Student," The Library: Transactions of the Bibliographical Society, 4th series, 10 (1930): 421-26. Saint Germain was a "moderate reformer" whose writings in support of the legal separation of church and state brought him into conflict with Thomas More, and prompted the members of the Pilgrimage of Grace to include him in their list of heresies; see A. F. Pollard, "St. German, Christopher," DNB.


125 Vinogradoff 381-84.
individual, an inconvenience has a much wider impact. According to the OED, these two terms are opposed in judicial discourse as early as 1503, and a very similar phrasing of the commonplace appears in Doctor and Student: "The law wyll rather suffre that myscheyf then the said inconuenience." In Annas' application of English common law, the soldiers' lies about the Resurrection, a course of action which does mischief to Christ and the apostles, would be justified because they circumvent an inconvenience: the overthrow of "Moyses lawe" (387).

Doctrinal issues underlie Annas' accusation that the apostles are "newe fangell" (71). Originally a somewhat critical term for a novelty or new fashion, "new fangle" took on a more particular meaning in the second quarter of the sixteenth century, becoming an opprobrious adjective applied to reformers. In 1532, Richard Whitford denounced "these newe fangle persones whiche in dede ben heretykes," and in 1539 a curate at Wincanton, similarly condemned "these new fangled fellows which read these new Books, for they be heretics." Conservatives also applied the term to Lutheran and Zwinglian views on the Eucharist; in his pamphlet, A newe

---

127 St. Germain 289.
128 OED new fangled, adj. 1.
129 Richard Rex identifies this term as one of the "more exotic formulations" of "the new learning." He convincingly argues that the latter phrase referred not to humanism, but rather to heresy or religious error, and was a "perjorative term" by sixteenth-century conservatives to describe the belief of early Protestants. See Richard Rex, "The New Learning," Journal of Ecclesiastical History 44 (1993): 26-44.
131 L & P xiv pt. 1 #897. Cited in Rex, 33.
dialogue wherein is conteynd the examination of the messe, William Turner places this criticism in the mouth of "Mastres Missa," who fears that "mani new fangled felowes would that I should be remoued out of the way, that Christes supper, (as they call it) myghte haue place in the church, as a holsomer thyng and more profitable for mannes soule then I am." The description of the Lord's supper that follows identifies the main features of Zwinglian eucharistic thought; it "is but a memorial of Christes death & a giuynge of thankes for the benefit of mans saluation, wherbi menns fayeth is strenghtened & their loue is increased."132

The eucharistic debate of the sixteenth century also colors the reformist language of Christ and Appendix. Terms like "thankfull remembrance" (716) and "thankfull memorye" (723) signal affinities with Zwingli's theology. Other words used by Christ, the apostles and Appendix are similarly loaded; "elected"/"electes" (712/723), "Evangelicall" (625, 852) and "godly" (668, 866, 966) all were favored terms in Protestant rhetoric.133 The reformist preference for a "plain" style of expression emerges in the apostles praise for Christ's preaching, or "playne teachinge" (854).134

133 OED evangelical adj. 2. a.; elect adj. 2. a., sb. 1.
Style

The playwright not only praises plain expression, but also demonstrates it through most of the play. Early reformers often viewed rhetorical tropes and figures with some trepidation, suspicious that eloquence, which often was based on pagan models, impeded the communication of the gospel. Rhetorical devices in *The Resurrection of Our Lord* are not elaborate, nor are they strictly ornamental. Instead they serve a dramaturgical or didactic purpose. Pilate’s speech is occasionally marked with balanced antitheses, as in line 18-19, “What [Christ] was or should be, that know not I / but this I knowe, that they accused hym of Envye,” or line 108, “What he coulde, or coulde not, I am not able to say.” The style emphasizes Pilate’s own ambivalence about the crucifixion and his role in it, and also illustrates his efforts to give a balanced judgement. Christ also uses rhetorical devices of repetition and contrast in his sermon to Cleophas and Luke, demonstrating the difference between the Messiah and his forerunner, Moses:

Moyses brought the lawe written, in tables of stone
Christ brought them written, in the hart of man
Moyses in the hill, talked with God in the cloude
Christ came from heaven, from the bosome of God

..............................

Moyses from the hill, brought the lawe Iuditiall

---

135 Auksi 268-69.
Christ one the hill, taught the lawe spirituall (640-45)

The sermon continues in this vein of comparison for another twelve lines, but the the art of this passage clarifies rather than obscures Christ’s teaching.

The “plain style” of the play remains close to that of its scriptural sources. Like much early Tudor writing, *The Resurrection of Our Lord* imitates biblical English. The fact that its author is writing in verse rather than prose leads to some differences in phrasing, but the diction of many passages echoes that found in early English translations of the Bible. In his sermon on the road to Emmaus, for example, Christ recounts a visit from followers of John the Baptist:

> Agayne when that Iohn Baptist, was cast nowe into pryson and sent two of his Disciples, and asked of hym this question art thou he which shall come? he bade then Iohns Disciples goe straight to Iohn agayne, and to hym [tell] his miracles (756-59)

His language parallels the Coverdale version of Matthew 11:2-5:

> When John beinge in preson herde of the workes of Christ, he sent two of his disciples, and sayde vnto him: Arte thou he yat shall come, or shal we loke for another? Iesus answered and

---


137 King, *English Reformation Literature* 139.

138 A potentially misleading footnote in Thora Blatt’s discussion of the play seems to credit Tyndale for the play’s New Testament references, and the Vulgate for Old Testament references; see Blatt 26 n.14. However, the note actually refers to the editions Blatt herself cites in her study.
sayde vnto them: Go youre waye and telle John agayne, what ye see and heare. The blynde se, and the lame go: the lepers are clensed, and ye deaf here: the deed aryse ageyne, and the gospell is preached to the poore.\textsuperscript{139}

The playwright’s adherence to biblical phrasing is no doubt related to Appendix’s defense of English translations of the Bible at lines 261-67.\textsuperscript{140}

Colloquial language in the play includes several proverbial phrases, identified in the explanatory notes of this edition.\textsuperscript{141}

\textbf{Versification and Metre}

Two verse forms are used in \textit{The Resurrection of Our Lord}. For dialogue the playwright uses rhymed couplets, but Appendix speaks in rhyme royal. Both verse forms were common in early Tudor interludes, occurring in plays by Bale, as well as in \textit{The Four Elements}, \textit{Calisto and Melibea}, \textit{Fulgens and Lucrece}, and \textit{Magnificence}.\textsuperscript{142} The playwright did not adhere to a strict metrical pattern, but wrote instead in lines containing anywhere from four to six stresses. Most lines contain a caesural comma which appears after the first two stresses in a line, but its metrical function

\textsuperscript{139} The passage also resembles Tyndale’s translation, as Coverdale drew on heavily on Tyndale’s work when he was constructing his own edition of the Bible.

\textsuperscript{140} See pp. 121-25 above.

\textsuperscript{141} The low incidence of these phrases contributes in large part to B. J. Whiting’s criticism of \textit{The Resurrection of Our Lord}. Making no attempt to disguise his distaste, he calls it “a pedestrian piece, devoid of grace, interest, and proverbs.” B.J. Whiting \textit{Proverbs in the Earlier English Drama}, Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature 14 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1938) 46.

\textsuperscript{142} Happé, “Introduction” 18.
rarely coincides with the syntax of the line. This practice resembles that of Bale in *King Johan*, as Peter Happé has noted.\textsuperscript{143} However, Bale's iambic pentameter lends *King Johan* a more regular rhythm than that of *The Resurrection of Our Lord*.

**F. Manuscript Description**

The only known witness to *The Resurrection of Our Lord* is Folger Shakespeare Library MS V. b. 192, and the remaining fragments of the play are the sole contents of the manuscript. Its eighteen paper leaves measure 267 x 160 mm. Scribal pagination appears in the upper right corners of rectos and and left corners of versos: 17-28, 37-38, 43-58, and 63-66. Therefore, eight leaves now are missing from the beginning of the manuscript: four between pp. 28 and 37, two between pp. 38 and 43, two between pp. 58 and 63, and an indeterminate number at the end. The last surviving leaf (65/66) is loose and shows signs of having been folded and stored in the manuscript; it is creased, broken in the middle, and repaired at outer edge with a slip of paper.

Traces of watermarks are visible on pages 21, 25, 37, 45, 49, 53, 55, and 57. Damp has caused some bleedthrough and fading, and has also obscured the form of the watermarks. Attempts to identify them with a light box and Dylux photography have proved unsuccessful. Inner edges and portions of leaves are particularly affected by the damp; nonetheless, the text is clear.

\textsuperscript{143} Happé, "Introduction" 19-20.
The scribe prepared the leaves of the manuscript by pricking and ruling them. Pricking is visible on the outside edge of all surviving leaves, except the first, where it must have been cropped. Pricking is also visible as marking for the 240 x 115 mm text frame, which is ruled in dark brown ink. Within this text frame, an additional vertical line creates a 27 mm column for stage directions. Pricking occasionally appears within this column, and the pattern of the pricking suggests that the scribe may have considered narrower dimensions for the stage direction column. Blind (i.e. dry point) ruling was used for the text, which averages 39 lines per page.

Aside from an omission on page 28, running titles appear throughout the manuscript: on pages 17-38 “The First Dayes Playe” and “The Seconde Dayes Playe” on pages 43-66. Catchwords appear at the bottom of each page except 53. On seven pages the catchword appears within the frame ruling rather than in the lower margin.

Collation of the manuscript is impracticable. Since the manuscript has been bound more than once, doubtless it lacked leaves before it was sewn into its present binding. No signatures exist, but the leaves containing pages 25/27 and 43/45 appear to be conjugate. Three stubs are visible at the beginning of the manuscript; the first has horizontal ruling in dark brown ink that matches the frame ruling in the rest of the manuscript. Either three or four stubs are visible at the end of the manuscript. Laetitia Yeandle,

---

144 These marks are sparser in later pages of the manuscript. If a number of pages were prepared at once, the pricking instrument might not have pierced the leaves each time.
145 See pp. 181-82 below.
Curator of Manuscripts at the Folger Library, and J. Franklin Mowery, conservator for the Folger, found that the paste down and last stub were "probably conjugate," with the "inner edge folded back over itself to provide reinforcement for sewing." This method of sewing may be true of other leaves in the manuscript, adding to the difficulty of collation.

Script

Folger MS V. b. 192 is a fair copy written in a very clear hand by a single experienced scribe. At least one other hand has made some alterations and additions. The scribe uses secretary script for dialogue and italic for literae notabiliores, including speech headings, running titles, stage directions, and some proper names within dialogue.

Characteristic minuscule secretary letter forms used by the scribe include the single lobed a, d with a simple (not a looped) ascender, two forms of e: reversed and two-stroke Greek, long f, flat topped g with an open tail, h with a modest flourish, twin-stemmed "lyre" form r, long and short s. The letters u and n are sometimes hard to distinguish. Majuscule forms include two forms of C; one of these forms, used only once, resembles a majuscule O (p. 51, l.2).

Abbreviations used include ampersand, contractions for -re or -ur, and -es, as well as the common mark of abbreviation indicating n which is

---

146 Laetitia Yeandle, personal interview, September 1998.
necessary at least once but may be otiose in other instances.

Punctuation

Punctuation includes instances of *percontativi*, parentheses, commas, and some period/virgule combinations. Of these, the instances of *percontativi* are the most significant, as this mark of punctuation was "new" and "rare" in England in 1581, when it was used by London printer Henry Denham.\(^\text{147}\) Holographs of Herrick and Middleton also include the symbol.\(^\text{148}\) The *percontativus* was used to mark rhetorical questions, or more generally, as a mark of declamatory punctuation.\(^\text{149}\) Its appearance in Folger MS V. b. 192 suggests to Dr. Malcolm Parkes that the manuscript's date is "probably 1590-1630."\(^\text{150}\)

Though less significant than the *percontativus* as an index to the manuscript's date, parentheses and commas appear more frequently in the text. Just under half of the instances of parentheses in the play enclose vocative expressions, a conventional use for this punctuation mark in sixteenth-century texts.\(^\text{151}\) Other instances reveal the general enthusiasm that early English writers had for parentheses. As J. Lennard observes,

> Humanist scribes had introduced parentheses to isolate

\(^{148}\) For examples of the symbol in these authors' hands, see A. G. Petti, *English Literary Hands from Chaucer to Dryden* (London: Arnold, 1977) 106-09.  
\(^{149}\) Malcolm Parkes, personal interview, January 24, 2000.  
interpolated expressions which were grammatically independent of their immediate contexts, but in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries they were employed (especially in England) much more freely than at any other time. Any expression which might be regarded as parenthetical was enclosed within the two new marks—exclamations, attributions of direct speech to speakers in passages of dialogue, *lemmata* in commentaries, sententious statements and invocations.\(^{152}\)

In some cases the scribe's rationale for what "might be regarded as parenthetical" exceeds even Lennard's capacious set of expressions. For example, the priests request a watch on the sepulchre "lest his Disciples, (shoulde come privilye) and steale hym / and saye he were risen, for anger, we Did hange hym" (76-77). His use of commas is more systematic; generally they mark the caesura in verse lines. As noted above, this usage also appears in other reformist plays.\(^{153}\)

**Stage Directions and Marginalia**

Aside from the conventional "Exit" and "Exeunt" all stage directions are in English. They generally appear in their own column, though occasionally the scribe has placed one right beside a speech heading. "Exit" and "Exeunt" sometimes appear on the same line as the subsequent speech

---

\(^{152}\) Lennard 16.

\(^{153}\) See pp. 175-76 above.
heading. Three other types of notation appear with some regularity in the margins. The first of these, a trefoil in the same ink as the text, appears to mark passages of particular doctrinal interest.\textsuperscript{154} The second, a large italic $N$, seems to be written in a different ink (and perhaps by a different hand). The symbol is a conventional abbreviation for "\textit{nota}"; but it is not clear what the scribe (or annotator) wished to note. Wilson and Dobell suggest that these marks denote possible exits of the Expositor figure, where no "Exit" stage direction occurs. A different explanation is offered by Alexandra F. Johnston, who suggests that the symbols may frame passages of reformist material which could be cut if necessary. Given the fragmentary state of the text, however, it is impossible to determine which passages the symbols would frame. Finally, scriptural citations for passages referred to in the text also appear in the margins. These notations appear most frequently in reference to Christ's sermon on the road to Emmaus and are all written in the scribe's hand. Most of them cite both chapter and verse, which suggests that the manuscript postdates the 1560 printing of the Geneva Bible, the first translation of the Bible to number verses.

\textbf{Binding}

Evidence of stitch holes in the gutter show that the manuscript has been stab sewn at least twice. The present binding is plain brown sheepskin

\textsuperscript{154} Most of the trefoils appear next to passages on Petrine authority and the Eucharist; see II. 461-99 and 706-722 in the present old-spelling edition.
over pasteboard, blind-tooled with a double line roll. The back board has some wormholes. The manuscript is stab-bound with thongs which appear four times on each pasteboard, at acute angles to the spine. A pastedown inside the back cover bears in the upper left hand corner pencil notations of the Folger case and call numbers (1828.1, V.B.192). Other marks on the pastedown include some scribbles in what may be the same ink used for some corrections (faded to a gray-brown) and in darker ink approximately halfway down the page. These may read either “mod am” or “mod um” or “mor [large flourish] am.” A bookplate on the inside front cover hints at the manuscript’s history.

Date and Provenance

Previous editors have dated the play’s composition 1530-60, and the manuscript 1580-1630, noting that “even this must be regarded as more or less tentative.” It may be possible to limit these parameters further. The reformist doctrine in the play suggests that the play was revised into its current form between 1535-1542, while the instances of *percontatious* suggest that the manuscript was copied between 1590-1630. The manuscript’s history before 1900 is murky, though a booklabel provides some evidence for ownership in the mid-nineteenth century. Centered on the inside front cover, the label measures 56 mm x 29 mm and reads “T. BRAYNE / OSWESTRY / [printers ornament].” Wilson and Dobell judged in 1912 that

---

155 Wilson and Dobell vi-vii.
the booklabel was relatively recent, but did not identify Brayne.156

Brayne is not an uncommon name in the local records of Oswestry, a market town not far from Shrewsbury, near the Welsh border. It is likely that the label belonged to one Thomas Brayne who was born on November 15, 1803 into a maltster family.157 In 1823 and 1826 Thomas was employed in the family trade,158 but later appearances in parish records and census accounts point to more literary occupations. In 1831 when Thomas’ second son was baptized, the parish clerk identified the father as a schoolmaster.159 He may have taught at Oswestry School. Founded in the fifteenth century, it was a rival of the nearby Shrewsbury School where William Ashton produced Protestant biblical drama in the sixteenth century. A Shropshire commercial directory for 1828 lists several other day or boarding schools for the town, which also might have employed Brayne.160 In 1850 another commercial directory indicates that Brayne is an accountant in Oswestry,161 and the census one year later lists him as a “writer.”162 This term may simply refer to Brayne’s accounting work, but even if Brayne was not composing any literary works, the picture of him that emerges from these records is that of a literate, educated man from a well-to-do family, the sort of person who might have

156 Wilson and Dobell vii.
157 Shropshire Records and Research Centre, St. Oswald Parish Register, B 1678-1812.
158 Records for the baptisms of his first daughter and son list his profession as maltster. Shropshire Records and Research Centre, St. Oswald Parish Register B 1813-1961.
159 Shropshire Records and Research Centre, St. Oswald Parish Register B 1813-1961.
161 Slater’s Royal National and Commercial Directory and Topography of the Counties of Derbyshire, Gloucestershire, Herefordshire, Monmouthshire, Shropshire, Staffordshire, Warwickshire, Worcestershire, and North and South Wales (Manchester, 1850) 36.
162 Shropshire Records and Research Centre, HO.107/1993 f. 537.
had an interest in literature and the means to acquire a manuscript. A final suggestive feature of Brayne’s biography is the fact that his brother Samuel was employed as an engraver in 1835;\(^{163}\) perhaps he produced the label that appears in Folger MS V. b. 192.

Even given the possible identification of Brayne, parts of the manuscript’s journey into the collections of the Folger Library remain mysterious. According to Seymour De Ricci, Dobell purchased it ``(ca. 1900), in a sale at Hodgson’s,'' and still had it in his possession in 1912 while preparing his Malone Society edition with J. Dover Wilson.\(^{164}\) De Ricci also claims that the manuscript passed through the hands of book dealer Frank Marcham before coming into Henry Folger’s possession. However Laetitia Yeandle finds no bill of sale for the manuscripts among Mr. Folger’s receipts. Its case number is 1828.1, and she notes that other items with this case number were acquired ca. 1928.

In addition to the De Ricci entry, printed notices of the manuscript include an entry in the *Catalog of Manuscripts of the Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington D.C.*\(^{165}\) and an unidentified notice which is stored with the manuscript in the Folger collection. The Wilson and Dobell text for the Malone Society is the only published edition.

---

\(^{163}\) Shropshire Records and Research Centre, St. Oswald Parish Register B 1813 –1961.


VI. The Resurrection of Our Lord: A Dual-Text Edition

A. Editorial Principles

This dual-text edition is based on the only known manuscript of the play, Folger Shakespeare Library MS V.b.192; it is collated with the only previous edition, the 1912 Malone Society Reprint, edited by J. Dover Wilson and Bertram Dobell. The editorial apparatus appears at the bottom of old-spelling pages. It records any substantive departures of this edition from the manuscript and any readings which differ from the previous edition. In each note, the lemma is taken from the present old-spelling edition. In cases of emendation, the lemma is followed by the manuscript reading; in cases of variant readings, the lemma is followed by its counterpart in the Malone Society text. The texts are cited as follows:

MS Folger Shakespeare Library MS V. b. 192


More detailed comments on catchwords, deletions, insertions and other textual matters are given in the textual notes, on pages 269-73. Explanatory notes appear in a separate section, from pages 274-96.

Old-Spelling Text:

Manuscript spelling has been reproduced except for the correction of some obvious errors; these emendations are placed in square brackets [] and dealt with in the apparatus. The scribe’s uses of y for th and alternation
between v and u have been retained. Long s is transcribed as modern s, but initial ff is reproduced. Contractions have been expanded; letters supplied for expanded contractions have been underlined rather than italicized in order to avoid confusion with the italic type used for some features of the text (see below). Raised letters are silently lowered, and Roman numerals are retained.

Word division in the manuscript is occasionally unclear, particularly in cases of a as an article or prefix, and of internal y. For example, in lines 43 and 126, the word pairs “a tombe” and “a verie” both appear to be written as single words, but both “asunder” and “anon” are written as two separate words (15, 59). I have separated the instances of a as an article, indicating in textual notes their proximity to the following word, and have left the prefixes separate as well. Similarly, internal occurrences of y often are followed with a space that seems to divide the word; see “captayne,” “vayne” and “callynge” in lines 177, 322, and 662. Since this practice seems to be an issue of letter formation rather than spelling convention, I have joined the two parts of the word, and reproduced the manuscript’s division in the apparatus. Scribal deletions are placed in angle brackets < > and interlineations in half brackets [ ]. All capitalization and marks of punctuation in the manuscript have been reproduced, including instances of the percontativus, represented by :.¹

The scribe uses large italic script for running titles, speech headings, the first word or words of a new speaker (or new stanza in the speeches of Appendix), and a smaller form of the script for marginal notations, some stage directions and some proper names within dialogue. These practices have been represented with twelve- and ten- point italic type. In the manuscript, speech headings are centered above characters’ lines, and stage

¹ Wilson and Dobell interpreted the percontativus as a question mark and represented it as such. This substitution is misleading, as the percontativus is a much more flexible symbol. For a thorough discussion of the scribe’s punctuation practices, see pp. 179-80 above.
directions usually appear in the margins; this placement has been retained, and additional marginal notations are also reproduced. Where folios are lost, I have supplied the first words of the first lost folio using the catchwords on the surviving folio. These words appear in square brackets.

Line numbering in the Malone Society edition includes speech headings and some stage directions. I have numbered only lines of dialogue. Where a line of verse is too long for the page, and extends onto the following line, I have reproduced the appearance of the page, but have numbered the "overflow" words as part of the verse line to which they belong. When referring to speech headings and stage directions in apparatus or notes, I have followed the practice of Lumiansky and Mills in their EETS edition of the Chester cycle, identifying these parts of the text with reference to the line number that precedes them. Thus, the stage direction for Christ blessing the bread at Emmaus, which follows line 880, is identified as "880+ sd."

Modern-Spelling Text:

Spelling and word division have been silently modernized throughout, according to OED conventions. In the interest of providing an accessible text which still retains features of early modern English, I have retained older forms of words, such as the pronouns "thee" and "thou" and the -eth and -est verb inflections. Capitals are used at the beginning of each line, for proper names, and anywhere else that they would appear in modern use. Roman numerals have been converted to Arabic numerals, and proper names are given their modern spelling, unless the older form is necessary for a rhyme.

I have silently implemented interlineations and other corrections made in the manuscript, but have retained some cancelled lines and words,
which appear in angle brackets <>. Other verbal emendations are identified by square brackets [] and discussed in the explanatory notes. In most cases I have decided not to add words that would "smooth out" the writing, preferring to retain the ellipses that often characterize early modern syntax.

Punctuation is editorial, though I have retained some instances of the caesural comma which also serve a syntactical purpose. In addition, I have provided other modernized syntactical pointing. Explanatory notes discuss those cases in which alternative punctuation might provide a substantially different reading.

As noted above, the scribe indicated stanza divisions in Appendix's lines with initial words in italic script; the same script was used for speech headings. In this modern-spelling text, stanzas are separated with a space, and rhyming lines are indented. Italic type is reserved for stage directions. All speech headings have been moved to the left margin, exits and entrances appear to the right of dialogue, while more elaborate stage directions have been moved from the margins to the center of the page. Since longer stage directions extend over several lines in the margin of the manuscript, their precise placement amidst lines of dialogue is sometimes ambiguous. In such cases, reference to the old-spelling edition will clarify the location of stage directions as they appear in the manuscript. Editorial stage directions appear in square brackets.

