

TEXTS IN PLAYS: THE CASE OF *MANKYNDE*

Pamela M. King

The subject of the 2011 *Medieval English Theatre* meeting, 'texts in plays' chimed well with aspects of Tiffany Stern's monograph, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (2009), which covers more broadly all the documents relating to performance in the Early Modern English playhouses. Stern points out that 'scrolls', the papers delivered onstage, such as letters, proclamations, bills, challenges, verses, itemised lists, songs, and epitaphs, take us nearer to a play as performed than any other section of the text.¹ Both on stage and on page they are a strange confusion of object, gesture, text, and para-text. So what are the questions we should ask about them? How are documents quoted in a play represented? How do material documents used in a play function as theatrical gestures? When we have a document in a play, to what extent is its physical character the generator of meaning like any other prop, or is it the content of that particular document that contributes meaning? Is it materiality or textuality or both that dominate? And do these texts always fulfil their potential to anchor nodes of meaning, themes, within the play as a whole, or is this a singular characteristic, as the following essay seeks to demonstrate, of *Mankynde*?

What Stern incidentally demonstrates is, of course, the very different nature of the textual traces we have of medieval plays, and the differences in theatrical practice that may reveal. The surviving early texts from the central canon — the York, N.Town, or Macro Plays, the corpus of Cornish plays, and individual 'non-cycle' and saints' plays — that survive in manuscript alone, are typically texts written after the event. This and their original playing circumstances present the scholar with none of the scattered papers written in advance of, and to inform, production, which now provide such a rich resource for the study of the productions of the early London playhouse. Moreover the Chester cycle and the Towneley collection are antiquarian documents even further removed in time from the actual performance of their content. Nonetheless, in that Stern's study draws attention to the likely existence of a complex textual environment surrounding the production of any play, it prompts interesting questions

about what evidence of discrete documentary material we can excavate from the books we have, about the possible nature of the ephemera that are lost, and about whether indeed Stern's categories are at all relevant to theatrical practice in the pre-print and pre-playhouse era.

As well as the approved 'book' and the actors' 'parts' about which so much has been written, Stern draws attention to a number of other papers that were part of a play. A playhouse play generated separate plot-scenarios and arguments.² Closest to these are the banns in *N.Town*, in *The Castle of Perseverance*, and the post-Reformation banns that were added to the Chester cycle. Although now read as prefaces to the script, at least the first two of these show every sign of having operated originally as separately-circulating entities, written as advance proclamations for prospective audiences, and akin to the modern programme. They are not, then, texts within plays at all, but precisely the opposite: separable texts that are now within the plays but originally were not.

Something similar may be said of prologues and epilogues, which Stern has found circulating in the era of the early playhouse as free-standing documents.³ In medieval plays, prologues and epilogues are apparently integral to the texts but are rhetorically distinct. Janet Ritch has written about their distinctive features,⁴ but what we don't know is whether they too circulated separately, although there is some circumstantial evidence that this may have been the case.⁵ The same may be said of interim entertainments, such as songs, dumb-shows and disguisings for which the separate directions may have been lost.⁶ In the one surviving Coventry playbook the songs are written on the final folios in different hands, and signed by the city waits Richard Stiff and Richard Sadler.⁷ There is every indication that those songs also led a separate life, as of course did the *Te Deum*, the *Magnificat*, and the other Latin liturgical insertions into the English texts. Certainly in the case of the liturgical items, and possibly in the case of the secular songs, these materials pre-existed the play text and thus brought to their performance in context a range of additional connotations of their own.

The evidence for other elements of plays developing separate lives is variable, and doubtless reflects the variety of different practices in the earlier period. Some individual pageants from Corpus Christi cycles were used as part of the celebrations laid on for visiting dignitaries in York and in Coventry. In a rather different fashion, David Klausner has suggested that *Wisdom* shows signs of having been conceived in a modular way, allowing for changes to suit different playing contexts,⁸ and we have direct

evidence of David Lyndsay's *Ane Satyre of the Thre Estaitis* being adapted in just this way in the versions played in Linlithgow, in Cupar, and in Edinburgh. What we don't know is whether, for example, the *sotties* or other elements from that long play were ever performed separately.

