© 2012 Kyle A. Thomas

THE 'LUDUS DE ANTICHRISTO:' PLAYING POWER IN THE MEDIEVAL PUBLIC SPHERE

BY

KYLE A. THOMAS

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in Theatre
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2012

Adviser:

Associate Professor Carol Symes

ABSTRACT

The *Ludus de Antichristo*, composed c. 1157-1160 at the imperial monastery of Tegernsee, Bavaria is one of the most complete dramatic texts to have survived the Middle Ages. I use the term "complete" because it can be applied to both the fact that a complete copy, contemporary to the original text, has survived the centuries and the fact that this is a text composed for a performance whose stage is the known world with liturgical figures, kings, institutions, and entire nations as its players. It also includes some of the most complete staging directions (or *didascalia*) for twelfth-century play. But the *Ludus* represents more than an unique example of medieval dramatic literature tied to the early years of the reign of Holy Roman Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa and his conflict with Pope Hadrian IV and, later, Alexander III. This play is functioning within a debate that began during the Investiture Controversy nearly a century before: the structure of power in Christian Europe and to whom temporal authority is given – the pope or the emperor.

This study will examine the *Ludus* as document directly participating in this debate and how its connection to other polemical documents similar to it indicates the existence of a medieval public sphere. I intend to focus on historical context, structural relevancy, the appropriation of other documents, the representation of agency and emotion, and the use of the play beyond the years of Frederick's relevancy in order to locate the *Ludus* and its specific functionality within the twelfth-century public sphere.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION……………………………………………………………………………………………..1

CHAPTER ONE: PLAYING OUT HISTORY…………………………………………………………… 8

CHAPTER TWO: TEXT, PLAY, AND STRUCTURE……………………………………………...27

CHAPTER THREE: PLAYING EMBODYMENT…………………………………………………...46

CHAPTER FOUR: PLAYING FOR LATER…………………………………………………………. 74

BIBLIOGRAPHY………………………………………………………………………………………….88

INTRODUCTION

The *Ludus de Antichristo*, composed c. 1157-1160 at the imperial monastery of Tegernsee, Bavaria is one of the most complete dramatic texts to have survived from the Middle Ages. I use the term "complete" because it can be applied to both the fact that a complete copy, contemporary to the original text, has survived the centuries and the fact that this is a text composed for a performance whose stage is the known world, with liturgical figures, kings, institutions, and entire nations as its players. It also includes some of the most complete staging directions (or *didascaliae*) for a twelfth-century play. Based upon the tenth-century letter *Epistola Adsonis ad Gerbergam reginam de ortu et tempore antichristi*, simply cited as *De Antichristo*, by Adso of Montier-en-Der, the play places the spectator or reader in the center of a "global" conflict culminating in the rise of Antichrist. But given its eschatological focus and political message, much of the sparse scholarship surrounding the play has focused primarily on a historiographical depiction of Frederick I Barbarossa's imperial ambitions, and their possible implications. Printed in German since the eighteenth century,[1] it is first mentioned in the English-language scholarship by E.K. Chambers in *The Mediaeval Stage*,[2] followed a few years later by Karl Young,[3] neither of whom give much weight to the play as a performance text. It was first translated into English by William H. Hulme in 1903,[4]

---

[1] See Horst Dieter Rauh, *Das Bild des Antichrist in Mittelalter: Von Tyconius zum Deutschen Symbolismus*, (Münster: Aschendorff, 1973), 365

[2] E.K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage* II (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1903), 62-65.

[3] Karl Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Church* II (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), 371-86.

[4] "Antichrist and Adam: Two Mediaeval Dramas," trans., William H. Hulme, *Western Reserve University Bulletin* 28.8 (August, 1925): 15-32.

and again by John Wright in 1967.[5] But beyond these texts there is relatively little other English language scholarship focused on the *Ludus de Antichristo*, especially research focused on the performative elements of the play.

The original manuscript of the play, which has not survived, was written sometime after the Frederick's response to Pope Hadrian IV at Besançon in 1157, when a letter sent to Frederick was interpreted to identify Hadrian as Frederick's feudal overlord. A copy, created sometime between 1180 and 1186, was bound into a manuscript which now resides at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich under the shelf mark Clm 19411.[6] But the impetus behind the creation of the play begins at least a century earlier with the War of Investitures, a dispute mostly between imperial and ecclesiastical power structures, with Pope Gregory VII attempting to lead a reform movement against Emperor Henry IV that aimed to recognize the pope as the highest temporal authority. Factions were divided across Europe for multiple reasons, but the Kingdom of Germany saw itself divided along pro-papal and pro-imperial lines. These divisions quickly split much of Europe, but the border-lines that developed transcended established geographic boundaries. Even though dukes and their duchies may have been labeled either pro-papal or pro-imperial, individual institutions and communities within their borders may have

[5] *The Play of Antichrist*, trans. John Wright (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1967).

[6] Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 19411, fols. 2v-7r, pp. 6-15. For a facsimile and transcription of the play from the original manuscript see *Ludus de Antichristo* I, ed., Gisela Vollmann-Profe (Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1981). The original manuscript has also been digitized under the title *Tegernseer Liebesgruß* and is available online via the Bayerishe Staatsbibliothek website: http://www.bsb-muenchen.de/Tegernseer-Liebesgruss.2467.0.html. I will be citing Vollmann-Profe's facsimile edition throughout this work.

had the need to identify themselves in opposition to these labels, despite the duchy, march, county, or kingdom wherein they were located.

The documents that these communities and individuals produced in order to communicate their views on the War of Investitures resulted in the creation of a public forum, independent of geography. This polemical location is identified as a pre-Habermasian public sphere by Leidulf Melve in his two- volume work, *Inventing the Public Sphere: The Public Debate During the Investiture Contest (c. 1030-1122)*.[7] Melve identifies early in his first volume the forms of dissemination that were common across Europe and the formation of public opinion based upon the information available to a wide audience.[8] But Melve seems reluctant to discuss the performative nature of many documents, hinting briefly at the importance of oral communication within the public sphere,[9] and unfortunately neglects the dramatic text as a form of communication that was also participating in this polemical dissemination.

Fortunately, what Melve lacks by recognizing the performative nature of medieval documents in the public sphere and the contribution performance gives to public opinion, Carol Symes addresses in her book *A Common Stage: Theater and Public Life in Medieval Arras*.[10] While Symes focuses predominately on the community of and around Arras (in what is now northeastern France), her work recognizes that other communities across Europe may have also provided a forum

---

[7] Leidulf Melve, *Inventing the Public Sphere: The Public Debate During the Investiture Contest (c. 1030-1122),* 2 vols. (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2007).
[8] Melve, *Inventing the Public Sphere* I, 32-43.
[9] See Melve, *Inventing the Public Sphere* I, 40, n. 206.
[10] Carol Symes, *A Common Stage: Theater and Public Life in Medieval Arras* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 2007).

for performance that would serve as a source of communication for the community within and without.[11] Thus, to ignore this understanding of performance is to ignore the way in which a community may have spread information, not only for itself, but also across larger geographic locations. Furthermore, the need for performance in the dissemination of information and the formation of public opinion is evident in the same argument used by Melve and others to dispute the existence of a medieval public sphere: the lack of literacy – especially of Latin. Performance was used to transcend language, and moreover, a document written in Latin, such as the *Ludus de Antichristo*, does not make itself inaccessible to a lay community, but rather lays out the presentation of a play for those in a community of a different vernacular (in this case, non-German speaking) who are able to read Latin, which then could be performed for the greater public.

Therefore, it is my focus in this study to locate the *Ludus de Antichristo* within the public sphere of the twelfth century. Even though the War of Investiture had officially ended with the Concordat of Worms in 1122, the conflict between Pope Hadrian IV and Emperor Frederick in 1157 re-ignited the embers that were still hot from the tensions between Rome and the imperial seat.[12] This study is dedicated to the multiple ways in which the *Ludus* participated in the continued debate over power structures in twelfth-century Europe. Overall, it is my argument that the *Ludus* is actively supporting Emperor Frederick and his view that the emperor was

[11] Symes, *A Common Stage*, 12.

[12] In fact Otto of Freising begins his *Gesta Friderici* with an explanation of the excommunication of Henry IV by Pope Gregory VII, indicating the tensions that had been a part of the imperial-papal relationship. See Otto of Friesing, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa* I.1, trans. Charles Christopher Mierow (New York: Columbia University Press, 1953), 28.

the chief temporal authority within the Christian world, thus locating the play within the pro-imperial section of the twelfth-century public sphere.

In the first chapter I outline the historical context from which the play was created. By identifying the exchange over papal and imperial authority that continued into the twelfth century, I construct connections between the *Ludus* and contemporary figures or events and focus on the way in which these are represented by the *Ludus* for the sake of the pro-imperial position. Furthermore, I highlight the geo-political landscape of southern Germany and the position of Tegernsee Abbey in pro-papal Bavaria as evidence of the polemical function that the *Ludus* served. Ultimately, this chapter is designed to identify the *Ludus* as an active participant in the discussion over the structure of power in twelfth-century Europe, not simply a document that is passively historicizing the most recent chapter in the War of Investitures.

In the second chapter I turn to the particular structural form of the *Ludus* and explore how the construction of a dramatic literary text takes on polemical features. By comparing the structure of the *Ludus*, specifically through its use of *didascaliae*, to other contemporary extant dramatic texts, such as the Anglo-Norman *Jeu d'Adam* and the *Ludus de Nativitate* and *Ludus de Passione* – both from Benediktbeuern – I identify the similarities and differences that emerge in relation to the *Ludus.* These deviations from or adherence to forms of dramatic literature, all arguably participating in a public format, give the *Ludus* a unique "fingerprint" that identifies its relationship to its sister plays, helping to further locate its function in the public sphere. Related to the examination of dramatic literature, I also examine how the

Ludus appropriates its source text, Adso's *De Antichristo*, to highlight points of separation and alteration that indicate a change in the interpretation of Adso and, therefore, identify a new marker by which the play can be located in the public sphere. Furthermore, I begin an analysis of the play as both a performance and a dramatic text. This distinction is crucial in distinguishing the *Ludus* as a highly accessible document designed specifically for reaching the widest possible audience.

Chapter Three is an exploration of the category of embodiment within the play. By examining the semiotic ways in which the body is constricted for and received by a twelfth-century audience, I intend to identify how the community at Tegernsee builds the particular world of the *Ludus* though the medium of the performed body. This is both indicative of how Tegernsee sees the role of the individual within the larger structure of European society, as well as how it publicly cultivates a particular image of the larger European social structure. Specifically, I focus on the performance of gender, alterity, deceptive, and grouped bodies; and the possible ways the medieval audience may have received the performance of these types of bodies. Thus, I am able to build a more complete picture of Tegernsee Abbey and the public sphere of its community. I also examine the use of emotion as a universal medium, independent of language, and an aesthetic element that paints a character with a particular emotional connotation through which they are identified within structure of society.

Finally, Chapter Four examines the life of the *Ludus* in the years after Frederick's power and popularity begin to wane. It is my argument that the close connection the play had to the emperor does not mean that the play lost its

relevance after Frederick suffered political and military defeat. Through an examination of the extant manuscript and the other documents alongside which the *Ludus* was bound, I build a picture of a document that had a life far beyond the years of Frederick's reign. Thus, even though the conversation within the public sphere had shifted, I show that a document like the *Ludus*, although created for a specific moment of necessity, had a life long after its particular documented moment had passed. Furthermore, the function of the *Ludus* within the public sphere is shown to have been no less relevant than it was in previous decades, indicating that the negotiation of power was a lasting concern of the medieval public sphere. I therefore show how performance and the dramatic text were able to address the issue of power, despite the shift in the text's functionality over the course of several years.

Overall, it is my hope that this study brings the *Ludus de Antichristo*, and plays like it, to the forefront of scholarship in medieval theatre and performance. The capacity of these documents to transcend borders, languages, and years speaks to their importance, not only within the medieval public sphere, but also as representatives of a world in which performance was a crucial part of everyday life. The *Ludus de Antichristo* not only belongs in the canon of medieval dramatic literature, but must also take up room in the classrooms of medieval (and) theatre history for its continued ability to speak to the public about the concerns of Tegernsee and the medieval world.

CHAPTER ONE: PLAYING OUT HISTORY

The twelfth century *Ludus de Antichristo* is a truly remarkable work of medieval dramatic art. Within the relatively small canon of twelfth-century plays, the *Ludus* sets itself apart for its many traits not found within contemporary texts, especially its portrayal of transnational political relationships. The setting of the play is quite literally the world as understood by its author, and each major player is given his or her seat of power.[1] Furthermore, the plot of the play is propelled toward the rise of Antichrist by the accumulation of temporal power by a single authority. The overtly political tones of the play and the sympathetic, even heroic, treatment of the Emperor of the Romans, has long pointed toward dating the play's association with a strong leader within the Holy Roman Empire. E.K. Chambers, one of the first Anglophone scholars to mention the play, thus settled on a date around 1160, when Frederick Barbarossa was in conflict with Pope Alexander III and his supporter, Louis VII of France.[2] It is possible that the play could be dated earlier given Frederick's conflict with Pope Hadrian IV at Besançon in 1157, a possibility that will be discussed further below. But few scholars have questioned Chambers' historical logic, contextualizing the play within the macro-political issues of the mid-twelfth century.[3] And while Chambers is not necessarily incorrect, he misses a larger point: namely, that he and the scholars that follow in his footsteps see this

---

[1] The Latin *sedes* has been translated "seat" in Wright's translation (1967) and "station" in Hulme's translation (1903). The author of *Ludus* mentions the placement of each *sedes* within the performance space according to the points of the compass, and hence in relation to the geographical location of the temporal powers they represent.
[2] Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage* II, 62-65. Chambers mentions that the play's imagined subjugation of the King of the Franks by the Emperor of the Romans and the silence of the Pope would suggest a date at the height of Barbarossa's conflict with Alexander III.
[3] Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Church* II, 390. See note 7.

play as a reaction to the major political conversations occurring around 1160 rather than actively participating in this stream of communication flowing from the micro-political systems of medieval Europe, like the cloister of Tegernsee, where this play appears to have been written, and connecting to the power struggle of the macro-political structure.

It is therefore the aim of this chapter to discuss the multiple levels on which the *Ludus de Antichristo* operates as a political text. In addition to understanding the play's position within the existing political power structures of the mid-twelfth-century, this chapter will outline the way in which the *Ludus* helps to communicate and negotiate among these power structures from the smallest to the largest levels. In her book, *A Common Stage*, Carol Symes describes the importance of plays and other public documents as forms of public media that influence the public towards acceptance of a particular reality; in essence, how dramatic text can be influential in developing a type of medieval Habermasian "public sphere."[4] To this end, this chapter will undertake an analysis of the *Ludus* as a dramatic text uniquely situated to undertake a discussion about power and, therefore, will be examined for contributions to the public understanding of political power structures, but also for its role as a performative text which distinguishes the community at Tegernsee within these historical structures. Ultimately, the goal of this chapter is to go beyond the initial hypothesis posited by Chambers and position the *Ludus* as more than a play written *in response* to outside forces acting upon the community at

[4] Carol Symes, *A Common Stage*, 137.

Tegernsee, but implicate the text as actively *participating* in the tectonic power shifts of this era.

To begin, no study of the tensions of mid-twelfth-century politics can fully be understood without examining the War of Investitures in the late eleventh century, which would come to define the tenuous relations between the Church and the Empire throughout the High Middle Ages.[5] Many scholars have examined this extremely complex struggle at length; here, I wish to examine how the internal German power politics shifted during the War of Investitures for the purpose of understanding the *Ludus* as a document that is both the product of these tumultuous relationships and a participant in ongoing arguments about true legitimacy and power.[6] Furthermore, the function of the play within the political conversation of the twelfth century cannot be fully understood without identifying Tegernsee Abbey and the literature it produced as existing upon the geo-political fault line dividing the pro-Staufen abbey from its location in Welfish (anti-Staufen) Bavaria.

The investing of ecclesiastical office by secular German authorities was certainly a source of contention within the Roman Church for many years before the reign of Henry IV began in 1056, in part because it had become necessary part to German politics, allowing princes to maintain favor, secure hereditary succession, and supply a ruler's royal fisc. But because Henry was only a boy when he rose to

---

[5] I have chosen the term "War of Investitures," following Benjamin Arnold's lead. Specifically, the concept of war is also a prevalent idea in the *Ludus*, as it signifies the ability to wield power in a larger macro-political sense.

[6] For further conceptions of power in a pan-European context, especially the idea that all power is innately political, in the writings of the twelfth century see Thomas N. Bisson, *The Crisis of the Twelfth Century: Power, Lordship and the Origins of European Government* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 484-529.

the authority of King of the Germans and for many years ruled under the shadow of a difficult regency, the minor secular rulers of the German duchies and marches enjoyed an increased level of autonomy. Furthermore, fueled by the growing voices of reformers, the Church made clear that it would no longer tolerate secular authorities interfering in ecclesiastical business.[7] In 1075, the *Dictatus papae* began to be circulated promoting a strongly pro-reform position that defines the power of ecclesiastical appointment as belonging solely to the Pope, going so far as to claim that even the emperor may be deposed under his authority.[8] This assertion of Papal and Church authority was not well received by Henry's court, and Henry's insistence that his crown represented the final temporal authority ignited a fury of opposition to the German crown, not only from the Pope and his allies around Europe,[9] but also from three powerful ducal families in the German lands. Due to the particular power structures in eleventh-century Germany, where each ducal territory enjoyed a certain amount of autonomy, the wealthy and militarily robust houses of Welf, Zähringen, and Rheinfelden were keen to protect (and possibly increase) their

---

[7] Benjamin Arnold, *Medieval Germany, 500-1300* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 96-98. Between 1071 and 1075, Pope Alexander II, and later Pope Gregory VII, worked to limit the imposition of the emperor in the appointment of bishops in Italy, especially in the case concerning the See of Milan, which was represented a usurpation of papal and Church authority.