Line numbering corresponds to the old spelling edition.
[The first sixteen pages of the manuscript are missing, and we do not know if all of them contained text of The Resurrection of Our Lord. It is likely that the play opened with an introduction by Appendix. Other early scenes may have included the meeting of the three Marys, their purchase of spices, the Centurion's account of the Crucifixion, and a preliminary meeting of the high priests. The surviving text begins in the midst of this meeting.]

[Caiphas]

which deceaved many people, all here rounde about yet by the Diligent watchinge, of the Bishoppes than they came both to naught, as nowe shall this man yf we should be more negligent, then they were in this we myght both be thought, vnworthy our office yet first we will make, the elders vnto this privye after that entreat Pilate, their vnto Louynglye.

Pilate

If yt be thus Centuriane, you make me to wonder

Centurione

Yes. and much more sir. which I coulde remember for though I shoulde lye. which was captayne to those souldiers whom you appointed, for the execution of those misdoers they will testifie, that when he suffered without Doubt their was great Darkenes, on the earth rounde about and when he yelded vpp the ghost from hym their

the vayle of the temple. Devided a sunder the earth shoucke, the stones brake, the graves opened so that I sayed playnelye, the sonne of God suffered

Pilate

What he was or shoulde be, that knowe not I but this I knowe, that they accused hym of Envye they layed open cryme, never to his charge but wordes of blasphemye, agaynst their God and vsage and you knowe howe I woulde fayne have Delivered hym but that they were so busye on me, for the Death of hym so that my wife troubled in her dreame att his Judgement

warned me for iudginge, agaynst that lust innocent and seyinge I woulde fayne, have ridde my hands of hym

Math. 27.19

15 a sunder] asunder W-D
24 27. 19] 27.19. W-D
The First Day's Play

[The first sixteen pages of the manuscript are missing, and we do not know if all of them contained text of The Resurrection of Our Lord. It is likely that the play opened with an introduction by Appendix. Other early scenes may have included the meeting of the three Marys, their purchase of spices, the Centurion's account of the Crucifixion, and a preliminary meeting of the high priests. The surviving text begins in the midst of this meeting.]

[CAIPHAS] Which deceived many people, all here round about.
Yet by the diligent watching of the bishops then,
They came both to naught, as now shall this man.
If we should be more negligent than they were in this,
We might both be thought unworthy our office.
Yet first we will make the elders unto this privy:
After that, entreat Pilate thereunto lovingly.

5 Exeunt [Annas and Caiphas.
Enter Pilate and Centurion]

Pilate If it be thus, Centurion, you make me to wonder.

Centurion Yes, and much more, sir, which I could remember.
For though I should lie, which was captain to those soldiers
Whom you appointed for the execution of those misdoers,
They will testify that when he suffered, without doubt
There was great darkness on the earth round about.
And when he yielded up the ghost from him there.
The veil of the temple divided asunder.
The earth shook, the stones broke, the graves opened.
So that I said plainly, the Son of God suffered.

10 PILATE What he was or should be, that know not I.
But this I know: that they accused him of envy.
They laid open crime never to his charge.
But words of blasphemy against their God and usage.
And you know how I would fain have delivered him.
But that they were so busy on me for the death of him,
So that my wife, troubled in her dream at his judgement,
Warned me for judging against that just innocent.
And seeing I would fain have rid my hands of him

15

20

25
but yit they cried with one voice, hange hym, hange hym
then least the jewes, shoude have any title agaynst me
be cause he was named the kyngge of Iurye
and so privilye have gone, and complayned to Cesar
vnder whom I am here, Deputie and officer
and for feare of that Debate, betwene Herod and me
I myght have byne wyped, soe from my Dignitie
I gave judgement of Death, vpon their accusation
and by washyng of handes, from his bloudsheede me innocent [p.18]
howe coulde I. I praye you, have Donne more for hym
then this that I Did, to have rydde my handes of hym

Centuriane

Yea, your honour doth remember, howe yester nyght last
a worshipfull Senator here \{was\} not agast
bouldlye to request his corps. to be buried
he iudged belike better, then all the rest Did
and as I understand the mans Doynge yt is sayed
he hath buried hym in a tombe, wher never non was Layed
yet woulde you not graunt, his corps with such speade
tell you lerned of me, that he was Deade in Deede
so that when you harde he was Deade so longe before
your honour wondered att yt, and that marvellous sore

Pilate

I wondered att yt. for that the Bishoppes I saye
vpon a superstition, of this their Sabboth Daye
requested that those three, which were condemned
myght be all hanghed, and soe Downe plucked
vpon their requestynge, of this their hanghinge
I thought that this Iesus, had then byne lyvynge

Centurione

But yt <shall> please your honour, when ye souldiers appoynde
had those, (of either syde hym) their first hanghed
when to hym they came (after) and see hym Deade
they brooke no bone of his legges, in verye Deede

43 a tombe\} atombe MS
54 appoyntede W-D
But that they cried with one voice. "Hang him! Hang him!".
Then, lest the Jews should have any title against me
Because he was named the King of Jewry,
And so privily have gone and complained to Caesar
Under whom I am here Deputy and officer.
And for fear of that debate between Herod and me
I might have been wiped so from my dignity.
I gave judgment of death upon their accusation.
And by washing of hands from his bloodshed me innocent.
How could I, I pray you, have done more for him
Than this that I did: to have rid my hands of him?

CENTURION  Yea, your honour doth remember how yesternight last
A worshipful senator here was not aghast
Boldly to request his corpse to be buried.
He judged belike better than all the rest did.
And as I understand the man's doing, it is said
He hath buried him in a tomb where never none was laid.
Yet would you not grant his corpse with such speed
Till you learned of me that he was dead indeed.
So that when you heard he was dead so long before.
Your honour wondered at it, and that marvelous sore.

PILATE    I wondered at it, for that the bishops, I say.
Upon a superstition of this their Sabbath day.
Requested that those three which were condemned
Might be all hanged, and so down plucked.
Upon their requesting of this their hanging.
I thought that this Jesus had then been living.

CENTURION  But if it <shall> please your honour, when the soldiers appointed
Had those of either side him there first hanged.
When to him they came after and [saw] him dead,
They broke no bones of his legs, in very deed.
but for suernes, on thrust into his side a speare
were out a non yssued, both bloude and water
but yonder commes the high Priestes agayne nowe
I am suer they are come, for to speake with you

Caiphas

My lorde Deputie, we become, to talke with yow a fewe words

Pilate

Sitt you downe, and saye what you will my lorde

Caiphas

My lorde, we doubt not, but yow consider yt parfectlye
howe this vagabounde ys comdemned to Death, most iustlye
for besides he was, both a runnagate, and a traytour
he was worthyer death, then any theiffe or murtherer
for he murthered our people, in a faulse beleife
and stale them from our lawe, like a faulse theiffe
nowe because his Disciples, doe creadyt his doctryne
they be soe newe fangell, and to fantasies enclyne
yea trustinge everye worde, whatsoever he Did saye
Even this : that he woulde ryse agayne the thride Daye
we become vnto you here, my Lorde Deputie
to Desier a watche, for his graves custodye
lest his Disciples, (shoulde come privilye) and steale hym
and saye he were risen, for anger, we Did hange hym

Annas

For all we have Donne (my Lorde) were in vayne
yf he shoule be stolne awaye, by any meane
for the people woulde beleeeve (verye well) such a tale
and you shoule not be able, verye well to quale
the commosion that woulde rise, of such a foolishe thynge
therefore yt were good, to prevent yt by fore seyne
else woulde this last errour, put vs to more busynes
then yt Did att first, for all our circumspectnes

Pilate

My lords, yow shall not be displeased, for nothinge I will saye
But for sureness, one thrust into his side a spear
Where out anon issued both blood and water. [Enter Annas and Caiphas]
But yonder comes the high priests again now.
I am sure they are come for to speak with you.

CAIPHAS  My lord Deputy, we be come to talk with you a few words.

PILATE  Sit you down and say what you will, my lords.

CAIPHAS  My lord, we doubt not but you consider it perfectly
How this vagabond is condemned to death most justly.
For, besides he was both a renegade and a traitor,
He was worthier death than any thief or murderer.
For he murdered our people in a false belief
And stole them from our law like a false thief.
Now, because his disciples do credit his doctrine
(They be so newfangled, and to fantasies incline).
Yea, trusting every word, whatsoever he did say.
Even this: that he would rise again the third day.
We be come unto you here, my lord Deputy
To desire a watch for his grave’s custody.
Lest his disciples should come privily and steal him
And say he were risen, for anger we did hang him.

ANNAS  For all we have done, my lord, were in vain
If he should be stolen away by any mean.
For the people would believe very well such a tale.
And you should not be able very well to quell
The commotion that would rise of such a foolish thing.
Therefore, it were good to prevent it by foreseeing:
Else would this last error put us to more business
Than it did at first, for all our circumspectness.

PILATE  My lords, you shall not be displeased. for nothing I will say;
for in my mynde, you did not take the best waye
att what tyme, you forsoke hym, and chose Barrabas
which ever a rebell (and a great murtherer) was
I talked with hym alonge, as both you here tell can
and ever he shewed hym selfe, a perfect wise man
and what thynge soeuer, I did of hym requier
he woulde give a direct (and a wise) answere
that yt was harde for any man, any waye furth
to trape hym in any worde. which came out of his mouth
therefore my lordes here, me thought. att that season
you were more earnest, then was required of reason

Caiphas

Such fellowes my lorde, as mynde mischeife no Doubt
they haue a craftie wytt, to compasse yt about
for a naughtie nature, never feales want
to studdye out myscieffe. he ys in hit soe pregnant
[ p. 20 ]
but yt they woulde sett their wytt, all on goodnes
as they bestowe yt, to invent all vngratiousnes
they myght be great ornamentes, to ther countrey & pleasure
and the publike weale, myght have of them a treasure
but as for this fellowe. we praye your lordshippe sye
coulde he Denye any thinge, which we to his charge did laye

Pilate

What he coulde, or coulde not. I am not able to saye
for he let you saye, what you woulde, without resistance aye
but for any wickednes. or synne hitherwarde
you never chardge hym with yt, that ever I harde
and yt ys not like, that he was an evill misdoer
[for the countrey reportes, that he was a great good Doer]
and to take his Doynges, to be a signe right good
that he was a man, (right highe) esteemed of God
and yt myght have stande, with your good pleasure
the people, through the countrey. had of hym a treasure

89 a great] agreat MS
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For in my mind, you did not take the best way
At what time you forsook him and chose Barabbas
Which ever a rebel and a great murderer was.
I talked with him alone, as both you [hear] tell can.
And ever he showed himself a perfect wise man.
And what thing soever I did of him require.
He would give a direct and a wise answer.
That it was hard for any man, any way forth.
To trap him in any word which came out of his mouth.
Therefore my lords here, methought at that season
You were more earnest than was required of reason.

CAIPHAS
Such fellows, my lord, as mind mischief, no doubt
They have a crafty wit to compass it about.
For a naughty nature never feels want
To study out mischief, he is in it so pregnant.
But if they would set their wit all on goodness
As they bestow it to invent all ungraciousness.
They might be great ornaments to their country and pleasure.
And the public weal might have of them a treasure.
But as for this fellow, we pray your lordship say:
Could he deny anything which we to his charge did lay?

PILATE
What he could or could not, I am not able to say.
For he let you say what you would, without resistance aye.
But for any wickedness or sin hitherward.
You never charged him with it, that ever I heard.
And it is not like[ly] that he was an evil misdoer.
For the country reports that he was a great good doer
And [takes] his doings to be a sign right good
That he was a man right high esteemed of God.
And if it might have [stood] with your good pleasure,
The people through the country had of him a treasure.
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Annas

*My lorde, we had our lawe, of Moyses the elected*

which no doubt of God hym selfe, was highlye beloved

120

*If he had byne of God, your Lordshippe, may well knowe*

he woulde never kicked, soe sore agaynst our lawe

when we observed the lawes, of our fathers trulye

then woulde that sturdy knave, appeache vs of ypocricye

and to shewe hatred to the lawes, of our forefathers

125

he of purpose kept companye, with publicanes & synners

therefore you may perseve here, a verie great likelihoode

that this man so contemptuous, coulde not be of God

Pilate

*My lords, concernynge the lawes, of your private God*

which Caesar doth suffer you, to kepe as you thinke good

130

*ys a thinge pertaynes not, att all to my office*

therfore I cannot tell you, what your lawe ys

but as for that thinge, wherto I am appoynted

*here let the*

135

Centurione

*and his souldiers make signe*

*of valour*

*as this Iesus, whom you, of many thinges accused*

in suspecte of seditiousnes, by vs was condemned

140

*If he were innocent, his wronge ys the more*

*If he were culpable, he hath suffered theirfore*

nowe further because, you doe feare seditione

which thynge pertayneth, vnto my administration

though their be no cause, greatlye of any such feare

you shall have your request, for the watche their

145

Centurione, call your men quicklye together

that my lorde Bishoppes, may have their desier

goe nowe Centurione, withall the rest

and kepe the Sepulchre, as they shall thinke best.  Exit

126 a verie] averie MS
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ANNAS My lord, we had our law of Moses the elected.
Which no doubt of God himself was highly beloved.
If he had been of God, your Lordship may well know.
He would never [have] kicked so sore against our law.
When we observed the laws of our fathers truly.
Then would that sturdy knave appeach us of hypocrisy.
And to show hatred to the laws of our forefathers.
He of purpose kept company with publicans and sinners.
Therefore you may perceive here a very great likelihood
That this man, so contemptuous, could not be of God.

PILATE My lords, concerning the laws of your private God.
Which Caesar doth suffer you to keep as you think good.
Is a thing pertains not at all to my office.
Therefore I cannot tell you what your law is.
But as for that thing whereto I am appointed,
To see true justice amongst you executed.

Here let the Centurion and his soldiers make [a] sign of valour
Or that no insurrection or rebellion may arise
Through tumult, or gathering, or any other wise
As doth appertain to my office and dignity.
As this Jesus, whom you of many things accused
In suspect of seditiousness, by us was condemned.
If he were innocent, his wrong is the more:
If he were culpable, he hath suffered therefore.
Now further, because you do fear sedition,
Which thing pertaineth unto my administration.
Though there be no cause greatly of any such fear.
You shall have your request for the watch there.
Centurion, call your men quickly together
That my lord bishops may have their desire.
Go now, Centurion, with all the rest
And keep the sepulchre as they shall think best.  
[The Centurion, High Priests and Soldiers walk toward the sepulchre]
Caiphas

Maister Captayne, we desier your favour
in this our busines. without displeasure

Centurione

As I am appoynted (my Lordes) to this service
so shall yt be donne, without slacknes ywisse

Annas

For slacknes here in, or your souldiers necelgence
may be an occasion, of greater inconvenyence

Centurione

Let inconvenyence come, no other wayes vnto you
and feare noe disquietynge, of your selves nowe

Caiphas

Then Annas first, we will heare seale the stone
That yt yt be stirred, yt may be knowne a none

Annas

Verelie Caiphas, that ys a right suer waye
soe shall yt be knowen, yt he be taken awaye

Caiphas

Nowe Centurione, as we may doe you pleasure
make the watche men, kepe their watche in order

Centurione

My lordes put noe mistrust, in the watche hardylye
yt watchynge will serve, yt shall not faile of our parte

Caiphas

And vnto you sirs, yt you fynde vs not liberall
we will not desier you, to watche att all

The ffirste Souldier

My lordes, for our true watchinge, put it out of aduen=ture
yt our true watchinge, may doe you any pleasure

Annas

You shall please your selves, and vs both
and avoide that evill, which the wicked about goeth
CAIPHAS Master Captain, we desire your favour
In this our business, without displeasure. 150

CENTURION As I am appointed, my lords, to this service.
So shall it be done without slackness, ywis.

ANNAS For slackness herein or your soldiers' negligence
May be an occasion of greater inconvenience.

CENTURION Let inconvenience come no other ways unto you.
And fear no disquieting of yourselves now.

CAIPHAS Then, Annas, first we will here seal the stone.
That if it be stirred it may be known anon.

ANNAS Verily, Caiphas, that is a right sure way.
So shall it be known if he be taken away.

CAIPHAS Now, Centurion, as we may do you pleasure.
Make the watchmen keep their watch in order.

CENTURION My lords, put no mistrust in the watch hardly.
If watching will serve, it shall not fail of our party.

CAIPHAS And unto you, sirs, if you find us not liberal.
We will not desire you to watch at all.

1st SOLDIER My lords, for our true watching, put it out of adventure
If our true watching may do you any pleasure.

ANNAS You shall please yourselves and us both.
And avoid that evil which the wicked about goeth.
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The: ij Souldier
What evil soever, the wicked doth imagine
we be att a poyn, to watche well and fyne
Caiphas
Soe doynge, yow shall doe my lorde Deputie highe service
and you shall fynde vs, better then our promise
Annas
And what pleasure efte, we can to you, in any matter
you may be boulde on vs ever after. Exeunt. Caiphas

Centurione
My fellowes in so much, I am your Captayne nowe
appointed by my lorde Deputie, to see ye orderinge of you
this is my counsayle nowe, that every man
take heede to his watche, with all diligence he cane
not to sleape, or absent hym selfe else awaye
when as he shoulde watche, and be present alwaye
for howe soever ye matter, fall out or frame
Doe you, as you shoulde doe, and yow shall beare no blame
The: ij Souldier
Maister Captaine, perswaide your selfe (this) throughly
that no Diligence shall faile (vpon our part) suerlye

Centurione
Soe shall you please, first my Lorde Deputie
and have great thankes, of the Bishoppes trulye
The: ij Souldier
Are not these Bishoppes, (sirs) earnest and stiffe
to make so much busines, about one poore caytiffe
 alas poore man, I dare sweare on a booke
theirys non goes about, for to steale hym out
The: ij Souldiour
Thou may well call hym a caytiffe, yea a begger
and those which accompanied hym, were little better
for riches he had non, theirefore yts great follye
to make all this busynes, about such beggerie

170+sh  ii. Souldier] ii. Souldier W-D
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2nd SOLDIER What evil soever the wicked doth imagine.
   We be at a point to watch well and fine.

CAIPHAS So doing, you shall do my Lord Deputy high service,
   And you shall find us better than our promise.

ANNAS And what pleasure eft we can [give] you in any matter.
   You may be bold on us ever after. 175
   Exeunt Caiphas and Annas.

CENTURION My fellows, in so much I am your captain now,
   Appointed by my Lord Deputy to see the ordering of you.
   This is my counsel now: that every man
   Take heed to his watch with all diligence he can.
   Not to sleep or absent himself else away
   Whenas he should watch and be present always.
   For howsoever the matter fell out or frame.
   Do you as you should do, and you shall bear no blame.

1st SOLDIER Master Captain, persuade yourself this thoroughly:
   That no diligence shall fail upon our part, surely. 185

CENTURION So shall you please first my Lord Deputy
   And have great thanks of the bishops, truly.  Exit {Centurion.}

1st SOLDIER Are not these bishops, sirs, earnest and stiff
   To make so much business about one poor caitiff?
   Alas, poor man. I dare swear on a book,
   There is none goes about for to steal him out.

2nd SOLDIER Thou may well call him a caitiff, yea, a beggar.
   And those which accompanied him were little better.
   For riches he had none. Therefore it's great folly
   To make all this business about such beggary.
The First Dayes Playe

The iij, Souldier

And I thinke them not foolishe, but rather starke madd
for yf he rise agayne, as they saye, he sayed
I doe thinke the bouldest, of all vs ffoure here
dare not loke of his countenance, for verie feare

The iii, Souldier

And yf his Disciples, shoulde come, as they saye
and privylye by nyght, to steale hym away
what probation were that, of his wordes and learnynge
which they of them selves, shoulde make good with lyinge

for yf he saied, he woulde rise within Dayes three
they will trye his saynge, either true or contrarie

The · j · Souldier after his astonishment

What a wonder, we shoulde be striken with such fear=
and dreads
that we coulde not stande, but fell downe like as deade

The · iii · Souldier

I sawe one like lightnynge, come downe alowe
with clothes as white, as ever was the snowe

Here they fell down as

The · iij · Souldier

after his astonishment

Hearing the

gonnes shott

of & thunders

Iesus riseth

throwyng

of Death

And I was soe feared, with the earthquake and thunders, the Angell>
that I thought heaven and earth, had gonethe together

The · iiiij · Souldier

He ys a sore fellowe, what soever he be
and that shall they proue, that resist hym. I see
for when on the crosse, he yelded vpp the ghost
what darkenes was their, rounde about, all the cost

The · iij · Souldier

And howe did the vayle of ye temple teare a sunder
that ys made even ye Priestes, them selves all to wonder

The · ij · Souldier

Att his death I sawe, great breakinge of stones

att his risynge I feared the breakinge of all my bones

[p. 24]
yf he be soe terrible, as he hath shewed here
I woulde ye Bishoppes, had felte some part of our feare

210sd throwyng | of Death | throwyng | of Death W-D
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3rd SOLDIER And I think them not foolish, but rather stark mad. For if he rise again, as they say he said, I do think the boldest of all us four here Dare not look of his countenance for very fear.

4th SOLDIER And if his disciples should come, as they say, And privily by night to steal him away, What probation were that of his words and learning Which they of themselves should make good with lying? For if he said he would rise within days three, They will try his saying, either true or contrary.

Here they fall down as dead in hearing the guns shot off and thunder. Jesus riseth, throwing off death <and the angel> [enters. Exit Christ and the angel.] After his astonishment [the 1st Soldier speaks:]

1st SOLDIER What a wonder we should be stricken with such fear and dread That we could not stand, but fell down like as dead!

2nd SOLDIER I saw one like lightning come down low With clothes as white as ever was the snow.

3rd SOLDIER And I was so feared with the earthquake and thunder That I thought heaven and earth had gone together.

4th SOLDIER He is a sore fellow, whatsoever he be, And that shall they prove that resist him, I see. For when on the cross he yielded up the ghost, What darkness was there round about all the coast!

3rd SOLDIER And how did the veil of the temple tear asunder? That [has] made even the priests themselves all to wonder.

2nd SOLDIER At his death I saw great breaking of stones: At his rising I feared the breaking of all my bones. If he be so terrible as he hath showed here, I would the bishops had felt some part of our fear.
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The •  j • Souldier

But nowe sirs. the man we were sett, to watche here
ys gone, and all we nowe, cannot tell where
yet is not he stolne awaye, from vs by nyght
but rylsen of hym selfe, like a man of myght
let vs tell this tale, to my Lorde Deputie
he wilbe leve no worde, that we saye truley
againe the Bishoppes obtayned this watche alwaye
lest this mans Disciples. shoulde haue stolne hym away
go and tell them in order evrye worde
they will saye we have slept, and accuse vs to my Lorde
let vs goe theirfore, out of ye waye, to my house right soone
and theyr reason in this matter, what is best to be donne

The • iiij • Souldier

Thy counsell in this fellowe, ys verie reasonable
therefore I for my part, wilbe theirto agreeable

The • iij • Souldier

And seyne we doubt (here) what way to take
I will not your counsayle here in forsake

The • iiiij • Souldier

And I feale not my wittes soe perfect as yet
but that I shoulde condescende to ytt

Then let vs goe. for after our great feare
we shall inquiet, the better seeke our answeres

Appendix

You see Christes resurrection, as in ye scripture we it have
then note here. the nature of malicious Envy

which persecuteth innocencye, even vnto the grave
as these Bishoppes were not stilde. with Christes death onlye
vntill they gott a watche. for his sepulcers custodie
their corrupt conscience. did doubt apart his myght
and dreed them selves, lesse truth at length would come=
to light./

Yet this was done, by gods wonderfull provision

[Exeunt]

243 scripture MS
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But now, sirs. the man we were set to watch here
Is gone, and all we now cannot tell where.
Yet is not he stolen away from us by night.
But risen of himself, like a man of might.
Let us tell this tale to my Lord Deputy.
He will believe no word that we say, truly.
Again, the bishops obtained this watch always
Lest this man's disciples should have stolen him away:
[If we] go and tell them in order every word.
They will say we have slept and accuse us to my Lord.
Let us go, therefore, out of the way to my house right soon.
And there reason in this matter what is best to be done.

Thy counsel in this, fellow, is very reasonable.
Therefore I, for my part, will be thereto agreeable.

And seeing we doubt here what way to take.
I will not your counsel herein forsake.

And I feel not my wits so perfect as yet
But that I should condescend to it.