In the context of the civic street performance, or of performances by traveling troupes, we of course have no title-pages or playbills,⁹ and no back-stage plots,¹⁰ nor the call-sheets and props lists provided in the playhouse for stage hands that indicate which items of scenery and props are required where, when, and with whom. These documents, which may have had no equivalents in the early period, give the scholar of the Early Modern playhouse access to levels of detail in theatrical procedure that medievalists can only dream of. As the list grows we become aware of just how little access we have, comparatively, to any textual traces of how staging was formulated, and how the plays were shaped in the course of performance. The notes in the margins that accompany the Chester Herod's part are an inscrutable instance of this level of information that is rare indeed.¹¹

Stern's study begins with the bibliographical examination of these different documents as layers of the process of putting on a play, evidence of cuts, revisions, additions, staging decisions. She goes on, however, to ponder underlying issues to do with textual stability; the relationship between text, para-text, and memory; and the distinction between texts evidently designed to have an existence as reading material and those that are essentially theatrical. What Stern's work also does, however, is to throw into relief the difference between the textually-dependent Early Modern theatre, with its very short runs of new plays, and the seasonal theatre of the earlier period where many of these functions were the province of communal memory. The exception is the document shared by both categories, the 'scroll'.¹²

Scrolls are material props, but are also script, containing elements of an individual performer's part. In Early Modern printed plays they exist in two forms, as the paper the actor carried onto the stage, and as the written content of that paper integrated into the 'book'. In many books, Stern notes, the content of a scroll is copied out on a separate page and is reproduced not in the format of the play-text, but in the format of the document that the scroll performs or enacts. Hence all aspects of *mise en page* are used to make a letter look like a letter, a proclamation like a proclamation. This may be simply so that the scribe charged with making the scroll as prop has guidance as to what it should look like. The

apparent attention to levels of verisimilitude implied by this process, and by the character of the surviving scrolls, cannot, however, be accounted for purely by the need to have a letter carried on to the stage look like a letter, as in reality the audience is unlikely to have been able to see the detail. The actor could walk on with a blank piece of paper the right size, except that if the actor is performing someone reading, he might as well read, and thereby lessen the job of memorising his part. It seems, however, that playhouse scrolls took on a separate life of their own. Letters from plays circulated independent of their context, as exemplars, with nothing to mark them out from 'real' letters.¹³ The theatre that discovered a secondary market of people who wanted to read plays also seems to have found a secondary market for copies of these other para-texts. Scrolls are at once objects, gestures, and texts. Moreover this last of Stern's categories offers an approach to texts within plays in the manuscript tradition and, in the rest of this essay, to the case of *Mankynde*.

Mankynde is full of references to its own textuality, a play in which language is thematic. It is also a play in which there were clearly 'scrolls', but also one in which we can push the idea of the scroll as theatrical gesture in interesting directions. The most memorable one for the modern audience is probably the 'Crystemes songe' (332) in which the audience is invited to join 'with a mery chere' (334):

Yt ys wretyn with a coll, yt ys wretyn with a cole ...
 He þat schytyth with hys hoyll, he þat schytyth with hys hoyll ...
 But he wypppe hys ars clen, but he wypppe hys ars clen ...
 On hys breche yt xall be sen, on hys breche yt xall be sen ...
 Hoylyke, holyke, holyke. hoylyke, holyke, holyke! ¹⁴