[8] While the authorship of the *Dictatus papae* is disputed, as well as the specific catalyst for its creation, the positions on reform which the document takes up are very clear. See Melve, *Inventing the Public Sphere* II, 179, n. 61; and Maureen C. Miller, *Power and the Holy in the Age of the Investiture Conflict: A Brief History with Documents* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005), 81-83.

[9] For references to the letters circulated concerning who's authority was greater, Henry IV or Gregory VII, and the familial language used in constructing this patrimonial relationship see Megan McLaughlin, *Sex, Gender, and Episcopal Authority in an Age of Reform, 1000-1122* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 133-37.

specific political prerogatives,[10] resulting in the election of a rival Gregorian German anti-king, Rudolf of Rheinfelden the duke of Swabia, in 1077.

Rudolf's election as anti-king serves as an excellent example of the shifting power structures during the War of Investitures, a shift that occurred both politically as well as geographically, in the form of new demarcations of ducal authority. After his election, Rudolf moved from Swabia to the Duchy of Saxony, which was heavily Gregorian. In an attempt to fill the vacuum of power in Swabia, as well as give himself a stronger sympathetic ruler in one of the German duchies, Henry established Count Frederick of Staufen as the new Duke of Swabia.[11] Unfortunately, Henry's appointment of Frederick did little to strengthen his power base in the region. Welf IV, the pro-papal Duke of Bavaria, and Berthold II, son of the aforementioned Rudolf of Rheinfelden, each had claims to the title of Duke of Swabia as well.[12] Even after successful campaigns against the reformers and a peace negotiated between the German rulers in 1098, Welf IV stilled maintained control over the land which he owned in southeastern Swabia, thanks primarily to the peace treaty which neither confirmed nor denied the claims of each of ruler to the title of Duke of Swabia.[13] By the beginning of the twelfth century, then, Swabia was a politically and geographically divided duchy of the German kingdom. Despite the growing wealth and prominence of the Staufens during the twelfth century, they

---

[10] Horst Fuhrmann, *Germany in the High Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 100-1. See also Benjamin Arnold, *Princes and Territories in Medieval Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 94-97.
[11] Arnold, *Medieval Germany,* 64.
[12] Arnold, *Medieval Germany,* 65.
[13] Arnold, *Medieval Germany,* 65. Despite their claims to the ducal title of Swabia, Berthold had been given title to the newly formed Duchy of Zähringen, and Welf was reconciled by his restoration as Duke of Bavaria.

lacked the ability to establish themselves as the central political power in the region, maintaining their strongest presence in their ancestral lands in the northern part of Swabia, near Saxony. Furthermore, the Bavarian claims on the southeastern lands of Swabia, those east of the Lech river, maintain that even the geography of the duchy is questionable. This tenuous relationship between the duchies of Swabia and Bavaria, facilitated by the War of Investitures, gives insight into the shifts of political power at the beginning of the twelfth century, where Germany maintained strong political divisions even after the Concordant of Worms (1122), which formally ended the War of Investitures. These geo-political divisions were manifested within the literature of the twelfth century, where identity could be constructed within the public sphere regardless of and, in the case of the *Ludus*, in contrast to location. The tensions of Gregorian and Henrician political divisions would come to dominate the landscape of Germany and the Roman Imperial crown until the rise of Frederick I Barbarossa, the former Duke of Swabia and a member of the house of Staufen.

According to Otto of Freising, Frederick's uncle and Bishop of Freising, Frederick's election as King of the Germans in 1152 was viewed as a source of stability within a realm torn by nearly a century of feuding and weak rulers,[14] supported for election of King as the son from both the Staufen and Welf families, his family alliances and his show of immediate leadership through the appointments that would serve both the Staufen and Welf houses was evidence of the hope many

[14] Otto of Freising, *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*, trans. Charles Christopher Mierow (New York: Columbia University Press, 1953), 116.

saw in his leadership.[15] Frederick not only sought to win over his kingdom by displays of political leadership, but he also set about creating legitimacy through reliance on Roman historical and legal precedence. Upon being crowned Roman Emperor in 1155, he announced his intention to base his rule on the authority of Roman law, connecting himself to the Roman Empire and to the line of Emperors that stretched from Otto the Great to Charlemagne to Constantine; referencing the function of the Emperor in the eschatological role of a Christian world order that was responsible for the structure of a secular society that was in service to this Christian/Roman ideal.[16] In practical terms Frederick sought out compliance to his interpretation of his legal legitimacy by both the Church and the northern Italian states, especially the troublesome city-state of Milan.[17]

But it was the issue of interpretation that renewed the troubles between Rome and the Emperor, when Pope Hadrian IV wrote to Frederick who had convened an Imperial Diet at Besançon in 1157 to discuss his rule within the lands of Burgundy that had come under his jurisdiction after his marriage to Beatrice, the daughter of the Renaud III, Count of Burgundy. Hadrian had been writing to Frederick for some time in order to settle an issue concerning an attack and ransom demanded of the Archbishop of Lund, Eskil, while he was travelling across Germany. While Hadrian did not accuse Frederick of instigating the attack, he had called on Frederick's intervention in helping to free Eskil and/or pay his ransom. Frederick

---

[15] Fuhrmann, *Germany in the High Middle Ages*, 138-39.

[16] Arnold, *Princes and Territories*, 17-18.

[17] The legal and historical arguments Frederick makes concerning his legitimacy as Emperor in the Italian peninsula are documented by Otto of Freising, *Gesta Frederici* II.29-30, trans. Mierow, 144-49.

did not intervene due to his feeling that Eskil had been for some time meddling in German secular and ecclesiastical affairs.[18] Thus, Hadrian finally decided to send two Papal legates to the diet in order to resolve the issue with Frederick. In the letter delivered by the legates to Frederick, Hadrian had made use of the word *beneficia* as it pertains to the type of benefits the Emperor receives from the Pope, either bestowment of the Roman Empire as a fief or spiritual blessing.[19] The idea that the Emperor received his right to rule from the Pope was in direct conflict to Frederick's view that he was the temporal authority by which the Christian world received it's structure, an idea he believed was upheld in ancient Roman law.[20] This feud would last beyond the Papacy of Hadrian IV, who had backed down from defining the Emperor as a vassal, into the Papacy of Alexander III, a reform-minded leader in much the same vein as his predecessor, Gregory VII, and determined to maintain the authority of the Church upon the physical and spiritual landscape of Europe.[21]

Here, though, we need to ask why a small cloister in southern Bavaria, in the late 1150s, would produce a dramatic text that is pro-imperial when the conflict

---

[18] Peter Munz, *Frederick Barbarossa: A Study in Medieval Politics* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1969), 141-42. See note 2 on p. 141 for descriptions of the multiple reasons Frederick may have chosen not to intervene in Eskil's plight.

[19]
> Neque tamen penitet nos tuae desideria voluntatis in omnibus implevisse, sed, si maiora beneficia excellentia tua de manu nostra suscepisset, si fieri posset, considerantes, quanta aecclesiae Dei et nobis per te incrementa possint et commoda provenire, non inmerito gauderemus.

Otto of Freising and Rahewin, *Gesta Frederici,* III.9, trans. Mierow, 181-83. Hadrian wrote to entreat Frederick to action concerning the carrying out of justice in the Germany, which, according to interpretation of *beneficia*, could be seen as being held in fealty to the Pope by Frederick.

[20] Arnold, *Medieval Germany*, 106. The legal concept cited by Arnold from which Barbarossa takes his view of his position as Emperor can be found in the *Annales Laudenses*, MGH Scriptores XVIII, p. 607.

[21] Munz, *Frederick Barbarossa,* 208.

between Frederick and the Pope (whether Hadrian IV or Alexander III) was certainly not dying down. A geo-political analysis of twelfth-century Tegernsee is needed to approach this issue. At present, Tegernsee is located in southern Bavaria, near the border with Austria. But during the twelfth century, this cloister was situated near the border between Bavaria and Swabia, which was difficult to define because so many of the eastern Swabian lands were controlled by the Bavarian Welfs (not to mention that the concept of defined borders is a modern construction). Furthermore, Tegernsee was positioned on the route through the Alps to Tyrol, traversed by traders and pilgrims who wished see the relics of St. Quirinus, which were housed there.[22] The abbey had served a strategically important function from its founding in the eighth century, and was known for the writings it produced, particularly those of the eleventh-century poet Froumund of Tegernsee (d. 1008), whose use of drama for the sake of teaching within the cloister at Tegernsee will be discussed in a later chapter. In the twelfth century, the abbey was situated well within the influence of the pro-papal Welf dynasty. How, then, would it have produced a pro-imperial dramatic text? For the unique quality of the *Ludus* is further highlighted by the fact that the abbey at Benediktbeuren, only a few miles west of Tegernsee, also produced dramatic literature which was significantly different in content and did not overtly participate in the pro-imperial conversation.[23] But Tegernsee was given a status not afforded to Benediktbeuren.

---

[22] Ulrich Schmid, "Tegernsee." *The Catholic Encyclopedia* 14 (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1912). This article is available online in a digital edition at http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14471b.htm.

[23] Further comparisons of the content between the work from Benediktbeuren and Tegernsee will be discussed in later chapters.

In 979, in a charter calling for the cloister at Tegernsee to take on a new abbot from Trier, Emperor Otto II granted the abbey a certain level of autonomy, resulting in free elections of future abbots and freedom from the suzerainty of the Bavarian dukes, thus making Tegernsee Abbey functionally independent of local temporal authorities.[24]

Turning to the *Ludus de Antichristo*, it is important to recognize that the character named "Emperor of the Romans"[25] is motivated by a reliance on historical documentation as a means to legitimize his actions:

> As the writings of historians report,
>
> The whole world once paid tribute to Rome;
>
> This the industry of our fathers accomplished,
>
> But the idleness of posterity squandered.
>
> Under them the imperial power collapsed,
>
> Which the might of our majesty shall regain.[26]

The Emperor of the Romans makes this statement before he sets about on a campaign to bring about the subjugation of the entire world under his authority.

---

[24] Schmid, "Tegernsee."

[25] "Imperatoris romani;" *Ludus de Antichristo,* fol. 2d (p. 6b).

[26] Sicut scripta
tradunt hystoriograuorum totvs
mundus fuerat fiscvs romanorum
hoc primorum strenuitas elaborauit
sed posterorum desidia dissipauit;
Sub his inperii dilapsa est po
testas. quam nostrę repetit potentię
maiestas.

Ludus de Antichristo, fol. 3b (p. 7b), trans., Hulme, 17. I have chosen to maintain the use of Hulme's text for its stronger Latin translation, unless it is necessary to indicate the use of meter, which Wright preserves in his work but to the disservice of the Latin original.

While Frederick is not directly mentioned, he is undoubtedly the model for the actions of this character.

But the *Ludus* does more than simply demonstrate sympathy for Frederick's cause; it identifies him as the true temporal power. The play sets up the Emperor as the defender of Christianity, which is not an unusual title for the Roman Emperor, and also provides representation for how true power plays out. When the Kingdom of Jerusalem comes under attack by the King of Babylon, the King of Jerusalem sends his messengers to the Church and Emperor, asking for aid and calling him "Defender of the Church."[27] After the Emperor agrees to come to the aid of the Kingdom of Jerusalem an angel appears and says:

> Judea and Jerusalem, fear not,
>
> Knowing that you will have God's help tomorrow!
>
> For your brothers are here to free you
>
> And effectually to subdue your enemy.[28]

The *Ludus* not only sets up the Emperor as the only temporal power strong enough to protect the Christian realm but also cites divine sanction of his status as Defender of the Church through the use of the angelic messenger.

The concept of power and piety go hand in hand in twelfth century Germany. Defensibility was a key concern of both secular and ecclesiastic authorities. In

---

[27] "Defensor ecclesię;" *Ludus de Antichisto*, fol. 4b (p. 9b).
[28] "Antichrist," trans. Hulme, 21.

> Iudea et ierusalem nolite time
> re sciens te auxilium dei cras uidere.
> Nam tui fratres assunt qui te liberabunt
> atque tuos hostes potenter superabunt;

Ludus de Antichristo, fol. 4b (p. 9b).

particular, Benjamin Arnold discusses the way in which secular power was exercised in the daily lives of sacerdotal communities during the High Middle Ages. In his book *Power and Property in Medieval Germany*, Arnold discusses a wide variety of forms in which the German nobility, whether secular or ecclesiastic, provided for the needs of ecclesiastical communities, but namely he identifies the need for defensibility, predominantly in the form of recycled castles, as a visable reminder of secular power, which had been reconstituted as a form of religious piety.[29] This same relationship between secular and spiritual power is at work in the character of the Emperor in the *Ludus.* He is both a temporal power endowed with the authority of his office, but also he is a spiritual power, given the authority to defend Christianity by God. As the source of defensibility for the Kingdom of Jerusalem, the play gives a prevailing message that in order to be deemed powerful, one must be able to provide defense against attack. The play sets up the action of the Emperor against the silence of the Pope as a damning representation of the lack of agency the Church carries in temporal and spiritual matters.

The text of the play is not only supportive of the secular ruler, but is highly critical of the Church and those that are its earthly representatives. One of the most fascinating episodes in the *Ludus* occurs after the Emperor has subdued all the enemies of Christianity and brought the world's nations under imperial rule, thus ending what could be considered the first part of the play. Immediately after the emperor takes his seat on his throne, a group of actors labeled as "Hypocrites" are instructed to move forward bowing their heads to their hands as a display of

---

[29] Benjamin Arnold, *Power and Property in Medieval Germany: Economic and Social Change c. 900-1300* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 150-74.

humility. The text instructs that they are to win over the favor of the laity while performing this action.[30] After this they are then instructed to gather before the character Ecclesia. The Hypocrites are led by Hypocrisy, who has been paired with Heresy as one of the major agents of the Antichrist, the one commanded to win the trust of the laity and, on the other hand, is to undermine the teachings of the clergy and turn them to followers of Antichrist. The Hypocrites announce:

> Our sacred religion has long been tottering,
>
> Since vanity laid hold of the Mother Church.
>
> What ruin comes through deceptive men!
>
> God does not love worldly prelates!
>
> Ascend to the highest heights of royal power;
>
> Through thee shall the remains of antiquity be changed![31]

These critiques of hypocrisy, false piety, and heretical teachings are clearly aimed at certain factions within the Church. But it is not the Church itself that is the source of these evils, for a few lines later Ecclesia is directed to leave Jerusalem and

---

[30] Et
specie humilitatis inclinates circumquaque
et captantes fauorem laicorum ad
ultimum omnes conueniant ante eclesiam.
Ludus de Antichristo, fol. 4c (p. 10a).