Then let us go, for after our great fear
We shall in quiet the better seek our answer.

You see Christ's resurrection as in the scripture we it have.
Then note here the nature of malicious envy
Which persecuteth innocence even unto the grave.
As these bishops were not stilled with Christ's death only
Until they got a watch for his sepulchre's custody.
Their corrupt conscience did doubt apart his might
And dread themselves, lest truth at length would come to light.

Yet this was done by God's wonderful provision:
that ye more they went about, to extinct the veritie
the stronger and more perfecter, they made his resurrection
and proved them selves fooles, for all their wit & policie
mans power lets not that, which God sayes once shalbe
as yow see by the watchemen, which were not of power
to abide the angels brightnes, but fell downe for feare
Yet note in these Bishoppes, a right honest pretence
they had invented to have extinct Christes name
they made Pilate beleve, that yf he were stolne thence
yt woulde make a commotion, by meanes of his fame
woulde God their were non such now which doth plaie ye same
which diswayes ye people, for readinge of the scripture
lest it make them Heretikes vnlesse they have a Doctor
\textit{I woulde} call them Heretikes, in my conceite rather
which can reade and may, and yet will not reade them
when the worde yt selfe, doth ravishe much better
then the words of them doe, which doe expounde ytt
therefore I counsall everie man, to seeke his owne profett
and as Christ is risen from ye deade, by his fathers power
so let vs rise from our oulde life, to walke anew manner
\textit{Nowe} marke the progression of the resurrection
\textit{Marie Magdalene \textendash}1-
\textit{Shall} we goe nowe sisters, as yt becometh vs
and anoint that sweete bodye, of our maister Iesus
\textit{Marie Solome \textendash}2-
\textit{Are} you suer you can goe to that place directlye
were as you saye, they layed his bodie
\textit{Marie Iacobi \textendash}3-
\textit{It is} a question, to be asked aright
for he you saye was buried in the twylight
\textit{Marie Jose \textendash}4-
\textit{Ther is} an other thinge (sisters) will more trouble vs
the stone on his grave, both great and comberous
That the more they went about to extinct the verity.
The stronger and more perfect they made his resurrection.
And proved themselves fools for all their wit and policy.
Man's power lets not that which God says once shall be.
As you see by the watchmen, which were not of power
To abide the angel's brightness, but fell down for fear.

Yet note in these bishops a right honest pretense
They had invented to have extinct Christ's name:
They made Pilate believe that if he were stolen thence.
It would make a commotion by means of his fame.
Would God there were none such now which doth play the same.
Which dissuade the people for reading of the scripture
Lest it make them heretics, unless they have a Doctor.

I would call them heretics in my conceit, rather.
Which can read and may, and yet will not read them.
When the Word itself doth ravish much better
Than the words of them do which do expound it.
Therefore I counsel every man to seek his own profit.
And as Christ is risen from the dead by his father's power.
So let us rise from our old life to walk a new manner.

Now mark the progression of the resurrection.  [Exit Appendix.]
[Enter the four women.]

MARY MAG. Shall we go now, sisters, as it becometh us.
And anoint that sweet body of our master Jesus?

MARY SAL. Are you sure you can go to that place directly.
Where, as you say, they laid his body?

MARY JACOBI It is a question to be asked aright.
For he, you say, was buried in the twilight.

MARY JOSE There is another thing, sisters, will more trouble us:
The stone on his grave, both great and cumberous.
Marie Magdalene

In deed (sister) we never thought of the stone
[Or] else we myght have made, for that provision
and we be wemen, of a feeble complexione nor able to stire or remove the stone
but I am Deceaved, or else I see

the stone layed by, right hansomelye
alas deare sisters, that ever I see this Daye
we be disapoynted, of this journey
some envyous creature, hath stolne hym hence
even vpon some malitious pretence

Enter Peter and Iohn.

holde my boxe I will tarrye noe longer
vntill I have toulde this vnto Peter
And Peter and Iohn thou greatlye beloved
I bringe heavye tydinges, which me sore greaved
they have taken my lorde, out of his grave

and layed hym were we shall never hym have
I came to have anoynted, that innocent sweete bodye
but alas sweat lorde, they have disappoynted me

Peter

Yet is not so Marie :

Yet Peter we will goe see

Marie Magdalene

Alas sweete Lorde, they were verie cruell

that woulde not lett thy bodye lye stile

Peter

Yt is even soe, as Marie sayed
they have taken hym away, and were else hym layed

Iohn

Ane hanious deede suerly, so to be wreake them. <of> [on] his bodye

Marie Madalene

Exeunt Peter & Iohn

Was their ever such crueltie as this

that malice with death, shoulde never ceasse:
what man was ever, soe envyed or hated
but his malice with death was abated
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MARY MAG. Indeed, sister, we never thought of the stone.
Or else we might have made for that provision.
And we be women, of a feeble complexion
[Not] able to stir or remove the stone.
But I am deceived, or else I see
The stone laid by, right handsomely.
Alas, dear sisters, that ever I see this day!
We be disappointed of this journey.
Some envious creature hath stolen him hence
Even upon some malicious pretense.
Hold my box; I will tarry no longer
Until I have told this unto Peter.
And Peter, and John, thou greatly beloved.
I bring some heavy tidings, which me sore grieved:
They have taken my Lord out of his grave
And laid him where we shall never him have.
I came to have anointed that innocent sweet body.
But alas, sweet Lord, they have disappointed me.

Enter Peter and John

PETER It is not so, Marie?

JOHN Yet, Peter, we will go see.

[Peter and John look in the sepulchre]

MARY MAG. Alas, sweet Lord, they were very cruel
That would not let thy body lie still.

PETER It is even so, as Mary said:
They have taken him away, and where else him laid.

JOHN An heinous deed, surely, so to bewreak them on his body. Exeunt Peter and John.

MARY MAG. Was there ever such cruelty as this.
That malice with death should never cease?
What man was ever so envied or hated
But his malice with death was abated?
and cannot thy corps sweete Iesus ly
still in the grave, for the venome of Envye
O you envious persons so Divilishe
you shall with your malice, altogether perishe
coulde you not be content, with your scornynge and loutynge
buffittinge, spittynge, and all your flowtynge
and after your scourgynge, to hange on the tree
[.p. 27]
betwene two theives, in dirisione soe shamefullye
and after you tooke of hym, their your pleasure
in all thenge your malice, did you allure
even when you lett out their his hart bloude
your malice was not saciate with that floude

but that you must burne, yet still in Envye
and feede your malice, vpon his deade bodye

\textit{Marie Jose}
\textit{Sister Marie. freate not so in vayne att this thenge}
but staye I praye you Lamentynge
\textit{Marie Iacobi}
\textit{For you doe but consume your hart with heavines}
about a thenge, that ys remedilesse
\textit{Marie Solome}
\textit{We may peradventure, hereof yt agayne}
when we thinke least of yt, and lesse doe complayne
\textit{Marie Magdalene}
\textit{Noe sister Solome. we have lost this labour}
they have stolne awaye my Lorde and saviour

theirfore I will cast my boxe awaye
\textit{Marie Solome}
\textit{Noe sister Marie, keepe I saye}
yt will serve for some other tyme playne
yf perchaunce, we may fynde hym agayne
\textit{Marie Magdalene}
\textit{Againe sister : noe noe that will never be}
they purpose we shall hym, never agayne see
And cannot thy corpse, sweet Jesus, lie
Still in the grave, for the venom of envy?

*Here [she] look[s] towards Jerusalem.*

Oh you envious persons, so devilish,
You shall with your malice altogether perish.
Could you not be content with your scorning and louting,
Buffeting, spitting, and all your flouting.
And after your scourging, to hang on the tree
Between two thieves, in derision so shamefully?
And after you took of him there your pleasure,
In all thing[s] your malice did you allure.
Even when you let out there his heart blood.
Your malice was not satiate with that flood.
But that you must burn yet still in envy
And feed your malice upon his dead body.

*Let Marie here lament.*

MARY JOSE  Sister Mary, fret not so in vain at this thing,
But stay, I pray you, lamenting.

MARY JACOBI  For you do but consume your heart with heaviness
About a thing that is remediless.

MARIE SAL.  We may peradventure hear of it again
When we think least of it, and less do complain.

MARY MAG.  No, sister Salome, we have lost this labor.
They have stolen away my Lord and Savior.
Therefore I will cast my box away.

MARY SAL.  No, sister Mary, keep I say.
It will serve for some other time plain
If perchance we may find him again.

MARY MAG.  Again, sister? No, no, that will never be.
They purpose we shall him never again see.
Marie Iacobi

Yet or we returne home, thus Dismayed
let vs goe to the place, were he was layed
and with our sweete oyntments his grave through <enbalme> [engawlme]
seynge we have not his bodye to enbalme here doe the

The J-Angell

Women, for any thynge you see, be not aﬀrighted we knowe you seeke hym, which was cruciﬁed
even Iesus of Nazareth, which was here buried he ys as you see here, rysen from the Deade
therefore marke what we saye, concernynge this matter

340

345 and goe and tell his Disciples yt. especiallye Peter
that he goeth before you into Galiley
and their he will shewe hym selfe, vnto you perfectlye
therefore I saye wemen be not aﬀrayed

Marie Magdalene

for you shall fynde yt true, that I have sayed

Both Angels Speake

Woman, what ys the matter, we praye thee
that thou here dost weape soe tenderlye

Marie Magdalene

For they have taken a way my maister
and layed hym alas, I cannot tell where

The J-Angell

Whom seeke you wemen, the lyvinge with the Deade

355 he ys not here, for he ys rysen in deede
remember what his wordes were vnto you latenlye
when he was with you last in Galeley
howe that the sonne of man, shoulde be Delivered
into synnesfull <mens> handes, and so be cruciﬁed

360 and after althis rise agayne the thride Daye
which ys come to passe, as trulye as he Did saye

Marie Iose

Sister Magdalene, yt was even soe
as they have toulde vs, therfore lett vs goe
MARY JACOBI Yet ere we return home, thus dismayed.

   Let us go to the place where he was laid
   And with our sweet ointments his grave through enguam.
   Seeing we have not his body to enbalme.

   Here do the women go to the sepulchre. [Two Angels enter]

1st ANGEL Women, for anything you see, be not affrighted.
   We know you seek him which was crucified.
   Even Jesus of Nazareth, which was here buried.
   He is, as you see here, risen from the dead.
   Therefore mark what we say concerning this matter.
   And go and tell his disciples it, especially Peter:
   That he goeth before you into Galilee
   And there he will show himself unto you perfectly.
   Therefore I say, women be not afraid.
   For you shall find it true that I have said.

   Mary Magdalen lamenteth.

BOTH ANGELS Woman, what is the matter, we pray thee.
   That thou here dost weep so tenderly?

MARY MAG. For they have taken away my master
   And laid him, alas. I cannot tell where.

2nd ANGEL Whom seek you, women, the living with the dead?
   He is not here, for he is risen indeed.
   Remember what his words were unto you lately.
   When he was with you last in Galilee:
   How that the son of man should be delivered
   Into sinful men's hands, and so be crucified.
   And after all this rise again the third day.
   Which is come to pass, as truly as he did say.

MARIE JOSE Sister Magdalene, it was even so
   As they have told us, therefore let us go.
Marie Magdalene

Yet sister lose. I am not satiﬁed thus

for yf he were rysen, he woulde visyte some of vs
and except I doe perceave, more yet then this
my hart will never be att quietnes
love hath soe pearced, my hart soe strouglye
that If teares coulde redeeme hym, happye were I

Christ

Woman what thinge ys yt, that makes thee so weephe
or who ys yt here, that thou dost seeke

Marie Magdalene

Sir because thou appearest. to be some Gardener

[Four folios are lost at this point. The missing material must have included the remainder of
Mary’s encounter with Christ, and probably the women’s report back to the dubious apostles
(referred to in lines 434, 442, and elsewhere). It is possible that the play also dramatized Christ’s
appearance to all the women, as the Chester resurrection play does. The text resumes midway
through a scene between the soldiers, high priests and elders.]

[Caiphas]

we will buy largelye this your good syllence

nor you shall not neede. to be in any feare
of my Lorde Deputie, yf it be brought to his eare
our reasons for you shalbe of such probation
that he shalbe forced, to credytt our perswasion
that whatsoever tales (att any tyme) shalbe tolde hym

The j. Soullier

Your request (my Lorde) here in ys unreasonoble
and concernynge good conscience, suerlye vntollerable

Annas

For that you seeme to feare, [y]ett the hurt of our conscience
you shall heare what ye lawe, doth speake in such doubttance
which requesteth of all men, in such scrippulous conscience

373 and] MS catchword
379 tyme] time W-D
383 yet] sett MS. W-D
MARY MAG. Yet sister Jose, I am not satisfied thus.
For if he were risen, he would visit some of us.
And except I do perceive more yet than this,
My heart will never be at quietness.
Love hath so pierced my heart so strongly
That if tears could redeem him, happy were I.  
[Exit all but Mary Magdalen]
[Enter] Christ like a gardener.

CHRIST Woman, what thing is it that makes thee so weep.
Or who is it here that thou dost seek?

MARY MAG. Sir, because thou appearest to be some gardener
[And]

[Four folios are lost at this point. The missing material must have included the remainder of Mary’s encounter with Christ, and probably the women’s report back to the dubious apostles (referred to in lines 434, 442, and elsewhere. It is possible that the play also dramatized Christ’s appearance to all the women, as the Chester resurrection play does. The text resumes midway through a scene between the soldiers, high priests and elders.]

[CAIPHAS] We will buy largely this your good silence.
Nor you shall not need to be in any fear
Of my Lord Deputy, if it be brought to his ear.
Our reasons for you shall be of such probation
That he shall be forced to credit our persuasion,
That whatsoever tales at any time shall be told him.
We will at all times be between you and him.

1" SOLDIER Your request, my lord, herein is unreasonable,
And, concerning good conscience, surely intolerable.

ANNAS For that you seem to fear [yet] the hurt of our conscience.
You shall hear what the law doth speak in such doubtance.
Which requesteth of all men in such scrupulous conscience
to suffer a myscheife, rather then an inconvenyence
the myscheife ys this, that all (whole) Moyses lawe
by this mans resurrection, shall have an overthrowe
because yt shoulde confirme (so playne) his former preachinge
that the lawe with his sacrifice, shoulde fynishe att his commyng
nowe when God hath confirmed, by Moyses our religion
and with two thousande yeres, hath had his confirmation
yt is reason, by the fuggelynge, of a craftie magiscioner
gods truth shoulde be subverted, and brought nowe to be vayne
for though he be rysen, as you reporte he ys
yet all ys but donne, by Deludynge of your sences
you may suffer then this myscheife, for avoydinge an inconvenyence
without danger to your soule, or hurt to your conscience

One of the Seniors

I trust my Lorde Annas, in that your scripulous sentence
hath answered verie well, for the quietynge your conscience
nowe lest you shoulde thinke, that any thinge were donne
in all this matter by them two alone
you shall vnderstande, that even the whole senate
have conferred together, and condescended of late
that yf you will saye, his Disciples did steale hym
you shalbe rewarded, ffulye to the bryme

The J. Souldier

My lordes, yt their in, we cane doe you any pleasure
we have the want, you have the treasure

Caiphas

Then have here this money, nowe for your hier
more then you woulde aske, wyshe, or requier
but because we requier, in you more honestie
we bynde you vnto vs, with the more liberalitie

The J. Souldier

My lordes, because yow will have vs, to spreede abroad this A [tale]
that his Disciples by nyght (as we sleapt) did hym steale
whatsoever he be, that will this Denye
we will saye, sweare, yea and fight, for the contrarye

Caiphas

Will you doe the like, good fellowes in this
To suffer a mischief, rather than an inconvenience.
The mischief is this: that all whole Moses' law
By this man's resurrection shall have an overthrow
Because it should confirm so plain his former preaching
That the law, with his sacrifice, should finish at his coming.
Now when God hath confirmed, by Moses, our religion,
And with two thousand years hath had his confirmation,
It is reason, by the juggling of a crafty [magician]
God's truth should be subverted and brought now to be vain.
For though he be risen, as you report he is,
Yet all is but done by deluding of your senses.
You may suffer then this mischief for avoiding an inconvenience.
Without danger to your soul or hurt to your conscience.

SENIOR I trust, my lord Annas, in that your scrupulous sentence
Hath answered very well for the quieting your conscience.
Now, lest you should think that anything were done
In all this matter by them two alone,
You shall understand that even the whole senate
Have conferred together and condescended of late
That if you will say his disciples did steal him.
You shall be rewarded fully to the brim.

1st SOLDIER My lords, if therein we can do you any pleasure.
We have the want, you have the treasure.

CAIPHAS Then have here this money now for your hire.
More than you would ask, wish or require.
But because we require in you more honesty.
We bind you unto us with the more liberality.

1st SOLDIER My lords, because you will have us to spread abroad this tale.
That his disciples by night as we slept did him steal.
Whatsoever he be that will this deny,
We will say, swear, yea, and fight for the contrary.

CAIPHAS Will you do the like, good fellows, in this?
The First Dayes Playe

The -ij-Souldier
We will my Lorde, performe our fellowes promise

The -iiij- Souldier
For he ys our mouth, and what that he doth saye
we are readye the same for to obaye

The -iiiij- Souldier
And whatsoever he hath promised in althings
you shalbe suer, to fynde vs noe chaunglynges

Caiphas
Then will we thinke, our monye well bestowed
and wilbe suer your friendes in everye your neede

Appendixe
Exeunt

Here lastlye, you haue seene, howe ye Bishops redeemed
the souldiers, faithfull sylence, with a great pece of money
and made them blaze this lye, which they had imagined
that he was not rysen, but stolnd away privilye
this tale they were hired, to spreade [through out Iurye]
wherby in their blindnes, they are confirmed I saye
for the Iewes beleeve non other, yet to this Daye
Nowe conferre the messengers, of Christes resurrection
Marie, and the souldiers, and lett vs tast the mysterye
Marie, tolde the Apostles, which toke yt for a delusion

[Another two folios are missing here. Appendix’s words at 432-34 indicate that his speech compared the resurrection reports of Mary and the soldiers guarding the tomb. It is likely that his speech ended the first day’s play, and that he also opened the second day’s performance. The next surviving folio has the running title, “The Seconde dayes Playe,” and picks up the action during a scene between Christ and Peter at the sepulchre.]
The First Day's Play

2nd SOLDIER  We will, my lord, perform our fellow's promise.

3rd SOLDIER  For he is our mouth, and what that he doth say.
              We are ready the same for to obey.

4th SOLDIER  And whatsoever he hath promised in all things.
              You shall be sure to find us no changelings.

CAIAPHAS  Then will we think our money well bestowed,
           And will be your sure friends in every your need.  Exeunt [all. Enter Appendix.]

APPENDIX  Here, lastly, you have seen how the bishops redeemed
           The soldiers' faithful silence with a great piece of money
           And made them blaze this lie which they had imagined:
           That he was not risen, but stolen away privily.
           This tale they were hired to spread throughout Jewry.
           Whereby in their blindness they are confirmed, I say.
           For the Jews believe none other yet to this day.

           Now confer the messengers of Christ's resurrection.
           Mary and the soldiers, and let us taste the mystery.
           Mary told the apostles, which took it for a delusion.

           [The]

[Another two folios are missing here. Appendix's words at 432-34 indicate that his speech compared the resurrection reports of Mary and the soldiers guarding the tomb. It is likely that his speech ended the first day's play, and that he also opened the second day's performance. The next surviving folio has the running title, "The Seconde dayes Playe," and picks up the action during a scene between Christ and Peter at the sepulchre.]
What shall therefore (maister) become of me wretche
which in althinges thus faith and promise doth breake

Jesus

Yf thou remembrest, when thou Denyest me
I loked backe, and thou weptst tenderlye
which teares I take for full recompensation
for thy periurye, Denyall, and execration
but thou myghtest have beleaved the wemen by right
for Maries hart, coulde not, have byne so light
and for that loye, of my first appearynge vnto you
that misterye as yet, ys hyde from you nowe
but my fore tellynge, myght have byne an occasione
to have put thee out of doubt, of my resurrection
for he which sayed that woulde be, which thou saiedst shoulde not be
in all other <mens> ^ [was] thought, to tuche the veritie

And when we were in Galiley (Peter) did not I then saye
that all shoulde come to passe, prophisiéd, alwaye
howe that the sonne of man, shoulde be betrayed
mocked, scourged, hangheed, and buryed
and that the thride Daye, he shoulde ryse agayne
as all the scriptures affirme yt, well and playne

Peter

But our wittes were so grosse (Lorde) and ignorant theirin
that we understooode noe worde of that sayinge

Jesus

And grosse yet it shoulde be, yf yt where not that I
shoulde be taken from you, as I toulde Marie
but as for thee Peter, amongst my Disciples all
I choise thee heade, and governer principall
that yf they shoulde chaunce, to faulter in their faith
thou shouldest confirme them, in the redye paith
for that thy faith, which thou didest confesse
that I was Christ (the sonne of God) Doubtlesse
I toulde thee I had prayed for yt, vnto my ffather
[PETER] What shall therefore, master, becom of me, wretch
Which in all things thus faith and promise doth break?

JESUS If thou rememberest, when thou deniest me
I looked back, and thou weptst tenderly,
Which tears I take for full recompensation
For thy perjury, denial, and execution.
But thou mightest have believed the women by right.
For Mary’s heart could not have been so light.
And for that joy of my first appearing unto you,
That mystery as yet is hid from you now.
But my foretelling might have been an occasion
To have put thee out of doubt of my resurrection;
For he which said that would be, which thou saidst should not be
In all other was thought to touch the verity.
And when we were in Galilee, Peter, did not I then say
That all should come to pass, prophesied, always?
How that the son of man should be betrayed.
Mocked, scourged, hanged, and buried.
And that the third day he should rise again
As all the scriptures affirm it, well and plain?

PETER But our wits were so gross, Lord, and ignorant therein
That we understood no word of that saying.

JESUS And gross yet it should be, if it were not that I
Should be taken from you, as I told Mary.
But as for thee, Peter, amongst my disciples all
I choose thee head and governor principal.
That if they should chance to falter in their faith,
Thou shouldst confirm them in the ready path.
For that thy faith, which thou didst confess,
That I was Christ, the son of God doubtless,
I told thee I had prayed for it unto my Father.
that hit att noe tyme, shoulde fayle or alter
but I perceave all my former communycation
ys forgotten of thee, and put in oblivion
yet seyng the mistrust, thou hast layed in me
with remorse of Conscience, for thy Denyll of me
I came with my presence, thee here to comforth
that thou shouldest beleve me (the better) from hence furth
therefore goe to thy fellowes, and tell them in their heavines
that I am nowe rysen, as thou canst beare witnes
for through the prerogatyve, of thy prehemyncence
they will creydt thy wordes, with more confydence
and byde them beleve the wemens tales nowe
for they tolde them nothyng, but that which was true.

Peter

O periured person, vnfaithfull and witlesse
howe hast thou byne blynded in all thy busynes
thou which wast alwayes in <thy> [his] conversion
and see his miracles, and harde his predication
and see many thinges (he sayed) come to effectuallnes
howe art thou fallen, to such vnthankfullnes
thou mayst saye theirfore, thou hast a maister of mercye
which was noe worse, Displeased with thy periurye
nor toke in worse part, thy myscreadytyng
the wemens declaration. consernyng his rysynge
who coulde have loked, ever for such gentlenes
without great enbradinge, of my wickednes
but such ys the nature, of that his pittie
who ys the well and fountayne. of all mercye
wherof I have tasted, a draught soe good
that all synners by me, have example to praise God
but nowe I will goe, to my fellowes, in their weepyng
and tell them the truth, of all the wemens sayinge
howe our maister his rysen, and hath appeared to me
whom the better they will creadytt, for my senioritie

Appendixe

We nowe have noe scripture, doth teache vs such appe[rance]
as we have made of Christ (to Peter) in this order
That it at no time should fail or alter:
But I perceive all my former communication
Is forgotten of thee and put in oblivion.
Yet seeing the mistrust thou hast laid in me.
With remorse of conscience for thy denial of me.
I came with my presence thee here to comfort
That thou shouldst believe me the better from henceforth.
Therefore go to thy fellows, and tell them in their heaviness
That I am now risen, as thou canst bear witness.
For through the prerogative of thy preeminence,
They will credit thy words with more confidence.
And bid them believe the women’s tales now.
For they told them nothing but that which was true.  