Although this is generally played in modern reconstructions with a pull-down roller-blind device like the prompt for an audience song in an Edwardian pantomime, the only indication in the play that the song had any material textual presence on the set is the first line. 'Coll', also 'cole', and 'colle' is generally understood to be a variety of spellings for the modern *coal*, as in *charcoal* from Old English *col*, an ember (although the *Middle English Dictionary* gives *barrel* for 'colle' and 'coll', and *glue* or *size*, *ruse* or *trick*, or *cabbage* for 'cole' — none of which are, however, likely in this context). Charcoal sticks, best made from willow, were used throughout the Middle Ages for everything from artists' sketches to writing on, for example, barrels. It is, therefore, conceivable that the Vices had a wooden board on which Nought, who says each line first, wrote it, before

or while New Guise and Nowadays repeated it for the audience. This would work as a means of revealing the song one line at a time in the same way as the pull-down scroll does in the modern pantomime, and it would explain the first line of the song; but in the end this is pure speculation. The line 'Yt ys wreten with a coll' is, after all, metrically integral to the song, and has the status, therefore, of an allusion rather than a stage direction. We can only speculate too on whether the song enjoyed separate prior or posterior circulation outside the play.

A less arresting, but more evident use of a text on stage in the play is the writ written and blotted by Nought and delivered by Mischief. Mischief sets up a mock court. New Guise has suggested that Mischief record Mankind's name in his book, but Mischief instead asks Nowadays to make a proclamation (666), which he duly does. New Guise then takes Mankind's coat away to be modified, at which point Nought hands a document to Mischief:

Myscheff: Here ys *blottybus* in *blottis*,
 Blottorum blottibus istis:
I beschrew yowr erys, a fayer hande! 680–82

Nought defends himself by saying he would have done better had he known how, then Mischief proceeds:

Take hede, sers, yt stoude you on hande
Carici tenta generalis
 In a place þer goode ale ys
Anno regni regitalis
Edwardi nullateni
 On 3estern day in Feuerere — þe 3ere passyth fully,
 As Nought hath wrytyn; here ys owr Tulli,
Anno regni regis nulli! 686–93

This macaronic passage has been explored in detail by Jessica Brantley and Thomas Fulton,¹⁵ so what follows simply summarises their findings insofar as they are germane to the topic under consideration. The authors unpack this section of the play to demonstrate how it operates as political satire. Nought's writ begins with a bungled citation of a legal document. *Carici tenta* probably stands for *Curia tenta* ('the court having been held'), a formula used to initiate a manor roll, as both Nought's opening and the way he gives the date conform to formularies for this type of document. The formulae are, however, manipulated to contain their own parody.

The first line ends eccentrically in *generalis*, which suggests something like ‘the court of the people having been heard’, thus an inversion of the usual assertion of authority. Then the date is given as *Anno regni regnitalis | Edwardi nullateni*, again adapting the legal formula of stating the regnal year to designate Edward as king *nullateni*, that is ‘by no means’. As the authors conclude here, ‘although it is difficult to parse these deliberately obfuscatory lines, it is clear that they emphasize links between kingship and negation’.¹⁶

Brantley and Fulton further develop a detailed argument to connect this text, and therefore the whole play with 1470–71 when Edward IV was temporarily deposed. In autumn 1470, Edward fled to King’s Lynn to escape the alliance of the Earl of Warwick, Margaret of Anjou, and the Duke of Clarence. He returned to London only after the Yorkist victories at Barnet and Tewksbury the following spring. The period is known as the ‘readeption of Henry VI’, as Henry became titular monarch for the time, but chronicle evidence demonstrates that neither king had broad popular support and that the very institution of the monarchy had dangerously lost credibility. The uniqueness of the monarch was exposed by events as a sham, and Henry’s entry into London as the theatrical show of a puppet king. They further suggest that veiled criticism of the monarch fits well with the play’s association with Bury St Edmunds which had maintained strong Lancastrian connections throughout Edward’s reign. The court is to be held ‘per goode ale ys’, further parodying the formulae of authority.

The suggestion of absence or ineffectuality is further turned to inversion or self-deletion, as the writ’s author is Nought: ‘as Nought hath wrytyn’ carries the sense that the nothing writ belonging to no king, has been written by Nemo, a pervasive satirical character in the period based on the paradox of the activity that is no activity at all because it is carried out by nobody.¹⁷ However he manifests himself, Nemo is always an absent authority and opponent of the powerful. The writ device here protects the playwright, therefore, by a number of screens, criticising the king only at the remove of a document that is in the play but not part of the play, a statement from the pen of Nought and in the mouth of Mischief.