[31] "Antichrist," trans. Hulme, 22.
Sacra religio iam diu titubauit ma
trem ecclesiam uanitas occupauit.
Vt quid perditio per uiros faleratos. deus
non diligit seculares prelatos. Ascende
culmina regię potestatis. per te re
liquię mutentur uetustatis.
Ludus de Antichristo, fol. 4d (p. 10b).

return to the *sedes* of the Pope "after suffering much abuse and indignity."[32] Rather, there are individuals who would see the Church and its teachings distorted and used for evil, personified in the *Ludus* as the Antichrist. Furthermore, it seems that the Pope is unable or unwilling to act or protect Ecclesia, lacking agency of any kind. Thus, the *Ludus* presents the ideally structured world according to the medieval mind, where the apocalyptic end times are ushered in by the eschatological order of society brought about by the Emperor, not the Pope. It was this theological understanding that the spiritually ordained order was found in the continuation of the Roman Empire through secular rule, thus lifting the divine importance of the Emperor and his position on Earth.[33]

The entrance of the hypocrites as a prelude to the entrance of Antichrist in the *Ludus* appears to be a reflection of a letter sent by Frederick to the German bishops in 1157 shortly after the incident at Besançon described above. According to Otto of Freising's copy of the letter included in the *Gesta*, Frederick opened his letter, which was addressed to the bishops in Germany but intended for the Pope, he explained his intention that "the peace of the churches is to be maintained by the imperial arms,"[34] but turned quickly to express that "there seems to be emanating

[32] "Antichrist," trans. Hulme, 23. "Ecclesia vero que ibi reman/serat. Multis contumeliis et ueribus/affecta redibit ad sedem Apostolici;" *Ludus de Antichristo*, fol. 5a (p. 11a).
[33] Bernard McGinn, *Apocalyptic Spirituality: Treatises and Letter of Lactantius, Adso of Montier-en-Der, Joachim of Fiore, the Spiritual Franciscans, Savonarola* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), 85-86. Although Adso wrote that the final temporal ruler and true Roman Emperor was found in the *rex Francorum*, the author of the *Ludus* maintains Adso's exegetical interpretation of scripture but carries the imperial lineage through to the *rex Teutonicorum*. This will be examined further in the following chapter.
[34] *Deeds*, trans. Mierow, 184. "Cui Christus pacis ac dilectionis suae caracterem impressit, causae dissensionum, seminarium malorum, pestiferi morbi venenum manare videntur;" Otto of Freising, *Gesta Frederici,* II.11.

causes of dissensions and evils, like a poison . . . [and] we fear the body of the Church will be stained, its unity shattered …"[35] He then goes on to highlight the actions of the legates sent by the Pope to the Imperial diet, having caused severe insult by their actions and their public reading of the letter and its controversial interpretation of *beneficia*. Furthermore, they were found to have parchment, seals, and copies of the letter that were to be disseminated to the churches in the German lands. Frederick stops short of connecting the actions of the two legates directly to the Pope as some type of plot intended to undermine the Emperor. Rather, he calls for the support of the bishops in grieving the insult perpetrated on the Roman Empire, as the power of that empire is held by the emperor as protector of the Christian realm. In a letter written a few months later, in 1158, Frederick explains the power structure God has ordained on a global scale:

In the chief city of the world God has, through the power of the empire, exalted the Church; in the chief city of the world the Church, not through the power of God, we believe, is now destroying the empire.[36] It is impossible to say with any degree of certainty that the author of the *Ludus* is using the letter sent by Frederick to the German bishops as source material. But these documents – the published extant letters and the play – are working in tandem. Together they serve as examples of the type of communication occurring as a result of the still existing tensions from the War of Investitures. The connections between these documents certainly

[35] *Deeds*, trans. Mierow, 184-85. "…totum corpus aecclesiae commaculari, unitatem scindi…;" Otto of Freising, *Gesta Frederici,* II.11.
[36] *Deeds*, trans. Mierow, 193. "In capite orbis Deus per imperium exaltavit aecclesiam, in capite orbis aecclesia, non per Deum, ut credimus, nunc demolitur imperium;" Otto of Freising, *Gesta Frederici,* II.17.

identify the existence of a medieval public sphere – one building upon the discourse of reform and the distribution of power that had been discussed in various texts for over a century, each taking a particular stand on the issues while later documents, like the *Ludus*, built upon the preexisting textual arguments through the mirroring of contemporary events and documents. This historical structure is played out in the *Ludus* through the physical conceptualization of the public sphere mirrored in the use of the letter format and its place as a publicly performed document.[37] On the one hand, Frederick calls publicly on the bishops to rally to his cause, and the other hand, the *Ludus* serves as a public representation of these wrongs and upholds the divine power of the emperor, themes that the emperor posits in his letter. The public address of Frederick's letter and the reinforcement of its themes by the *Ludus* (whether direct or indirect), as well as the performative nature of both genres of texts, letters and drama,[38] work to create a version of events for a larger public consumption, one that promotes the imperial point of view. And while it is nearly impossible to prove whether the play was ever fully staged at Tegernsee, it is possible to argue that it was performed in many other ways. Indeed, Chambers identifies the text as a *tendenzschrift*, or pamphlet,[39] produced with a particular

---

[37] The actual performed usage of letters and messengers will be discussed in a later chapter, but nevertheless, this contrasts the perception posited by Melve, *Inventing the Public Sphere* II, 657, who never recognizes the public performativity of letters and other medieval documents like dramatic texts in his construction of a medieval public sphere.
[38] For more on the performative nature of letters during the High Middle Ages see M.T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979), 202-20.
[39] Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage*, 64. This is likely one of the reasons behind Chambers' (and later Young's) unwillingness to see the *Ludus* and other texts for their performative nature, rather than as a marginal part of the history of the Latin liturgy. See Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage* 2, 41-67; and Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church* 2, 420-21.

purpose in mind and for public dissemination.[40] It is a document made to travel beyond the cloister at Tegernsee, thus serving a public function: that ultimately the legitimacy of the argument for Frederick's power as Emperor is tied to public consumption as the means by which a particular reality is reinforced.[41]

Indeed, some have pointed to the work *De Investigatione Antichristi* (1161) of Gerhoh of Reichersberg as possible proof that the *Ludus de Antichristo* was known outside of the walls of Tegernsee Abbey.[42] Although Gerhoh does not openly mention the *Ludus de Antichristo* he speaks directly to those who would perform representations of the Antichrist and the dangers of such theatrical spectacles, especially when they concern the Antichrist.[43] While this does not necessarily connect Gerhoh directly to the *Ludus* it is not hard to connect his work to the same public conversation, especially given that Gerhoh had been writing in support of strong clerical reforms since the early 1150s. Gerhoh is traditionally referred to as a reform-minded theologian, and the major impetus behind much of his work is the heretical actions of the secular community and the inability, unwillingness, or direct

---

[40] For reference to the High Middle Ages concept of *tendenzschrift* see C.A. Macartney, *The Medieval Hungarian Historians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 175; and Richard A. Fletcher, *The Barbarian Conversion: From Paganism to Christianity* (Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1999), 403.
[41] Symes, *Common Stage*, 137.
[42] Chambers and Young both point to Gerhoh as a possible source for the dissemination of the *Ludus.* Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage* 2, 64. Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church* 2, 392.
[43]

> Quid ergo mirum si et isti nunc Antichristum vel Herodem in suis ludis simulantes eosdem non, ut eis intentioni est, ludicro mentiuntur sed in veritate exhibent, utpote quorum vita ab Antichristi laxa conversatione non longe abest?... Alius item Antichristo suo quasi suscitandus oblatus intra septem dies vere mortuus, ut comperimus, et sepultus est. Et quis scire potest, an et cetera simulata Antichristi scilicet effegiem, daemonum larvas, herodianam insaniam in veritate non exhibeant?

Gerhoh of Reichersberg, "De spectaculis theatricis in ecclesia dei exhibitis," trans. Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church* 2, 524-25.

participation by the Church in correcting these evils.[44] But his writings reflect a desire to support, even strengthen the position of the Church against secular leaders and *De Investigatione Antichristi* (c. 1161) serves an instructional function for the clergy warning against presenting dramatic representations of the antichrist and/or Herod within the church as those who do are guilty of committing the same sins as portrayed within the play.[45] Regardless of whether he even had knowledge of the *Ludus*, Gerhoh's writings serve to identify the polemical sphere in which texts are used as public forms of communication designed to bring the ecclesiastical community to a particular point of view.

The political shifts occurring from the late eleventh and into the mid-twelfth century between the imperial secular rulers and the reform minded ecclesiastical institutions thus placed Tegernsee in a particularly difficult position. Located within the perennially pro-papal Duchy of Bavaria which was ruled by the anti-imperial (or anti-Staufen) Welf dynasty, the abbey could have easily fell under the control of the pro-reformists. But its ability to elect its own abbot and its direct line of fealty to the Emperor, not the Bavarian dukes, created a conducive atmosphere for the creation of a pro-imperial work like the *Ludus de Antichristo*. Furthermore, this work is not only a performance of pro-imperial eschatological ideology, but a work designed to perform a function. By taking the side of the emperor, perhaps even mirroring his own arguments as exemplified by his imperial letters, the abbey at Tegernsee is

[44] Constant J. Mews, "Accusations of Heresy and Error in the Twelfth-Century Schools: The Witness of Gerhoh of Reichersberg and Otto of Freising," in *Heresy in Transition: Transforming Ideas of Heresy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. John Christian Laursen et al. (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005), 49-50.
[45] Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church* 2, 411-12.

taking a stand against the historical tradition of its larger geo-political area. The *Ludus* serves to identify the cloister as different and affirm its own historical tradition, one that it most likely wishes to maintain. In a way the play serves to echo the struggle of Frederick Barbarossa as he fights to maintain his temporal autonomy from the Church.

There can be little doubt that the *Ludus de Antichristo* is participating in the larger conversation concerning the shifts occurring in the political landscape of Europe during the mid-twelfth century. The play deals with specific material that identifies it and the community at Tegernsee with the pro-imperial sentiments surrounding Frederick Barbarossa. Furthermore, it is a document that serves the purposes of the Tegernsee community within the larger conversation about the role of the ecclesiastical community in the conflict between the Church and the emperor. This is not a static document that can only be unlocked through performance: rather it is actively engaging in the political power shifts occurring across Europe, specifically performing the function of representing the concerns of the Tegernsee community within the larger public understanding of the macro-political community.

CHAPTER TWO: TEXT, PLAY, AND STRUCTURE

The *Ludus de Antichristo* was certainly designed to participate in the conversation concerning the struggle between temporal and spiritual powers in twelfth-century Europe. The play represents the concerns of the cloister at Tegernsee, inserting the monks' particular views and opinions into the public sphere formed by the pan-European reform movement, wherein documents promoting the voices of particular individuals or a communities circulated to a wider audience. But the documents participating in this war of words were seldom so overtly dramatic as the *Ludus*. Letters, legal briefs, and other types of manuscripts – while arguably performative – are often not identified as such, because they are seen as functionally distinctive in their presentation of content and utilized unique yet identifiable stylistic standards and conventions.[1] It is therefore important to explore why the dramatic format was the selected vehicle of dissemination for the *Ludus de Antichristo*, given the multiple textual options from which the author could have chosen to promote the particular concerns of the abbey at Tegernsee.

The twelfth-century proved to be a prolific era for the creation of dramatic literature, but was still early in the development of the dramatic textual form. The multiple and experimental ways to build the structure of a dramatic work mirrored in many ways the conversation occurring in the public sphere about the relationship between temporal and spiritual powers, in that the power to control how

[1] See Carol Symes, "The Medieval Archive and the History of Theatre," *Theatre Survey* 51, no. 1 (May 2011): 29-58 for further explanation of the lack of connectivity in scholarship concerning performativity in various forms of medieval documentation as well as common characteristics of medieval dramatic texts.

information is presented to an audience identifies the particular function of a document.[2] In order to further identify its role upon the twelfth-century stage of reform and anti-reform literature, this chapter specifically dedicates itself to a comparison between the *Ludus* and contemporary extant dramatic texts; for example, the Christmas play and Passion play from the nearby abbey at Benediktbeuern. While this is not a complete survey of dramatic texts of the twelfth century, I intend to use this comparative methodology to identify the unique qualities of the *Ludus* and determine its functionality as a dramatic text within the wider public sphere. The structures this chapter identifies within the extant dramatic texts of the twelfth-century come in three forms: (1) the formula by which the dramatic text is built, (2) the way power is structured within the text, and (3) the appropriation of other documents within the structure of the *Ludus*. Firstly, a dramaturgical analysis of the form that the author of the *Ludus* used to design his text compared to its similarities to or deviations from its other contemporary texts allows for a clearer understanding of the early medieval development of dramatic textual formulas. It determines the textual boundaries that the author sought to employ or jettison in creating the text of the *Ludus* based upon his understanding of efficacy upon a wider audience. Secondly, the *Ludus de Antichristo* and its contemporary extant texts are considered as constructs within their authors' particular understanding of the power structures working upon themselves and their communities. The unique ability of live performance to embody this power certainly points to a possible reason for the choice of a dramatic textual

---

[2] Symes, *A Common Stage*, 137-38. Symes identifies that power must be publicly displayed and that the dictation of this power can be put into the public sphere through multiple tools.

dissemination. However, the way in which power plays out so overtly in the *Ludus* is set in contrast to its contemporaries, especially the Benediktbeuern texts, wherein the play of power is not an immediately identifiable quality of the dramatic text. I intend to identify the apparent power structures of the *Ludus* as a means to identify this document and Tegernsee as a geographic epicenter where shifts of power are of the greatest concern. Lastly, an analysis of the play's use of Adso of Montier-en-Der's tenth-century treatise concerning the identification of the Anitchrist is crucial to understanding the larger scope from which the *Ludus* draws its inspiration. The ways in which the *Ludus* makes use of Adso's popular text as a means to represent the contemporary power structures of the twelfth century identifies the function of the *Ludus* within the public sphere as it attempts to differentiate itself as a dramatic text while pulling from other forms of literature.

It is necessary to begin by identifying the dramatic text as burgeoning literary form and thus to distinguish the forms that governed the scripting of twelfth-century dramatic texts, as compared to other literary forms. The use of writing to capture performance was only beginning to crystallize into recognizable genres in the centuries after the first millennium. With the growth of more centralized powers during the High Middle Ages, the fledgling technology grew from a form of official record keeping to a practice maintained and cultivated across literary forms.[3] So, to begin, it is important to examine the relationship of the text to performance; i.e., what is the public function of a dramatic text? This relationship is

[3] Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record*, 1.

most clearly identified in the use of "stage directions," or *didascaliae*, and will be the focus of further examination.

Carol Symes, presenting a nuanced explanation of Gregory Nagy's study of the Homeric canon, explicates the identification of three categories of relationship between text and performance, identifying the method of *transcript* – documenting a past performance as a means to preserve its structure and methods for future performances – as the most common amongst premodern dramatic texts.[4] This certainly appears to be the case for the text of the *Ludus de Antichristo*, but it is unclear whether there ever occurred a performance to which the text can be tied. Nevertheless, it appears that the text of the play, copied c. 1178-1180 and preserved at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek,[5] serves to document very specifically the action of the play which centers around events occurring around the year 1160, as described in the previous chapter. The specifics of the extant document and its manuscript will be discussed in a later chapter, but the structure of the text and its unique quantity on *didascaliae*, point to its function as a transcript text and a conscious effort on the part of the text's scribe to lay out the performance in very specific terms for use by future audiences.[6] In fact, the best way to view the existence of *didascaliae* is to understand them as the author's attempt to provide specific visual references for a particular future audience (or readership) that he

---

[4] Symes, "The Medieval Archive," 34.
[5] Vollmann-Profe, *Ludus de Antichristo*, vi.
[6] I use the term scribe instead of playwright (or author) in order to signal the text's function as transcript, and because the focus of this chapter is the text of the *Ludus* and how the play was written down.

envisions during the course of documentation.[7] In this way, the *didascaliae* serve as interlocutor between the assumed reader/audience and the dialogic text, becoming a type of narrator.[8]

I have argued in the previous chapter that the *Ludus de Antichristo*, which is full of specific *didascaliae*, functions within the conversation of the larger public sphere concerning the reform movement of the twelfth century and thus would have been expected to reach a wider audience than that of the cloister at Tegernsee. With a potentially large but currently unknown distribution in mind, the author of the dramatic text may have found that a reliance on *didascaliae* would provide the reader and/or the performer with a more specific context for understanding the play. Given that the performative elements of plays are experienced visually, either within the mind of the reader or by the eye of the viewer, assuming control over the "extra-textual" elements of the play through the use of *didascaliae* would place the author as the visual guide for the dramatic text.[9] This still allows the play to maintain symbolic elements that can be represented through metaphor or allegory and not overt narrative, thus identifying the position of play in regard to sensitive thematic material. For example, the author's treatment of the character of the Pope in the *Ludus* falls solely within the boundaries of the *didascaliae*. While this *persona* is not treated as a major player within the action of the play and may even be considered as treated unsympathetically, the author is guiding the visual aspects of

---

[7] Pascale Aebischer, "Didascalia and Speech in Dramatic Text," *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism* 17, no. 2 (Spring 2003): 31-32.
[8] Aebishcer, "Didascalia," 32-33 and Marvin Carlson, "The Status of Stage Directions," *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 24, no. 2 (Fall 1991): 40-41.
[9] Aebischer, "Didascalia," 32.

the dramatic text away from him. The scribe is pulling the focus away from the character of the Pope, and it is very easy to forget he is even a part of the play. This power of the *didascaliae* to control the visual aspects of the play serves as a specific framework, or structural fingerprint, by which the *Ludus* can be identified within the larger canon of twelfth-century dramatic literary form. In order to highlight how the use of *didascaliae* differentiates dramatic texts of the twelfth-century and locates the position of the *Ludus* as participating in the reform debate I will now turn to a contemporaneous dramatic text that, on the surface, makes similar use of *didascaliae.*

The *Ordo representacionis Adæ* (more commonly known as the *Jeu d'Adam*) certainly appears similar to the *Ludus de Antichristo* in its quantity and usage of *didascaliae*. Included within the *Adam* text are *didascaliae* that instruct the actors in the proper speaking of the vernacular Anglo-Norman verse, descriptions of costumes or props, even directions on how to conduct theatrical tricks such as the killing of Abel (by striking a concealed pot).[10] But the focus here is not just how the *didascaliae* function in regards to performance, but rather how they function as a structural element of the dramatic text. Carol Symes through her extensive work with the extant manuscript, has shown that the scribe working to put the play into writing, while possibly an amateur, nevertheless experimented with his text, ultimately deciding on verse lines for the former and long lines for the latter.[11] The manuscript shows that scribe was unsure of how to treat his play given the absence

---

[10] Carol Symes, trans., "The Play of Adam (Ordo representaciones Adæ)" in *The Broadview of Anthology of British Literature*; p. 27 from the unpublished manuscript.
[11] Carol Symes, "The Appearance of Early Vernacular Plays: Forms, Functions, and the Future of Medieval Theater," *Speculum* 77, no. 3 (July 2002): 804-05.

of a model for transcribing dramatic texts, as well as the unusual alteration between the vernacular and Latin. In contrast, the scribe working with the *Ludus* – whose manuscript is roughly contemporary with that of the *Ordo* – displays more expert commitment to a particular structure. He breaks his use of metrical verse to provide instructions in Latin prose. Curiously, the *didascaliae* are all underlined within the extant manuscript but it is unclear if the same scribe who produced the document also added this identifying element or whether this was added much later. But what is fundamentally important is that even though there was no established textual standard for the inclusion of *didascaliae*, there was an understanding of its importance. Each scribe makes use of this structural element to guide not only the performance but also the reader. The extensive use of *didascaliae* in the *Ludus* and *Adam* texts highlights one of the structural options that was being developed among twelfth-century plays and raises questions about the function of such a large quantity and specificity of *didascaliae* when other texts relied on far fewer and left much of the action to the interpretation of the reader/performer.