Exit [Jesus]

PETER  
O perjured person, unfaithful and witless.
How hast thou been blinded in all this business?
Thou which wast always in his conversation.
And [saw] his miracles, and heard his predication.
And [saw] many things he said come to effectualness:
How art thou fallen to such unthankfulness?
Thou mayest say, therefore, thou hast a master of mercy.
Which was no worse displeased with thy perjury
Nor took in worse part thy miscrediting
The women’s declaration concerning his rising.
Who could have looked ever for such gentleness
Without great upbraiding of my wickedness?
But such is the nature of that his pity
Who is the well and fountain of all mercy.
Whereof I have tasted a draught so good
That all sinners by me have example to praise God.
But now I will go to my fellows in their weeping.
And tell them the truth of all the women’s saying:
How our master is risen and hath appeared to me.
Whom the better they will credit for my seniority.  

Exit Peter. Enter Appendix

APPENDIX  
We now have no scripture doth teach us such appearance
As we have made of Christ to Peter in this order.
The Seconde Dayes Playe

but that we gatherthis, even of the circumstance
both of St Luke his wordes, and of St Pauls together
which both doth write that Christ appeared vnto Peter

but with what words, or when, or where, doubtles ye scripture
shewes not, but that by conference of places. we conjecture
Saynt Luke writeth, how yt after, the wemen had declared
howe Christ in deede was rysen, and how yt they were sent
to bide them goe to Galile, wherto Christ was repayred

wher they alive shoulde see hym, as he on ye crosse was rent
though Peter with the other, thought yt playne Deludement
yet went he to the sepulcher (agayne) with doubtfull motion
wher in, the vewe of thinges : he fell in admiracion
In which suer admiracion, yt seemes to be most likeliest
that Christ shoulde shewe hym selfe, to Peter in his studye
but with what other wordes, then yt is here exprest
leth them iudge, which the Doyngs of other lyst to trye
the order of appearynge, (we Iudge) ys kept Dulye
for this was before that they had, which went to Emaus

as those words in luke showe, in returne vnto Cleophas
Then where have we in scripture, but two words of ye matter
the rest you must then attribute, vnto our invention
and though about the thynge, we can noe more but smatter
leth iudgement passe of vs, as we with good intention

upon the circumstances, have shewed our ymagenation
yf yt be to your lykynge, we be right well apayd
and soe I nowe commytt you, to the rest which shalbe played :N:

Cleophas

Whether nowe Brother. I praye you hartelye

Luke

To Emaus brother, yf you will any thinge with me

Cleophas

Verelye brother, I will kepe you companye
for my iurney that way furth also Doth lye
but what make you to sigh, and to looke so sadlye
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But that we gather this, even of the circumstance
Which both doth write that Christ appeared unto Peter.
But with what words, or when, or where, doubtless the scripture 505
Shows not, but that by conference of places we conjecture.

Saint Luke writeth how that after the women had declared
How Christ indeed was risen, and how that they were sent
To bid them go to Galilee, whereunto Christ was repaired,
Where they alive should see him, as he on the cross was rent.
Though Peter, with the other, thought it plain deludement.
Yet went he to the sepulchre again with doubtful motion
Wherein the view of things he fell in admiration.

In which sure admiration it seems to be most likeliest
That Christ should show himself to Peter in his study:
But with what other words than it is here expressed
Let them judge which the doings of others list to try.
The order of appearing, we judge, is kept duly.
For this was before that they had which went to Emmaus.
As those words in Luke show in return unto Cleophas.

Then where have we in scripture but two words of the matter.
The rest you must then attribute unto our invention:
And though about the thing we can no more but smatter,
Let judgement pass of us, as we with good intention
Upon the circumstances have showed our imagination.
If it be to your liking, we be right well [re]paid.
And so I now commit you to the rest which shall be played.

[Exit Appendix. Enter Luke and Cleophas]

CLEOPHAS Whither now, brother, I pray you heartily?
LUKE To Emmaus, brother, if you will anything with me.
CLEOPHAS Verily, brother, I will keep you company,
For my journey that way forth also doth lie.
But what [makes] you to sigh and to look so sadly?
Luke

The matter which chanced, amongst vs soe latelye
when I remember our master Iesus conversation

his miracles, his Doctryne, and his communycation

howe the fowle spirites ever obeyed his commaundement

howe the wynddye stormes, to hym were obedient

I thought little, that ever he woulde have suffered

hym selfe so shamefullye, to have byne hanged

for yf he had byne, the greatest mysdoer that lyved

they coulde not have handled hym, more cruellye then they did

Cleophas

And I brother att that, noe lesse then you doe marvayle

for hither to I have taken hym, for the redeemer of Israel

for whosoever did note, his innocencye in his lyvynge

with the circumspect answeres, & maiestie in his preachinge

woulde have sayde, that no man but hym selfe alone [p. 46]

could have had such gyfftes, as he had many one

and he woulde many tymes talke of Israel's captivitie

and howe his Deliverance, did Dawe verye ngygne

that his Apostles strove oft for the prehemynance

who myght sytt next hym, in his magnificence

but when the mater framed, and came to this passe

that the Bishops apprehended hym, by the treason of Judas

and that he was soe spitefullye mocked and derided

and lastlye to the cursed crosse, crucified

both his Apostles, and other. Disciples all :

were even discomforted, and Dismayed with all

yet his wordes before his Death, did move an expectation

of waytyng for a promyse, of his resurrection

Luke

But we heare nothynge of that, but ygt ye foolishe wemen
came to Peter and sayde, that he was rysen

whose saynge was counpted, but phantasticall follye

and their vpon I lefte them, and came into the countrey

Cleophas

Euen soe I, for ygt I harde noe more of his resurrection
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LUKE
The matter which chanced amongst us so lately.
When I remember our master Jesus' conversation.
His miracles, his doctrine, and his communication.
How the foul spirits ever obeyed his commandment.
How the windy storms to him were obedient,
I thought little that ever he would have suffered
Himself so shamefully to have been hanged.
For if he had been the greatest misdoer that lived,
They could not have handled him more cruelly than they did.

CLEOPHAS
And I, brother, at that no less than you do marvel
For hitherto I have taken him for the redeemer of Israel.
For whosoever did note his innocence in his living,
With the circumspect answers and majesty in his preaching.
Would have said that no man but himself alone
Could have had such gifts, as he had many one.
And he would many times talk of Israel's captivity
And how his deliverance did draw very nigh.
That his apostles strove oft for the preeminence.
Who might sit next him in his magnificence.
But when the matter framed and came to this pass:
That the bishops apprehended him by the treason of Judas.
And that he was so spitefully mocked and derided.
And lastly, to the cursed cross crucified.
Both his apostles and other disciples all
Were even discomforted and dismayed withal.
Yet his words before his death did move an expectation
Of waiting for a promise of his resurrection. [Enter Jesus as a pilgrim.]

LUKE
But we heard nothing of that, but that the foolish women
Came to Peter and said that he was risen.
Whose saying was counted but fantastical folly.
And thereupon I left them, and came into the country.

CLEOPHAS
Even so I, for that I heard no more of his resurrection.
thought nowe to goe to Emmaus, halfe in desperation

Jesus

My frendes what communycation ys this, yat yow twow have [had]
and talke either with other, and walke soe sadde

Cleophas

All Jerusalem speakes of our talkynge
and as thou were anewe come, and knewe nothyng

dost thou of vs nowe, these thynges enquyer
and knowest not these Dayes, what hath byne done their

Jesus

What be those things, I praye you

Cleophas

Of Jesus of Nazareth, we Did talke nowe
which was a man of great estymation

both before God and man, in worde and operation
he was a man suer beloued of God
and the people, toke for a prophett of God
this man was condemnned of Death, and cruysied
by the Priestes and elders. which hym accused

we thought he had byne he, which was promysed
for the redemption of Israel, to have byne Delyvered
but that hope hath fayled vs everye Delle
by meanes of that, his soe shamefull death and cruell
for before we toke hym, to be the messias

yf yt had not byne, for this straunge case
yet we thought ever, that he woulde rise agayne
as before his passion, he spake yt playne
that the thride Daye, he woulde ryse, which ys this:
but we harde nothyng of hym yet, but onlye this

which the wemen tolde vs, that he shoulde be rysen
that the Angels reported yt, to them their then
when with their oyntmentes, they went ye morrynge earlye
in mynde to have anoyned in the grave his bodye
where with astonyed, went certayne of our companye

straight way to his grave their saynge to trye
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Thought now to go to Emmaus, half in desperation.

JESUS My friends, what communication is this, that you two have had. And talk either with other, and walk so sad?

CLEOPHAS All Jerusalem speaks of our talking, And as thou were anew come, and knew nothing. Dost thou of us now these things enquire, And knowest not these days what hath been done there?

JESUS What be those things, I pray you?

CLEOPHAS Of Jesus of Nazareth we did talk now. Which was a man of great estimation Both before God and man, in word and operation. He was a man sure beloved of God. And the people took for a prophet of God. This man was condemned of death and crucified By the priests and elders which him accused. We thought he had been he which was promised For the redemption of Israel to have been delivered. But that hope hath failed us every deal By means of that his so shameful death and cruel. For before we took him to be the Messias. If it had not been for this strange case. Yet we thought ever that he would rise again. As before his passion he spoke it plain That the third day he would rise, which is this. But we heard nothing of him yet, but only this Which the women told us: that he should be risen. That the angels reported it to them there then When with their ointments they went the morning early. In mind to have anointed in the grave his body. Wherewith, astonished, went certain of our company Straightaway to his grave, their saying to try.
where they founde severallye, his sheate & napkyn layed
but his bodye was gone, as the wemen sayde
this was the talke, we had betwene vs
of this good man, whom we called Iesus

Jesus

600 O fools, and starke Dullerds that you be
in the vnderstandyng of the scriptures truelye
why beleev you not the saynges of all the prophettes
seyngle yt com[e] to passe, so playnelye as yt ys
which all the determynation of God did testifie

605 that Christ shoulde suffer all this, and so enter to his glorye
thought you that Christ, shoulde be a worldlye conquerour
and yet his kingdome <stan> stands not rather by invisible power
[then] am I a better scoller (I perceave) then you be
and did take better heede, to his Doctryne Daylye

610 for you myght have perceaved, yf you had not byne carnall
that his kyngdome ys to be vnderstoode spirituall
in executynge the office, of the promised seede
which shoulde blesse vs in God, and revoke the curse in deedc
which curse hangs still over <our heades> [vs by our] first disobedience

615 and was expiated, by this seedes obedience
and was shadowed in the lawe, with everye Ceremonye [p. 48]
that the seede of the woman, shoulde onylye make vs free
and not the worke theirof, or any our sacrifice
for that thynge was left to his office

620 and yf you be desierous, the truth theirof to knowe
I will open yt to you. by the meanyng of the lawe
Moyses brought vs from bondage, to ye lande of promisse
yet was he but a fygure their, of the true Moyses
which delivered mankynde, out of the Devels thrall

625 and brought vs to the libertie, of the lawe Evangelicall
were God wilbe worshipped, with a spirituall service
and not with a carnall, and bodilye sacrifice
of this Moyses, the first Moyses playne prophicied
when he promised a prophet, of our breatherne & kynred

630 one in all poyntes as myghtie, as ever he was

608 then] blotted in MS: then W-D
Where they found severally his sheet and napkin laid,
But his body was gone, as the women said.
This was the talk we had between us
Of this good man, whom we called Jesus.

JESUS
Oh fools, and stark dullards that you be
In the understanding of the scriptures, truly!
Why believe you not the sayings of all the prophets,
Seeing it come to pass, so plainly as it is,
Which all the determination of God did testify:
That Christ should suffer all this, and so enter to his glory?
Thought you that Christ should be a worldly conqueror
And that his kingdom stands not rather by invisible power?
Then am I a better scholar, I perceive, than you be
And did take better heed to his doctrine daily.
For you might have perceived, if you had not been carnal
That his kingdom is to be understood spiritual,
In executing the office of the promised seed
Which should bless us in God, and revoke the curse indeed.
Which curse hangs still over us by our first disobedience.
And was expiated by this seed’s obedience.
And was shadowed in the law with every ceremony
That the seed of the woman should only make us free,
And not the work thereof, or any our sacrifice.
For that thing was left to his office.
And if you be desirous the truth thereof to know.
I will open it to you by the meaning of the law:
Moses brought us from bondage to the land of promise.
Yet was he but a figure there of the true Moses
Which delivered mankind out of the Devil’s thrall
And brought us to the liberty of the law evangelical.
Where God will be worshiped with a spiritual service
And not with a carnal and bodily sacrifice.
Of this Moses the first Moses plain[ly] prophesied
When he promised a prophet of our brethren and kindred.
One in all points as mighty as ever he was.
whose wordes he bade marke, when yt was come to passe
for the lorde had promised, he woulde put in his mouthe
all his whole mynde, to be vttered <to suche> <which> suche,
that who to his wordes gave noe attendance
shoulde sure for the same, suffer gods vengeance
This Moyses did prophesye, nowe goe and conferre yt
yt ever after Moyses, their were ever man as yet
to be compared vnto hym, in all deedes fortunate
but only this man, which you speake of a late
Moyses brought the lawe written, in tables of stone
Christ brought them written, in the hart of man
Moyses in the hill, talked with God in the cloude
Christ came from heaven, from the bosome of God
Moyses from the hill, brought the lawe Iuditiall
Christ one the hill, taught the lawe spirituall
Moyses fasted fortye Dayes, Christ Did the same
hitherto betwene them, you heare, howe althinges frame
Moyses was the ancker, of the oulde lawe I saye
which with the bloude of beastes, was consecrate alwaye
and Christ was the ancker of the newe testament
which with his precious bloude, had his consecrament
Moyses taught the shadowe. Christ taught the veritie
then Christ ys even that Moyses, which ye first did prophesye
Moyses brought the lawe, but with much tirriblenesse
Christ came meeke and quyet, without any busines
yet this same before. Esayes, Did prophesye
that he shoulde not crye, or his voice be harde lowdlye
And that he meake : came to call the meeke
and turne murnynge and sadnes, into myrth & gladnes
nowe vnto these prophesies, compare his owne saynge
were those which be burdened, he calleth to refreshynge
callynge his yoke pleasant, and his burthen easye
biddinge everie man learne, Howe meeke he was & lowiye

650 newe] new W-D
662 callynge] callynge MS
Whose words he bade mark, when it was come to pass.
For the Lord had promised he would put in his mouth
All his whole mind, to be uttered such
That who to his words gave no attendance
Should sure for the same suffer God's vengeance.
This Moses did prophesy. Now go and confer it,
If ever after Moses there were ever man as yet
To be compared unto him, in all deeds fortunate,
But only this man which you speak of [of] late.
Moses brought the law written in tables of stone:
Christ brought them written in the heart of man.
Moses in the hill talked with God in the cloud:
Christ came from heaven, from the bosom of God.
Moses from the hill brought the law judicial:
Christ on the hill taught the law spiritual.
Moses fasted forty days; Christ did the same.
Hitherto between them you hear how all things frame.
Moses was the anchor of the old law, I say.
Which with the blood of beasts was consecrate[ed] always.
And Christ was the anchor of the new testament.
Which with his precious blood had his consecrament.
Moses taught the shadow: Christ taught the verity:
Then Christ is even that Moses which ye first did prophesy.
Moses brought the law, but with much terribleness:
Christ came meek and quiet without any business.
Yet this same before Isaiah did prophesy
That he should not cry, or his voice be heard loudly.
And that he meek came to call the meek
And turn mourning and sadness into mirth and gladness.
Now unto these prophesies compare his own saying:
Where those which he burdened he calls to refreshing.
Calling his yoke pleasant, and his burden easy.
Bidding every man learn how meek he was, and lowly.
and shoulde fynde quietnes, vnto their soules vndoubtedlye
except you woulde referre this, vnto Salaman rather
which was a quiet man, and theirfore called a pacifier
which buylt vs a temple, in moynt Sion gorgious
and made an order theirin, most godlye and marveylous
but then the prophetes saye, that ye lawe with his ceremonyes
att the commynge of messias, shouide ende and their ceasse
and that Jerusalem, with the temple shouide come to confusion
because they forsooke (when yt came) their salvation
then this ys not that Salomon, which the prophet Nathan
promysed to David, shoulde possess his seate than
for Nathan promysed David, of his seate a kyng
which shoulde buylde a faithfull house, & seate everlastinge
then this cane agree. to that Salomon never
whose house ys possessed, nowe of a straunger
and howe can you call yt a faithfull house either
when David was a mankiller, and Salomon an Idolater
then this Iesus ys this Salomon, the true pacifier
whose bloude Did reconcile, both God and man together
and stabisheth the Church, his spirituall kingdome
with invisible faith, which never shall see confusion
nor this temple ys not, which the lorde Did saye
should be buylded, where he shoulde rest forever and aye
for the temple which Salomon buylt, shalbe Destroyed
and God no more in yt, shalbe praysed or worshipped
but the temple which Christ shal buylde shall raigne eterneallie
and their he shalbe worshipped in <the> spirit and veritie
he ys a spirit and theirfore he Delighteth
in spirituall things, as his nature requireth
the Church ys his kingdome, where he raynges spirituallie
in the hartes of men, with ffaith, Love, and Charitie
hitherto I have proved hym, the true Moyses, ye true Salomon
which shoulde buylde the true temple in Moynt Syon

686 forever] for ever W-D
And should find quietness unto their souls undoubtedly.
Except you would refer this unto Solomon, rather.
Which was a quiet man, and therefore called a pacifier.
Which built us a temple in Mount Sion gorgeous.
And made an order therein most godly and marvelous.
But then the prophets say that the law with [its] ceremonies
At the coming of Messias should end and there cease.
And that Jerusalem with the temple should come to confusion
Because they forsook, when it came, their salvation.
Then this is not that Solomon. which the prophet Nathan
Promised to David should possess his seat then:
For Nathan promised David of his seat a king
Which should build a faithful house and seat everlasting.
Then this can agree to that Solomon never.
Whose house is possessed now of a stranger.
And how can you call it a faithful house, either.
When David was a mankiller and Solomon an idolater?
Then this Jesus is this Solomon. the true pacifier.
Whose blood did reconcile both God and man together.
And establisheth the Church, his spiritual kingdom.
with invisible faith, which never shall see confusion.
Nor this temple is not which the lord did say
Should be built where he should rest forever and aye.
For the temple which Solomon built shall be destroyed.
And God no more in it shall be praised or worshipped.
But the temple which Christ shall build shall reign eternally
And there he shall be worshipped in the spirit and verity.
He is a spirit, and therefore he delighteth
In spiritual things, as his nature requireth.
The Church is his kingdom, where he reigns spiritually
In the hearts of men, with Faith, Love, and Charity.
Hitherto I have proved him the true Moses, the true Solomon
Which should build the true temple in Mount Sion.
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Cleophas

This ys strange Doctryne brother to vs
which we never harde, of any our Doctors

Luke

Noe for who soe speakes agaynst Moyses Solomon or the \*temple*
shalbe made an heretike, yf he escape so well

Jesus

Nowe herken to David, howe God to hym Did sweare
to sytt in his tempell, a newe Priest forever
not instituted of the lawe, but of God almyghtie
after the order of Melchisedecke, as pleased the Dietie
to offer vnto hym, the most pure sacrifice that coulde be

♠
even the precious bloude, of his most precious bodye
which was sheede vpon the crosse, to redeeme mans captivitie
this ys that Priest which Holye had in promysynge
which shoulde Doe althinges, to gods mynde according

♣
which with faithfullnes shoulde buylde, a faithfull house & faire
were he shoulde walke before his anoyneted Pristes forever
this house ys his Church. of the faithfull elected
to God in his bloude, both kynges and Priestes consecrated

♣
of his priestes in his Church. which ys his house spirituall
shalbe offered a sacryfice, of his bloude & bodye mysticall
renewynge so their bishops Death, with a thankfull remembrance
which offered hym selfe once one the crosse for mans deliverance
with this sacrifice he consecrate, ye newe testament verelye
that yt shoulde be a bonde of love betwene hym & vs eternallye

♣
yf you doe not knowe this ask the twelve yt rather
what thinge yt was he institute, att the last supper

♣
yf it were not of that Sacrifice, of his bloude and bodye
a communion of the electes, and a thankfull memorye

renuad
you have harde nowe, howe this prishoode ys renuad
and howe the sacrifice of the lawe, ys to be abolisshed
thus Christes comynge from heaven, makes carnall thinges spirituall [p. 51]
the Cittie, temple, prieshoode, and the sacrifice withall
nowe yf you will compare the prophises of the messias
CLEOPHAS

This is strange doctrine, brother, to us.
Which we never heard of any our doctors.

LUKE

No, for whoso speaks against Moses, Solomon or the temple
Shall be made an heretic, if he escape so well.

JESUS

Now hearken to David, how God to him did swear
To sit in his temple a new priest forever
(Not instituted of the law, but of God almighty.
After the order of Melchisidek, as pleased the Deity).
To offer unto him the most pure sacrifice that could be:
Even the precious blood of his most precious body
Which was shed upon the cross, to redeem man's captivity.
This is that priest which Elisha had in promising:
Which should do all things to God's mind according.
Which with faithfulness should build a faithful house and fair
Where he should walk before his anointed Priests forever.
This house is his church of the faithful elected.
To God in his blood, both kings and priests consecrated.
Of his priests in his Church, which is his house spiritual.
Shall be offered a sacrifice of his blood and body mystical.
Renewing so their bishop's death with a thankful remembrance.
Which offered himself once on the cross for man's deliverance.
With this sacrifice he consecrate[d] the new testament, verily.
That it should be a bond of love between him and us eternally.
If you do not know this, ask the twelve it, rather.
What thing it was he institute[d] at the Last Supper,
If it were not of that Sacrifice of his blood and body
A communion of the elects, and a thankful memory.
You have heard now how this priesthood is renewed
And how the sacrifice of the law is to be abolished;
Thus Christ's coming from heaven makes carnal things spiritual:
The city, temple, priesthood, and the sacrifice withal.
Now if you will compare the prophesies of the Messias
vnto althinges nowe, as they are brought to passe

you shall then have noe cause, to Doubt or be offended
but rather to acknowledge hym nowe come, as he was promysed
The place first of his birth, by the prophet ys Declared
to be Bethlehem of Iuda, and of the stocke of David
<where doubtlesse he was borne, of the same> stocke & kynred
<for his mother was of Iudaes lynage, and of ye stocke of David>
and note Esaias watchworde of messias commyng well

that a mayede shouIde conceave, and bringe a childe & his name Emanuell
though this misterie (to the Iewes) was not <openlye> knowne openlye
yet yt was not hyde, from Ioseph, and his companye
which Ioseph was a witnes, of this misterie most
that she was a virgin, and had conceaved, of the holye ghost
further I am suer, concernynge his nativitie
you have harde of the Magies, which visytt apparentlye
which both Esaye and David. longe afore did prophesy
of such as shouId bringe presence, from Saba and Arabie
the slaughter of the innocentes did not Jeremye aforehande tell
representynge yt vnto vs. in the person of Rachell
bewaylyngs sore her childrenes death, & would not be comforted
to see them all so cruellye, of their lyves bereaved

And concernyng his miracles, both many folde & wonderous
did not Esaye writte the same, in the spirit most mervelous
that the blynde Deaffe and Dumme, with ye lame and leprosy
shoulde <att> the commyngge of Messias, be healed of their infirmytie
and all this you sawe hym doe, with greatter to certayne

why doe you not receive hym, the prophises beinge so playne
Agayne when that Iohn Baptist, was cast nowe into pryson
and sent two of his Disciples, and asked of hym this question
art thou he which shall come: he bade then Iohns Disciples
go straight to Iohn agayne, and to hym <tell> his miracles
as who shoulde saye, yf I tell hym not, I am ye sonne of man.
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Unto all things now, as they are brought to pass.
You shall then have no cause to doubt or be offended.
But rather to acknowledge him now come, as he was promised.
The place first of his birth by the prophet is declared
To be Bethlehem of Juda, and of the stock of David.
Where doubtless he was born of the same stock and kindred
For his mother was of Judah’s lineage and of the stock of David.
And note Isaiah’s watchword of Messias’ coming well:
That a maid should conceive and bring a child, and his name Emmanuel.
Though this mystery to the Jews was not known openly.
Yet it was not hid from Joseph and his company:
Which Joseph was a witness of this ministry most:
That she was a virgin and had conceived of the holy ghost.
Further, I am sure, concerning his nativity
You have heard of the Magi, which visit apparently
Which both Isaiah and David long before did prophesy
Of such as should bring presents from Saba and Araby.
The slaughter of the innocents did not Jeremiah beforehand tell.
Representing it unto us, in the person of Rachel
Bewailing sore her children’s death, and would not be comforted
To see them all so cruelly of their lives bereaved?
And concerning his miracles, both manifold and wondrous.
Did not Isaiah write the same in the spirit most marvelous:
That the blind, deaf and dumb, with the lame and leprosy
Should at the coming of Messias be healed of their infirmity?
And all this you saw him do, with greater too, certain.
Why do you not receive him, the prophesies being so plain?
Again, when that John Baptist was cast now into prison
And sent two of his disciples and asked of him this question:
"Art thou he which shall come?", he bade then John’s disciples
Go straight to John again and to him tell his miracles.
As who should say, "If I tell him not I am the son of man.

