

NEQUE VOX NEQUE SENSUS:
The Resuscitation of Wit in *Wit and Science*

Meg Twycross

About thirteen minutes into John Redford's *Play of Wit and Science*¹ the hero (Wit) is killed. This is not usual in any narrative: even in tragedy, the death of the hero is usually postponed until at least the penultimate scene. Here the club of the giant Tediousness potentially brings proceedings to an abrupt end. All is not lost, however: enter, with a song, a helpful young woman and her three companions (Honest Recreation, with Comfort, Quickness, and Strength), who bring him back to life to fight again.

This death and resuscitation has caused a good deal of interest, but not because it is a striking *coup de théâtre*. In 1933, E.K. Chambers decided that it might have echoed 'the Mock Death and Cure' of the traditional Hero/Combat Mummers' Play.² He mentions the episode only in passing, as possible evidence for the pre-existence of this Play in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, though its earliest written records date only from the mid-eighteenth.³ But as is the way with scholarship, when later writers took it up, it became a circular argument: because the episode might be a copy of a similar episode in the Mummers' Play, it suggests that the Mummers' Play existed in the 1530s and 40s; then (a familiar leap forward) because the Mummers' Play has thus been proved to have existed in the 1530s and 40s, *Wit and Science* must have drawn on it.

Chambers was building on the work of Charles Read Baskervill, who made the connection in 1924, though his main interest was in the mummers' Wooing Play:

Festival customs of the folk affected English drama greatly even after the forces of the Renaissance were tending to divorce it from the merely popular and ephemeral and give it a truly literary character. The renouveau [*death and resurrection*], for example, is reflected in a series of related morality plays — Redford's *Wyt and Science*, *The Marriage of Wit and Science*, and *The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom* — in which Wit is slain by Tediousness and is revived.⁴

Baskervill repeated this, with further perceived parallels, in his 1927 paper on 'Conventional Features of Medwall's *Fulgens and Lucrez*', offering the explanation 'Redford seems to have adapted folk Christmas plays in some

scenes of *Wyt and Science*, perhaps because such material would please boys who were familiar with it'.⁵

This is not the place to pursue in detail the larger topic of the rise and fall of the theories of ritual drama in Britain, and of the antiquity of the Mummings' Play.⁶ It is now accepted that there could be alternative explanations for the similarities between the motifs and stock characters which were, in the mid twentieth century, routinely cited by some writers as evidence of the 'ritual origins' of the more conventional stage.

In fact, Chambers is much more cautious about direct links between *Wit and Science* and the Mummings' Play than is usually assumed. However, with his weight behind it, it became part of accepted scholarly tradition,⁷ even though the scholars who cite it do not always seem to know quite what to do with it. The 'popular appeal' theory was a favourite; Arthur Brown, the editor of *The Marriage of Wit and Science*, said in 1952 that 'there was a very long tradition of a character being brought back to life in the folk play and it is clear that Redford was making use of this fund of folklore to make his moral play more attractive to the rougher element in his audience'.⁸ Others, like Richard Axton,⁹ and more recently, Victor Scherb,¹⁰ see an implied contrast between the school/court drama and the folk play, with the latter introducing a disruptive, possibly sub-Bakhtinian, element.

This theory seems to have been so satisfying that it blocked off speculation about other possible cultural references, or even sources, for this unexpected turn of events in the plot. It is of course perfectly possible that Redford made it up out of whole cloth because his allegory demanded it. Strictly speaking, Wit is the human intelligence. Over-reaching itself by too much undirected academic effort, it ceases to function: as we might say, the student becomes 'brain dead'. So 'Wyt fallyth downe and dyeth'.

In real terms, of course, the student's intelligence has not been terminated, it has merely gone dormant. It can be revived by some timely recreation ('re-creation', as the etymology points out, the 'action or process of creating again or anew').¹¹ The fun here lies in the clash of apparent referents: what is impossible for a human being is possible — if we take an exaggerated metaphor at face value — for an allegorised human faculty. But because in theatre the faculty is impersonated by a human actor, we always see it as, in part, the human being in whom the faculty is being deployed. So Wit is seen not just as a function of the brain, but as a student using his brain — A.P. Rossiter called him 'a nice young

freshman¹² — and we are apparently faced, onstage, with a human death and resurrection. Which is impossible. Or is it?