While fundamentally different in many ways, including their source material and language usage, the *Jeu d'Adam* and the *Ludus de Antichristo* each use *didascaliae* as a major structural element within the literary text as evidenced by their quantity, but also by their function: guiding the visual and even aural aspects of the play for the reader and the possible performer. And although these two texts indicate unique methodologies for how scribes of the dramatic texts constructed their work, the function the *didascaliae* served in each of these two texts is

fundamentally different. While each form of *didascaliae* work in tandem with the dialogue to direct the primary action of the play, it is only the *didascaliae* of the *Ludus* that outline a certain marginality or defocusing to other characters and action occurring during the performance, achieved through the engagement of the reader's memory by returning to previously indicated characters or spaces, thus widening the visual representation by mnemonic device. This will be examined more in depth below but in essence, while there is no formal standardization for the quantity or identification of *didascaliae* within a dramatic work, there appears to be two structural methodologies behind the importance of their inclusion.

To identify these two structural methods, I turn now to the two well-known plays from Benediktbeuern, the Passion play (*Ludus de Passione*) and the Christmas play (*Ludus de Nativitate*), which are both extant in the celebrated *Carmina Burana* manuscript. Although the manuscript dates to about 1230, the plays are most likely constructions of the twelfth century.[12] It is easy to recognize the quantitative difference in the use of *didascaliae* between the Christmas play of Benediktbeuern and the Antichrist play of Tegernsee. The text of the Christmas play makes use of *didascaliae* primarily for the direction of the movement of characters, but also to clarify who is speaking, and to provide a few specific identifying characteristics; i.e. Aaron carrying a flowering branch,[13] Archisynagogus "agitating his head and his

---

[12] These two plays, the *Ludus de Passione* and the *Ludus de Nativitate* are approached, respectively, by Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church* I, 513-33 and II, 172-96. See also David Bevington, *Medieval Drama* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975), 178-80 and 202-3; Jill Baumgaertner, "The Benediktbeuern 'Ludus de Nativitate:' Journey to Fulfillment," *Christianity and Literature* (1979): 13-30; Michael Rudick, "Theme, Structure, and Sacred Context in the Benediktbeuern 'Passion' Play," *Speculum* 49, no. 2 (April 1974): 267-86.
[13] *Ludus de Nativitate*, trans. Bevington, *Medieval Drama*, 182.

entire body and striking the ground with his foot, and imitating with his scepter the mannerisms of a Jew in all ways,"[14] and King Herod who is to be "gnawed to pieces by worms."[15] While these are all wonderfully descriptive passages used by the author of text to provide visual references or embellishments, the *didascaliae* are providing this information for the sake of visualization and not as an instructive way to guide the motion of the play. The play begins with a procession of prophets, much like in the latter extant portion of the *Jeu d'Adam*, and then proceeds to the familiar narrative of Christ's birth. Characters exit and enter and are instructed to move to different places, but there is little occurring on the outside of the play's primary action – the play is driven by the dialogue of the present characters, and possibly tradition or the liturgy dictated how the play was to be performed and the space in which the performance took place.[16] Thus, the need for *didascaliae* is reduced because the action of the play is more direct and easier to visualize when characters leave the narrative. For the Christmas play, the *didascaliae* even instruct that the playing space be yielded fully to the characters carrying forth the action of the play.[17] This particular use of *didascaliae* reinforces a dramatic structure that identifies the singularity of the playing space, keeping it strictly defined, and thus it is the action of the play that enters into this space. In addition to the *Jeu d'Adam,*

---

[14] *Ludus de Nativitate*, trans. Bevington, *Medieval Drama*, 183.
[15] *Ludus de Nativitate*, trans. Bevington, *Medieval Drama*, 200.
[16] Symes, "The Medieval Archive," 47-50. The procession of the prophets and the theological dialectic that occurs between St. Augustine and Archisynagogus sets the stage for the prophesied coming of Christ and addresses the theological questions of such a miraculous event, such as the Virgin Birth – all of which mirrors aspects of the introit and Kyrie in the Mass, see Margot Fassler, "Liturgy and Sacred History in the Twelfth-Century Tympana at Chartres" *Art Bulletin* 75.3 (September 1993): 501-3.
[17] *Ludus de Nativitate*, trans. Bevington, *Medieval Drama*, 189.

this particular dramatic structural use of *didascaliae*, as it pertains to the playing space, can also be found in other twelfth-century plays such as the Passion play from Montecassino, and *The Raising of Lazarus* (*Suscitatio Lazari*) by Hilarius.[18]

The playing space is much more fluid (non-linear) in the *Ludus de Antichristo* and the textual structure relies on *didascaliae* in order to indicate shifts of action and focus. There are few instructions for characters to leave the performance space of the play no matter how often or how seldom they are referenced as participating in the direct action of the play. Rather, the *Ludus* makes use of a type of marginality concerning the playing space and primary action of the play. Again, using the character of the Pope as an example, he is instructed to enter during the procession when Eccelsia and the Emperor enter and ascends to the area designated for Eccelsia and her retinue.[19] Aside from this early entrance, there is no mention of his character again in the *didascaliae*. He is never instructed to exit the play or the playing space, but rather seems to remain on the margins of the action. He is brought into view once more only briefly, later, when it is mentioned that Ecclesia, after being insulted by the Hypocrites, returns to the *sedem apostolici*,[20] but even this instruction does not designate the performance of any specific action, rather it functions to recall the character from the memory of the reader, foregrounding him into visualization, if only momentarily, thus refocusing his place in larger action occurring in the play. The shift in focus of the play's action also leaves other

[18] In Bevington's preface to *The Raising of Lazarus* in *Medieval Drama*, p. 155, he comments on the lack of directions given by the text's author, thus leaving much to the imagination of the reader or to future performances.
[19] "Ascendit autem ipsa cum Apostolico et clero. Imperatore et militia sua eundem tronum;" *Ludus de Antichristo,* fol. 3a (p. 7a).
[20] *Ludus de Antichristo*, fol. 5a (p. 11a).

characters on the margins, namely the particular temporal powers of Gentilitas, the King of Babylon, and the King of the Franks, and in the latter half of the play, the King of the Teutons also finds himself marginalized within the playing space. The need to direct the action of the play back to previous characters and locations actively engages the memory of the reader, recalling the entirety of the playing space back into visualization in order to negotiate the action of the play. This distinguishing structural use of *didascaliae* in the text places the *Ludus* in a different category from the texts mentioned above.

This strategy is also found in the text of the Passion play, the second of text from Benediktbeuern, but to a far more modest extent. This play differs from its sister play in that makes use of marginalizing visual descriptions within its *didascaliae*, similar to the *Ludus de Antichristo*. This is immediately identifiable in the first few lines of text when the *didascaliae* describe the order of the characters as they enter; Pilate, his wife, and soldiers enter first, followed by the chief priests then a merchant and his wife and then Mary Magdalene. But even though the characters have all been identified as existing within the wider space defined in the mind of the reader, the focus of the play is directed toward Jesus who is instructed to "advance alone to the seashore to call Peter and Andrew,"[21] neither of whom where mentioned in the previous procession but have suddenly arrived in the visualized playing space. Much of the action follows the characters as they move between other characters and locations. The action surrounding Mary Magdalene all occurs as she moves between a merchant, a lover, a chorus of girls, and finally to

---

[21] "Postea vadat Dominica Persona sola ad litus maris vocare Petrum et Andream…" *Ludus de Passione*, trans. Bevington, 203.

the feet of Jesus. Later, a number of Jews are instructed to follow Judas to the location of Jesus, who is instructed to ascend the Mount of Olives and descend to the sleeping disciplines twice before Judas approaches to betray him. The visual expansiveness of the playing space and the need to recall characters from earlier in the play continues throughout the length of the text and is facilitated by the *didascaliae* in a similar fashion to the *Ludus.*

The proximity of the Benediktbeuern abbey to the abbey at Tegernsee is suggestive, and may indicate a reason for this shared structural technique. While other extant dramatic texts from the twelfth century make similar use of *didascaliae* in directing the imagined visual gaze of the reader and defining the playing space, the relationship of these two abbeys and their differing hierarchical structures (i.e. Tegernsee's direct fealty to the imperial seat) certainly plays upon the documents produced within their walls. Furthermore, the way in which these documents produced at the abbeys communicate with an imagined audience, which appears to be the primary function of *didascaliae*, helps further to identify the *Ludus de Antichristo* as participating in the public sphere of the twelfth century, but to a different aim than that of the Benediktbeuern plays.

There are some similarities between the dramatic texts of Benediktbeuern and the *Ludus* of Tegernsee, notably that both are working within the same structural format. The Passion play and the *Ludus* each use *didascaliae* in a similar fashion as described above, but to different ends. It cannot be known which play or text was produced first so it is impossible to posit whether one was written in response to another, but given the abbeys' proximity and their proclivity as centers

of writing, it is likely that they both would have knowledge of the other's documents. The similar function the *didascaliae* suggests that there may have been a similar understanding of performance as well as a similar readership. The ability of the *didascaliae* in both texts to define the playing space and structurally divide the play into "scenes" at the least implies a common model. But the marginality each form of *didascaliae* promotes marks the point of departure for these two texts.

While the function of the *didascaliae* from both locations show the need to reach an imagined readership, the structure of the *Ludus* is markedly different from both of the Benediktbeuern plays, essentially following two major characters in two distinct halves on the play. The first half of the play focuses on the Emperor of the Romans who sets out to bring the entire world under his jurisdiction while the second half of the play centers on Antichrist who also takes on the task of conquering the kingdoms and powers of the world. There are other important characters that drive the action of the play, such as Eccelsia, Synagoga, the allegorical representations of kingdoms and communities, and the Prophets. But it is the number of tertiary characters, many of whom make up the retinues of primary characters, which exist on the margins of the play and that need to be visualized by the *didascaliae*. These characters include the Pope, clergy, soldiers, messengers, and hypocrites. For the reader this form of foregrounding action and characters establishes visual brackets which the reader builds an imagined, even mimetic or diegetic, space while still maintaining an overall idea of the larger space at work.[22]

---

[22] The concept of foregrounding in order to build non-visual performance space is discussed as it applies to any dramatic work that is not immediately visually represented (but

The characters that find themselves consistently on the margins of these brackets are the least powerful, or least lacking of individual agency, within the play. Thus, the play exhibits its concept of power structures within the format of the text.

The *didascaliae* of the *Ludus* could thus be taken to provide a visual representation of the agency at work in the larger reform debate of the mid-twelfth-century. The performed embodiment of agency and marginality will be discussed in a later chapter, but the structure of the *Ludus* certainly makes use of *didascaliae* to direct the imagined reader to a visualization of the play, it characters and space, that focuses on those characters that act on behalf of temporal power. The Emperor is the primary example. He commands his own seat of power within the performance space, as do the other temporal powers, adding credence to the text's upholding of kingship as strongest agency over geographic space. But, after the Emperor has subdued each of the temporal powers in battle they are to approach his seat (*ad sedem imperatoris*) to which they pledge their service and their crowns. While these actions are apparent in a performance, and the power given to the Emperor clear in the semiotic negotiation (or possession) of space easily read through visual clues, the necessity to define these power structures through text is a clue to the textual function of the *didascaliae*. The characters that are left to the margins of the described action, such as the Pope, are never instructed to move once in the space, and are only described as existing in space without negotiating it. The visualized space works around him and thus when he is referred to later in the play when Ecclesia returns to his seat he returns to focus, but his position is altered because of

---

specifically within radio drama) in Michael Issacharoff, "Stage Codes," in *Performing Texts*, ed. Michaël Issacharoff et al. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), 71-72.

his lack of agency and focus as the action of the play progresses in the text. Furthermore, the *didascaliae* make effort to describe the hypocrites under the command of Antichrist as acting in much the same way as the messengers of the Emperor in the first half of the play. They are only instructed to move under the mention of another power. The *didascaliae* maintain the focus of the stronger power by mentioning the authority of the Antichrist (or the Emperor) in the action of the hypocrites or lesser characters. This singular agency held by the Emperor (i.e. the temporal power) is mirrored in the letters of Frederick Barbarossa, who, after the Diet of Roncaglia in 1158, laid the structure of his realm with himself as the final authority, even over ecclesiastical matters, but all for the sake of peace.[23] The *didascaliae* of the *Ludus* create for the reader a visualization of this world, where the Emperor has the power to structure the Christian world in the last epoch of history before the coming of the evil temporal power of the Antichrist.

As compared to the two plays mentioned from the abbey at Benediktbeuern, the *Ludus de Antichristo* is employs the use of *didascaliae* in order to produce an overt framework that highlights the personal agency and power of temporal authority. The authoritative voice of the *didascaliae* frames the narrative of the play and creates space(s) by which the understanding of power is specifically negotiated. This propagandic control over the text is indicative of the public sphere in which the *Ludus* is operating in the twelfth century. This constructed structure represents a polemical view of the power structures in twelfth-century Europe, and constructs for the reader a world in which the Emperor's agency fits into Biblical eschatology.

[23] Otto of Freising, *Deeds*, trans. Mierow, 239-43.

The *Ludus* also functions as more than just the framework for a performance, but rather as the textual representation of power negotiations currently shifting in the twelfth century, identifying the tensions that are still stirring from the century-old War of Investitures. Furthermore, it is the ecclesiastical community at Tegernsee Abbey that is dictating this performed world, lending sacerdotal authority to the *didascaliae* which serve to identify the temporal powers as possessing the agency needed to define the landscape visualized within the play.

So much of the information concerning the visualization of agency and power would become immediately clear in performance, thus the function of *didascaliae* keep these structures in place even without an accompanying performance. The script of the play thereby indicates that it was specifically intended to reach a wider audience – an audience distant in either space or time. This play was never intended solely for the community at Tegernsee, rather it was the community that sought out an audience within the more far-reaching European public sphere of the twelfth century. But the structure of the script is not the only indicator of the play's engagement in the public sphere. The appropriation of adapted text also holds clues as to the structure which the *Ludus* wished to disseminate.

The *Ludus de Antichristo* is based upon a tenth-century letter ostensibly addressed to Queen Gerberga of Saxony by Adso of Montier-en-Der circulated widely circulated as *Epistola Adsonis ad Gerbergam reginam de ortu et tempore antichristi* or simply cited as *De Antichristo*.[24] In it, Adso outlines the circumstances

[24] The abbey of Montier-en-Der was, under Adso's leadership, in the course of being rebuilt after years of Viking invasions. The letter to Gerberga, the wife of the French king, is an assurance of the continued existence of the Roman order and the important spiritual role of

leading up to the advent of the Antichrist, exposes his plans to deceive the world through the performance of Christ-like deeds, and comments on the roll that the Roman Empire, as the final scripturally ordained world power, will have in ushering in his coming. The two halves of the play that center on the Emperor and the Antichrist, respectively, are a representation of the two powers described in Adso's treatise, and much of the events that Adso describes that will point to the approach of the Antichrist through the actions of the emperor are appropriated within the *Ludus*. Adso explains that the Antichrist will first take up his throne in the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem,[25] then send out messengers and preachers throughout the world to convert the leaders of all nations through signs of magnificent power, like the raising of the dead, so that all "will doubt whether or not he is the Christ who according to the scriptures will come at the end of the world."[26] He also explains the role of the two prophets, Enoch and Elijah, as they strive to convert the "sons of Israel," and the Antichrist's killing of them.[27] All of these elements are woven into the *Ludus*. This in itself is not surprising; Adso's letter was widely quoted, revised, and used to structure of many polemical texts produced, with about forty extant twelfth-century manuscripts containing Adso's treatise.[28]

---

the *rex Francorum*. See Bernard McGinn, *Apocalyptic Spirituality: Treatises and Letter of Lactantius, Adso of Montier-en-Der, Joachim of Fiore, the Spiritual Franciscans, Savonarola* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), 81-88. For an examination of Adso's influences and the popularity of the treatise see Kevin L. Hughes, *Constructing Antichrist* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2005), 167-77.

[25] Adso of Montier-en-Der, "Letter on the Origin and Time of the Antichrist," in *Apocalyptic Spirituality*, trans. Bernard McGinn, 91.

[26] Adso, "Antichrist," trans. McGinn, 91-92.

[27] Adso, "Antichrist," trans. McGinn, 94-95.

[28] Hughes, *Constructing Antichrist,* 244. For further comment on the popularity of Adso's treatise see also McGinn, *Apocalyptic Spirituality*, 88; and Richard K. Emmerson and Ronald

But, a major change made in the *Ludus*, differentiating it from Adso's text, places Frederick in the seat of authority, whereas Adso had insisted that the Roman Empire exists through the office of the King of the Franks, who at the time of his writing was Gerberga's husband, Louis IV. Furthermore, in pursuing the discussion of Roman authority carried through the line of Carolingian west Frankish kings, Adso is advocating against the strong German (or eastern Frankish) king and Roman Emperor, Otto I, as God's ordained spiritual and temporal authority.[29] This single powerful figurehead wearing the German and imperial crown is reminiscent of the view of Frederick Barbarossa in the twelfth-century. But the *Ludus*, building upon the legal insights that Barbarossa distributed himself, as discussed in the first chapter, identifies the power of Roman authority within the Imperial crown worn by the Roman Emperor. Thus, the creator of the *Ludus* has reinterpreted Adso's popular treatise in order to identify Frederick as the possessor of the imperial authority and thus the heir of Rome. To further clarify this fact, the *Ludus* carefully stages the subjugation of the King of the Franks, who is conquered by the Emperor in battle. Those familiar with Adso's letter would have certainly recognized this deviation from *De Antichristo*. Furthermore, the play's appropriation of imperial authority, in response to calls for reform of ecclesiastical appointment, can also be seen as polemical to Adso's belief in Louis IV's the right to claim the Roman imperial over Otto I, who instituted that the election of the Pope must be approved by the

B. Herzman, *The Apocalyptic Imagination in Medieval Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), 114
[29] McGinn, *Apocalyptic Spirituality*, 87.

emperor, a practice continued into the Investiture Controversy and at the crux of the argument between Frederick and Alexander III.