240

730

735

740

745

750

755

760
The Secorde Dayes Playe

let hym goe to the prophettes, and they will tell yow, who I am
He came into Ierusalem, rydynge vpon an asse
did not Zacharies prophesye, their then come to passe Zacha: 9.9
Loe Ierusalem (saieth he) thy kyng comset, thy righteous saviour
rydynge vpon an asse, full meekelye, and full poore
he that came thus poorelye, came with noe worldlye pompe
yet did he thus subdue, the Divels pride, and his pompe
notwithstanding this ys povertie, offended ye weke ever
so that when he was taken, the twelve hym forsoke ther
and was yt not (by Zacharie) longe before prophisied
that the sheaphearde shoulde be smytten, & ye sheepe dispersed
Agayne, yet what saye you nowe, to the treason of Iudas
was yt not tolde before by David. howe it shoulde come to passe
saynge ye man of my peace, which did eate my breade, & whom I trusted wel
hath lifte vpp his heele against me, like a traytour fell
and the money he was soulde for, was it not by Zacharie prophesied
howe yt shoulde by a fyelde, wher straungers shoulde be buried
further the conspiracie of them, which hym accused
was yt not by David, playnelye prophesayed
howe the kynges of the earth, (and ye heades) were algathered
against their lorde and Christ. vnto yat office annoyednt
cryinge hange hym, hange hyme, he ys no other worthye
and saved a thifelife for hym, that they might see hym Dye
Nowe of his accusation of blasphemye, was not Ioseph a figure
soulde by his breatherne to ye Ismalytes in great anger
exod .37. for that his Dreames, shoulde seeme by the interpretatione
that he shoulde be their lorde, and they in his subiection
and came yt not to passe, that he their lorde prouyded
for them foode in that dearth, or else they must haue perished
even so, whom yow here speake of, <h>is counted of his breatherne
to be but a blasphemer, for whom, yet God did ordayne
that he shoulde be their stewarde, & even their sole provider
for foode in yat great banyshement, which their soule should suffer
What saye you to his sylence, in his examynation
did not Esaye and David both make theirof demonstration
Let him go the prophets and they will tell you who I am."

He came into Jerusalem riding upon an ass:

Did not Zachariah's prophecy there then come to pass?

"Lo, Jerusalem," sayeth he, "thy king comes, thy righteous savior.

Riding upon an ass, full meekly and full poor."

He that came thus poorly came with no worldly pomp.

Yet did he thus subdue the Devil's pride, and his pomp.

Notwithstanding, this his poverty offended the weak ever.

So that when he was taken, the twelve him forsook there.

And was it not by Zachariah long before prophesied

That the shepherd should be smitten, and the sheep dispersed?

Again, yet what say you now to the treason of Judas?

Was it not told before by David how it should come to pass.

Saying, "The man of my peace, which did eat my bread, and whom I trusted well,

Hath lift[ed] up his heel against me, like a traitor fell."

And the money he was sold for, was it not by Zachary prophesied

How it should buy a field where strangers should be buried?

Further, the conspiracy of them which him accused.

Was it not by David plainly prophesied

How the kings of the earth and the heads were all gathered

Against their lord and Christ, unto that office anointed.

Crying "Hang him, hang him, he is no other worthy."

And saved a thief for him, that they might see him die?

Now of his accusation of blasphemy, was not Joseph a figure.

Sold by his brethren to the Ismailites in great anger

For that his dreams should seem by the interpretation

that he should be their lord, and they in his subjection?

And came it not to pass that he, their lord, provided

For them food in that dearth, or else they must have perished?

Even so, whom you here speak of is [ac]counted of his brethren

To be but a blasphemer, for whom yet God did ordain

that he should be their steward, and even their sole provider

For food in that great banishment which their soul should suffer.

What say you to his silence in his examination?

Did not Isaiah and David both make thereof demonstration,
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likenyng hym to the sheepe, leede vnto the slaughte[r] and as still as the lambe, which lyeth before the sheerer he was scourged, scorned, crowned with thorne, and spite vpon and shewed to the people, to make a laughynge stock vpon

800 here Esaye, in the person of the people, as he myght doth prophisyse and lament, that most dolourous sight saynge we did take hym (onlye) for a cast awaye and as cleene given over, of his God, for alwaye but he was thus wounded, for our faultes rather and his woundes, hath healed vs, nowe for ever yf he were thus wounded, for our synnes by Esaye then yt must needes followe, that Messias must needes Dye yf he must needes Dye, then the scribbes and pharises have deceiver them selves, with their false glosses

810 which beleve and teach, like most vayne Deceyvers that ye Messias shall not Dye, and so makes ye prophete lyers Nowe the carrynge of ye crosse, did not Isaake figure like wise Gene. 22.6. which carried the woode hym selfe vnto ye place of sacrifice yet further in the lawe. Did not the brasen Serpent Numb.21.8 his hangynge on the crosse. vnto vs playne represent that whosoe looked vpon hym, with the eye of faith shoulde be [cured] of the serpentes stinge (his synne) and be safe

Also ye grave & stone, was yt not tuchd of Jeremye which in his person sayeth, in the lake, they have cast me

820 and further besides that, they have layed a stone vpon me agayne in the grave, that he shoulde not their putryfye doth not David in his person, speake yt playnelye thou shalt not leave my soule in hell, any season Psal: 16.10 nor suffer thy holye one, either to see corruption

825 ffurther concernyng his resurrection, harken howe the Jewes Desiered, of hym some token who answered : you shall have non other token of me but even Ionas, three Dayes kept in the whalles bellye how woulde you requier here, a more playne fygure to declare his resurrection, or more true mrrour

796 slaughter] slaughted MS
817 cured] cursed MS: see textual note.
Likening him to the sheep led unto the slaughter
And as still as the lamb, which lieth before the shearer?
He was scourged, scorned, crowned with thorn and spit upon.
And showed to the people, to make a laughingstock upon.

Here Isaiah, in the person of the people, as he might.
Doth prophesy and lament that most dolorous sight
Saying, "We did take him only for a castaway,
And as clean given over of his God for always.
But he was thus wounded for our faults, rather.
And his wounds hath healed us now, forever."
If he were thus wounded for our sins, by Isaiah.
Then it must needs follow that Messias must needs die.
If he must needs die, then the scribes and Pharisees
Have deceived themselves with their false glosses.
Which believe and teach, like most vain deceivers.
That the Messias shall not die, and so makes the prophets liars.
Now the carrying of the cross did not Isaac figure likewise.
Which carried the wood himself unto the place of sacrifice?
Yet further in the law, did not the brazen serpent
His hanging on the cross unto us plain represent.
That whoso looked upon him with the eye of faith
should be cured of the serpent's sting (his sin) and be safe?
Also the grave and stone, was it not touched of Jeremy
Which in his person saith, "In the lake they have cast me,
And further besides that, they have laid a stone upon me"?
Again in the grave, that he should not there putrefy
Doth not David in his person speak it plainly:
"Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell any season,
Nor suffer thy holy one either to see corruption"?
Further concerning his resurrection, hearken
How the Jews desired of him some token;
Who answered, "You shall have none other token of me
But even Jonah, three days kept in the whale's belly."
How would you require here a more plain figure
To declare his resurrection, or more true mirror.
Ionas was cast in the sea, to pacifie the tempest
Christ was cast from heaven to ye earth, to bringe man to rest
Ionas swallowed of the whalle, was cast out ye thride Daye
Christ was buried in ye earth, to rise againe the thride Daye
accordynge to the sayinge of Osaye, which spake thus
after two dayes he will revive vs, and ye thride daye raise vs
Here nowe you have harde, althinges nowe come to passe
which were ever shadowed, or prophised of ye Messias
his kyngdome, his priesthoode, his birth, his povertie
his preachinge, his miracles, his passion, as you see
why doe you stande in Doubt then, of his resurrection
havinge of all the other thynges, soe faire a probation
but be you asleape, and possessed with Drowsynes
that you can neither heare nor see, the scriptures witnes
else you myght have beleevd, the wemen lightlye
which tolde you he was rysen, and that they did hym see

_Cleophas_

_Howe_ saye you (brother) was not this a good scoller
which did take soe good heed, to his preachinge ever

_Luke_

_Yea_ brother, for non of his Apostles whom he choyse ἡ ἓκε [cheffely]
did ever recorde his doctrine vnto vs playnelye
therfore we may be called fooles, and starke Dullertes all
which toke so lytle heedde, to his doctrine Evangelicall

_Cleophas_

_Yea_ and this ys to me, a wounderfull strangh thinge
that he coulde never, with all his playne teachinge
dryve out of our heades, that false vnderstandynge
we conceaved of oulde, of ye Scribbes & Pharisis lear[nynge]
but we become to the towne, we will take vpp our [Inne] η (theire)

_Iesus_

_Then_ God be with you : for I must goe further

851 therfore] therfor W-D
852 doctryne] Doctrine W-D
857 Inne] ine or Ine MS (one minim short)
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Jonah was cast in the sea to pacify the tempest:
Christ was cast from heaven to the earth, to bring man to rest.
Jonah swallowed of the whale was cast out the third day:
Christ was buried in the earth to rise again the third day
According to the saying of Hosea, which spoke thus:
"After two days he will revive us, and the third day raise us."
Here now you have heard all things now come to pass
Which were ever shadowed, or prophesied, of the Messias:
His kingdom, his priesthood, his birth, his poverty.
His preaching, his miracles, his passion, as you see.
Why do you stand in doubt, then, of his resurrection.
Having of all the other things so fair a probation?
But be you asleep and possessed with drowsiness
That you can neither hear nor see the scriptures' witness?
Else you might have believed the women lightly
Which told you he was risen, and that they did him see.

CLEOPHAS How say you, brother? Was not this a good scholar
Which did take so good heed to his preaching ever?

LUKE Yea, brother, for none of his apostles whom he chose chiefly
Did ever record his doctrine unto us so plainly:
Therefore we may be called fools and stark dullards all
Which took so little heed to his doctrine evangelical.

CLEOPHAS Yea, and this is to me a wonderful, strange thing
That he could never, with all his plain teaching
Drive out of our heads that false understanding
We conceived of old, of the scribes and Pharisees learning.
But we be come to the town; we will take up our Inn here.

JESUS Then God be with you! For I must go further.
The Seconde Dayes Playe

Cleophas

Nay sir, we have had good communycation of you

with your leave, you shall not depart from vs nowe

therefore we praye you tarrye, for you shall farre as we

and ye nyght drawes on apace, & yow cannot goe farre

Iesus

Seynge needes yow will have my companye

I am content to tarrye

Luke

Yea God sende me such companye whensoever I travell

that will passe furth the tyme with such godlye councell

I have had through furye, many a sundrye walke

yet in all my iournynge, I never harde such talke

therefore (Sir) you are right <hartelye> welcom to our

and I praye yow let vs enioye yt, as longe as may be

Cleophas

Brother, yf yt myght stande, with his good pleasure and

woulde God he woulde tarry, and contynewe with vs still

for he did our maisters doctryne, muche better regarde

then any of vs all yet, that ever I harde

therefore (Sir) we doe here praye you hartelye

to thinke your selfe welcome, vnto our companye

Sir here ys such poore pittance, as we are able to pre\[pare\]

but take in good worth (we beseeche you) this poore farre

Iesus

Whatsoever yt be, you sett before me

I will accept yt (ryght) thankefullye

Here Christ takes the breade, breake yt and

gives yt vnto them, and so sodenlye departeth

Luke Cleophas

he ys gone : Gonne.

here they make gestures of wounder a while

Cleophas

Then I doe perceave, yt was our maister Iesus

that hath opened the scriptures, so pightlye vnto us
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CLEOPHAS  Nay sir, we have had good communication of you;  
           With your leave, you shall not depart from us now.  
           Therefore we pray you tarry, for you shall fare as we fare.  
           And the night draws on apace, and you cannot go far.

JESUS  Seeing needs you will have my company.  
        I am content to tarry.

LUKE  Yea, God send me such company whencesoever I travel  
        That will pass forth the time with such godly counsel.  
        I have had through Jewry many a sundry walk.  
        Yet in all my journeying I never heard such talk.  
        Therefore, sir, you are right welcome to our company.  
        And I pray you let us enjoy it as long as may be.

CLEOPHAS  Brother, if it might stand with his good pleasure and will.  
           Would God he would tarry and continue with us still.  
           For he did our master's doctrine much better regard  
           Than any of us all yet that ever I heard.  
           Therefore, sir, we do here pray you heartily  
           To think yourself welcome unto our company.  
           Sir, here is such poor pittance as we are able to prepare.  
           But take in good worth, we beseech you, this poor fare.

JESUS  Whatsoever it be you set before me.  
        I will accept it right thankfully.

Here Christ takes the bread, breaks it, and gives it unto them, and so suddenly departeth.

LUKE  He is gone!

CLEOPHAS  Gone!  
   Here they make gestures of wonder awhile.

CLEOPHAS  Then I do perceive it was our master Jesus  
             That hath opened the scriptures so pightly unto us.
I wondred that any Disciple he had
shoulde be so perfect, in those thinges which he sayed
but howe chaunceth yt with vs, I praye you good brother
that yt was soe longe, or we coulde knowe our maister
which dissembled with vs so longe in his talke
that he never uttered hym selfe, in all this longe walke

Luke

885

Brother, did you not marke, when he ye breade did breake
how with words of thankes givinge, or ever he it brake
Did first blesse yt, and after to vs reached yt
even as he was wont to Doe, before he suffered
vpon the sight wherof, my hart did give me

890

in suspition of his talke, that yt was even he

Cleophas

And I vpon the sight, of that his former vsage
in breakynge of the breade, and devotion in his visage
which he alwayses accustomed, in like his other feedinge
had my eyes opened vnto the full acknowledgynge

895

of his person, to be the same, which hangd vpon the crosse
even as the openyng of the scriptures shewes ytt he was

Luke

900

Suerlye brother, we were a sleepe & did slumber
or else his communication did shewe hym vs, much better
in that his much discourse, he made soe playnelye
by Moyses ye prophets, throughout soe orderlye
concernyne his birth, and preachinge <to> of his passion
with the testimonies therof, also of his resurrection
and shewed hym their by, another maner Messias
then the Scribes and Pharises, hath declared to vs

910

and shewed that through weakenes, death & miserye
he must first passe, and so enter to his glorye
and this conference was made, with such spirit & such grace
that yt would have forced any man to acknowledge=
hym Messias. Cleophas

Yea we myght have acknowledge that, yf we had byne [happie]

915

for howe did his talke ravishe vs all inwardlye

[p. 56]
I wondered that any disciple he had
Should be so perfect in those things which he said.
But how chanceth it with us. I pray you good brother,
That it was so long ere we could know our master.
Which dissembled with us so long in his talk
That he never uttered himself in all this long walk?

LUKE

Brother, did you not mark when he the bread did break.
How with words of thanksgiving, ere ever he it brake
Did first bless it and after to us reached it.
Even as he was wont to do before he suffered?
Upon the sight whereof, my heart did give me
In suspicion of his talk, that it was even he.

CLEOPHAS

And I, upon the sight of that his former usage
In breaking of the bread, and devotion in his visage
Which he always accustomed in like his other feeding.
Had my eyes opened unto the full acknowledging
Of his person to be the same which hanged upon the cross.
Even as the opening of the scriptures shows that he was.

LUKE

Surely, brother, we were asleep and did slumber.
Or else his communication did show him us much better.
In that his much discourse he made so plainly
By Moses [and] the prophets throughout so orderly.
Concerning his birth and preaching of his passion
With the testimonies thereof also of his resurrection.
And showed him thereby another manner Messias
Than the scribes and Pharisees have declared to us.
And showed that through weakness, death and misery
He must first pass, and so enter to his glory.
And this conference was made with such spirit and such grace
That it would have forced any man to acknowledge him Messias.

CLEOPHAS

Yea, we might have acknowledged that if we had been happy.
For how did his talk ravish us all inwardly.
for my selfe I cane saye, all the tyme of his talkinge
my spirites were ravished. and rapt with the hearynge
that I coulde have byne glade. yt yt had byne his will
without meate or drincke, to have harde hym talke still

Luke

Sure yt yt did with you, as yt did, with me yore
you were never in such case, with any talke before
for yt pricked, heated, enflamed, and ravished vs
yt kindled and sett a fier our hartes with in vs
the preachinge I saye of the Scribes and Pharises

ys faultie and coulde, in comparison of his

Cleophas

Nowe lett us dispatche our busynes anon
that we returne to Ierusalem all soone
for me thinke the tyme. verye longe we tarrye

till the Apostels of this matter. be made all pryvie

Luke

For hartes anoied, freett with Desperation
woulde be right glade of any consolation
therefore dispatche a non all your busynes
that we to Ierusalem may withall speedynes

Ap[en]dix

Christ here. as you have seen. appeared as a straunger
to two in doubtfull hope. expoundinge all the scriptures
of Christ howe he shoule dye. and rise of death ye conquerer
that man therby through faith. might enioye those treasures
of pardon. grace. and favour. and all those heavenlye pleasures
layde vpp in store for them. which will not be offended
att that straunge forme he commes. for vs to be amended

As sickenes, hatred, want, banishment & persecution
by straunge formes (as we thinke) for Christ. to appeare vnto [\{vs\}
but yt that we give eare. vnto that consolation
the gospell shewes theirin. with promises most ioyous

Christ in his proper forme. will shewe hym selfe esfe most [\{marveilous\}]
in forme of liffe and health. had by his resurrection
that noe doubt shall remayne. concernyng full salvation

932 a non] anon W-D
945 marveilous] maveilous MS
For myself, I can say all the time of his talking
My spirits were ravished, and rapt with the hearing.
That I could have been glad, if it had been his will.
Without meat or drink to have heard him talk still.

LUKE
Sure if it did with you as it did with me yore,
You were never in such case with any talk before.
For it pricked, heated, inflamed and ravished us;
It kindled and set afire our hearts within us.
The preaching, I say, of the scribes and Pharisees
is faulty and cold in comparison of his.

CLEOPHAS
Now let us dispatch our business anon.
That we return to Jerusalem all soon.
For methinks the time very long we tarry
Till the apostles of this matter be made all privy.

LUKE
For hearts annoyed, fret with desperation
Would be right glad of any consolation.
Therefore dispatch anon all your business
That we to Jerusalem may with all speediness. Exeunt. [Enter Appendix]

APPENDIX
Christ here, as you have seen, appeared as a stranger
To two in doubtful hope, expounding all the scriptures
Of Christ; how he should die and rise of death the conqueror.
That men thereby through faith might enjoy those treasures
Of pardon, grace and favor, and all those heavenly pleasures
Laid up in store for them which will not be offended
At that strange form he comes for us to be amended:

As sickness, hatred, want, banishment and persecution.
By strange forms, as we think, for Christ to appear unto us.
But if that we give ear unto that consolation.
The gospel shows therein with promises most joyous
Christ in his proper form will show himself eft most marvelous
In form of life and health, had by his resurrection
That no doubt shall remain, concerning full salvation.
In such formes he tries out, even by our owne confessione
the secreetts of our harte, our faith or infidelytie
theye cures he our foolishnes, our sloth, and doultishe reason
with all the wordes of God, which speaks of his true glorye
and makes vs apte therby, for to request his companye
were breakynge to vs breade, the foode of true salvation
he shewes hym selfe playne lorde, ouer synne, death & hells poysone
And further we may learene, by these good mens example
in all doubt of our faith, how sympley for to talke
as Doubtinge not Denyinge, in feare, and yet vnstable
they had therfore the truth reveiled in their walke
so yf with in our harters, their be noe selfe wild Darke
Christ will by some straunge meanes, ye truth vnto vs open
and the warmenes of the spirit, shalbe theriof a token
Note lastlye, howe that Christ here, whom death coulde never holde
was holden by the prayers, of those two symple persons
teachynge therby, howe we by prayer, may be boulede
to make Christ tarrye with vs, by inwarde secreett mocions
of truth and godlye life) aye poyntyng[e frutefull lessons
yf we be then in prayer, earnest att all season
we shall then doubtesse feale the frute of Christes passion
For the worde teacheth, howe prayer shoulde be vsed
and prayer obtayneth, that the worde hath promised
Nowe I will kepe you noe longer./ ffrom ye rest of ye matter :N:
Cleophas
Were we purposed (brother) to have taried all nyght
we will to Jerusalem agayne, all right
and shewe them in order, howe yt chaunced with vs
peradventure the Apostles, will yet beleeve vs
Luke
For the woule not beleeve for this cause, the wemen
for that he shoulede appeared (they thought) first to ye men
but for that they doe knowe, howe we departed from them
they will better beleeve, that thinge we shall tell them
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In such forms he tries out, e'en by our own confession.

The secrets of our hearts, our faith or infidelity:

Then cures he our foolishness, our sloth, and doltish reason

With all the words of God, which speak of his true glory.

And makes us apt thereby for to request his company.

Where breaking to us bread, the food of true salvation

<He shows himself plain lord over sin, death and hell's poison.>

And further we may learn by these good men's example

In all doubt of our faith, how simply for to talk:

As doubting, not denying. In fear, and yet unstable

They had therefore the truth revealed in their walk.

So if within our hearts there be no self-willed dark.

Christ will by some strange means the truth unto us open

And the warmth of the spirit shall be thereof a token.

Note lastly how that Christ here, whom death could never hold.

Was holden by the prayers of those two simple persons.

Teaching, thereby, how we by prayer may be bold

To make Christ tarry with us by inward secret motions

Of truth and godly life, aye pointing fruitful lessons.

If we be, then, in prayer earnest at all season

We shall then doubtless feel the fruit of Christ's passion.

For the word teacheth how prayer should be used.

And prayer obtaineth that the word hath promised.

Now I will keep you no longer from the rest of the matter. Exit

[Enter Cleophas and Luke.]

CLEOPHAS Where we purposed, brother, to have tarried all night.

We will to Jerusalem again at 1 right,

And show them in order how it chanced with us.

Peradventure the apostles will yet believe us.

LUKE For they would not believe for this cause the women:

For that he should [have] appeared, they thought, first to the men.

But for that they do know how we departed from them.

They will better believe that thing we shall tell them.
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Cleophas

Then lett us goe apace, lese we be benighted

Luke

For I trust we brynge glade tydynges to them all befrighted

John

And is our maister rysen, indeede Peter:

Peter

In deede Iohn, as I tolde you the matter

John

Then the wemen, did tell vs a true talle

Peter

Euer ye worde was true they sayed, without fayle

John

What misbeleife. <as> ^ [was] in our hertes then

that we coulde never credit the wemen
but counted their wordes (theirin) phantasticall
when onelye the fault, was in vs all

Peter

We thought, yt he rose from death agayne

that we had byne they, whom he first playne
woulde have shewed hym selfe to all throughout
and that was the thinge, lapped vs in such Doubt

Andrew

Then Peter, we will all beleive thee

for that thou sayest, he hath appeared vnto thee
for thou was in the same Doubt with vs
in like Dispaire, and Conscience scrupulous

James

And I knowe, that Peter coulde not saye ytt

vnlesse yt were true, and to be credit

but who be yonder, which comes so apace
be yt not they, which went to Emaus

John

And breatherne welcome, for synce you were here

we knawe what ys become of our maister

he ys rysen from death, as the wemen sayed
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CLEOPHAS  Then let us go apace, lest we be benighted.