Perhaps the hunch that it was suggested to Redford by something other than ritual drama is worth following up. I came across a possibility completely by accident. I was trying, in another paper,¹³ to make a tentative point about the lack of Latin in the play, to demonstrate a possible difference between a play written for grammar-school boys or undergraduates, and a play written for choirboys. There are only two Latin phrases in the whole play. One is *mons Pernassus* (949). The other is somewhat more enigmatic.

When Wit has been revived by his four saviours, he succumbs to insensibility again. This time, instead of being bludgeoned by the club of the giant Tediousness, he collapses with exhaustion after too much honest recreation. He has danced himself to a standstill, and falls thankfully into the lap of an accommodating female called Idleness. Honest Recreation is horrified — ‘Yt ys an harlot, may ye not see?’ (337) — and after an exchange of views she departs. By this time, Wit has passed out. Idleness, who has not altogether friendly plans for him, tests his degree of insensibility: ‘*Neque vox neque sensus*, byr lady’ (428), she remarks approvingly.¹⁴ For some reason nobody seems to have looked up the source of this quotation, though all the editors dutifully translate it ‘neither voice nor feeling’. It seemed to me to be unlikely to be literary, at least not from classical literature. Instead, I went to my *Concordance to the Vulgate*. It turned out to be unexpectedly germane.

The original phrase is in fact *non erat vox neque sensus*. It comes from 4 Kings 4:31 (Vulgate: AV 2 Kings 4:31), the story of Elisha’s revival of the Shunamite’s son. This woman had been very hospitable to the prophet, even to reserving him a permanent guest-room in her house. In gratitude, Elisha enquired tactfully for something he could do for her. It was suggested to him that since she was childless, and her husband was old, the prophet might intercede with God to give her a son. This miracle duly happened. Then after a few years, when the child was grown, and had gone out to the fields reaping with his father, he collapsed with an acute headache, and died in his mother’s lap a few hours later. (Perhaps it is another crumb of evidence for Redford’s use of the story that the boy had said to his father ‘My head acheth, my head acheth’ (4 Kings 4: 19)¹⁵ before being taken home to die: Study’s *leitmotif*, ‘My head acheth sore’.) She laid him in the guest room on the bed, shut the door, and went to

summon the prophet. He sent his servant Giezi (Gehazi) in advance with his prophet's staff and instructions to lay it upon the child's face:

*31 Giezi autem praecesserat ante eos et posuerat baculum super faciem
pueri et non erat vox neque sensus
reuersusque est in occursum eius et nuntiavit ei dicens non surrexit puer.*

Gehezi went before them, and layd the staffe vpon the face of the chylde, But *there was neyther voyce nor any felynge*. Wherefore he wente agayne to mete hym [Elisha], and tolde hym, saynge: the chylde is not awaked.¹⁶

Elisha came in person, and 'beholde, the childe was deade & layde vpon his¹⁷ bed'.

*33 ingressusque clusit ostium super se et puerum
et oravit ad Dominum
34 et ascendit et incubuit super puerum posuitque os suum super os eius
et oculos suos super oculus eius
et manus suas super manus eius
et incurvavit se super eum et calefacta est caro pueri
35 at ille reversus deambulavit in domo semel huc et illuc
et ascendit et incubuit super eum
et oscitavit puer septies aperuitque oculos ...*

He wente in therfore, and shut the dore to the lad and hym, and prayed vnto the Lorde. And went vp and lay vpon the lad, and put his mouth vpon his mouth, & his eyes vpon his eyes, and his handes vpon his handes, and when he so lay vpon the chylde, the flesshe of the chylde waxed warme. And he went agayne, and walked once vp and downe in the house, and then went vp, and layde hym selfe vpon hym agayne. And then the chylde nesesd [sneezed]¹⁸ seuen tymes and opened his eyes ...