Nought is also associated parodically with Tully, that is Cicero, and Brantley and Fulton further suggest that this may allude to the very popular *De Officiis* in which Cicero expresses his republican sentiments warning *Nulla sancta societas | Nec fides regni est* (‘No sanctified fellowship, no faith, can exist with kings’).¹⁸ Reading outwards from the writ, therefore, we can begin to see how the play elsewhere and in a number of

ways critiques lordship — Tutivillus presents himself as *dominacium dominus*, lord of lords, and Nowadays encourages Mischief to get a *cape corpus*, a writ of arrest against a vagrant serf or criminal, and a *non est inventus*, the response written by the sheriff on the dorse of the writ charging him to arrest someone, if he has been unable to find him in his jurisdiction, demonstrating that the Vices are attempting to use those in authority, and the perverted legal system they administer, in order to abduct Mankind. Here it seems that an on-stage scroll acts as a material sign of a thematic strand within the play as a whole.

But there is a further twist concerning this embedded text. The section begins with the stage direction, 'Nought *scribit*' (672–3), in what Nowadays later describes as 'a goode rennyng fyst' (683), suggesting a cursive script. Whatever Nought conveyed on stage, however, the 'writ' within the manuscript version of *Mankind* is not set out on the page as a writ at all, although it takes a distinctive form. Its structure is audible to the audience, as the metre changes from that of the surrounding dialogue, and it is set out in the manuscript as a tail-rhyme lyric (three bracketed rhyming lines followed by an offset fourth line).¹⁹ Tail rhyme is the form common in lyrics of popular complaint at the end of the fifteenth century, so it seems possible, even likely, that Nought's writ, like a number of scrolls, could and did enjoy a separate existence, not as a simulated writ but as a political verse. It is a writ that is no writ, written badly with blots by nobody, underscored by the authority of a king that is no king, and although constructed according to the legal formulary of one type of authoritative document, constructed metrically, and written into the manuscript according to an identifiable pattern of discourse associated with political satire.

So what is to add? There is a further on-stage text, or scroll, that is both prop and text, that occurs early in the play, and which has not received the same attention as the previous two examples. As soon as Mercy leaves Mankind to withstand the Vices on his own, Mankind sits down and writes:

Her wyll I sytt, and tytyll in þis papyr
 The incomparable astat of my promycyon.
 Worschypfull souerence, I haue wretyn here
 The gloryuse remembrance of my nobyll condycyon,
 To haue remos and memory of mysylff: þus wretyn yt ys,
 To defende me from all superstycyus charmys:
 'Memento, homo, quod cinis es, et in cinerem reuerteris.'
 Lo, I ber on my bryst þe bagge of myn armys. (314–22)

Mankind decides to wear a paper on which is written a Lenten text (Job 34: 15) to defend him from what he calls 'charms'; but the so-called 'badge of his arms' itself comes into the category of a charm in that it is a text whose material existence is accorded apotropaic power. In order to distinguish this type of charm from writing designed to be incanted on the one hand, or the talisman on the other, such charms or 'writings worn on the body for protection' are more precisely referred to as 'written amulets'.²⁰ The Church was officially uneasy about involvement with the circulation of written amulets because of their affinity with practices associated with magic, but there is copious evidence that monks all across Western Europe and throughout the Middle Ages copied such texts into manuscripts, typically in margins or on flyleaves, for future reference and for further copying.²¹ A number found their way into household books, commonplace books, and other compendia of miscellanies owned by the laity, such as *The Commonplace Book of Robert Reynes of Acle*.²² Some of the charms in this book are clearly of the incantatory kind, punctuated by the crosses indicating the points during recitation at which the speaker should cross himself,²³ but others are the texts from written amulets, such as the charm against epilepsy headed 'ffor the Fallyng Euyll', *Benedicetur: sunt capta dum dicitur Ananizapta* ('Be blessed: they — i.e. bad things — are arrested when Ananizapta is said'), which Reynes' editor identifies as a very corrupt version of a charm that appears on a ring in the Waterton Collection in the Victoria and Albert Museum and which reads:

*Est mala mors capta dum dicitur Ananizapta
Ananizapta ferit illum qui laedere quaerit.*

'A bad death is arrested when *Ananizapta* is said;
Ananizapta strikes that which seeks to harm.'