LUKE  For I trust we bring glad tidings to them all befrighted.  Exeunt.

Here they walk aside and Peter with the apostles comes in.

JOHN  And is our master risen indeed, Peter?

PETER  Indeed, John, as I told you the matter.

JOHN  Then the women did tell us a true tale.

PETER  Every word was true they said, without fail.

JOHN  What misbelief was in our hearts then
    That we could never credit the women.
    But counted their words therein fantastical.
    When only the fault was in us all.

PETER  We thought if he rose from death again.
    That we had been they whom he first plain
    Would have showed himself to all throughout.
    And that was the thing lapped us in such doubt.

ANDREW  Then, Peter, we will all believe thee.
    For that thou sayest he hath appeared unto thee.
    For thou was in the same doubt with us.
    In like despair, and conscience scrupulous.

JAMES  And I know that Peter could not say it
    Unless it were true and to be credit.
    But who be yonder which comes so apace?
    Be it not they which went to Emmaus?

JOHN  And brethren, welcome, for since you were here
    We know what is become of our master:
    He is risen from death, as the women said.
and appeared to Peter, when he was right sadde

Cleophas

We be glade of that, you shall heare nowe agayne
what chaunced by the waye, vnto vs twayne
as we went to Emaus, partyle in despaire
of his resurrection, as all you here where

and makeinge our monge, concernyng the matter
he appeared vnlo vs, by the waye like a straunger
and reprovyng our dulnes. in althinges and Doubt
he expounded the scriptures of Messias through out
and proved by them, that he must needes Dee

and soe for to enter, into his glorye
but when we came to Emaus, he fayned to goe further
yet we did so entreate hym, that he taried with vs their
then by blessinge, breakinge, and reachinge ye breade to \[vs\]
[our eyes]

[At this point, two folios have been lost, which contained the end of Cleophas’ account, Christ’s subsequent appearance to all of the disciples, and the beginning of Appendix’s commentary on that appearance.]

[Appendix]

The thride ys of spirites, yt their be such or noe
whom Christ here doth denye, to have fleashe or yet bone
that therbe, Christ doth affirme, but not to beleve this tho
that they in fleashlye formes, Doe walke as many one
affirme that they have seene them, as they have rydde or gone

those be but lyinge spirites, Delusions of the Divell
to tempt vs in our faith, and drawe vs vnto evill

And though we see Christ eate in sight of his Disciples
yt argues not theirefore, that our immortall bodyes
shalbe susteigned with meate, or other carnall tryffels

were generation ceasses, and althese worldlye studdies
and whereas we shalbe, as the Angels, in all gloryes

1019 our eyes] MS catchword
1031 whereas] where as W-D
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And appeared to Peter when he was right sad.

CLEOPHAS

We be glad of that. You shall hear now again
What chanced by the way unto us twain.
As we went to Emmaus, partly in despair
Of his resurrection, as all you here were.
And making our moan concerning the matter.
He appeared unto us by the way, like a stranger.
And reproving our dullness in all things, and doubt.
He expounded the scriptures of Messias throughout.
And proved by them that he must needs die.
And so for to enter into his glory.
But when we came to Emmaus he fained to go further.
Yet we did so entreat him that he tarried with us there.
Then by blessing, breaking, and reaching the bread to us
[Our eyes]

[At this point, two folios have been lost, which contained the end of Cleophas' account, Christ's subsequent appearance to all of the disciples, and the beginning of Appendix's commentary on that appearance.]

[APPENDIX] The third is of spirits, if there be such or no.

Whom Christ here doth deny to have flesh or yet bone.
That there be. Christ doth affirm, but not to believe this, though:
That they in fleshly forms do walk, as many one
Affirm that they have seen them, as they have rid or gone.
Those be but lying spirits. delusions of the devil
To tempt us in our faith, and draw us unto evil.

And though we see Christ eat in sight of his disciples,
It argues not therefore that our immortal bodies
Shall be sustained with meat, or other carnal trifles.
Where generation ceases, and all these worldly studies.
And whereas we shall be as the Angels, in all glories.
but this was a prerogative, for a playne Demonstration
of a right naturall bodie, after resurrection

And here I leave agayne, att this season
vntill further matter. give further occasion

Peter

Breatherne you knowe howe the scribbes & pharisés
doe watche and make search for vs with all polices
and all ys to fynde agaynst vs. some matter
for that great hatred. they beare to our maister

therefore my counsayle ys, we gett vs to Galiley
yf their peraduenture, we may be more pryve
and since we see our maister. this ys the eight Daye
were here we have lyen. in great feare all way
and for that we feare nowe. to goe out. by light

we may with more secreetnes. conveye our selves by night

Iohn

We be readye (Peter) to doe what <thou> [you] will
either to goe. or else to tarrye still
but yonder comes Thomas. I am soruye that he
hath lost the sight. of our maister. so vn happelye

Thomas I praye thee. when thou wast last with vs
what was the cause, thou soe Departed from vs

Thomas

I had busynes to doe. which I coulde not Defferre
and yet for all that. I am neever the neere

Iohn

Yf thou hadst tarried, with vs altogether
thou shouldst both have seene. and have harde our maister

Thomas

You may longe tell me, that talle all waye
before you cane make me, beleeve yt I saye

Peter

Dost thou thinke (Thomas) that we iest with thee
and that Iohn doth not tell thee. the truth verelye
But this was a prerogative for a plain demonstration
Of a right natural body after resurrection.
And here I leave again at this season
Until further matter give further occasion.

[Exit Appendix. Enter Peter and all the apostles but Thomas]

PETER

Brethren, you know how the scribes and Pharisees
Do watch and make search for us with all policies,
And all is to find against us some matter
For that great hatred they bear to our master.
Therefore, my counsel is we get us to Galilee:
If there, peradventure, we may be more privy.
And since we [saw] our master this is the eighth day
Where here we have lain in great fear always.
And for that we fear now to go out by light.
We may with more secretness convey ourselves by night.

JOHN

We be ready. Peter, to do what you will.
Either to go, or else to tarry still.
But yonder comes Thomas; I am sorry that he
Hath lost the sight of our master. so unhappily.
Thomas. I pray thee, when thou wast last with us,
What was the cause thou so departed from us?

THOMAS

I had business to do which I could not defer.
And yet for all that I am never the nearer.

JOHN

If thou hadst tarried with us altogether
Thou shouldst both have seen and have heard our master.

THOMAS

You may long tell me that tale always
Before you can make me believe it, I say.

PETER

Dost thou think. Thomas, that we jest with thee,
And that John doth not tell thee the truth verily?
Thomas. 1.

I thinke you disposed, with wordes so wise
to bringe me, to some foolishe paradice

Peter. 2.

Thou deceavest thy selfe (Thomas) for to thinke soe
for we iest nor mocke thee, neither too mot froe
for all we sawe hym, in the same selfe bodye

as I tould you before, he appeared to me
yt I lye (sirs) you can all testifye yt
was yt so or no. that Thomas may belewe yt

Andrew. 3.

Thomas, the verye same bodie. which was hanged on ye crosse
we sawe. but more glorifieci, then before yt was

John. 4

And that thou shouldst marvayle. a great deale ye more
he came in the Doores shutt, never harder of before

Iames. 5

In that <he> [we] did take hym for a ghost. att first sight
till he spake. and tolde to vs. who he was all right

The. iij. Iames. 6

Yea. we doubted as yet. for all his speakyenge

vntill with eatynge. he put vs out of Doubtyenge

Phillipe. 7

Then afterwarde (Thomas) as he was wont to doe
he preached vnto vs. of manye thinges to

Bartholomew. 8.

And opened the scriptures. concernynge the Messias
howe althynges before written, are nowe come to passe

Matheu. 9.

And opened our eyes, that we perceavd well
that he was the promised saviour of Israell

Symeon. 10.

And for the vnderstandyngge, of ye scriptures more suerlye
he breathed in vs his spirit, for this nowe our capacitie
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THOMAS  I think you disposed with words so wise
To bring me to some foolish paradise.

PETER   Thou deceivest thyself, Thomas, for to think so.
For we jest nor mock thee neither to [nor] fro.
For all we saw him in the [self same] body
As I told you before he appeared unto me.
If I lie, sirs, you can all testify it;
Was it so or no, that Thomas may believe it?

ANDREW Thomas, the very same body which was hanged on the cross
We saw, but more glorified than before it was.

JOHN    And that thou shouldst marvel a great deal the more.
He came in the doors shut, never heard of before.

JAMES   In that we did take him for a ghost at first sight.
Till he spoke, and told to us who he was all right.

2nd JAMES Yea, we doubted as yet, for all his speaking.
Until with eating he put us out of doubting.

PHILIP  Then afterward, Thomas, as he was wont to do.
He preached unto us of many things, too.

BARTHOLOMEW And opened the scriptures concerning the Messias,
How all things before written are now come to pass.

MATTHEW And opened our eyes, that we perceived well
That he was the promised savior of Israel.

SIMON   And for the understanding of the scriptures more surely,
He breathed in us his spirit, for this now our capacity.
Iude .11.

And authorized vs their with. to our office agayne
to bynde and loose synnes. (by preachinge both twayne

Peter

Howe sayest thou nowe (Thomas) cane this be a leasynge
when as all thy fellows. doe affy[r]me (all) one thinge

Thomas

All my fellows: and you also (Peter) may be deluded
with some fancye or vision. which you have mistaked

Peter

Yf we be deluded (Thomas) in this
we will never beleev (from) hence furth our sences
dost thou (Thomas) beleev. that I am Peter
which talkest with thee nowe. and whom thou dost heare

Thomas

Why shoulde I not beleev yt. when I doe thee sey
in the same selfe likenes. wherin ever I knewe thee

Peter

And we sawe our maister. in the selfe same likenes
he honge of the crosse. and was wounded doubtlesse
and offered his bodye. to vs ali. to feale hym
thou art theirfore (Thomas) farre out of the waye
to thinke three of our sences. soe farre beguyld I saye
which woulde not have vs. to beleev that thinge
which we sawe. harde. and felt. without any doubtynge
theirfore thou makest vs all. here to wonder

what shoulde be the cause. of this thy great errour

Andrewe

What ys the cause:. but even meere wilfullnes
to take opinion. of selfe will. foolishenes
And authorized us therewith to our office again: 
To bind and loose sins by preaching both twain.

How sayest thou now, Thomas; can this be a leasinge
When as all thy fellows do affirm all one thing?

All my fellows, and you also Peter, may be deluded
With some fancy or vision, which you have mistaked.

If we be deluded, Thomas, in this,
We will never believe from henceforth our senses.
Dost thou, Thomas, believe that I am Peter
Which talkest with thee now and whom thou dost hear?

Why should I not believe it, when I do thee see
In the [self same] likeness wherein ever I knew thee?

And we saw our master in the self same likeness.
He hung [on] the cross and was wounded, doubtless.
And offered his body to us all to feel him.
That, feeling his wounds, we should not doubt of him.
Thou art, therefore, Thomas, far out of the way
To think three of our senses so far beguiled. I say.
Which would not have us to believe that thing
Which we saw, heard and felt, without any doubting.
Therefore thou makest us all here to wonder
What should be the cause of this thy great error.

What is the cause? But even mere willfulness
To take opinion of self-willed foolishness.
John

Then Andrewe (I saye) yt is a madd opinion
to be thus bent (so strounge) agaynst all reason

Iames

That heade, which thinkes, his owne reason the best
are most part with fancies, ys all possest

The .ii. iames

Fancies in deede, as proves nowe in Thomas
which letteres that to truth he cannot give [place]

Phillipe

A truth with oure witness, ys for hym most fytt
for witnesses I see, that he will not credytyt

Bartholomewe

Yf witnesses doe stande, vpon a nomber
I thinke we were sufficient witnesses here

Symeon

But Thomas with hym selfe allowes noe witnes
but such as herein. shalbe even all senselesses

Iude

For that thinge which of vs. was felt, harde. and seene
will not sinke in Thomas his head, by noe meane . /

Thomas

And when you have sayd (sirs) all that you cane saye
you cane not all, make me beleeeve yt. noe waye
I will not credityt. no not my owne eye

though I shoulde see hym. stande here before me
vnesse that I see, and feele both those woundes
made in his handes and feete with those hell houndes
which nayled hym to the crosse. without feare or dreade
of their cursed fact, and most heynious deede

and further I will not beleeeve my owne sight
vnesse with the sight, (that also) I myght
even playne have my hande, in the wounde of his syde
which was made with the speare, both large and wyde

1115 witnesses] witneses W-D
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JOHN
Then, Andrew, I say, it is a mad opinion
To be thus bent so strong against all reason.

JAMES
That head which thinks his own reason the best
[For] most part with fancies is all possessed.

2nd JAMES
Fancies indeed, as proves now in Thomas,
Which lets that to truth he cannot give place.

PHILLIP
A truth without witness is for him most fit,
For witnesses I see that he will not credit.

BARTHOLOMEW
If witnesses do stand upon a number.
I think we were sufficient witnesses here.

SIMON
But Thomas with himself allows no witness
But such as herein shall be even all senseless.

JUDE
For that thing which of us was felt, heard and seen
Will not sink in Thomas' head, by no mean.

THOMAS
And when you have said, sirs, all that you can say.
You cannot all make me believe it, no way.
I will not credit, no not my own eye.
Though I should see him stand here before me.
Unless that I see and feel both those wounds
Made in his hands and feet with those hell hounds
Which nailed him to the cross, without fear or dread
Of their cursed fact and most heinous deed.
And further I will not believe my own sight
Unless with the sight that also I might
Even plain have my hand in the wound of his side
Which was made with the spear, both large and wide.
The Seconde Dayes Playe

except I doe see this, in everye proportion

I will never credit his resurrection

Peter

Thou makes vs to marvayle, to see thee soe stiffe
or what thinge shoulde make thee, soe harde of beleiffe
for though we all at first, did doubt in the matter
yet were not we see stiffe, to contyne we in errore

Thomas

Stiff, or vnstiff, you cannot all turne me
before I see and feale, those woundes of his bodye

Jesus

The peace of God be amoungst you
Thomas, because thou art here, so harde of beleiffe
and agaynst all thy fellowes, stands in yt soe stiffe

that thou wilt not beleive, yet, my resurrection
for all thy fellowes here, their testification

[unlesse in]

[The remainder of the play is missing. The final scene in Grimald’s *Christus Redivivus* dramatizes Christ’s appearance to Thomas, and this episode was the final segment of the Easter narrative in the liturgical drama as well. It is likely that *The Resurrection of Our Lord* also concluded after a dialogue between Thomas and Christ, and that Appendix spoke an epilogue of some kind.]
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Except I do see this in every proportion.
I will never credit his resurrection.

PETER
Thou makes us to marvel to see thee so stiff.
Or what thing should make thee so hard of belief?
For though we all at first did doubt in the matter.
Yet were not we so stiff, to continue in error.

THOMAS
Stiff or unstiff, you cannot all turn me
Before I see and feel those wounds of his body. [Enter Jesus]

JESUS
The peace of God be amongst you.
Thomas, because thou art here so hard of belief
And against all thy fellows stands in it so stiff
That thou will not believe, yet, my resurrection
For all thy fellows here their testification.
[Unless in]

[The remainder of the play is missing. The final scenes in Grimald's Christus Redivivus dramatizes Christ's appearance to Thomas, and this episode was the final segment of the Easter narrative in the liturgical drama as well. It is likely that The Resurrection of Our Lord also concluded after a dialogue between Thomas and Christ, and that Appendix spoke an epilogue of some kind.]
C. Textual Notes

This section identifies and comments on aspects of the text such as scribal deletions and other alterations, and explains some readings in the present edition that differ from those of Wilson and Dobell. I have noted absences of catchwords, but call attention to those that are present only in instances of discrepancy between the catchwords and initial words on the next page.

28. any title] A questionable instance of word division, as the y is brought up to cross the bar of the t.

35. washynge] sh has been altered in different ink. The s is written over a smear which extends into a rather large space between the s and h, suggesting that a previous spelling, which used more letters, was rubbed out.

54. shall] deleted in different ink, like that used in the sh of “washynge” above.

55. those, (of] parenthesis written over comma. Elsewhere the scribe uses both marks in conjunction (cf. lines 76, 115, 189, and 518) so both marks may be intended here as well.

73. Even] Ev is an awkwardly formed alteration, perhaps correcting a w which was the result of dittography from the following line.

95. trape] final e is partially erased.

98. lorde,] Initially written as “lordes.” The scribe then erased the final s and wrote a comma over it.

109. resistance] n is smudged. It may have been altered to distinguish it as an n, rather than a u.

113. A probable instance of eye-skip; this line was omitted and then interlineated.

170+sh. ii. Souldier] This part of the speech heading appears in small italic script, like that used for proper names in dialogue.

206-11sd. &r / the Angel.] Deletion made in the same ink as the main text.

223. nowe] w blotted.

234. theyr] Raised r added in different ink, and perhaps by a different hand, as the nib of the pen appears to be finer and the hand shaky.

237-39 margin 2:] and 1:] Wilson and Dobell suggest these numbers “reverse the order of speeches.”

262. diswayes] e is blotted, perhaps in an attempt to correct it to a d.
297. disapoynted] In the manuscript, the mark of abbreviation for the \( n \) extends over both the \( o \) and the \( y \). Wilson and Dobell place it over \( y \). Other abbreviations for nasal consonants in the text may be otiose, but this one and those at lines 592 and 949 are necessary.

303. to] the scribe first wrote \( b \), then corrected the letter to \( t \).

323. you] could also be “yon.” Minuscule \( n \) and \( u \) are sometimes difficult to distinguish, but there is no other example of “yon” in the text.

327 margin. The first instance of the marginal trefoil notation, which appears again next to lines 461, 476, 499, 706, 714, and 722. In other instances it signals controversial doctrine, but its use here is more cryptic.

340. Wemen] first \( e \) may be changed from an \( o \). There is certainly a cross bar, but the circle is also tightly closed. It is more likely that the change was made from \( o \) to \( e \) rather than from \( e \) to \( o \) as “wemen” is the predominant spelling in the manuscript.

343. There is no page heading on this page (p. 28).

359. <mens>] This deletion occurs in a gray-brown ink which is lighter, and probably later, than that of the main text.

364. satified] possibly “satisfied,” but there are no other instances of linked \( s \) and \( f \) to compare in the manuscript.

385. [y]ett] The long \( s \) is very clear in the manuscript, but “yet” is more logical here, given the soldiers’ resistance to the bargain. “Set” would suggest that the priests would accept harm to their own consciences, but their argument here seems to be that the proposed action will not harm anyone’s conscience.

390. commynge] Here and in line 723 the scribe uses a straight line rather than a looped mark of abbreviation to indicate an omitted nasal consonant.

407-35. The running title for this page reads: “The first daies playe.”

407. their in,] comma is very faint, and paper quite worn at this point.

413. (tale] Here and elsewhere the scribe uses an opening mark of parenthesis to mark a continuation of a verse line. Other instances of this practice are also identified below.

429. through] This word was omitted at first; another scribe started to write it directly above “out,” but evidently misspelt it, as he scratched it out and wrote it above “Iurye” instead. Both the ink and the hand of the correction differ from those of the main text. The ink is lighter, and the \( u \) resembles a \( y \). The same hand appears to have altered the \( t \) in “out” as well.

461, 476 and 499 margin. The trefoil notation is used to mark lines stating Peter’s preeminence, a controversial topic among Protestants.

527 margin. \textit{N} in margin is in lighter ink than the rest of the page and is probably a later addition to the manuscript. Wilson and Dobell suggest that the symbol marks exits of Appendix. If this is the case, its occurrence at line 970 is superfluous, as a stage direction appears there as well. Instead, the symbol’s appearances may frame scenes which could be omitted in performance.
544. woulde have] catch word from the previous page is “would have.”

566. (had] Parenthesis marks a continuation of a verse line.

603. come] is blotted. Wilson and Dobell suggest it is altered.

633. <to such> <which>] Two different emendations have been made here. The scribe seems to have corrected himself as he proceeded through the line trying to make sense of his exemplar. Wilson and Dobell suggest that the second deletion is made in darker ink.

667. gorgiou[s] ] The original last letter of this word, probably a long s, has been altered and blotted, and s is written above the u in original link.

671. confusion] s altered from t and blotted.

699. (temple] Parenthesis marks continuation of a verse line.

706, 714, 722 margin. The trefoil notation here marks potentially controversial eucharistic doctrine.

724 margin. renued] Since the scribe was running out of room at the end of the line, he underlined “renued,” and wrote “renued” in the margin as well, for clarity.

726. thus Christes] catch word from the previous page is “Thus Christ.”

729 margin. The triangular mark looks too regular to be accidental, and may be a trefoil notation which was abandoned or smudged.

734-35 margin. A large bracket in different ink appears to the right of both lines, but the deletions are in the original ink.

763. Zacharies] s at the end of this word is cramped and may be an afterthought; other references to the prophet all spell his name “Zacharie.”

763 margin. .Zacha: 9.9 ] c is altered from h.

767. yet did] catch word from the previous page is “yet Did.”

768. povertie] v altered and blotted in later dark ink.

774 margin. well] “well” written in margin to clarify interlined last word in the line.

776. (sied] Parenthesis marks continuation of a verse line.

777. by] y altered from e, possibly in later ink.

780. earth, (and] Opening parenthesis obscures a comma; both marks were probably intended to be read. Cf. 55 above.

790. his] Blotted initial h may represent a scribal attempt to correct the word to “is.”

790. countpted] wn altered, perhaps to clarify the distinction between u and n, which can be difficult to differentiate in this manuscript.
817. cured] Emended to “cursed” through an interlineated s, which is written in a different ink and probably by a different hand.


849. (chieffley] Parenthesis marks continuation of a verse line.

857. (heire] Parenthesis marks continuation of a verse line.

866 margin. Note made by a later hand.

886. praye] r altered from undistinguishable letter and blotted.

886. good] d altered (or smeared); the scribe may have written “god” first, and then tried to rub out and alter his error.

908-09 margin. A small bracket highlights these lines. Like the marginal bracket beside lines 734-35, it appears to be a later addition. Wilson and Dobell suggest that the bracket signals omission of both lines, though no part of either line is deleted.

913. him Messias.] The scribe ran out of space and wrote the end of this verse line next to the next speech heading.

920. yf yt] second y altered, perhaps from i, as Wilson and Dobell suggest.

942. (vs] Parenthesis marks continuation of a verse line.

950-84. Running title for this page reads “The Secoude dayes playe.”

950. then cures] catch word from the previous page is “then cures.”

954. Line deleted in the original ink, indicating that the scribe was doing some revision from his exemplar.

965. mocions] n altered from u.

966. life]) The scribe appears to have omitted an opening mark of parenthesis.

971 margin. :N:] A later addition, cf. 525 above.

986-89 margin. Doodling perpendicular to the text, reads “58 88.” The writer or writers (two kinds of ink are apparent) was copying the page number.

987. wemen] first e altered from o in original ink, another example of the scribe regularizing his spelling of this word.

994. beleeve] first e altered from o.

1035 margin. :N:] A later addition, cf. 525 above.

1046. will] second l altered from t, to agree with change from “thou” to “you” earlier in the line. A long unusual flourish also appears above the word.
1077. manye] $n$ altered from $y$.

1085. synnes, (by] Opening parenthesis obscures the comma; there is no closing parenthesis.

1087. affy[r]me] $r$ interlineated in a different hand and in darker ink.

1089. mistaked] $d$ altered from $n$ in darker ink like $r$ in “affyrme” above.

1114. truth] $th$ is smudged or blotted.