The use of Adso's well-known letter as the structural blueprint for the *Ludus de Antichristo* further strengthens my argument that the *Ludus* was a purposefully public document participating in a particularly public discussion. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the use of documents to delineate a public sphere within which the limits of secular and sacerdotal power could be discussed across a larger geographical, social, and economic spectrum expanded during the War of Investitures and continued well into the twelfth century. The *Ludus* can be confidently identified as a document participating in this public sphere. The polemical element of the *Ludus* as a textual form that argues in support of Frederick Barbarossa and the authority of temporal power over the sacerdotal lies in its use of structure: namely the use of form which uses *didascaliae* as an authority through which the visualization of space follows characters of primary importance and agency, leaving certain characters, like that of Apostolico, on the margins; and its structural implementation of *De Antichristo* which distinguishes the *Ludus* as a polemical document working in response other documents, most likely other appropriations or adaptations of Adso's treatise. These structures were not necessarily invented by the creator or scribe of the *Ludus* – as I have argued that similar techniques were being used at nearby Benediktbeuern – but rather were employed in specific ways to identify the play as a document working towards a particular goal within the twelfth-century public sphere.

CHAPTER THREE: PLAYING EMBODYMENT

The *Ludus de Antichristo* provides a window into the twelfth-century public sphere through an examination of its historical context and its function as a dramatic text within this context. But the *Ludus* also serves to represent its contemporary physical world. By giving *Ludus de Antichristo* a virtual global stage upon which the current and future conflicts of worldly powers are enacted, the creator of the play has provided a place for all of humanity to be represented. Placed before the audience are bodies all of kinds: gendered bodies; bodies of the other; empowered bodies; diseased bodies; bodies en masse; all represented within the context of a twelfth-century performance. The purpose of this chapter will be to examine the *Ludus de Antichristo* for its insights into the concept of embodiment through the use of the performed body and its emotive qualities. Facilitated by the manuscript's use of *didascaliae*, I begin by undertaking an examination of these different forms of embodiment: from portrayals of gender, to foreign or "othered" bodies, to false bodies, and bodies working in symbiosis. Furthermore, I build a more complete concept of twelfth-century embodiment and representation by examining these qualities within the same contemporaneous works from Benediktbeuern, discussed in the previous chapter: the *Ludus de Nativitate* and the *Ludus de Passione*. Then, drawing on the model of Michal Kobialka's book *This is My Body*, I place the human form within a twelfth-century understanding of representation in a liturgical setting and the semiotic relationship between that which is performed and the spectator.[1] Lastly, I explore an understanding of what

[1] Michal Kobialka, *This is My Body* (Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 2003).

Barbara Rosenwein terms the "emotional community,"[2] or how the emotive qualities represented through both a performative and textual analysis of the *Ludus* give greater insight into the social structures at work in the twelfth century. Ultimately, the representation of bodies in the *Ludus* and the emotional community that produced it is indicative of how the play functions in the public sphere. I intend to determine how the *Ludus* interprets its physical world by identifying the way in which bodies are represented, and the way in which Tegernsee Abbey desires to be interpreted to a wider audience as seen in its construction of emotion.

The creator of the *Ludus de Antichristo* has provided a world full of bodies. Some of these bodies are allegorical and some are literal (i.e. a representation of an individual character). Considering a particular character's allegorical or literal representation as well as the gendered body that they inhabit reveals a particular semiotic relationship at play between the spectator and the performer (or performed). A greater understanding can be extracted about the play's intent and the creator's view of those allegorized or literal characters when this relationship is examined further. The character of Ecclesia is particularly interesting. Even though she is embodied in the female form, which was a traditional medieval practice of presenting the Church (a feminine Latin noun), when she is first mentioned in the text, along with the characters of Justice and Mercy, the playwright assumes little about audience expectations because a detailed explanation of her appearance is given:

---

[2] Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities In The Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 2006), 2.

> Then Ecclesia, in the garb of a woman protected by a breastplate and wearing a crown, shall come forward by the help of Mercy with the oil, at her right, and of Justice with the scales and the sword, at her left, both dressed as women also.[3]

Even when working within the construct of liturgical medieval performance, the creator of the play still felt it necessary to explain that Ecclesia and her escorts, Mercy and Justice, were to be dressed as women. Ecclesia's presentation as a woman can be traced to longstanding ancient tradition of representing gendered concepts as bodies that match the gender of the noun. But, for the twelfth-century medieval spectator, the theology linking the collective body of the Church to Jesus as the Bride of Christ is perhaps equally as important.[4] With the clergy playing the roles of all the characters of the play, it must be clear to the reader (and perhaps the spectator) that these allegorical characters are to be female. This direction in the text is unique to the *Ludus* in comparison to the two contemporaneous texts from Benediktbeuern. Both of those plays have male and female characters (and even children and spiritual beings), but the creator(s) of the text do not find it necessary to discuss the representation of gender through the use of costume. This raises the

---

[3] *Ludus de Antichristo*, fol. 3a (p. 7a), trans. Hulme, 16.

> Tunc
> Ecclesia in muliebri habitu procedit
> induta thoracem et coronata. As
> sistente sibi misericordia cum oleo ad dextram
> etiustitia cum libra et gladio ad sinistram utrisque
> muliebriter indutis.

[4] Caroline Walker Bynum, *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* (New York: Zone, 1996): 171-72.

question concerning why the *Ludus de Antichristo* explains the gendered dress of these characters.

In her essay, "One Flesh, Two Sexes, Three Genders?" Jacqueline Murray, in summarizing Jo Ann McNamara's work on medieval gender constructs, explains that a binary construction of gender during the Middle Ages is problematic given that McNamara's work shows that the perception of gender would have been viewed on a spectrum, with less concrete definitions for what is masculine or feminine.[5] She goes on to pursue evidence that the medieval idea of gender also left room for a third gender, a term that could be applied to those who remained chaste.[6] For McNamara and Murray, men and women who chose to live a life of chastity were transformed, returning to one flesh united before God, thus bringing them closer together on the greater continuum of medieval gender.[7] In light of this insight we can conclude that gender can be delimited by factors other than the sex of an individual, and it is important for the creator of the *Ludus* to note that these characters are all to be dressed as women. The representation of gender is shifted towards femininity with the inclusion of a women's clothing because even upon the male body of a member of the clergy the third gender is neither masculine nor feminine.

---

[5] Jacqueline Murray, "One Flesh, Two Sexes, Three Genders?," in *Gender and Christianity in Medieval Europe: New Perspectives*, ed. Lisa M. Bitel and Felice Lifshitz (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008): 36.
[6] The concept of gender and its historical construction is also posited by Joan W. Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *American Historical Review*, 91, no. 5 (December 1986): 1053-54. I make larger use of Murray's article because of its specificity.
[7] Murray, "One Flesh, Two Sexes, Three Genders?" 50-51.

But there is more to the description of these characters than just instructing that they wear the clothing of women. First, by examining the character of Mercy it can be determined that she is to be seen as a female with feminine qualities, as nothing she wears or carries with her would suggest otherwise. But other elements, such as the breastplate worn by Eccelsia, or the sword wielded by Justice, if seen in the hands of a member of the clerical performer provides a more complicated semiotic idea of gender in relation to sex. If the gender of a member of the clergy serves as a neutral point in which the play can construct a character's gender, then instructing that Eccelsia be dressed as a woman yet wield items that are in opposition to that character's femininity suggests that the sex of that clerical performer may also be taken into consideration when the characters of the play are performed.

Carol J. Clover's study on the construction and deconstruction of gender in Scandinavia works within the same gender continuum described in Murray's work above. But, her focus on the perception of the sexed body suggests that there existed a view that all bodies were of one sex (Laqueur's "one-sex" model), which was male, and women were viewed simply as less perfect and internally male.[8] But going beyond sex she finds that the gender of an individual was determined by his/her/their own agency. According to Clover, what is most feared in the Norse society is not the female body but "the condition of powerlessness, the lack or loss of volition, with which femaleness is typically...associated."[9] Therefore, the male body

---

[8] Carol Clover, "Regardless of Sex: Men, Women, and Power in Early Northern Europe," *Speculum* 68.2 (April, 1993): 377.
[9] Clover, "Regardless of Sex," 379.

could be construed as effeminate given the inability to act out of power as much as the female body could be construed as masculine given the opposite quality.

It is no great stretch, given the historical connection among medieval Germanic cultures, to propose that some underlying idea of the gender construct posited by Clover would be prevalent in German-speaking lands as well as in Scandinavia. Again, examining the three characters mentioned above, the further costume elements and "props" they carry perhaps hold evidence that, although they are female, their gender may be masculine. But, given that the sword Justice carries serves as a common signification of the swift carrying out of judicial power, I shall focus primarily on Eccelsia, whose breastplate is uncommon in other medieval portrayals of her character and therefore is possibly a construction of the creator of the character rather than a normal portrayal of her allegorical signification.

The breastplate is of a defensive nature, worn to protect the vital organs in the upper torso. Worn in battle, or as preparation for a possible skirmish, it signifies for Ecclesia preparedness for a particular foe. At her entrance this foe is yet uncertain, but rather than conceal the breastplate until the time of battle, the *didascaliae* makes it clearly understood that she is wearing the device for protection from the moment her character is presented to the audience. There is never any direct indication that the breastplate is responsible for her protection as if used when in battle. But later in the play Ecclesia has gone to the Temple in Jerusalem with the Emperor and remained there even as Antichrist has risen to power in the Holy Land and overthrown the King of Jerusalem. The *didascaliae* then direct that: "But Ecclesia, who has remained there, returns to the Papal throne, after suffering

much abuse and indignity."[10] It is certainly conceivable that these insults, indignations and what Wright calls in his translation, "blows,"[11] may have come in a physical form. If so, the necessity of the breastplate would be well understood.

But another character in the play is also instructed to wear a breastplate. When Antichrist enters in the play it directs that he is to be wearing a breastplate or a coat of mail, but it is to be concealed under his clothes (*sub aliis indutus loricam*). It is not until he approaches the King of Jerusalem that he removes the garments covering his breastplate and overtakes the king. This concept of deception, of something hidden within, is key to understanding the female body during the medieval period. There is further evidence of deception as evidenced by Antichrist's reliance on false miracles and trickery to win over the fealty of the King of the Teutons, which will be discussed later in greater detail. For Murray and Clover there is certainly enough evidence to suggest that the internal qualities of a women's body held a certain amount of mystery and this unknownability was perceived as weaker in comparison to the external, knowable, qualities of a man's body.

Furthermore, if gender can be understood as providing agency, thus giving power, then perhaps the end of the play can provide a clearer understanding about what the play is signifying about Anitichrist's agency in relation to the character's gender. As Antichrist has reached the pinnacle of his power and every nation had submitted to his authority, he states for all to hear:

---

[10] *Ludus de Antichristo*, fol. 5a (p. 11a), trans. Hulme, 23. "Ecclesia vero que ibi reman/serat. Multis contumeliis et uerberibus/affecta redibit ad sedem apostolici."
[11] *The Play of Antichrist*, trans. Wright, 83.

This is my glory which they long ago foretold,

Which all shall enjoy with me who have merited it;

Universal peace and security will reign

After the destruction of those whom vanity has deceived.[12]

He is immediately struck down from above in a clash of thunder in, what would seem, an ironic twist to what he has just proclaimed. Eccelsia then steps forward and sings: Behold the man who did not choose God as his helper.[13] Antichrist's own agency (or more precisely, his power) has also been deceptive and misleading. Rather than directing himself (and others) toward unity in God, he has sought to create a false unity in himself. This Augustinian idea of directing oneself toward Unity is the signification of the ultimate Truth, and any pursuit this Truth outside Unity (God) is a falsehood.[14]

Thus the many false and hidden qualities signify weak personal agency and when applied to the character of Antichrist is indicative of medieval ideas about the feminine gender. In contrast, by revealing the breastplate of Ecclesia from the very beginning of her entrance, the creator of the play is externalizing her preparedness and readiness for conflict, signifying her masculine qualities.

---

[12] *Ludus de Antichristo*, fol. 7b (p. 15b), trans. Hulme, 32.

Hec mea Gloria
Quam diu predixere. Qua fruentur mecum qui-
cumque meruere. Post eorum casum quos
uanitas illusit. pax et securitas
uniuersa conclusit.

[13] *Ludus de Antichristo*, fol. 7b (p. 15b), trans. Hulme, 32. "Ecco homo qui non posuit deum adiuto/rem suum."

[14] This major thematic idea is found in section 113 of Augustine, "De Vera Religione," in *The Works of St. Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*, ed. Edmund Hill and John E. Rotelle, trans. Edmund Hill (Brooklyn, N.Y.: New City Press, 1990), 104.

In the text of *Ludus* Ecclesia is presented as a female character presumably represented by the body of a male cleric, but a female body gendered as masculine and befitting a more positive, or, to again use Augustinian thought, spiritually attuned representation. Contrasted against Antichrist who is male, also presented upon the body of a clerical performer but gendered as feminine there appears a greater theological signification. Kobialka brings this medieval theological semiology to light in his book, *This is My Body*, which focuses on research of the logos *Hoc est corpus meum*. For Kobialka it was during the twelfth century that a threefold discourse began to surround the Eucharist. This ternary mode of approaching Eucharistic theology was grounded in the way that believers experienced the body of Christ. Kobialka's discussion of the mode of understanding the Eucharist applies as follows: firstly, the corporeal understanding provided a space for the body to become flesh and "necessitated that Christ be really, naturally, and substantially present during the Mass."[15] Secondly, the spiritual approach is based in Anselm's teaching that the bread fed on during Mass is the composed of Christ's body and the heavenly bread, the *panis celesis*, which the angels fed on.[16] Thus the physical presence of Christ is symbolic of a spiritual presence that will one day be reality. Thirdly, the Ecclesiological approach stated in simplest terms focuses on the bond formed by the faithful with Christ, which delineates the Church, and that "to receive the body of Christ spiritually was to remain in the unity of the Church."[17] For Kobialka the corporeal and spiritual modes of the Eucharist serve

[15] Kobialka, *This is My Body*, 149-50.
[16] Kobialka, *This is My Body,* 151.
[17] Kobialka, *This is My Body,* 156.

individual or private functions while the Ecclesiological mode serves a public function. The intersection between Kobialka's work with twelfth-century Eucharist liturgy and the allegories at work in the performance in the *Ludus* is the spiritual truth that each aim to communicate.[18] Therefore, the ternary methodology provides insight into a twelfth-century audience's understanding of the signifiers at work during liturgical practices, and, for our purposes, gives further indications of how the creator of *Ludus* may have intended the characters of Eccelsia and Antichrist to be received.

Kobialka's approach to the Eucharist focuses on Real Presence in the liturgical setting. The necessary component in each mode of approaching the Eucharist is the physical body of Jesus Christ. It is from the point of the physical body that each mode takes its departure. Because these modes deal greatly with the semiotic qualities of the performance of the Eucharist they can yield insight other types of performance as well as forms of reception.[19] If applied to liturgical performance and the characters of Eccelsia and Antichrist in the *Ludus*, this ternary methodology reveals new understandings about how to view the relationship between the performed and the audience. When viewing these characters through the corporeal mode it is the body of the clerical actor that provides a space for the existence of the character. According to Murray: "Chastity took human beings back

---

[18] See Donalee Dox, *The Idea of the Theater in Latin Christian Thought* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004), 43-71. In addition to other explorations of theatrical development in the Middle Ages, Dox explains the theological movement away from the problems with theatrical presentations prevalent in Augustinian thought.
[19] The early semiotic arguments of Eucharist theology are discussed in Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991), 15-16.

to the prelapsarian one flesh...[t]his flesh had united male and female before the intrusion of gender into the Garden."[20] The pre-gendered flesh provides the site for real transformation into the gendered body. Presented through the lens of the spiritual mode the characters take on a certain duality, where their physical body also points to a symbolic reality. For Ecclesia, presented in the body as female, it is her masculinity that signifies a greater strength, which is found only in God. Antichrist, on the other hand, is presented in a male body, but it is his femininity that is symbolic of heretical deception and ultimate destruction. Finally, the ecclesiological mode presents the body as a point of unification between spiritual authority and the faithful thus delineating a greater whole. Eccelsia is the Church personified, but her body marks the union between its masculinity and outward femaleness. Therefore, she symbolizes the strength of Divine authority within the body of Mother Church. Antichrist becomes a symbol of the amalgamation of internal duplicity within the body of false authority. Antichrist, therefore, may serve as a warning to the laity and priests who follow heretical teachings.