Further, it seems that *Ananizapta* is itself an acrostic for *antidotum Nazareni auferat necem intoxicationis santificent alimenta pocula trinitatis alme* ('remedy of the Nazarene to remove the death by poison from our cups by the Holy Trinity').²⁴ In some instances, the copy of the charm was accompanied by written instructions on how to transfer it on to a textual amulet. 'Brief scriptural quotations could release the sacred power of passages written out in full', thus, as Skemer observes, uniting the oral and written tradition through the triggering of verbal memory.²⁵ This is surely the precise type of textual amulet implied in Mankind's charm.

'For some medieval people, charms would count as magic. Others would be hard pressed to distinguish between them and purely religious

prayers.²⁶ The official status of the textual amulet in ecclesiastical writings is always ambivalent. John Mirk, and Ranulf Higden, following William of Pagula, both warn against them, but this may be because of the danger of superstitious content entering into the formulae reproduced on the amulet rather than because of the practice itself.²⁷ Mankind's adoption of a written amulet consisting of unadulterated scriptural material would in all probability signify to an educated or ecclesiastical audience nothing more morally hazardous than his relative naivety, akin to John the carpenter in Chaucer's 'Miller's Tale' who recites his criss-cross prayer on finding Nicholas lying in what he understands to be a dead swoon brought on by dabbling in 'astromye'. In Mankind's case, however, that naivety of course turns out to be moral hazard enough.

Written amulets were at any rate common, and preserved for particular purposes. There is some evidence of people making whole collections of textual amulets covering a variety of eventualities from pregnancy to toothache, and keeping them bundled together.²⁸ I am irresistibly reminded of the Goon Show sketch in which Eccles has the time, eight o'clock, written on a piece of paper. A nice man wrote it down for him when he asked him the time, so he keeps it in case anyone asks him the time. Bluebottle asks him what he will do if someone asks him the time and it isn't eight o'clock. 'Then I won't show it to them', says Eccles.²⁹ Written amulets worked like that: the owner collected them either as texts written into a commonplace book or written out on scraps of parchment for wearing, and kept them until their content was appropriate for a particular circumstance in which they could be activated.

Mankind's charm is, oddly, never directly mentioned again, as his spade takes over as his sole weapon against the Vices, but the idea of the talismanic power of text is threaded through the play once we begin to look. Arguably it is established thematically by Mankind's gesture and by the written amulet as a prop, a theatrical scroll. If he continues to wear it, and there is no suggestion that he does not, it is still there when he is stripped of his coat by the Vices.

In this play it is well known that the spoken language of Mercy is perverted by the Vices. Arguably the specific subset of language that confers upon it the apotropaic powers of a charm is not only set up in Mankind's adoption of his textual amulet, but is also juxtaposed with the 'wrong' kind of charm invoked by Mischief. When the Vices have been routed on their first and failed attempt to corrupt Mankind, and hit with his spade, Mischief offers to cut off Nowadays' head in order to cure his

headache (433–5). This section clearly has an affinity with, and refers to, the quack doctor episodes in ‘folk’ play, such as appears in the *Croxton Play of the Sacrament*. Nought comments on the threat: ‘Wyll 3e off wyth hys hede. Yt ys a schreude charme!’ (436). A ‘shrewd charm’ can be read as referring to bad magic as opposed to the good magic of Mankind’s charm. This is clearly what theologians following William of Pagula inveighed against as *sortilegia*, that is the worst kind of superstitious para-theology.³⁰ Moreover the quack doctor routine immediately precedes the whistling that calls up Tutivillus, and when Tutivillus sends the Vices forth all over the county, they practise their neck-verse to avoid hanging. The neck verse is another charm. Once we begin to look, the idea of good and bad charms, and particularly of forms of words carrying apotropaic power, is threaded throughout the play.