1114. ys] $s$ altered in later ink, from either a miswritten $f$ or a long $s$. 
D. Explanatory Notes

These notes provide brief comments on philological, biblical and literary features of the text, and sometimes direct the reader to more detailed discussion in the introductory study of the play. Within each note, references to pages in the introductory study are printed in plain type; cross-references to other notes appear in bold type. I have glossed or paraphrased difficult words or passages, commented on sources and analogues in the Bible as well as in other English resurrection plays, and noted alternate possibilities for modernized punctuation, while explaining my own editorial decisions. All references to other plays are taken from the editions cited in the introductory study, and individual pageants within larger cycles or collections are identified by number. Biblical quotations are taken from the 1535 Coverdale Bible, unless otherwise noted; raised letters have been silently lowered and abbreviations are expanded and italicized. Dates for OED definitions are provided only if the sense cited is first attested during the sixteenth century; in all other cases, the sense was current before 1500.

1-7. The speaker is probably Caiphas. In the text that survives, he speaks more frequently and with greater authority than Annas, initiating the dialogue with Pilate, the Centurion and the Soldiers and priests. John 11:49 and 18:13-14 note that he was high priest at the time of the Crucifixion and identify him as the one who first suggested Christ should die. Here he is speaking of two other problematic popular religious figures who were suppressed by previous high priests. I have found no biblical source for his allusion to two specific previous figures, though the synoptic gospels note that the Pharisees were concerned about the popularity of John the Baptist (see Matt. 21:26, Mark 12:32 and Luke 20:60).

2. The Jewish priests are here referred to as bishops, an anachronism common in early English biblical drama. For discussion of this convention, see pp. 149-51 above.
8-61. This conversation between the Centurion and Pilate draws on the material found in Matt. 27, Mark 15, Luke 23, John 19 and the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus 11. The synoptic gospels tell us that the Centurion witnessed the crucifixion and there declared Christ to be the Son of God, but record neither a subsequent audience with Pilate nor the governor’s discomfiture. The apocryphal account, however, relates that “the Centurion reported to the governor what had happened. And when the governor and his wife heard, they were greatly grieved, and neither ate nor drank on that day” (Gospel of Nicodemus 11:2). Several other English resurrection plays dramatize the conversation; see York 38/37-120 and Towneley 26/45-151.


17. The reference for the adverb “playnelye” is ambiguous; the word could refer either to the way the Centurion spoke, or to the manner in which Christ suffered. The caesural comma may not have syntactical significance here, but I have retained it in the modernization since the reading is plausible.

18-37. Pilate’s speech here reminds us of the events of the trial, a useful review since the play probably did not dramatize the Passion sequence.

18-19. Pilate sets up two pairs of opposites in these lines: what Christ “was” vs. what he “should be,” as well as what Pilate himself knows and doesn’t know. This rhetorical balance characterizes his language in the play (see also 108) and complements its characterization of him as a well-meaning, if ultimately ineffectual, figure of justice.

19. Matt. 27:18 and Mark 15:10 both tell us that Pilate knew the high priests were motivated by envy. Appendix and Mary Magdalene also comment on this envy; see 244 and 306-21.

20-21. Pilate’s distinction between “open cryme” and “wordes of blasphemye against their god and usage” shows that Christ has been accused of heresy, a crime prosecuted fairly independently by the ecclesiastical courts from 1401 to 1534. However, legislation under Henry VIII gave secular authorities more control in such proceedings. See John G. Bellamy, Criminal Law and Society in Late Medieval and Tudor England (Gloucester: Alan Sutton; New York: St. Martins, 1984) 38, and Leonard W. Levy, Blasphemy: Verbal Offense Against the Sacred, From Moses to Salman Rushdie (New York: Knopf, 1993) 80.

26. Here “seyinge” might be interpreted to mean “saying,” but other instances of this spelling unambiguously mean “seeing.” Compare, for instance, 83, 339 and 1094.
26-35. The structure of this passage is complicated by the string of dependent clauses that preface the compound sentence in lines 34-35. This accumulative style emerges at several points in the play, notably 70-77 below. A reasonable paraphrase might be: “Because I wanted to be rid of the responsibility, but the Jews demanded his death, then, to avoid both Jewish complaints to Caesar and the loss of my position through an offense to Herod, I condemned him as the Jews wished, and cleansed myself from this act by washing my hands.” The awkwardness of the structure reflects the difficulty Pilate has justifying his action to both himself and the Centurion.

26. The marginal references to bible verses here and below (733-820) indicate that the manuscript was copied after 1560. The Geneva Bible, first printed in that year, was the first English translation with numbered verses. The Coverdale translation of 27:19 reads: “And whan he sat vpon the judgment seate, his wife sent vnto him, sayenge: Haue thou nothinge to do with that righteous man, for I haue suffered many thinges this daye in a dreame because of him.” The verse inspired several pageants in early English drama; see N-Town 31 and York 30.

28. Pilate uses “title” in its legal sense of an “assertion of a right, a claim;” see OED title sb. 7. c. (1534).

28-31. While Pilate is aware that Jesus has been called King of the Jews in all four gospel narratives, only John 19:12-13 relates the Jews’ implicit threat that they would have recourse to Caesar.

31. Under Caesar, Pilate was governor and procurator of Judea. Here he describes his station with a term that places him within the sixteenth-century governmental system, for deputy was the official title given to “one deputed to exercise authority on behalf of the sovereign power; a proconsul, a viceroy, a Lord Lieutenant (of Ireland)” (OED deputy sb. 2. a.). None of the other English resurrection plays use the title for Pilate; the playwright may have taken it from an early English translation of the Bible. Tyndale refers to Pilate as “debite” (see, for example, Matt. 27:2, 11, 15), and editor David Daniell describes this as an “odd choice” (xxxi). Coverdale retained the term, with the spelling “debyte,” while the Bishop’s Bible (1568) used “deputie.”

32. Luke mentions the animosity between Pilate and Herod, and notes that Pilate’s referral of Jesus to Herod’s jurisdiction helped to mend the rift; see Luke 23:7-12.

34. “Accusement” is a now-obsolete term for an accusation or charge; see OED accusation vbl. sb.

35. A transitive verb may be missing after “bloudsheede.”
38-47. All four gospels record that Joseph requested Christ's body from Pilate; Mark includes Pilate's surprise that Jesus is already dead, and John adds that Nicodemus assisted Joseph with the burial. Cf. Matt. 27:57-60, Mark 15:43-46, Luke 23:50-53, and John 19:38-42.

39. Cf. Coverdale's translation of Mark 15:43, which describes Nicodemus as “a worshipfull Senatore.” Like deputy above (see note to line 31), senator carried specific meanings for a sixteenth century audience, including OED senator 1. d. “A member of a governing body or parliament. Often applied ( unofficially and sometimes rhetorically) to a member of either House of the British Parliament.” This sense would follow the anachronistic parallels that the playwright establishes elsewhere.

48-51. The high priests' request for hanging differs from that found in John 19:31. There, the Jewish authorities wish to break the legs of Christ and the thieves, an injury which would hasten their deaths and ensure that the proceedings would be over before the Sabbath began at sundown. In lines 55-57, however, the playwright seems to equate hanging with leg breaking.


56. The unexpected form “see” is one of several uninflected past tense forms found in the play; see pp. 165-66 above for further comments on these linguistic peculiarities.

62-148. The lengthy conversation between Pilate, Caiphas and Annas is based on three verses, Matt. 27:62-65, in which Pilate approves the high priests' request for a watch, authorizing them to take a guard and secure the tomb. The playwright elaborates on the brief gospel account, emphasizing Pilate's detachment from the high priest's concerns. In many English resurrection plays, however, Pilate is an active participant in the conspiracy to prevent and/or suppress the Resurrection. For further discussion of the character's role in the resurrection tradition, see pp. 82-89, 92, 94, 109, 113-14 above.

65. See OED vagabond B. sb. 1. a. “One who has no fixed abode or home, and who wanders about from place to place; spec. one who does this without regular occupation or obvious means of support; an itinerant beggar, idle loafer, or tramp; a vagrant.”


69. John 18:31 and 19:7 refer to the differences between Jewish and Roman law. In a sixteenth-century context, the reference to “oure” law also could differentiate the English ecclesiastical and secular courts.
70-77. Another instance of awkward syntax resulting from multiple subordinate clauses. Line 71 seems to be a parenthetical elaboration of the disciples' belief in Christ's doctrine, while lines 72-73 give the reason their belief is dangerous. Caiphas returns to the result of their belief in line 74, which I have punctuated as the main clause of the sentence in the modernization.

71. In the sixteenth century, reformist teachings were often described by opponents as "newfangled." See pp. 171-72 above for further discussion of this term.

73. The first of seventeen examples of percontatius in the text; see p. 179 above for further discussion of this mark of punctuation.

77. The phrase "for anger, we did hang him" refers to the disciples' motivation for stealing the body and proclaiming the resurrection. The comma after "anger" does not serve a syntactical purpose.

86. Pilate seems to mean here that the priests will be happy that he does not express his disapproval publicly.

87-89. Alternate modern punctuation of these two lines can result in rather different readings. If one does not insert a full stop until the end of 89, then Pilate argues that the high priests did not choose the best way when they forsook Christ. Alternately, a stop at the end of 87 suggests that Pilate's conversation with Christ took place "at [the] time" that he was forsaken by the Jews. Both readings are defensible; I have chosen the former because its enjambment creates a less predictable rhythm.

90. "Him" refers to Christ. I have read "here" as a spelling of "hear" and emended it in the modernization. Pilate hasn't told the high priests what went on in his interview with Christ, so it is unlikely that they could have told anyone here much about it. However, they probably had heard that the interview had occurred.

94. "So" is understood at the beginning of this line.

97. Pilate's reference to "reason" invokes one of the two bases of sixteenth-century jurisprudence, reason and conscience. Both terms emerge at 381-82 below. See also pp. 169-71 above for discussion of the legal vocabulary in the play.
98-101. The *OED* classifies this spelling of *mischiefs* as a sixteenth-century Scottish variant. Caiphas here uses the word in the sense of evil or wicked behavior (*OED* mischiefs sb. 5), but this reference foreshadows a later appearance of the term in legal argument at 386-98 below.

100-01. Proverbial; see Whiting 46.

108. Here again Pilate carefully balances a positive against a negative phrase, while asserting his own distance from the proceedings. See 18-19 above for another example of this rhetoric.

109. Several related senses of “aye” may apply here: “continually” or “at all times and on all occasions.” See *OED* aye adv. 1. a. and b.

112. The adverb here lacks the -ly suffix, which I have supplied in the modernized text.

114. I have regularized the verb from the infinitive to “takes,” in order to agree with “comes” in the line above.

116. Uninflected past tense verbs appear at other points in the play; see pp. 165-66 above for discussion of this linguistic peculiarity. I have inflected all such cases in the modernization.

118. The high priests mean that Moses was chosen by God (see *OED* elect B. sb. 1. 1532); see also 712 and 723 below for a distinctly Protestant usage of this word.

121. The omission of “have” here is unusual but attested elsewhere in eModE; see pp. 167 above for additional comments. Another instance appears at 977 below; in both cases I have supplied “have” in the modern-spelling version.

123. “appeach” was a current spelling for *impeach* after 1525. See *OED* impeach v. 3, “To bring a charge against, cast imputation upon, asperse, (honour, character, etc.)”

132-44. Pilate’s concern’s about sedition would have resonated with some audiences in the mid fifteen-thirties, after Catholic resistance to the king’s first wave of reforms culminated in the Pilgrimage of Grace. In 1536, Richard Morison, who had championed anti-Catholic dramas in his treatise, *An discourse touching the reformation of the lawes of England*, responded to this uprising with two pamphlets of 1536, *A remedy for sedition...concernynge the true and loyall obeysance, that Commens owe unto their prince*, and *A lamentation in whiche is shewed what ruyne cometh of seditious rebellyon* (STC 20877, 15185).
133sd. The “sign of valour” that the Centurion and his men make is a probably salute in recognition of Pilate’s official status (“that thing to which I am appointed”).

136-38. Awkward syntax and an irregular rhyme scheme indicate that a line is missing between lines 137 and 138.

152. For “ywisse” see OED *wis, *wys, B. adv. “certainly.”

147-57. Pilate’s command, “goe now,” cues the other players to move from his court to the sepulchre. In the chancel of a parish church, this distance would not be very far—perhaps only from the sedilia on the south wall to the sepulchre on the north wall. Lines 149-56 could easily cover the travel time, so that the high priests could be next to the sepulchre by line 157.

154-55. This use of “inconvenyence” probably means “trouble” or “harm” (OED *convenience sb. 3. a.), but these lines also foreshadow its use in a legal sense in 386-98 below.

157-60. Of the four surviving English “cycles,” only N-Town dramatizes the sealing of the tomb; in that episode, the high priests provide the wax and Pilate seals on the tomb; see 34/238-61.

167. A reasonable paraphrase for “put it out of adventure” would be “do not consider it to be in jeopardy;” see OED *adventure sb. 4.

170. The inverted phrasal verb results in some awkwardness, but the high priests mean that the soldiers can avoid the evil which the wicked person goes about doing. The meaning is clarified somewhat by the soldiers’ response, and also by line 192, where the first soldier protests that no one “goes about” to steal Christ’s body.

175. For “efte,” see OED *eft adv. 2. “Indicating sequence or transition in discourse: Again, moreover, likewise”; or 3. “Afterwards.” In eModE the main verb was sometimes understood, ad the auxiliary verb, like “can” here, stood on its own. I have added the the main verb that we usually expect in ModE.

184. This expression sounds proverbial, but predates Tilley B 444, “Do as you are bidden and you will never bear the blame” (1678), and Tilley B 342, “He that does bidding deserves no dinging” (a 1598).
189. For "stiff," see OED *stiff* A. adj. 1. b. "In an unfavourable sense: obstinate, stubborn; not amenable to reason" (1526).

190-93. The second Soldier picks up on the first Soldier's term "caytiffe," but attaches his own connotative meaning to the term. The denotative sense of the word is "a prisoner" (*OED caitiff* A. sb. 1). The first soldier uses it sympathetically for a wretch who inspires pity (A. sb. 2.), while the second uses the word more critically, "expressing contempt and often involving strong moral disapprobation." (A. sb. 3.).

191-92. Though the playwright often uses very loose rhymes, the aural clash of "booke" and "out" suggests textual corruption in this couplet.

199-200. This admission of fear should Christ rise again is unusual in the English resurrection play tradition. The York, Towneley and N-Town soldiers are confident that they can ward off any grave robbers, but the *miles gloriosi* of Chester and the Cornish *Ordinalia* also brag that they can restrain and thrash even the resurrected Christ; see Chester 18/106-53, and *Ordinalia* 189-90.

200-05. Other resurrection plays provide some indication that the soldiers take specific positions for the watch. The Towneley soldiers, for example, set themselves "on euery syde" (26/214). See also Chester 18/150-51 and N-Town 34/270-325. There are no such references here, and the Resurrection seems to take the soldiers by surprise before they even settle down for the watch. In performance, however their comments after the Centurion leaves could cover the stage business of taking positions and settling in.

206-11sd Though the reference to the angel is cancelled in the manuscript, I have retained it here, since the second soldier later refers to the angel's presence (see 209-10 below). For further discussion of the staging of this moment, see pp. 154-56 above.

206-42. The text departs here from the biblical order of events. Matthew 28:2-4 indicates that the soldiers returned to consciousness after the women had spoken to the angel. York 38 and Towneley 26 follow the order of events given in Matthew.

209-10. The soldier is referring to the angel, described in Matthew 28:2-3 as follows: "for the angell of the LORDE descended from heauen, and came and rowlled backe ye stone from the dore, and sat vpon it. And his countenaunce was as ye lightenyng, and his clothinge whyte as snowe."
227-32. The phrase “let us” might be paraphrased “if we.” The same phrase is understood at the beginning of 231.

232. The soldier's decision here to depart and discuss further what has happened has no parallel in the Bible or in other English resurrection plays.

240. See OED condescend v. II. 7. intr. “To assent to (a statement, opinion, etc.)” (1548). See also 404 below.

242sd. Since some of Appendix' exits are indicated in the manuscript, I have added entrances and regularized exits in the modernized edition. It is also possible that Appendix remained onstage during some scenes as an observer, like the expositor figure in Christus Redivivus, who states, “I shall be a spectator of the play with you” (“Ego uobiscum una spectator ero fabulae,” (118-19). See pp. 117-20 above for further discussion of Appendix as expositor.

244. Appendix follows Matthew and Mark in this reference to envy. See also 19 and 306-21.

257-70. For a full discussion of Appendix's comments about Bible reading, heresy and bishops, see pp. 121-25 above.

265. The scribe has shifted pronouns, referring to scripture as “them,” rather than “it,” and corrupting the rhyme scheme.

266-67. Appendix's comments have a certain irony, since he himself is an expositor.

269-70. These lines are reminiscent of Paul's exhortations in Colossians 3:1-4: “Yf ye be rysen now with Christ, seke these thinges then which are aboue where Christ is, syttinge on the righte hande of God. Set youre mynde on the thinges which are aboue, not on ye thinges that are vpon earth. For ye are deed, and youre lyfe is hyd with Christ in God.”

271+sh-279. No other resurrection play includes four Marys. The York cycle distinguishes the three by number, while Towneley and Chester identify the characters more specifically as Mary Magdalene, Mary Jacobi and Mary Salome- Mark 15:40 describes the women who watched the resurrection as “Mary Magdalene, & Mary of Iames ye litle, & the mother of Ioses, and Salome.” The inclusion of four women in The Resurrection of Our Lord is probably based on this verse, “where, however, at most three are really intended” (Wilson and Dobell viii). I have found no parallel for the spelling “Solome.”
282. The spelling "wemen" probably follows the example of Tyndale or Coverdale; see, for example, Matt. 28:5, Mark 15:40 or Luke 23:55; see pp. 158 and 174-75 above for further discussion of the way these translations influenced the play's language.

283. The playwright sometimes uses "nor" where we would expect "not," and vice versa, see also 1063 below. These instances reflect looser uses of negatives in eModE (double negatives were also acceptable; see 375 and 685). I have regularized them to conform to modern usage.

290-303. With the entrance of Peter and John, the playwright conflates the accounts given in Luke 24: 10-12 and John 20:2-10. In the first gospel, the Marys report back to disbelieving disciples, but Peter goes to the tomb and sees the linen clothes laid by themselves. In John, Mary Magdalene alone visits the tomb and reports back to Peter and John, who run to the tomb together. See also the dramatic treatment of the race to the tomb in N-Town (36/95-16) and Chester (18/361-424).

301-03. Chester includes far more discussion between Peter and John, emphasizing Peter's repentance (18/385-420). Christ's Resurrection also focuses on Peter's remorse at the tomb, where both Andrew and John try to comfort him (267-569).

306-21. Mary follows Matthew and Mark in this reference to envy; see also 19 and 244 above.

310-12sd. For discussion of staging possibilities here, see p. 147 above.

317. This instance of "allure" seems to strain the meanings provided by the OED. Mary suggests that the high priests indulged their malice, rather than that they tempted or enticed their malice; see OED allure v. 1.

323. With this use of "stay," Mary Jose urges Mary Magdalen to bring her weeping under control; see OED stay v. III. 28 (1537).

324-25. Proverbial, see Whiting 46. See the parallel expressions in Christ's Resurrection, where the second Mary also urges Mary Magdalene, "it is bot in vayne / thus remedilesse to mak compleyn" (256-57)

328. Proverbial, Tilley L9, "You lose your labor" (c. 1597).

331. The object "it" is understood for the transitive verb "keep."
338. The word "engawlrne" is not attested in the OED, but seems to be related to OED *gum v.1*. "To treat with aromatic gums as in... embalming a corpse." See pp. 168-69 above for further discussion of the word.

340-69. In the conversation between the angels and the women, the playwright weaves together exchanges from all four gospels. The first angel's words draw on the remarks made by the single angel mentioned in Matthew 28:5-7 and Mark 16:6-7, the words they speak together are taken from John 20:13 where two angels appear to Mary Magdalene alone, and the second angel's lines come from Luke 24:5-7.

350-51. The angel's words to Mary Magdalen demonstrate the "thee/thou" register used in the play. I have discussed the significance of the play's pronouns of address above, pp. 160-64.

364-69. The conflation of all four gospels leads to contradictory behaviour and illogical sequences in most resurrection plays, as Mary Magdalene always receives the news of Christ's resurrection, but later must be shown weeping at the beginning of the hortulanus episode. This potential discrepancy is explained here by Mary Magdalene's resistance to the angels' message, since the risen Christ would surely "visyte" some of his followers. (365-66).

368. Mary's comment about a sword piercing her heart oddly recall the words that Symeon spoke to the Virgin in Luke 2:35: "And the swerde shal pearse thy soule that the thoughtes of many hertes may be opened." Cf. Christ's Resurrection 502-04 where the Virgin refers to this prophecy.

369. Cf. Mary Magdalene's desire to "redeem" Christ's life in Christus Redivivus 162-63: "Hei mihi, quod precio, quod precibus, quod lachrymis / Obruta duro fato uita redimi nequit." ("Woe is me that a life, overcome by stern death, cannot be redeemed by price, by prayers, or by tears.").

370-71. Christ and Mary addressing each other as "thou"; see the discussion of pronouns of address above, pp. 160-64.

372-73. Christ appears to all three women in Christ's Resurrection (665+sd-672) and Chester 18, Appendix 1-D/24-55.

373-424. This sequence draws on Matthew 28:11-15, and resembles Christus Redivivus 172-73 and 178-81 in that the soldiers report to the high priests alone.
381-82. This protest that the bargain violates conscience and reason reflects the importance of these two concepts in sixteenth-century jurisprudence. Verbal contracts, in particular, were subject to the jurisdiction of conscience, so the soldiers are questioning the legality of the high priests’ offer. Further discussion of legal vocabulary in the play appears on pp. 169-71 above.

386-98. In his reference to a mischief and an inconvenience, Annas echoes both his own and Caiphas’ remarks from 98-101 and 154-55 above, but uses the terms to draw a legal distinction between a wrong suffered by an individual and a wrong suffered by a larger group. See OED mischief sb. 3. b. (1509) and inconvenience sb 3. c. The two terms were also linked in proverbs; see Tilley M 995, “Better once a mischief than always an inconvenience (a 1598). For further discussion of the legal vocabulary in the play, see pp. 169-71 above.

393-94. The use of “magiscioner” suggests some corruption or intervention in the text, since one would expect “magiscian” as a rhyme word with “vayne.” Agent nouns are typically formed by adding a suffix to the related noun; one who gambled was a “gamester,” while a slow-witted person was a “dullard,” so perhaps the the reviser added a suffix he was more familiar with.

399-401. In 399, and possibly in 400, “your” refers to Annas. By 401, however, “you” refers to the soldiers.

400. “Of” is understood before “your conscience.”

404. See OED condescend v. II. 8. “To come to an agreement; to agree or determine with, or together.” See also 240 above.

422. For “chaunglyges,” see OED changeling A. sb. 1. “One given to change; a fickle or inconstant person; a turncoat, renegade” (1553).

425-31. Appendix’s summary of the action here follows Matt. 28:11-15. The phrasing is closer to Tyndale than to Coverdale; for example, Appendix describes the “great piece” of money where Tyndale has “large money” and Coverdale “money ynough.”

432. For “conferre” see OED confer v. 4. “to bring into comparison, compare, collate (Exceedingly common from 1530 to 1650).” The sense survives today in the Latin abbreviation cf.

436-99. This scene between Peter and the risen Christ has only one analogue in the English resurrection play tradition; several manuscripts of the Chester cycle include a brief encounter between the two, which similarly emphasizes Peter’s sovereignty (18 Appendix I-D/72-95). For further discussion of the scene’s significance, see pp. 126-32 above.
436. The end of this line may be corrupted; "breach" would provide a better rhyme for "wretche" in line 435.

437+sh The character's speech heading changes from "Christ" in the first play to "Iesus" in the second (Wilson and Dobell viii).

438-79. Jesus mainly uses "thou" to address Peter, but slips into the "ye/you" register at 442-43. See pp. 160-64 above for further discussion of pronouns of reference.

441. Here "execration" may refer to the action of uttering a curse, or to the curse itself; see OED execration 1. a. and 2.

443. For Mary's light heart after her sight of Christ, see also her exit speeches in Towneley 26/642-51, or York 39/134-41.

458-59. Jesus recalls the exchange recorded in John 20:17, and probably dramatized on pages 29-36 of the manuscript, which are now lost.