Another form of embodiment evident in the *Ludus de Antichristo* is the foreign body. The play seems to set the exotic, non-Christian, characters in contrast to those within European Christendom, but does so in a comparatively benign way. When the play opens, the first two characters to step forward are Gentilitas (a difficult idea to translate into English, Gentilitas is used to personify paganism) and the King of Babylon. The opening lines are a type of defense of polytheism when Gentilitas sings of the problematic worship of a single god when so much of nature

[20] Murray, "Three Genders," 50.

is at odds with itself. The scholar J. H. L. Pflueger suggests that "[i]t may be that the influence of returning crusaders [that] led to the moderating of polemics over against representatives of non-Christian faiths."[21] Next Synagoga is instructed to enter *cum iudeis* (with the Jews) as she sings of worshipping God but rejecting Jesus and despising the gods of the descendants of Ishmael. It is only after all the non-Western (and its successor, the Roman Church), non-Christian characters have entered and taken their places that Ecclesia enters, beginning the introductions of Roman Christendom. Other characters such as Enoch and Elijah, who appear as the prophets later in the play will also be considered in the analysis of the embodiment of the other.

Determining how these characters would have been represented on stage is no easy task given that there are almost no *didascaliae* describing their dress, mannerisms, or other identifying characteristics. For the character Synagoga, the play does mention that she should be wearing a veil or covering because the Prophets are to remove it near the end of the play. But, the veil covering Synagoga's eyes is a common medieval representation of her character symbolizing the inability of the Jewish people to see the Messiah, and therefore would have been an understood element of her character's representation.

Turning to other sources for a working understanding of the Jewish alterity in the twelfth century, the extant manuscript of the contemporaneous Benediktbeuern *Ludus de Nativitate* contains the character Archisynagogus, which is also an allegorical representation of the Jews and based upon the same character

[21] J.H.L. Pflueger, "On the English Translation of the 'Ludus De Antichristo,'" *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 44.1 (January, 1945): 24.

mentioned in the pseudo-Augustinian *Sermo contra Judeos, Paganos, et Arianos*. In *Nativitate*, Archisynagogus and his Jewish retinue are described as being loud, obnoxious, shoving others, thrashing about, stomping the ground "and imitating with his scepter the mannerisms of a Jew in all ways."[22] Throughout the discussion between Archisynagogus and Augustine, it is Archisynagogus that is unable to contain his frustrations and is directed by the *didascaliae* to gesture and act in stubborn and foolish ways. By presenting characters as uncontrollable and given over to rage and emotion the creator of the play was intending make the object of a negative or critical gaze.[23] But, upon examining the text of the second Benediktbeuern play, the *Ludus de Passione*, which contains many characters who are Jews and aside from the inclusion of the Biblical narrative, which directs the Jewish people to ask for Christ to be crucified, there is little to suggest that the Jewish people are to act as foolishly or clown-like as in the portrayal of Archisynagogus. It would seem that the *Ludus de Antichristo*, like *Passione*, does not draw its character embodiment of Jewishness from the same pseudo-Augustinian work as the *Nativitate*. Nor does it fit the sympathetic treatment of Synagoga to match her to Archisynagogus.

One reason for the treatment of Jewishness in the *Ludus* comes from the fact that the *Ludus* is mirroring Adso's letter. As dicussed in the previous chapter, the *Ludus de Antichristo* appropriates much of Adso's tenth-century treatise *De Antichristo*. In this letter Adso makes references to the Jews and their role in the coming of the Antichrist, saying that the Jews will be the first to welcome the

[22] *Ludus de Nativitate*, trans. Bevington, *Medieval Drama*, 183.
[23] Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 149.

Antichrist as he will arrive in Jerusalem, be circumcised, and proclaim himself the Messiah, and foolishly the Jewish people will believe him.[24] In fact, according to Adso, it is possible that Antichrist is also Jewish because, although born in Babylon, he will be born from the tribe of Dan.[25] Adso also references the emergence of Enoch and Elijah who come to preach the gospel to Jewish people. Although recognized as Old Testament figures, it is difficult to say whether they would have been represented as Jewish or even as "others," as they have a decidedly New Testament message.

Given the presence and dissemination of anti-Semitic writings of twelfth-century Europe it is important to examine why, in the *Ludus*, qualities of Jewish embodiment are treated with, at best, sympathetic empathy, and at worst, indifference to specific explanation? This lack of focus on Jews and Jewishness in Adso's letter might provide the framework for the play's creator to treat them in this light, but perhaps it is what is missing in the play that signals the unnecessary need to present a heavily othered sense of Jewishness. In her book *Gentile Tales*, Miri Rubin weaves together the narrative of late medieval anti-Semitism as it surrounds the liturgy of the Eucharist. In her introduction she posits why this narrative began to spread across Europe. "The very practices through which medieval Christian culture was experienced in the centuries after 1000 held the Eucharist to be central and precious and led to a growing sense of discomfort about the Jew's proximity to

---

[24] Adso, "Antichrist," trans. McGinn, 94.
[25] Adso, "Antichrist," trans. McGinn, 90.

it within Christian spaces."[26] Given that this play does not contain any representation of Christ, but rather his antithesis, the play's creator may be seeking to have Synagoga seen as a sympathetic character; one that is just as easily tricked by the presence of a false Christ. Following the arch of her character, which is driven by her relationship to Antichrist, from indignation towards Jesus, to accepting Antichrist as the Messiah, then suffering death after she learns of her mistake and professes Jesus to be the true Messiah, would suggest that she is a more complete character than her "Jewish" counterparts in other contemporary extant texts. In fact, Synagoga's journey is the only example in *Ludus* of a character moving from unbelief in Christ as the true Messiah to belief. Therefore it is reasonable that the creator of the play would not wish to separate the audience from her character by creating a fearful or clownish one-dimensional embodiment similar to Archisynagogus.

Turning to the other foreign bodies in the play, Gentilitas and the King of Babylon are not presented in the same light as Synagoga, although neither is presented mockingly or bitingly. Each is the representation of the empowered other. The King of Babylon carries with him the power of his kingdom, similar to the other kings in the play except that he uses it to attempt an attack on Christendom and Jerusalem, but is defeated by and made subject to the Emperor. Later he is also defeated in battle by Antichrist and is made subject to him as well. While Gentilitas is not referred to as a king, he does occupy a throne (*Tunc rex ueniens ad tronum gentilitatis*) and serves as a voice for paganistic polytheism. One way to determine

[26] Miri Rubin, *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1999), 1.

how these two characters may have been portrayed is to turn to contemporary art (especially given that the King of Babylon is most likely to be understood as Arab). One document that may hold visual clues about how Arab "others" were signified is the twelfth-century Madrid Skylitzes Manuscript. Written in Greek and produced in Norman Sicily in the early twelfth century, the manuscript is full of detailed images depicting the history of Greek Byzantium between 811 and 1057. The images portray Arab or Muslim peoples as having black or white hair, with slightly darker skin than the Byzantium peoples and in some cases wearing a white head covering.[27] It is difficult to determine whether these images of people from the Arab world would have been what the creator of the *Ludus* would have known in Tegernsee, Germany, but the Madrid Skylitzes' dissemination from Eastern Byzantium to Norman Sicily certainly suggests the widespread acceptance of these ideas. Even though it is difficult to pinpoint an exact idea of how these characters may be been represented in the performance of *Ludus de Antichristo* it is certain that the play does not align them with Western Christendom and therefore they are certainly to be considered "others."

Returning to Kobialka's assessment of the ternary mode of bodily representation, there is certainly significance to be found in each of these othered characters as they are presented in the playing area before an audience. I shall consider Gentilitas and the King of Babylon together, as they represent similar embodiments of the other. It is perhaps most difficult to understand these two characters through the corporeal mode as it is not mentioned, and difficult to be

[27] M. Tahar Mansouri, "The Arabs Through Skylitzes' Miniatures," *Mediterranean World* 20 (2010), 238-241.

specific about how the body of the performer would have served as the space for the inclusion of the bodies of the characters. Ethnicity is most certainly the form in which the signification of this embodiment would have taken place, but outside of contemporary representations in other documents, there is little that can be concluded about the effectiveness of this mode of embodiment. But, given that these characters are in fact "others," the spiritual mode, on the other hand, serves to point out the separation between heathenism and Christianity. Distancing the gaze of the Christian audience through use of the embodied other signifies the distance between God and the unbeliever. The ecclesiological mode serves to map the boundaries of Christendom through the physical body of the "other" and it is doubtless that this mode would have served to further separate the homogenous audience from the embodied others of Gentilitas and the King of Babylon.

Applying Kobialka's methodology to Synagoga presents similar challenges but different results. If Synagoga is to be considered an empathetic character, and I believe she is, then her otherness serves a different purpose. Again, the corporeal mode is a challenge as there is no direct description of her physicality or ethnicity, but given that the audience could identify empathetically with her character, it is doubtful that the signification would have gone far beyond her common medieval representations. As for the spiritual mode, Synagoga's character arch would suggest that there is something to be learned from her journey, making it difficult to think that she would have been as othered as Gentilitas or the King of Babylon. Rather, she embodies the spiritual change of the penitent and thus would represent, at least by the end of her arch, a faithful Christian. Through the ecclesiological mode,

Synagoga signifies the inclusiveness of Christianity and through whatever representation used during the performance her function as an example to unbelievers (or more specifically, Jews) lends importance to the necessity that she not be too distanced from the gaze of the audience.

The remaining two forms of embodiment I wish to examine are found in the presentation of false bodies and bodies "en masse." For each of these forms I wish to point to specific examples within the play. The portrayal of false bodies occurs after Antichrist tries to win over the King of the Teutons first by showering him with gifts, then in battle. Neither tactic works, so Anitchrist turns to performing miracles in front of the King. The text would suggest that the miracles performed on the bodies of the individuals are false, as the bodies of the performers were never truly inflicted. The portrayal of bodies working "en masse" occurs several times within the play, but in most cases it is simply Antichrist or one of the kings sending part of their retinue to perform a specific duty. The unique example of a group of people working as one body with a single goal occurs immediately before Antichrist's entrance when the Hypocrites enter and work together in the appearance of humility to, according to Hulme's translation, "gain the favor of the masses."[28] Both of these instances are unique to the play as well as within the play and warrant further examination.

Turning first to the presentation of false bodies, the directions within the play text state:

[28] "Antichrist," trans. Hulme, 21.

> The Hypocrites then lead a lame man before Antichrist. When he is healed, the king of the Teutons shall waver in his faith. Then they bring forward a leper, and when he is healed, the king shall doubt more. Finally they bring in one on a litter, lying as if he had been killed in battle.[29]

There are three miracles performed by Antichrist but the clearest example of a false body in these lines of the play is in the last "miracle" where a man is to be brought in pretending to dead. The first two miracles could also have been intended to be false, but even so, the text would suggest that the signification of falsity to the audience occurs on the last "miracle." It seems simple enough that an actor would pretend to be dead and then sit up and talk on the command of Antichrist, but this moment in the performance poses many questions. For the medieval audience, what would signify a dead body and a healthy body present together within one performer? How would the miracle occur upon the body of the performer in order to signify truth for the other performers (i.e. the King of the Teutons) but deceptiveness for the audience?

It is, unfortunately, almost impossible to determine the specifics of how this false miracle may have been performed. But the reasons behind why it was so crucial that the spectator understand the signification of a false miracle are dictated

---

[29] *Ludus de Antichristo* fol. 5d (p. 12b), trans. Hulme, 26-27.

> Tunc ypocrite adducunt
> claudum coram antichristo. Quo sanato rex
> teotonicorum hesitabit in fide. Runc iterum
> adducunt leprosum et illo sanato rex plus
> dubitabit. Ad ultimum important
> feretrum in quo iacebat quidam simulans
> se in prelio occisum.

by Jody Enders when she discusses the importance between a theological performance and a theatrical performance in her essay "Performing Miracles: The Mysterious Mimesis of Valenciennes." Although her particular case study occurs much later, in 1547, her concern is the indistinguishability of the miracle performed saying that "where *theatrical* uncertainty reigns, so too does *theological* uncertainty."[30] It is crucial, to ensure no confusion or discrepancies in the performance of a miracle, even if it is a false miracle. Whether written as documentation of performed falsity of the miracle or as future reference that this must be a performed falsehood, the last thing that the medieval creator of the *Ludus* wanted was uncertainty as to whether the miracle was real or not. The truth in the performance lies in the reality that the body of the performer never experiences any type of physical or spiritual change.

Turning now to the body working "en masse," the manuscript reads: "[L]et the Hypocrites move forward silently, nodding on every hand with the appearance of humility, to gain the favor of the masses."[31] The body "en masse," that is, the collective action of the Hypocrites, is approached in much the same as the individual body. How is the body composed? How does the body move in time and space? Of particular interest in this section is the body's movement silently through space as well as the gesture used in order to reach a specific end; in this case to gain the

[30] Jody Enders, "Performing Miracles: The Mysterious Mimesis of Valenciennes," *Theatricality*, eds. Tracy C. Davis and Thomas Postlewait (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2003), 45.
[31] *Ludus de Antichristo* fol. 4c (p. 10a), trans. Hulme, 21. "Procedant ypocritę sub silentio. Et/specie humilitatis inclinantes circumquaque/et captantes fauorem laicorum."

confidence of the audience (the use of the word *laicorum*, the laity, would suggest that these are the spectators not performers).

The gesture of nodding the hand on the hands of others performed in this scene would fall under Augustine's concept of *signa data* given that it is used to signify humility.[32] The large body of Hypocrites helps to give focus to the gesture spreading around the space through the use of repetition much faster than a single individual could accomplish. This focus on the single gesture by both the Hypocrites and the audience, through their reactions, allows it to stand alone in a more superficial way.[33] Thus the humility that is signified through the common understanding of gestures of piety is also given a shallow insincerity. Furthermore, the use of multiple bodies working in symbiosis and directly approaching members of the audience shifts the gaze from the performing space to the viewing space. Now the performance space has increased to include those who were previously only spectators. The gesture is still a performed gesture but now it is the audience member who, if accepting of the gesture, also accepts their role in the performance. They become willing participants in the hypocrisy of the Hypocrites, thus they, to some degree, also become a body of hypocrites working "en masse" within the performance of *Ludus de Antichristo*.

Looking at these final two forms of embodiment through the lens of Kobialka provides further understanding of their possible meanings and purpose. For the false body, the corporeal method implies that the body becomes the space and the

---

[32] J.A. Burrow, *Gestures and Looks in Medieval Narrative* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2002), 1-2.
[33] Joaquín Martínez Pizarro, *A Rhetoric of the Scene: Dramatic Narrative in the Early Middle Ages* (Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1989), 113.

signifier for truth or deception. Written upon the body of the performer are signs of its life or lifelessness by means of signifiers that, unfortunately, are not included in the text. The spiritual mode reveals the false body to be the signifier of the temporality of the flesh. In creating a body that is essentially lying, the creator of the *Ludus* has hit upon the theology that reliance on things of a carnal nature do not bring about true transformation, which only occurs through Jesus Christ. The physical body will disappoint and fail, but the spiritual body will live forever. Applying the ecclesiological mode to the concept of the false body points to a present concern the play's creator may have had during the twelfth century. As discussed in the first chapter, Frederick Barbarossa's relationship with the Church and its leadership was strained for multiple reasons, thus the ecclesiological mode of examining the embodiment of falsity could possibly signify a greater concern about false clergy. Scholarship on this play seems to suggest that it was written in support of Frederick and his appointments of bishops, so it is within reason to suggest that the false body would be used as a signifier of false authority active within the larger body of the Church, thus working to undermine the true authority.[34]

Looking now towards the use of bodies "en masse," the corporeal mode would seem to suggest that the bodies of many working in symbiosis creates the place for a single form of signification to emerge, thus giving the many bodies a quality of one. Analyzing these bodies through the spiritual mode evidences the abilities of many working as one alongside the theology of the Church: that Christ's

---

[34] Frederick was aware of his eschatological role and welcomed it. Munz, *Frederick Barbarossa,* 376-84.

body is made of many parts. But, because this body works together for purposes of deception, the inference made above, that this is a greater signification of contemporary issues and not to be considered the work of the true body of believers, is certainly a strong possibility. Finally, the ecclesiological mode also lends itself to the similar conclusion that was given under the embodiment of falsity. But this is perhaps a more direct indignation towards clergy who claim that they act out of piety. As the point of unification for the spiritual authority and the faithful, the ecclesiological mode is highly embodied as the Hypocrites "win over" the laity. Thus, the greater signification of the gesture serves to shift the gaze of the audience from the "stage" to themselves and what it leads to if false clergy are followed.

While the discussion of bodies in the *Ludus de Antichristo* provides a significant understanding of the medieval concept of embodiment, especially as it relates to the semiotic relationship between performance and spectator as seen through the lens of ternary performance modes explained by Kobialka, the play also lends information concerning the function of the *Ludus* in the twelfth-century public sphere. By examining the semiotics of embodiment in performance, a picture is formed of how the abbey at Tegernsee understood what exactly the body is able to signify. Thus, the body becomes a signified of this community. The body of the character is constructed upon the rituals, traditions, morality, the greater identity the community has built for itself. The medieval communal architecture has as its blueprint in the individual body.[35] This structure, which is mirrored in the formation of the performed body, identifies the *Ludus* as a document working to

---

[35] Jody Enders, *The Medieval Theatre of Cruelty* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1999), 102-04.

construct bodies in the public sphere that portray a specific understanding of the larger European structure. And while the body may be the structure of society, the emotions of the performed body – its aesthetic portrayal – are how the community wishes to be seen in a public context. Therefore a study into the semiotics of the performed bodies in the *Ludus* must also include an examination of its emotive qualities.