This is so detailed and physical that it gives the impression of being a medical rather than a magical procedure (though probably we should not draw a distinction).¹⁹ It has indeed been claimed as the earliest-ever account of cardiopulmonary resuscitation (CPR).²⁰ Because the patient is a child, possibly quite a small child, the mere weight of the adult together with the movement of his chest and probably his administration of 'rescue breaths' (what used to be called 'artificial respiration' or 'the kiss of life') — '[he] put his mouth vpon his mouth' — could combine the necessary chest

compressions with aeration of the lungs to kick his stalled system into starting up again spontaneously.

The warming process stressed in the account was probably necessary because the child's system had gone into peripheral cardiovascular shutdown to preserve his core functions: in layman's terms, all the blood had retreated from his extremities to feed the vital organs of heart, brain, kidneys, and lungs. Their action could however have been imperceptible to an observer: consequently he was cold and to all appearances lifeless. This warming process is used nowadays in cases of drowning in very cold water, but also and most frequently in the revival of the newly born, both human and animal.

I do not and never will have sufficient medical knowledge to assess the various diagnoses offered by medical historians as to what was actually wrong with the child. Suggestions have ranged from sunstroke (which would originally have raised his temperature and caused the headache, but might have led to secondary hypothermia) to a sub-arachnoid haemorrhage, to meningitis; to which a medical friend adds the possibility of snake- or insect-bite and, since the child had gone out into the fields with the reapers (*ad messorum* 4 Kings 4:18), ergotism.²¹ The important thing here is that both medical historians and biblical scholars²² assume that the tale of 'Elisha's child' is at base a true story, and the treatment, however it may have been perceived by the practitioner, a genuine and recognisable one.

In fact Elisha was not the first Old Testament prophet to use this technique: his mentor Elijah had resuscitated the son of the woman of Sarephtha (Vulgate 3 Kings 17:17–24) in the same way, though it is not reported in such detail. Again, the child apparently dies (*non remaneret in eo halitus*, 'there was no breath left in him' v.17), the prophet takes him up to his room and lays him out on his bed, and this time 'stretched him selfe vpon the chylde thre tymes' (*expandit se atque mensus est super puerum tribus vicibus* v.21), and the child's soul (his *anima*) comes back to him. The stress on breath (*halitus*) and soul (*anima*) is more marked here, and probably reflects the thinking of the time. John Tercier, speaking of Elisha, stresses the age-old association of breath, and indeed air, with life, and that the 'exchange of breath has as much to do with the primitive needs of the psyche at the deathbed as it has to do with oxygenating the blood'. He points out that God is said to have animated Adam by breathing 'into his nostrils the breath of life'; *et factus est homo in animam viventem* (Genesis 2:7).²³ John A. Paraskos shows how there are in fact variant readings of

the details of the procedures followed by both Elijah and Elisha, depending on the textual history of the translations.²⁴ There are versions of both episodes which read 'he breathed' or 'blew into' the child, instead of 'stretched himself over' him. The Vulgate *oscitavit* should actually be translated 'yawned' or 'gaped', implying a sudden intake of air.²⁵

Redford should have been familiar with both the Elisha and the Elijah stories, because he was not only the Master of the Choristers at St Paul's Cathedral in the 1530s and 40s, but also a singing man in the choir, and professionally must have known the pre-Reformation liturgy like the back of his hand. The Elisha episode occurs in the Sarum Missal as the Lesson for the Thursday after *Laetare* (the fourth week in Lent); in the Gospel, John 5:17–29, Christ alludes to the Resurrection of the Dead.²⁶ The following day, the Lesson is the story of Elijah's revival of the son of the woman of Sarephtha, and the Gospel is the Raising of Lazarus, John 11:1–45.²⁷