460-67. These lines refer to Matt. 16:13-19. However, in the gospel passage, Jesus also promises to build His church on Peter, and to give him the keys of the kingdom and the power to bind and loose in heaven and earth. Presumably the playwright or reviser felt that these promises, the foundation for the papacy, had no place in a Protestant play.

480-95. For discussion of Peter's repentance, see pp. 79 and 126-28 above.

483-84. For discussion of this and other uninflected past tenses in the play, see pp. 165-66 above.

491. "Enbradinge" is a verbal substantive form of OED embraid, v.1, "To upbraid, taunt or mock." Of the nine examples given there for this word, eight come from sixteenth-century sources.

498. The spelling "his" (for is) seems to be analogous to hyt (for it) in 467 above.

500-27. Appendix's commentary on the scene between Peter and Christ betrays a defensive attitude about the dramatization of material that is not narrated in the Bible. See pp. 119-20 above for further discussion of this unease.

515. For "studye" see OED study sb. 3. a., "A state of mental perplexity or anxious thought."
523. For "smatter" see OED smatter v. 2. a., "To talk ignorantly or superficially, to prate or chatter."

528-933. This episode is based on Luke 24:13-32, though the events are also alluded to in Mark 16:12. Analogues include Chester 19, N-Town 38/1-240, Towneley 27, and Ordinalia 211-14.

530. "What make you" is an early modern construction, usually meaning "What are you doing?" However, here the sense would seem to require "What makes you to sigh," since Luke replies with a single thing that makes him sigh: the matter that has recently taken place.


537. The synoptic gospels agree that Christ calmed the stormy seas while he and the disciples were out in a boat; see Luke's account at 8:22-25.

543. Emphases on Christ's preaching here, at 545 and at 914-25 may be related to the play's Protestant slant.

550-51. For the apostles' competitiveness, see Matt. 20:20-28 and Mark 10:35-45.

560-62. Peter and John later admit that they dismissed the women's testimony of the Resurrection, see 986-93.

569-70. Cleophas moves into the "thee/thou" register when first answering Jesus; for a full discussion of pronouns of address in the play, see pp. 160-64 above.

577. "Him" is understood.

590-97. Details of the spelling and vocabulary of this passage recall Tyndale's translation of Luke 24:24: "ye and certayne wemen also of oure company made us astonyed, which came erly unto the sepulcre, and founde not his body: and came sayinge, that they had sene a vision of angels, which sayde that he was alyve. And certayne of them which were with us, went their way to the sepulcre, and found it even so as the wemen had sayde: but him they saw not" (emphasis mine).

594. For "astonied" see OED astonied 3., "Bewildered, filled with consternation, dismayed" or 4., "Greatly surprised, amazed, astonished"
600-846. Christ's response to Luke and Cleophas takes the form of a long sermon. The N-Town plays, Towneley plays, York and Chester cycles each contain some expansion of Luke 24:27, "And he beganne at Moses and at all the prophetes, and expounded vnto them all the scriptures, that were spoken of him." However, in none of the other plays is Christ's response so long. Christ's sermon also functions as a vehicle for reformist teaching; see pp. 134-38 above.

614-15. Cf. Romans 5:19: "For as by the disobedience of one, many became synners, euen so by the obedience of one shal many be made righteous."

617-19. Here Christ himself puts forth one of the central tenets of Protestant belief: we are not made free from sin through any of our own works or through sacrifices such as the Mass. His sacrifice is the only thing that can save us. The construction "any our sacrifice" might be paraphrased "any sacrifice of ours."

622-55. All four "cycle" plays follow Luke 24:7 by including a reference to Moses (see Towneley 27/224, Chester 19/80-87, York 40/133-37, and N-Town 38/97-100 ). Along with Solomon and David (see 665-90 below), Moses figured in Henry VIII's royal iconography; for further discussion, see p. 56 above.

628-35. See Deuteronomy 18:18-19: "And ye LORDE saide vnto me: ... I wil rayse them vp a prophet from amonge their brethren like vnto the, and wyl put my wordes in his mouth, & he shal speake vnto them all that I shal commaunde him. And who so euer wyl not herken vnto my wordes, which he shal speake in my name, of him wil I requyre it."

639. The phrase "a late" must be the equivalent of "of late," though the OED does not cite any examples for that formulation of the phrase.

640-55. This stylistic pattern of repetition and contrast between type and fulfillment is used again at 831-34 below.

640-47. For the actions of Moses described here, see Ex. 19:9-20:21 and 24:12-18.

649. "Consecrate" is one of several Latinate verbs that are sometimes not inflected in the play, see also 718 and 721 below. I have inflected these verbs to conform to modern usage.

651. "Consecrarnent" here seems to be the playwright's coinage, a blend of "consecration" and "sacrament." It is unattested in the OED.
Two different verses are referred to here. The first is Isaiah 42:2: “He shal not be an outcryer, nor an hie mynded person. His voyce shall not be herde in ye stretes,” while the second may be Isaiah 61:3: “That I might conforte all them that are in heavynesse, that I might geue vnto hem yat mourne in Sion, bewty in the steade of ashes, ioyful oyntment for sighinge, pleasaunt rayment for an heuy minde. The Chester Emmaus play includes a brief explication of Isaiah 66:13 (19/88-95).

Internal rhymes here create the impression of two short couplets, a technique used several times in the conclusion of Appendix’s speeches; cf. 271 and 971.

The extra rhyming line and the awkward subjunctive “should find” suggest textual corruption. However, as it stands, the phrasing of the passage is very close to that of its biblical source, Matt. 11:28-30: “Come vnto me all ye that laboure and are laden and I wil ease you. Take my yock vpon you, and lerne of me, for I am meke and lowlye of hert, & ye shall fynde rest vnto youre soules: for my yock is easy, and my burden is light.”

No other English treatment of the Emmaus story uses Solomon as a type of Christ, though the Towneley play does refer to prophesies of David and Daniel (27/179-87). Like Moses (see 622-55 above), both Solomon and David were popular figures in Henry VIII’s royal iconography; for further discussion, see p. 56 above.

For the building of Solomon’s temple, see 2 Chronicles 2:1-7:10 or I Kings 5:1-8:66.

The possessive pronoun “his” is an archaic form of our modern “its,” so I have changed it accordingly in the modernization.

Nathan’s words to David appear in the book we now know as 2 Samuel. Coverdale’s audience was familiar with it as “the ii boke of the kynges.” The prophesy appears at 7:12-13 and 16: “I wil after ye rayse vp thy sede, which shal come of thy body: his kyngdome wil I stablishe, he shall buylde an house for my name, and I wyll stablyshe ye seate of his kyngdome for euer. . . . As for thy house & thy kyngdome, it shal be stablished for euer before the, & thy seate shal endure fast for euermore.”

i.e., Solomon did not fulfil that prophesy.
680. Though David killed many men, not least the giant Goliath, this line refers to the way he disposed of Uriah, the husband of Bathsheba. David arranged for Uriah to be killed on the front line of a battle, and then married Bathsheba, who had already been his lover; see 2 Samuel 11:1-27. Solomon became an idolater under the influence of his many foreign wives and concubines; see I Kings 11:1-13.

701-07. See Ps. 110 4 (Coverdale Ps. 109): The LORDE sware, and wil not repent: Thou art a prest for euer after ye order of Melchisedec.” Paul elaborates on this promise in his letter to the Hebrews, 4:14-5:10, and 7:15-28, emphasizing that Christ was not made a priest through the old Law, and that his sacrifice on the cross superseded all other priestly sacrifices.

712-27. For discussion of the reformist doctrine and language presented in these lines, see pp 132-38 above.

718, 721. “Consecrate” and “institute” are Latinate verbs that are sometimes not inflected in the play, see also 649 above. I have inflected these verbs to conform to modern usage.

733 margin. See Micah 5.2: “And thou, Bethleem Ephrata, art little amonge the thousandes off Iuda. Out off the shal come one vnto me, which shall be ye gouernoure in Israel: whose outgoinge hath bene from the begrynynge, and from euerlastyinge.”

736 margin. Isaiah 7:14 reads “And therefore the LORDE shal geue a token of him self: Beholde, a virgin shall conceaue and bear a sonne, and shal call his name Emanuel.”

744 margin. Probably referring to v. 6 of Isaiah 60: “The multitude of Camels shali cover ye, the Dromedaries of Madian and Epha. All they of Saba shal come, bringinge golde & incense, and shewinge the prayse of the LORDE.”

745 margin. Probably referring to Ps. 71:10: “The kinges of the see and of the Iles shal brynge presentes, ye kinges of Araby & Saba shall offre giftes.”

746 margin. Jeremiah 31:15 states, “Thus saieth the LORDE: The voyce of heuynes, wepyngge and lamentacion came vp in to heauen: euen of Rachel mournyngge for hir children, and wolde not be comforted, because they were awaye.”
Perhaps the scribe thought that Christ’s comments about healing drew on Isaiah 61:1: “The sprete of the LORDE God is with me, for y* LORDE hath anoynted me, and sent me, to preach good tydinges vnto the poore, yat I might bynde up ye wounded hertes, yat I might preach delyueraunce to ye captuye, & open the preson to them that are bounde.” However, it seems more likely that this reference is an error for Isaiah 35, specifically verse 5: “Then shal the eyes of the blinde be lightned, and the eares of the deaff opened. Then shal the lame man leape as an herte, & the domme mans tunge shal geue thankes.”

The reference directs us to Matt. 11:2-5: “Whan Iohn beinge in preson herde of the workes of Christ, he sent two of his disciples, and sayde vnto him: Art thou he yat shall come, or shal we loke for another? Iesus answered and sayde vnto them: Go youre waye and tell Ihon agayne, what ye se and heare- The blynde se, and the lame go: the lepers are clensed, and ye deaf here: the deed aryse ageyne, and the gospell is preached to the poore.”

See Zach. 9:9: “Reioyce thou greatly, o daughter of Sion: be glad o daughter Jerusalem. For lo, thy kinge commeth vnto the, euen the righteous and sauioure: Lowly and symple is he, he rydeth vpon an asse and vpon the foaie of an asse.”

Arise (o thou swearde) vpon my shepherde, and vpon the prynce of my people, sayeth the LORDE of hoostes: Smyte the shepherde and the shepe shalbe scatred abrode.” Jesus also refers to this verse in Matthew 26:31.

“Yee euen myne owne familier frende, whom I trusted, which dyd eate my bred, hath lift vp his hele agaynst me.”

“So they wayed doune xxx. syluer pens, ye value that I was prysed at. And the LORDE sayde vnto me: cast it vnto the potter (a goodly pryce for me to be valued at of them) and I toke the xxx. syluer pens, and cast them to the potter in the house of the LORDE.” The verse is also cited at Matt. 27:9-10.

“The kynges of the earth stode vp, and the rulers are come together, agaynst the LORDE and agaynst his anoynted.”

Pilate also recalls the events that fulfilled this prophesy in line 27 above.

An erroneous annotation. The reference should be to Genesis 37 (Wilson and Dobell 29). Particularly relevant are verses 5-28, in which Joseph first dreams that his eleven brothers’ sheaves of grain bow before his own, and then that the sun and moon and eleven stars worship him. His brothers plot to kill Joseph, but instead sell him to Ismaelite traders.
Christ refers to two verses. The first is Isaiah 53:7, which reads, "He shall be led as a sheep to be slain, yet shall he be as still as a lamb before the shearer, & not open his mouth." The second is Ps. 44:22 (Coverdale 43), which uses the same metaphor: "But for thy sake we are kylled al the daie longe, and are counted as shepe apoynted to be slayne."

Cf. Isaiah 53:3-5: "He shall be the most symple & despised of all, which yet hath good experience of sorowes & infirmities. We shal reken him so symple & so vyle, that we shal hyde oure faces from him. Howbeit (of a treuth) he only taketh awaye our infirmitie, & beareth oure payne: Yet we shal iudge hum, as though he were plaged and cast downe of God: where as he (not withstondinge) shal be wounded for our offenses, & smyten for oure wickednes. For the payne of oure punishement shalbe layde vpon him, & with his stripes shal we be healed."

812 margin. See the first part of Genesis 22:6: "And Abraham took the wood to the brentofferynge and layed it vpon Isaac his sone."

814 margin. See Numbers 21:8: Then sayde the LORDE vnto Moses: Make the a brasen serpente, and set it vp for a token who so euer is bytten, and lokethvpon it, shall lyue." Jesus also quotes this verse in John 3, foreshadowing his crucifixion.

818-22. There is an extra rhyming line in this group, but the clear syntax and logic argue against textual corruption.

818. See Lamentations 3:53: They haue put doune my life in to a pitte, and layed a stone vpon me."

823 margin. See Psalm 16:10 (Coverdale 15): "thou shalt not leaue my soule in hell, nether shalt thou suffre thy saynte to se corrupcion."

825-36. In the N-Town Emmaus episode, which has the most elaborate sermon of the four "cycles," Christ also offers Jonah as a typological precedent for the resurrection; see N-Town 39/115-20. The more extensive comparison to Jonah in The Resurrection of Our Lord may be prompted by the fact that the prophet's story was a favorite of reformers; see pp. 55 and 62-65 above for further discussion of its use in sixteenth-century biblical drama.


831-34. The same stylistic pattern of repetition and contrast appears at 640-55 above.
835-36. Cf. Hosea 6:2: “After two dayes shal he quyckne vs, and in the thirde day he shal rase vs up, so that we shal lyue in his sight.”

847-51. The pilgrims’ embarrassment that they don’t know Christ’s message as well as this stranger lends ironic humor to the scene.

852. For discussion of the adjective “evangelical” see pp. 134-35 above.

854. This praise for Christ’s “playne teachinge” reflects Protestant ideals of sound preaching and teaching style; see pp. 173-75 above for further discussion of this stylistic preference.

858-64. The Towneley pilgrims are more insistent in their request that Christ tarry at the inn (27/246-62), and in the N-Town treatment of the story they struggle physically with him (38/168-91). Here, the two disciples “pray” him to tarry, and Christ easily agrees, a point which Appendix later picks up as a point of doctrine; see 962-66 below.

880+sd. See p. 154 above for discussion of the staging here.

883. “Pightlye” is not attested in the OED, but appears to be an adverb created from the past tense or past participle of OED pitch v.1 5. a. “To put (anything) in a fixed or definite place or position, so as to stand, lie, or remain firmly or permanently; to set, fix, plant, place; to found or set up (a building, pillar, etc.).” Perhaps Cleophas means that Christ’s explication was well organized; Luke makes a similar remark at 904-05.

890. An understood “he” is the subject of “Did.”

905. “And” has been omitted here; I have added it in the modernization.

915-25. These lines expand on Luke 24:32 to emphasize the effects of good preaching: “And they sayde, betwene them selues: Dyd not oure hert burne with in vs, whan he talked with vs by the way, whyle he opened the scriptures vnto vs?” Note also the contrast in the play between Christ’s effective preaching and the “faultie and couldle” preaching of the Scribes and Pharisees.

934-47. The appearance of Christ to the Gospels in the upper room is now lost from the text. Appendix chooses three points from this appearance to expound upon: 1.) Christ may appear in unexpected guises, 2.) like the pilgrims, we may doubt but should never deny, and 3.) through prayer we can prevail.
940-42. The idea that Christ appears in strange forms such as sickness, hatred, want, banishment and persecution may be related to the acts of corporal mercy derived from Matt. 25:34-40. These works include feeding the hungry, giving drink to the thirsty, clothing the naked, providing shelter for those without homes, visiting the sick, ransoming captives, and burying the dead.

961. The reference to the “warmenes of the spirit” that identifies Christ’s truth recalls the way that his preaching “pricked, heated, enflamed, and ravished” the pilgrims and “kindled and sett a fier [their] hартes” (922-23).

962-66. The insistence that prayers involve “inwarde secreett mocions of truth and godlye life” again reflects the Protestant ideals and language of the play.

977. The omission of “have” here is unusual but attested elsewhere in eModE texts; see p. 167 above for additional comments on this auxilliary form in the play. Another instance of its omission occurs at 121 above; in both cases I have supplied “have” in the modern-spelling version.

980+sd. Despite the “Exeunt,” the apostles never seem to leave the audience’s sight. This direction suggests that performance took place on a single stage, or used place and scaffold staging. Interestingly, the York cycle also indicates its staging in dialogue at this point in the Emmaus play; the apostles must hasten away “for prossesse of plaies þat preecis in plight” (40/192).

984-93. These lines suggest the misogynistic tone of the missing scene on pages 29-36, now lost. For the scriptural analogue see Luke 24:11, where the women’s words “semed vnto [the apostles] as though they had bene but fables, and they beleued them not.” In the Towneley plays, the disciples display similar disregard and scorn for the women’s message, and Paul rails for three stanzas about the flaws of women (368/29-52)

986-93. Cleophas and Luke have already remarked on this reaction to the women’s testimony; see 560-2 above.

994. For discussion of the use of “thee” towards Peter, see pp. 163-64 above.

1002-05. The greeting is one of two reports in the Bible of the appearance to Peter dramatized above. For discussion of this appearance, see pp. 125-32 above.
summary. From Appendix's later comments, it is clear that the missing pages followed the account in Luke (24:36-49) of Christ's sudden appearance among the disciples as they listened to the Emmaus pilgrims. When they fear he is a spirit, he encourages them to touch him, and eats roasted fish and honey as further proof of his corporeality. The playwright combined this episode with Christ's post-resurrection appearance to the disciples in John 20:19-23, for the apostles later tell Thomas about the proofs of Christ's corporeality as well as the fact that he breathed the Holy Ghost upon them and gave them (all) the power to remit and retain sin.

The playwright conflates two gospel accounts here. John 20:19 records that the disciples "were gathered together, and the dores were shut for feare of ye Iewes," and Peter's decision to go to Galilea may be an interpretation of Matt. 28:16-17: "The eleuen disciples went vnto Galilee, in to a mountayne where Iesus had appoynted them. And when they sawe him, they fell downe before him: but some of them doubted."

The remainder of the surviving text follows the account in John 20: 24-27

Note the instance of "thou" corrected to "you" in this line. The other apostles only use the "thee/thou" register to address Thomas in this scene. For further discussion of the personal pronoun choices here and elsewhere in the play, see pp. 160-64 above.

The suggestion that Thomas is preoccupied with worldly concerns has an analogue in Towneley 28, where he is a dandy who goes "prowde as pacok" (273) and casts away his finery in his repentance speech (577-608).

For the use of numbers in the apostles' speech headings, cf. Towneley 28, where all of the apostles except Peter and Paul (sic) are identified by number.

The scribe uses "not" where we would expect "nor." Like the related example at 283 above, this usage illustrates the flexibility of eModE negatives. I have regularized it to conform to modern usage.

Since the playwright uses our expression, "self same" (1097) as well as "same self" (here and 1095) I have regularized all examples of the phrase to conform to modern usage. For discussion of this insistence that the Christ's pre- and post-resurrection body were the same, see pp. 143-45 above.

The name "Symeon" refers to the apostle Simon Zelotes (Wilson and Dobell viii)

For "capasatie," see OED capacity 4. and 5., both of which refer to intellectual power.
1084. The spelling "authorised" is one of several current in the sixteenth century; see *OED authorize v.*

1086. For "leasynge," see *OED leasing sb. b. "in particularized use: A lie, falsehood."

1094. Here Thomas begins to match his companions use of the "thee/thou" register. See pp. 160-64 above for a full discussion of the play’s pronouns of address.

1095-97 Since the playwright uses our expression, "self same" as well as "same self" (see also 1064) I have regularized all examples of the phrase to conform to modern usage. For discussion of this insistance that the Christ's pre- and post- resurrection body were the same, see pp. 143-45 above.

1110-11. Proverbial, see Whiting 46. The use of "are" in 1111 seems superfluous, since "ys" agrees with "that head." I have amended "are" to "For," which is similar aurally, if not graphically. Another possible emendation is "or." With modern punctuation and spelling, the lines would then read, "That head which thinks his own reason the best / Or most part, with fancies is all possessed."

1142. Christ’s first words here interrupt the verse pattern, and aurally shock as his appearance must visually shock.
Appendix: Episodes in the English Resurrection Drama

The ten extant English resurrection dramas construct their Easter narratives in a number of ways. The chart below illustrates the episodic content of these plays, beginning with the council of the high priests and Pilate. Footnotes identify plays which also contain earlier episodes. Line or page references follow the conventions established in the study above. Brackets denote episodes that are recounted but not shown in the texts as we have them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode</th>
<th>SFrag</th>
<th>ChRes</th>
<th>LSR²</th>
<th>Ord³</th>
<th>Chester</th>
<th>York</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council of Pilate and High Priests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>278-94</td>
<td></td>
<td>18/1-81</td>
<td>38/1-162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centurion's testimony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38/37-120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>295-371</td>
<td>188-90</td>
<td>18/82-153</td>
<td>38/163-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurrection moment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[1-28]</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>18/153+sd</td>
<td>38/186+sd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ's resurrection speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18/154-85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quem quieris</td>
<td>Res. 1-44</td>
<td>1-265</td>
<td>[1-28]</td>
<td>197-201</td>
<td>18/309-68</td>
<td>38/351-446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard reaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>192-95</td>
<td>18/186-241</td>
<td>38/288-352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard report/payoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>195-97</td>
<td>18/242-308</td>
<td>38/353-454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter and John at tomb</td>
<td>719-66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18/369-420</td>
<td>38/187-287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter's lament</td>
<td></td>
<td>266-569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18/401-420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hortulanus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>570-637</td>
<td>[1-28]</td>
<td>201-03</td>
<td>Play 39 App. 1D/1-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance: other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marys</td>
<td></td>
<td>638-91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>App. 1D/24-55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance: Peter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>App. 1D/56-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance: Virgin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>191-92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peregrini</td>
<td>Per. 1-72</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1-28]</td>
<td>211-14</td>
<td>19/1-143</td>
<td>Play 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon to pilgrims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19/72-95</td>
<td>40/130-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance: upper room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>209-11</td>
<td>19/160-215</td>
<td>41/1-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument between</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>203-09</td>
<td>19/216-39</td>
<td>41/97-168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas and disciples Per. 72-81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>214-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance: Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>219-20</td>
<td>19/240-75</td>
<td>41/169-98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The companion e. Museo play, Christ's Burial, also contains scenes of lamentation at the cross, the deposition, pieta, and burial.
2 Also includes the Harrowing of Hell, Joseph of Arimathea's request for Christ's body, healing and imprisonment of Longinus, deposition and burial.
3 Also includes the imprisonment and rescue of Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, and the Harrowing of Hell.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode</th>
<th>N-Town</th>
<th>Towneley</th>
<th>CReditivus(^4)</th>
<th>ResLord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrowing of Hell</td>
<td>Play 33,</td>
<td>Play 25</td>
<td>I. v: 146-69</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35/1-72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centurion's testimony</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>26/45-151</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>8-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard set</td>
<td>34/182-325</td>
<td>26/194-229</td>
<td>II, i: 134-48</td>
<td>145-206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurrection moment</td>
<td>34/72+sd</td>
<td>26/229+sd</td>
<td>III, I: 148-51</td>
<td>206+sd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quem quaeritis</td>
<td>36/1-94</td>
<td>26/351-446</td>
<td>III, iii: 152-59</td>
<td>272-369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III, vi: 164-67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guard reaction</td>
<td>35/137-64</td>
<td>26/447-506</td>
<td>IV, I: 168-73</td>
<td>207-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[IV, vi: 188-97]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter and John at tomb</td>
<td>36/119-44</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>III, iv: 158-61</td>
<td>289-303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter's lament</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>28/73-96</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28/1-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance: other Marys</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>III, vi: 166-69</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance: Peter</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>436-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance: Virgin</td>
<td>35/89-136</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peregrini</td>
<td>38/1-268</td>
<td>Play 27</td>
<td>[V, i: 198-207]</td>
<td>528-933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon to pilgrims</td>
<td>38/89-152</td>
<td>27/208-39</td>
<td>[V, i: 202-07]</td>
<td>600-846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance: upper room</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>28/97-272</td>
<td>[V, i: 198-201]</td>
<td>[1020-33]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument between Thomas and disciples</td>
<td>38/297-332</td>
<td>28/273-560</td>
<td>V, i: 196-207</td>
<td>1054-1141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) Also includes lamentation at the tomb, and the Harrowing of Hell.
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