Barbara Rosenwein characterizes an "emotional community" as "a group in which people have a common stake, interests, values, and goals."[36] Furthermore she posits that an emotional community is difficult to define spatially, given that they are not coextensive and may be large and predominant, subordinate to other communities, or completely independent.[37] As outlined in the first chapter, the geographic boundaries of Bavaria in the twelfth century are not as clearly defined as they are today. While Tegernsee Abbey still exists in the same position it was several centuries ago, it is impossible to know how far the boundaries of the emotional community would have stretched. Nonetheless, the public sphere of the twelfth century was much larger than the geographic region of Tegernsee and the *Ludus* is speaking to a certain section of that sphere – its emotional community. There the play must be examined for the performed emotive qualities of the body at work in order to identify the characteristics of the emotional community to which it was speaking.

As discussed previously, it is important to recognize that the play is essentially two very separate episodes: the first being the rise of the Emperor as he

---

[36] Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 24.
[37] Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 24.

brings together the kingdoms of the world under his rule finally abdicating his Empire to God by laying his crown and imperial insignia upon the altar in the Temple at Jerusalem. The second episode focuses on the rise of Antichrist who presents himself as the true Christ and brings together the kingdoms of the world under his authority only to be struck down when he declares that he will be worshipped. There is a distinct difference between the constructions of emotion in these two episodes. Because the first episode deals with characters that are representative of actual living people, many of whom are of high social status, so much of the actions and emotions (or control of emotions) would have been dictated by custom and court behavior. After the Emperor has brought the kingdom of the Franks and the kingdom of the Greeks under his authority, the former by conflict and the latter by political maneuvering, the king of the subjected kingdom approaches the throne of the Emperor where the text states that: "Then the Emperor shall receive him kindly and restore his kingdom to him."[38] This kindness the Emperor displays is in response to the other king's humility in his presence. This choreography of emotions is part of the well-established tradition of supplication.[39] As a result of the display of humility shown to the Emperor, he restores the kingdom to the king as a part of the empire, upon which the subjected king rejoices to be in service to the Emperor saying: "We venerate the glory of the Roman name/And we rejoice in the service of Ceasar the august."[40]

---

[38] *Ludus de Antichristo* fol. 3c (p. 8a), trans. Hulme, 18. "Tunc imperator/eum suscipiens in hominem et conce/dens sibi regnum."
[39] Geoffrey Koziol, *Begging Pardon and Favor* (Ithaca: Cornell Univ. Press, 1992), 54-55.
[40] *Ludus de Antichristo* fol. 3d (p. 8b), trans. Hulme, 18.
Roma

This display of emotions in the first episode of the play is very formalized, copying the customs of the highest courts in Europe. In venerating the Emperor this way the play is itself performing an act of humility. The emotional community in which this play was written wished to display their respect and support of Frederick. Because of Tegernsee's direct fealty to Barbarossa, this portrayal of the very controlled, calculated and benevolent Emperor must have been presented to the public sphere in order to locate the community as loyal to him.

The second episode serves to contrast with the first as it focuses on the actions of Antichrist and the emotions they evoke. Desiring of power and authority he subjugates the kingdoms of the world demanding that they give him tribute. But when trying to win over the King of the Teutons with gifts, the king is angered and insulted at this false Christ saying "May his reward attend him to perdition/Where he shall receive dire vengeance for the insult."[41] Angered, Antichrist calls together all the kingdoms under his authority and says that the he will destroy the German race. A battle ensues and Antichrist's army is defeated. Frustrated, Antichrist then turns to performing "miracles" saying, "Ignorant unbelievers are always looking for signs."[42] This time he succeeds and the King of the Teutons submits to his authority.

Anger is a particularly strong emotion with very important significations in the medieval world. Rosenwein states that only the wicked exhibited rage and its variants, which was something almost inhuman, for it was the minions of hell that

---

ni nominis honorem ueneramur. augus
to cesari seruire gloriamur.

[41] "Antichrist," trans. Hulme, 25.

[42] "Antichrist," trans. Hulme, 27.

tormented souls with this same quality.[43] While it is never directly stated that Antichrist, or any other character for that matter, expresses "rage," Rosenwein is commenting on the medieval narrative structure which has performative elements, but is not itself a performance. Antichrist's desire to kill or subdue all those who do not submit to his being God, his constant insults levied against those who oppose him, and his "anger" (*commotus*) toward the indignation of the Prophets all point to a character given over to his "raging" emotions.

But other characters seem to experience anger and frustration as well. The Prophets call out Antichrist as a liar, blasphemer, and false god. The King of the Teutons, as described above, is insulted by Antichrist's claims to be God and his attempt to bribe the king. But these expressions of emotion are presented in a different light. These emotions are in response to Antichrist who, because of the display of false miracles and a strong tendency to be given over to his anger, is always presented to the audience as a false Christ, an embodiment of evil. Thus, in Augustinian terms, these characters orient their emotions toward God by rejecting Antichrist and therefore use them in a spiritually good way, whereas Antichrist directs his emotions at the world, which is always a signification of evil.[44]

The conclusion can thus be made that this is an emotional community concerned with the presence of evil. The cloister at Tegernsee belonged to a community that saw the devil at work within the Church and played out their emotional anxiety in the form of *Ludus de Antichristo*. Presenting their emperor, Frederick, as emotionally ritualized except in matters of a spiritual nature, they

---

[43] Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 149.
[44] Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 51.

indicate their stance within the public sphere against those within the Church acting out of anger and frustration. For if anger and rage are evil, they are brought about by only one source: the devil.[45] Therefore by creating a public document in the *Ludus* the emotional community at Tegernsee sought out or bound itself with the greater emotional community within the public sphere that was sympathetic Frederick Barbarossa and his cause. In contrast they also distinguish themselves from other contemporary Bavarian communities, like that of Benediktbeuren, whose performance practices suggest an emotional emphasis different from that of Tegernsee. While trying to determine the exact boundaries of this particular emotional community may prove to be difficult, it is certain that Tegernsee's legacy within twelfth-century public sphere is very much behind the creation of this incredible play.

[45] Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 182.

CHAPTER FOUR: PLAYING FOR LATER

Pope Alexander III's legitimacy as the rightful bishop of Rome, elected by a majority vote of the College of Cardinals, was finally put to rest in the decades following the initial schism brought about by Frederick Barbarossa's influential support of Victor IV in 1159. Thereafter, Frederick's defeat at the battle of Legnano in May of 1176 resulted in the Treaty of Venice in 1177, whereby Frederick acknowledged Alexander as the true pope and relinquished some of his temporal authority over the city of Rome. This had the effect of ultimately weakening his claims on the northern Italian states that formed the Lombard League. The function of the *Ludus de Antichristo* accordingly shifted during this time period, possibly due to the waning influence of Barbarossa and the fading of the initial optimism cultivated by his supporters early in his reign. Initially a dramatic literary document put into service as a widely-accessible political platform for the abbey at Tegernsee, the *Ludus* was copied and bound within a larger manuscript sometime between 1180 and 1186 along with a number of other letters and treatises. This "little codex," as Vollmann-Profe affectionately names it, now resides at the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich under the shelf mark Clm 19411.[1]

The *Ludus* thus found itself amongst other documents that served the more locally immediate needs of the cloister school at Tegernsee about a quarter century after its creation. This shifting function of the *Ludus* highlights the life of the dramatic literary document in the Middle Ages when the relevant context surrounding the genesis of the play becomes a moment of the past. This chapter will

[1] Vollmann-Profe, "Antichristo," v-vi.

examine the life of the *Ludus* in the years after 1160 and the continued need for such documents within a more local context. More specifically, this chapter focuses its efforts on understanding the type of shift that occurred for the play and its relationship to performance. It addresses the questions concerning where, or when, the threshold for performance ends (or if it ever does), and if what Symes identifies as the functional method of *transcript* ever changes.[2] This chapter will also examine the change from immediate contextual relevance to historical documentation that surround the *Ludus* and the manuscript in which it is bound. Furthermore, the shifting function of the dramatic document emphasizes the changes occurring in the debate over reform efforts and the structures of power in twelfth-century Europe, highlighting the *Ludus* as a document created for a moment of necessity – a comment on current events – but that which receives new meaning as the audience of the document also changes, both in size and in attitude. This chapter will build upon the previous chapters' examinations of the immediate need for the *Ludus* by examining the development of its later functionality, further highlighting the existence of the twelfth-century public sphere and its primary concern with the structure of spiritual and temporal power.[3]

Vollmann-Profe, in the introduction to her translation of the *Ludus*, provides a list of the documents contained within the manuscript, along with a description of the codex's physical features:

---

[2] Symes, "The Medieval Archive," 34.

[3] Melve identifies the process by which the medieval public sphere is formed, and while the criteria he outlines is debatable, he nonetheless sees the shifting nature of document and audience over time as a prime marker by which the public sphere can be identified. See Melve, *Inventing the Public Sphere* I, 12-14.

> The little codex (16.2 x 11.9 cm, recorded in double columns) contains 140 sheets (139 made of parchment, 1 later sheet glued together, with 17 quires): (1) poetry (including the *Ludus*); (2) grammatical analysis, stylistic rhetoric and philosophical treatises; (3) excerpts from the *Gesta Friderici I imperatoris* by Otto of Freising and Rahewin; (4) collection of letters; (5) letters and individual letter examples (including the well-known *Tergernsee Love Letters*); and (6) letters and legal documents (the so-called *Tegernsee Letter Collection of the Twelfth Century*).[4]

Specifically, these letter compilations include Wipo of Burgundy's *Proverbia*, writings from Otloh of St. Emmeram, the *Breviarium de dictamine* by Alberic of Monte Cassino, and an excerpt from the *Praecepta dictaminum* by Adalbertus Samaritanus. All together, these writings and excerpts indicate the instructional nature of the manuscript, exemplifying texts that aid in the education of a well-rounded student, knowledgeable in multiple areas of rhetoric, history, and poetry.

In general, then, the manuscript which contains the *Ludus* emphasizes the importance of rhetoric, importing and preserving texts that outline the medieval concept of *ars dictaminis* – the art of letter writing which developed out of the classical and late antique rhetorical styles and emphasized the education of proper written correspondence.[5] Specifically, the *Breviarium de dictamine* and the *Praecepta dictaminum* both address the formation of structures specific to letter

---

[4] Vollmann-Profe, "Antichristo," v [my translation].

[5] Luella M. Wolff, "A Brief History of the Art of Dictamen: Medieval Origins of Business Letter Writing," *The Journal of Business Communication* 16.2 (1979): 3-4.

writing and the use of classical rhetorical styles to inform the content of the letters. The forefather of *ars dictaminis* was Alberic of Monte Cassino (d. 1088) and the *Breviarium* was his effort to formalize and teach the art of letter writing through the use of textual variety (especially when addressing an audience of a different status), the function of certain sections within the letter, and the use of metrical verse as a formalized methodology; all done in service to a broad generalized concept of a letter-format that still emphasized the personal human elements needed even in formal communication.[6] Adalbertus Samaritanus in his *Praecepta* focuses significant attention on the teacher of epistolary construction, stating that he should be well-rounded in all aspects of the classical liberal arts, and provides several specific salutation formats and complete model letters.[7] Given that Tegernsee was known as a center of writing it is no surprise that the primary treatises centered on the growing conventions of letter writing would be found within the cloister.

Furthermore, the manuscript contains two distinct letter collections: the so-called *Tegernsee Love Letters* and *Tegernsee Letter Collection of the Twelfth-Century*.[8] Each models the type of letter writing that was blossoming during the twelfth century. The *Love Letters* are a fascinating collection of personal correspondences between unnamed individuals. Written in a rhyming prose style, not uncommon for personal letters of the twelfth-century, the letters were most likely written outside

---

[6] James J. Murphy, *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974), 208-210.
[7] Murphy, *Rhetoric*, 213-14.
[8] The former can be found in with annotations and in translation in Peter Dronke, *Medieval Latin and the Rise of European Love-Lyric* II (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 472-82; and the latter edited by Helmut Plechl in *Die Tegernseer Briefsammlung des 12. Jahrhunderts*, in *MGH Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit* 2 (Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2002), 1-341.

of Tegernsee but kept at the cloister to provide examples of elegant Latin prose style and the beautiful use of language.[9] The *Letter Collection*, on the other hand, contains more than three hundred examples of more formalized letters exchanged between ecclesiastics and secular officials, one hundred and ninety of which directly concern the particular regional history of Tegernsee and were produced at the monastery itself.[10]

There is little doubt that these treatises and letter collections serve to educate the students at the cloister school in the art of letter writing. But what is perhaps overlooked is the necessity for which a letter is written. The symbiotic relationship between rhetoric and *ars dictaminis* (the latter giving rise to the former while the former popularizes theories on the latter),[11] as played out within the educational setting of the cloister, connected the student to the practice and formulae of twelfth-century argumentation. Indeed, during the twelfth century the *ars dictaminis* was the major pedagogical method for learning the expression of effective modes of communication, specifically in cases of persuasion.[12] The need to artfully and intelligently express one's opinions and desires can reasonably be seen as a major impetus behind the inclusion of these letter collections and the aforementioned treatises concerning the *ars dictaminis*. Thus, the codex not only

---

[9] Constant J. Mews, *The Lost Love Letters of Heloise and Abelard: Perceptions of Dialogue in Twelfth-Century France* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999), 103-4.
[10] Plechl, *Tegernseer Briefsammlung*, V-VI.
[11] John O. Ward, "Rhetorical Theory and the Rise and Decline of 'Dictamen' in the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance," *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 19, No. 2 (Spring 2001): 178.
[12] Ward, "Rhetorical Theory," 186.

instructs its reader on the specifics of letter-writing but also presents the utilization of argumentation as a methodology for communication within a public context.

The use of letters to create a medieval rhetorical space is highlighted by the inclusion of Otto and Rahewin's *Gesta Frederici* and Wipo of Burgundy's *Proverbia* within the manuscript. Wipo's text certainly points to a need for eloquence when communicating directly with those in power. Writing in metrical Latin verse, he composed his *Proverbia* (c. 1028) as a collection of axioms for Henry III, not long after his coronation as king of Germany.[13] But it is the *Gesta Frederici* that represents the greatest culmination and utilization of the concept of *ars dictaminis* for portions of the biography contain official letters from Frederick's imperial reign. The necessity for Frederick and his supporters to project a persuasive voice into the public debate on ecclesiastical reform has been discussed in an earlier chapter, but the relationship which the letters and treatises included within the Bavarian manuscript share with the *Gesta Frederici* goes beyond its inclusion of official correspondence. Rather, the *Gesta Frederici* demonstrates a history of persuasive argumentation used in order to advance a particular point of view within the medieval public sphere. Also, Frederick's reliance on letters included a particular focus on legal precedent to advance his own arguments, thus setting an example for the inclusion of rhetorical devices as a means by which he could prove his case to a broad audience.

---

[13] For further examination of Wipo's literature and life in the German imperial court see Theodor Ernst Mommsen and Karl Frederick Morrison, *Imperial Lives and Letters of the Eleventh Century* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962), 42-44.

The inclusion of these documents within the Bavarian "little codex" signal the need to educate students at the Tegernsee cloister for the sake of effective communication within the growing (both quantitatively and geographically) medieval public forum through the use rhetorical and historical precedent, and were perhaps chosen by the students themselves for the sake of their own instructional needs.[14] There can be little doubt that the cloister at Tegernsee had at its heart the desire to produce both students and documents that were capable of participating through the use of multiple mediums upon the larger stage of European political and ecclesiastical exchange. The documents included in the manuscript, including the *Ludus*, are woven together (both literally and figuratively) with this particular goal. But, the specific function of the *Ludus* as an educational tool within the manuscript and the means by which it connects to the functionality of the other documents is where I must turn next.

The earliest and most striking correlation between the *Ludus* and the *ars dictaminis* is found within the representation of the messengers in the play, who are sent by the Emperor to the stations upon which the temporal rulers sit. It is unclear whether they are to read from an actual letter or just to recite aloud what is instructed of them; but regardless, their speeches make use of notable methods encompassed by the *ars dictaminis*. When approaching the king of the Franks where they declare:

> The Emperor of the Romans sends greeting
>
> To his dear friend, the famous king of the Franks!

[14] Helmut Plechl, "Die Tegernseer Handschrift Clm 19411: Beschreibung und Inhalt," *Deutsches Archiv für Erforshung des Mittelalters* 18.2 (1962): 457-58.

We know you a friend wise in counsel,

Who should be subject to Roman laws.

And this sentiment should call you back again

To give service and honor forever to the highest power,

To which service we are now come to invite you,

And to request you to return quickly under its command.[15]

Although short in length, the message carries with it all the key principles of good epistolary form. The salutation of friendship was one of the key principles of *ars dictaminis*: less of a manipulative tool and more a function of the public nature of these documents, the salutation established the grounds upon which the sender wished to stand in relation to the receiver, for the consideration of all who might read or hear the contents (and requests) of the letter.[16] The message to the King of the Franks thus sets the foundation for the forthcoming argument by making rhetorical appeals to *ethos* (the wise character of the King of the Franks) as well as appealing to precedent and *logos*; thus, it provided all the necessary rhetorical devices from which a reasonable demand can be requested. Although the message does not seem to have the desired effect (as the Emperor must eventually subdue the King of the Franks in battle), the message is more successful with other world powers. Ultimately, the goal of the message is not only to present the request and arguments of the Emperor in conformity with the principles of *ars dictaminis*, but

---

[15] "Antichrist," trans. Hulme, 17. The messengers repeat this statement, with slight changes, to each of the representatives of earthly powers.