Both stories were pressed into service in typological works to foreshadow the miracles of Christ. In the *Biblia pauperum* the two stories, illustrated, are types of the Raising of Lazarus.²⁸ Both victims are shown as quite small children. The illustrator of the woodcut version, however, is not very precise: Elisha's patient is shown on a bed and it is not clear exactly what the prophet is doing; while Elijah's is lying on the ground, apparently outside, and the prophet is merely praying over him. The manuscript illustrator of British Library King's MS 5 (folio 8^F) is much closer to the biblical account: Elisha leans over the child, pressing down on his hands, and appears to be about to lower himself down so that his mouth is 'upon his mouth, and his eyes upon his eyes'. Both these artists show an anxious audience, despite the prophets' tacit insistence that they be left alone. Further back in time, *Pictor in carmine* presents Elijah reviving the son of the widow of Sarephtha as a type of Christ raising the widow's son at Nain (Luke 7:11–15), and Elisha raising the Shunamite's son as a type of Christ raising Jairus' daughter (Mark 5:22–4, 35–42; Matthew 8:18–19, 23–5; Luke 8:40–42, 49–55).²⁹

Redford would have known the Elisha story from the liturgy, and possibly also from the pictorial tradition: but did it perhaps strike even closer to home? As housemaster of the St Paul's choirboys, might he have empathised with tales of the sudden death of children? Had he perhaps experienced it himself among his pupils? Had he even witnessed or even taken part in a resuscitation attempt?

It is not possible to say whether or not he, in the 1530s or 40s, would have recognised Elisha's activity as CPR — certainly not under that name or as that particular procedure, as it was only formalised in the late 1950s, and recommended for lifesavers between 1958 and 1961.³⁰ Different aspects of the process might however have been recognisable. Here we come up against the problem of written evidence. It is my impression that certain procedures may well have been in use even though they are not mentioned in the medical literature, purely because they did not fit into the schemes according to which classical and medieval textbooks were written; or possibly because they were part of pragmatic 'folk' medicine rather than professional practice. Our evidence for them turns up anecdotally in a completely different kind of literature, under the guise of miracles. For example, the re-warming procedure in resuscitation was apparently known: in the *Legenda Aurea* St Julian the Hospitaller is recorded as using it to recover a case of hypothermia.³¹ However, it first turns up in the medical literature later, in the seventeenth century.³² The earliest detailed record of its clinical use in England is of the resuscitation of Anne Green, who was hanged for infanticide at Oxford Castle in December 1650, and was then discovered to be still alive by the university anatomists who were about to dissect her.³³ But the description, which is highly detailed and includes active internal as well as external re-warming, suggests that they were following a well-known and accepted procedure.

As for mouth-to-mouth resuscitation, Hebrew and medieval midwives are said to have blown into the mouths of newly-delivered infants, as farmers do into the noses of lambs. The physician Paolo Bagellardo recommends this in his *Libellus de egritudinibus puerorum* (1472).³⁴ Other forms of artificial respiration were attempted experimentally: in the 1540s Vesalius described the use of bellows to keep animals alive during vivisection, and it is said that in the 1530s Paracelsus tried, unsuccessfully, to resuscitate a corpse using the same technique.³⁵ Again, however, the official literature seems to lag behind: the earliest full medical account in Britain of a successful mouth-to-mouth resuscitation is from 1732, by William Tossach, a Scottish surgeon who worked on a man who was overcome by smoke and fumes in a mining disaster at Alloa.³⁶ It was not until 1774 that the [Royal] Humane Society promoted systematic resuscitation of the drowned, strangled, and suffocated.³⁷

Nonetheless, they recur frequently in hagiographical literature. The mention of Christ's resuscitation miracles should remind us that such stories are by no means uncommon in the New Testament. Christ raised

Lazarus, Jairus's daughter, and the widow's son from Nain. Peter raised Tabitha (a.k.a. Dorcas: Acts 9:36), and Paul revived Eutychus, a young man who had fallen from a third-floor window (Acts 20:9–12). Outside the Scriptures, they are a regular occurrence in the lives of the saints. This is not surprising, as Christ sent out the apostles with the command, 'Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, *raise the dead*, cast out devils' (Matt 10:8). In the apocryphal gospels, Paul, Peter, Thomas, Philip, and John stack up an impressive tally of resurrections.³⁸ It becomes a prerequisite in a particular type of saint's life.³⁹