To conclude this exploration there are some further, more speculative thoughts we might entertain on how this play materialises language on stage. At the climax of the action is Tutivillus the recording demon. Tutivillus’s long and complicated history is relatively well known.³¹ With his bag on his back, he collected up all the words uttered by church-chatterers, and all the syllables that slovenly priests omitted from the office. He was, therefore, associated with the sins of both saying too much and saying too little. The slovenly priest who did not understand his Latin grammar, and so omitted or slurred over the unstressed syllables that marked the inflectional endings, was guilty of syncope. Or the ignorant celebrant might omit whole elements, mistaking the rubric *et sequitur* for the liturgical element itself. The play *Mankynde*’s oppositional use of active and idle language, first explored by Paula Neuss, then by Janette Dillon, and lately by Charlotte Steenbrugge,³² has passed into critical commonplace, so is it not curious that Tutivillus is there in name alone, with none of his conventional attributes? Arguably his traditional associations are dispersed across the play and their action and focus is not Tutivillus, but, paradoxically, Mercy. Long before Tutivillus appears, New Guise taunts Mercy, ‘Ey, ey. yowr body ys full of Englysch Laten’ (124). Nowadays adds:

I prey yow hertyly, worschyppull clerke,
To haue þis Englysch mad in Laten:
‘I haue etun a dyschfull of curdys,
Ande I haue schetun yowr mowth full of turdys.’
Now opyn yowr sachell wyth Laten wordys
And sey me þis, in clerycall manere!

128–33

The tables are turned; it is Mercy, not Tutivillus, who has the satchel of Latin words. Latin — latinate English, dog Latin, and real Latin — are particularly associated with authority in the play. Dillon modified Neuss's argument by suggesting that the play satirises all discourses, including the latinate language of the Church — although Steenbrugge has lately sounded a more cautionary note.³³ It could be that the play's suspicion of the excessive use of Latin is objectified by Mercy's real or imagined satchel which ought to belong to Tutivillus, whose part may have been, and certainly can be, doubled with Mercy's. Towards the end of the play it becomes increasingly apparent that Mercy himself is a walking animate text. He is the satchel of doctrine, the human swear-box, as the quality of Mercy is reduced to a set of verbal procedures by which the individual sinner attains mercy, or, if you will, the Lenten preparation for the Day of Great Atonement.

Too many words or too few, good or bad language, is all reckoned by Mercy to be part of an accounting procedure. On the last day all will have to 'jelde yowr acownte' (177), yield a reason for every idle word (174) spoken in 'in derysyon | Of her owyn Chryste to hys dyshonur' (168–9). Words are weighed in the end, just as they are in 'The Pardoner's Tale' for the blaspheming rioters. Words are also a matter of quantity, of profit and loss, part of that holy form of double-entry book-keeping that Everyman has to understand at the end of that play. The yielding of the account is probably a dead metaphor in *Mankynde*, if not in *Everyman*, but the idea of words, of text, as ethically articulated quantity, runs through the whole play: 'Few wordys, few and well sett!' (102) is what Mercy commends, but he does not practise what he preaches in a play that objectifies and thematises its own competing textualities.

University of Bristol

NOTES

1. Tiffany Stern *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge University Press, 2009) 199.
2. Stern *Documents* 8–35.
3. Stern *Documents* 81–119.
4. K. Janet Ritch 'The Role of the Presenter in Medieval Drama' in 'Bring furth the pagants': *Essays in early English drama presented to Alexandra F. Johnston* edited