[16] Giles Constable, "Dictators and Diplomats in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries: Medieval Epistolography and the Birth of Modern Bureaucracy," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 46, *Homo Byzantinus: Papers in Honor of Alexander Kazhdan* (1992): 39.

also to serve as the device by which the audience understands the logical and reasonable political policies of the Emperor.

In contrast, the *Ludus* makes use of the message and messengers as a similar performed device to provide the audience with a glimpse into the inherent untrustworthiness of Antichrist. In the second half of the play Antichrist sends out his messengers first to the King of the Greeks saying:

> Health to you, O King, from our Savior,
> The ruler of kings and of the whole earth,
> Who, as was promised the world in the scriptures,
> Shall descend from the arch of heaven at the Father's
>   command.
> He shall hold the same forever by his divine power,
> Who now in his mercy invites us to life;
> Here he wills to be worshipped by all as God,
> And he commands the whole world to glorify him.
> If thou failest to observe the spirit of this decree,
> Thou with thine shalt perish by the edge of the sword![17]

Here the salutation is short and immediately sets up a vision of an incredible and powerful sender, relating to the King of the Greeks an imbalance of power in favor of Antichrist. This argument is carried through the entirety of the message as the reason for which Antichrist's demands should be met. While effective, in that the King of the Greeks is swayed by this message, the *Ludus* uses the poor

[17] "Antichrist," trans. Hulme, 23-24.

implementation of *ars dictaminis* as the device by which the evil ambitions of the Antichrist can by identified for an audience versed in political discourse, like the community at Tegernsee. The weakness of Antichrist's arguments are further highlighted when messengers are sent to the King of the Teutons (the previously named Emperor) and are instructed to recite the same message as before but with a slight change in the final two lines: "And in honoring thee, the absent friend, with these gifts/He wishes to feel thee present."[18] The politics of these contrasting messages between the Emperor and Antichrist are unmistakable, highlighting the educated tactical claims made by the Emperor in the course of his actions in order to fulfill the prophetic rise of the final Emperor (an adaptation of Adso: the Roman Empire represents the final Earthly kingdom before the rise of the Antichrist), but also to set up Antichrist as acting upon unfounded, weak conclusions about his right to reign as ruler.[19]

The use of *ars dictaminis* in the performed dialogue between rulers is evidence of the rise of the art of diplomacy and its use of rhetorical devices.[20] Thus the performance of a model letter within the *Ludus* is also a reflection of the actual act of negotiation between political powers, demonstrated effectively through the proper use of principles of *ars dictaminis*. Perhaps, then, the instructive nature of the *Ludus* extends beyond the creation of model public documents and embodies the implementation of a type of *ars dictaminis* in the realm of political savoir-faire. The

[18] "Antichrist," trans. Hulme, 25.
[19] Vollmann-Profe, "Antichristo," vii, describes the political ends of the play as designed by the author through the comparison between the Emperor and the Antichrist, setting up the Antichrist "less as Anti-Christ than as Anti-Caesar" (my translation).
[20] Constable, "Dictators and Diplomats," 45.

messengers are the embodied letter and power of the ruler they represent. Therefore the play not only upholds the concepts of successful letter writing, it also takes into consideration the form in which letters are delivered and presented to their recipients. The performative nature of twelfth-century communication is, on the whole, captured in the *Ludus de Antichristo*.

As a dramatic text, the *Ludus* would have fulfilled multiple functions within a manuscript designed to nurture public intellectuals capable of more than creating well-written letters, but rather possessing the ability to insert themselves into the political and social landscape of Europe as agents who understand the manifestations of power. Thus, while the power and political agency once held by Barbarossa early in his reign was no longer as palpable in the years after 1176, the ability of the play to showcase the nature by which power is transmitted and communicated was no less effective. A function of the shifting focus discussed in chapter two, the reliance on unnamed messengers to establish the means by which power is communicated (both effectively and ineffectively) can become the immediate focus of instruction in the latter part of the twelfth-century while the historical connection to Barbarossa serves as a documentation of past events. Thus, there is certainly a place for performances of the *Ludus* well after the prime years of Barbarossa's eschatology. In fact, the use of drama as an instructive tool at Tegernsee had a long history; in the tenth century, Froumond of Tegernsee had playfully asserted that dramatic devices made his lessons more enjoyable for his

students.[21] By the twelfth-century the use of dramatic texts as a pedagogical tool had been a part of the medieval schoolroom for some time, requiring students to memorize lines of metrical verse, learn proper techniques of presentation, and appreciate the role of narrative as a rhetorical device; furthermore, the consistent use of these texts may be the reason why so few extant copies have survived to the current time.[22] Thus, it is certainly possible that the *Ludus* may have been packaged into its codex for the sake of continued performance in the classrooms of the cloister at Tegernsee – teaching students the history of the abbey's direct fealty to the Emperor, providing opportunities to memorize versified Latin text and to learn the *ars dictaminis* first hand, in the role of a ruler or messenger.

It is clear that the audience for the *Ludus* had shifted but its influence within the medieval public sphere has not. While the dramatic text of the play now functions in the mode of *transcript*, documenting a past performance, it still leaves room for future performances which would have been no less important, but rather would have recontextualized the necessity of the play. As the conflict between Frederick Barbarossa and Pope Alexander III lost steam, the conversation occurring within the medieval public sphere would have altered and the *Ludus* would have no longer been as impactful as it had been in previous years. To put this in the terms that Leidulf Melve uses in his discussion of the formation of the medieval public sphere: the public had changed, thus resulting in variations in the functions of the

---

[21] Carol Symes, "The Performance and Preservation of Medieval Latin Comedy," *European Medieval Drama* 7 (2003): 36.
[22] Symes, "Medieval Latin Comedy," 41-44.

document for that public, or even a complete shift to a new public.[23] But, what is most important in Melve's discussion of the formation of the public sphere is the order in which this sphere is constructed. First, the text takes on meaning from an audience, and then a public is formed – what Melve calls an "interpreter:" whomever is making use of the text; which allows the text to exist transhistorically.[24] Therefore, as those who served as "interpreters" of the *Ludus* within the reform efforts in the years around 1160 can to no longer uphold the *Ludus* for the sake of their particular position(s), the play experienced a modification towards the use by a new "interpreter." Although Melve identifies the need for texts to work in opposition to other points of view, successfully forming a debate between divergent opinions and documents, thus completing the formation of the public sphere,[25] the role of "interpreter" nevertheless identifies a useful necessity for a document by a particular community. In the case of the *Ludus*, the smaller community happened to be the cloister school at Tegernsee Abbey. And while Melve would possibly argue that this reduces, if not outright eliminates the *Ludus* as a document participating the medieval public sphere in the years following the shift in the nature of the conversation (and divergent voices) after Barbarossa's defeat in 1176, I contend that the *Ludus* continued to instruct students who would become future scribes, legates, and royal officials in the ways of communicating within the public sphere. Thus the echoes of the *Ludus de Antichristo* continued to resound in the conversations surrounding the role of kings, the continuance of sacerdotal tradition,

---

[23] Melve, *Inventing the Public Sphere* I, 12.
[24] Melve, *Inventing the Public Sphere* I, 12-13.
[25] Melve, *Inventing the Public Sphere* I, 13-14.

the formation of new Biblical interpretations, and the overall performance of power upon the European continent for many years after 1160.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adso of Montier-en-Der. "Letter on the Origin and Time of the Antichrist." In *Apocalyptic Spirituality: Treatises and Letter of Lactantius, Adso of Montier-en-Der, Joachim of Fiore, the Spiritual Franciscans, Savonarola*, 89-96. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.

Aebischer, Pascale. "Didascalia and Speech in Dramatic Text." *Journal of Dramatic Theory and Criticism* 17, no. 2 (Spring 2003): 25-44.

Arnold, Benjamin. *Medieval Germany, 500-1300*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.

–––. *Power and Property in Medieval Germany: Economic and Social Change c. 900-1300*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

–––. *Princes and Territories in Medieval Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Augustine. "De Vera Religione." In *The Works of St. Augustine. A Translation for the 21st Century*. Translated by Edmund Hill. Edited by John E. Rotelle and Edmund Hill. New York: New City, 1990.

Bartlett, Robert. *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change 950-1350*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Baumgaertner, Jill. "The Benediktbeuern 'Ludus de Nativitate:' Journey to Fulfillment." *Christianity and Literature* (1979): 13-30

Beckwith, Sarah. *Signifying God: Social Relation and Symbolic Act in the York Corpus Christi Plays*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2001.

Bevington, David. *Medieval Drama*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975.

Bisson, Thomas N. *The Crisis of the Twelfth Century: Power, Lordship and the Origins of European Government*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.

Burrow, J.A. *Gestures and Looks in Medieval Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Butterworth, Philip, ed. *The Narrator, the Expositor, and the Prompter in European Medieval Theatre*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2007.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion*. New York: Zone, 1996.

Carlson, Marvin. "The Status of Stage Directions." *Studies in the Literary Imagination* 24, no. 2 (Fall 1991): 37-48.

Chambers, E.K. *The Mediaeval Stage*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1903.

Clanchy, M.T. *From Memory to Written Record: England 1066-1307*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Clover, Carol J. "Regardless of Sex: Men, Women, and Power in Early Northern Europe." *Speculum* 68.2 (1993): 363-87.

Constable, Giles. "Dictators and Diplomats in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries: Medieval Epistolography and the Birth of Modern Bureaucracy." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 46, *Homo Byzantinus: Papers in Honor of Alexander Kazhdan* (1992): 37-46.

Dox, Donalee. *The Idea of the Theater in Latin Christian Thought.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004.

Dronke, Peter. *Medieval Latin and the Rise of European Love-Lyric* II. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Emmerson, Richard K., and Ronald B. Herzman. *The Apocalyptic Imagination in Medieval Literature*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.

Enders, Jody. *The Medieval Theater of Cruelty: Rhetoric, Memory, Violence*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999.

–––. "Performing Miracles: The Mysterious Mimesis of Valenciennes." In *Theatricality*, edited by Tracy C. Davis and Thomas Postlewait, 40-63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

–––. *Rhetoric and the Origins of Medieval Drama*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Engel, Evamaria. *Die deutsche Stadt des Mittelalters*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1993.

Fassler, Margot. "Liturgy and Sacred History in the Twelfth-Century Tympana at Chartres." *Art Bulletin* 75.3 (September 1993): 499-520.

Fletcher, Richard A. *The Barbarian Conversion: From Paganism to Christianity*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1999.

Fuhrmann, Horst. *Germany in the High Middle Ages*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Gerhoh of Reichersberg. "De spectaculis theatricis in ecclesia dei exhibitis." In *Drama of the Medieval Church* 2. Translated by Karl Young. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.

Gunter, Günther. *Der Antichrist: Der staufishe Ludus de Antichristo*. Hamburg: Friedich Wittig Publishers, 1970.

Hughes, Kevin L. *Constructing Antichrist*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2005.

Hulme, William H., trans. "Antichrist and Adam: Two Mediaeval Religious Dramas." *Western Reserve University Bulletin* 28.8 (August, 1925): 5-32.

Issacharoff, Michaël. "Stage Codes." In *Performing Texts*, edited by Michaël Issacharoff and Robin F. Jones, 59-74. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988.

Jackson, W.T.H. "Time and Space in the 'Ludus De Antichristo.'" *Germanic Review* 51.1 (Winter 1979): 1-8.

Jaeger, C. Stephen. *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals 939-1210*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.

John, Wright, trans. *The Play of Antichrist*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1967.

Klaus, Aichele. "The Glorification of Antichrist in the Concluding Scenes of the Medieval 'Ludus De Antichristo.'" *MLN* April 91.3 (1976): 424-36.

Kobialka, Michal. *This Is My Body: Representational Practices in the Early Middle Ages*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1999.

Koziol, Geoffrey. *Begging Pardon and Favor: Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Ludus de Nativitate. In *Medieval Drama*, 180-201. Translated by David Bevington. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975.

Ludus de Passione. In *Medieval Drama*, 203-23. Translated by David Bevington. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975.

Macartney, C.A. *The Medieval Hungarian Historians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

Mansouri, M. Tahar. "The Arabs Through Skylitzes' Miniatures." *Mediterranean World* 20 (2010): 235-51.

McGinn, Bernard. *Apocalyptic Spirituality: Treatises and Letter of Lactantius, Adso of Montier-en-Der, Joachim of Fiore, the Spiritual Franciscans, Savonarola*. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.

McLaughlin, Megan. *Sex, Gender, and Episcopal Authority in an Age of Reform, 1000-1122*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Melve, Leidulf. *Inventing the Public Sphere: The Public Debate During the Investiture Contest (c. 1030-1122)*. 2 vols. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2007.

Mews, Constant J. "Accusations of Heresy and Error in the Twelfth-Century Schools: The Witness of Gerhoh of Reichersberg and Otto of Freising." In *Heresy in Transition: Transforming Ideas of Heresy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, edited by Ian Hunter, John Christian Laursen, and Cary J. Nederman, 43-57. Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2005.

–––. *The Lost Love Letters of Heloise and Abelard: Perceptions of Dialogue in Twelfth-Century France*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999.

Miller, Maureen C. *Power and the Holy in the Age of the Investiture Conflict: A Brief History with Documents*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.

Mommsen, Theodor Ernst, and Karl Frederick Morrison. *Imperial Lives and Letters of the Eleventh Century*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.

Munz, Peter. *Frederick Barbarossa: A Study in Medieval Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1969.

Murphy, James J. *Rhetoric in the Middle Ages: A History of Rhetorical Theory from Saint Augustine to the Renaissance*. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974.

Murray, Jacqueline. "One Flesh, Two Sexes, Three Genders?" In *Gender and Christianity in Medieval Europe: New Perspectives*, edited by Lisa M. Bitel and Felice Lifshitz, 34-51. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2008.

Otto of Freising and Rahewin. *The Deeds of Frederick Barbarossa*. Translated by Charles Christopher Mierow. New York: Columbia University Press, 1953.

–––. *Gesta Friderici Imperatoris*. The Latin Library. http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/ottofreising.html.

Pflueger, J.H.L. "On the English Translation of the 'Ludus De Antichristo.'" *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 44.1 (1945): 24-27.

Pizarro, Joaquín Martínez. *A Rhetoric of the Scene: Dramatic Narrative in the Early Middle Ages*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.

Plechl, Helmut, ed. *Die Tegernseer Briefsammlung des 12. Jahrhunderts*. In *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit* 2, 1-341. Hannover: Hahnsche Buchhandlung, 2002.

Plechl, Helmut. "Die Tegernseer Handschrift Clm 19411: Beschreibung und Inhalt." *Deutsches Archiv für Erforshung des Mittelalters* 18.2 (1962): 418-501.

Rauh, Horst Dieter. *Das Bild Des Antichrist Im Mittelalter: Von Tyconius Zum Deutschen Symbolismus*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1973.

Rosenwein, Barbara H. *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Rubin, Miri. *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

–––. *Gentile Tales: The Narrative Assault on Late Medieval Jews*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.

Rudick, Michael. "Theme, Structure, and Sacred Context in the Benediktbeuern 'Passion' Play." *Speculum* 49, no. 2 (April 1974): 267-86.

Schmid, Ulrich. "Tegernsee." *The Catholic Encyclopedia* 14. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1912. Accessed 10 January 2012. http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14471b.htm

Scott, Joan W. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *American Historical Review* 91, no. 5 (December 1986): 1053-75.

Simon, Eckehard, ed. *The Theatre of Medieval Europe: New Research in Early Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Suydam, Mary A., and Joanna E. Ziegler, eds. *Performance and Transformation: New Approaches to Late Medieval Spirituality*. New York: St. Martin's, 1999.

Symes, Carol. "The Appearance of Early Vernacular Plays: Forms, Functions, and the Future of Medieval Theater." *Speculum* 77, no. 3 (July 2002): 8778-831.

–––. *A Common Stage: Theater and Public Life in Medieval Arras*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007.

–––. "The Medieval Archive and the History of Theatre." *Theatre Survey* 51, no. 1 (May 2011): 29-58.

–––. "The Performance and Preservation of Medieval Latin Comedy." *European Medieval Drama* 7 (2003): 29-50.

Symes, Carol, trans. "The Play of Adam (Ordo representaciones Adæ)." In *The Broadview of Anthology of British Literature*. Unpublished manuscript.

Tierney, Brian. *The Crisis of Church and State 1050-1300*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Tegernseer Liebesgruß. Bayerishe Staatsbibliothek. Accessed 15 January 2012. http://www.bsb-muenchen.de/Tegernseer-Liebesgruss.2467.0.html.

Vollmann-Profe, Gisela, trans. *Ludus de Antichristo*. Göppingen: Kümmerle, 1981.

Ward, John O. "Rhetorical Theory and the Rise and Decline of 'Dictamen' in the Middle Ages and Early Renaissance." *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 19, No. 2 (Spring 2001): 175-223.

Warning, Rainer. *The Ambivalences of Medieval Religious Drama*. Translated by Steven Rendall. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.

Wolff, Luella M. "A Brief History of the Art of Dictamen: Medieval Origins of Business Letter Writing." *The Journal of Business Communication* 16.2 (1979): 3-11.

Wright, John, trans. *The Play of Antichrist*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1967.

Young, Karl. *The Drama of the Medieval Church*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.