- David N. Klausner and Karen Sawyer Marsalek (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007) 230–70.
5. See for example, the ‘Cambridge Prologue’ and the ‘Rickinghall Fragment’ in *Non-Cycle Plays and Fragments* edited Norman Davis *EETS SS 1* (1970) 114, 117; and the ‘Durham Prologue’ and ‘Reynes Extracts’, the latter being a prologue and an epilogue, in *Early English Drama: an Anthology* edited John C. Coldewey (New York: Garland, 1993) 14–16; at 9–13.
 6. Stern *Documents* 120–73.
 7. The Coventry Corpus Christi Plays edited Pamela M. King and Clifford Davidson (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 2000) 54.
 8. David N. Klausner ‘The Modular Structure of Wisdom’ in ‘Bring furth the pagants’ 181–96.
 9. Stern *Documents* 36–62.
 10. Stern *Documents* 201–31.
 11. Peter Meredith ‘Stage Directions and the Editing of Early English Drama’ in *Editing Early English Drama: Special Problems and New Directions* edited Alexandra F. Johnston (New York: AMS Press, 1987) 65–94.
 12. Stern *Documents* 174–200.
 13. In ‘Exchanging Performative Words: Epistolary Performance and University Drama in Late Medieval England’ *METH* 32 (2010) 12–25, Thomas Meacham argues that the practice of formal epistolary rhetoric was itself a kind of performance, and records instances of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century letters designed for festive enactment used as pedagogic exemplars (16).
 14. *Mankynde* in *The Macro Plays* edited Mark Eccles *EETS* 262 (1969) 153–84; quotation lines 335–43. All references to the play are to this edition.
 15. Jessica Brantley and Thomas Fulton ‘Mankind in a Year without Kings’ *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 36:2 (2006) 321–54.
 16. Brantley and Fulton ‘Mankind’ 330.
 17. Brantley and Fulton ‘Mankind’ 331–8.
 18. Brantley and Fulton ‘Mankind’ 338–40.
 19. Brantley and Fulton ‘Mankind’ 329.
 20. Don C. Skemer *Binding Words: Textual Amulets in the Middle Ages* (University Park, PA: Penn State Press, 2006) 18.
 21. Skemer *Binding Words* 76.
 22. *The Commonplace Book of Robert Reynes of Acle: An Edition of Tanner MS 407* edited Cameron Louis (New York and London: Garland, 1980).

23. For example the lengthy charm for the fever: Reynes *Commonplace Book* edited Louis 167.
24. Reynes *Commonplace Book* edited Louis 242 and 443–4.
25. Skemer *Binding Words* 83.
26. Richard Kieckhefer *Magic in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge UP, 2000) 75.
27. See *Instructions for Parish Priests* by John Myrc edited Edward Peacock EETS OS 31 (1868) 12. For the relevant sections of Higden's *Speculum curatorum* and William of Pagula's *Oculis Sacerdotis*, see G.R. Owst 'Sortilegium in English Homiletic Literature of the Fourteenth Century' in *Studies presented to Sir Hilary Jenkinson* edited J.C. Davies (London: Oxford UP, 1957) 272–303.
28. Skemer *Binding Words* 167.
29. In 'The Mysterious Punch-Up-The-Conker'; *The Goon Show* Series 7, Episode 19; first broadcast 7th February 1957. Script by Spike Milligan and Larry Stephens, produced by Pat Dixon. Excerpt online (accessed 24.01.2013) at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:What_time_is_it_Eccles.ogg
30. See Owst 'Sortilegium' 272–303.
31. Margaret Jennings 'Tutivillus: The Literary Career of the Recording Demon' *Studies in Philology* 74 (1977) 1–95, at 18–19.
32. Paula Neuss 'Active and Idle Language: Dramatic Images in *Mankind*' in *Medieval Drama* edited Neville Denny (London: Edward Arnold, 1973) 41–67; Janette Dillon 'Mankind and the Politics of "English Laten"' *Medievalia et Humanistica* 20 (1994) 41–64, Charlotte Steenbrugge, 'O, yowr louely wordys': Latin and Latinate Diction in *Mankind* 'METH 31 (2009) 28–57.
33. Dillon 'Mankind and the Politics' *passim*, and Steenbrugge 'O, yowr louely wordys' *passim*.