As hagiography becomes more formulaic, less is said about how these miracles were performed. Most of the details of the cure are stripped out: it is all done by the power of prayer. Some of the earlier lives, however, sound as if they are trying to tell of an actual event in a reporterly way. In Sulpicius Severus' *Life of St Martin* (c. 400), the saint emulates Elisha almost exactly. A young man had put himself under Martin's instruction as a catechumen, but while Martin was away for three days, he suddenly fell ill and died. Martin arrived to find them laying out the body:

*Tum vero sanctum Spiritum tota mente concipiens, egredi cellulam, in qua corpus jacebat, ceteros jubet; ac foribus obseratis super exanimata defuncti fratris membra presternitur: et cum aliquandiu orationi incubuisset, sensissetque per spiritum Domini adesse virtutem, erectus paululum, et in defuncti ora defixus, orationis suae ac misericordiae Domini intrepidus expectabat eventum: vixque duarum fere horarum spatium intercesserat, vidit defunctum paulatim membris omnibus commoveri, et laxatis in usum videndi palpitare luminibus.*⁴⁰

Then drawing in the Holy Spirit with his whole mind, he ordered the others out of the cell in which the body lay, and having bolted the doors, he stretched himself out upon the lifeless limbs of the deceased brother, and when he had lain on top⁴¹ [of him] for some time in prayer, and had felt through the spirit of the Lord that there was some *virtus*⁴² present; rising up for a short space, and fastening on the features of the deceased, he fearlessly awaited the outcome of his prayer and of the mercy of the Lord. He had interceded for the space of scarcely two hours, when he saw the dead man move a little in all his limbs, and flutter his opened eyes in order to see.

The revived catechumen instantly sought baptism, and lived for several years after. Here there is more concentration on the power of prayer, and perhaps on the transference of *mana/virtus*, and less on mouth-to-mouth

resuscitation,⁴³ but it is a remarkably similar story. In his next miracle, St Martin revives a hanged suicide in much the same way.

Despite the stylisation which is a feature of hagiography, a high proportion of these resuscitations are plausible. Many of them cover precisely the kind of crises, involving anoxia and/or cardiac arrest, which the Royal Humane Society was founded in the later eighteenth century to deal with. They could be imposing a stylistic template on real-life events. Skimming through the *Legenda Aurea*, we find drowning (St Andrew, St Nicholas, St Martha, St Peter Martyr, St Dominic, St Clement, and St Elizabeth of Hungary, who seems to have made this her speciality); strangling and hanging (St Martin, St Nicholas, and St Elizabeth again), choking due to a fishbone in the throat (St Blaise); being crushed by masonry (St Benedict and St Dominic) and in road traffic accidents (St Stephen, St Dominic); falls from high windows (St Paul twice, St Peter Martyr); and poisoning (St John the Evangelist, St Giles).⁴⁴ Some of these are miracles after the death of the saint, but this merely means that the hands-on action was by somebody else. It was apparently acknowledged that these had something in common: Guy de Chauliac treats of falls, drowning, and suffocation in the same passage;⁴⁵ in *The Knight's Tale*, Chaucer classifies them as disasters under the aegis of the planet Saturn.⁴⁶

Besides these there are many where the saint raises those who have died from unspecified causes, or is merely said to have done this as part of the standard apostolic list: 'the blind saw, the deaf heard, the lame walked, the dead were brought back to life' (*caecis visus, surdis auditus, claudis gressus, vita mortuis restituta sunt*).⁴⁷ For the saints, effecting resurrection was nothing new: it was part of their stock in trade.

Honest Recreation is no saint, and *Wit and Science* is not hagiography. It could be argued that the saint's life is such a different genre, and (possibly) so sacrosanct that Redford would never have thought of drawing on it. It certainly seems unlikely that the parallels have any thematic significance. Their narrative pattern is a different matter. The very fact of their existence might have created a climate of acceptance — like the one postulated for the Hero/Combat Play by the supporters of the folk-play theory, but more realistic. One has to remember that in the saint's lives it is presented as miraculous, but fact. The way in which Redford treats it makes it surprising, but not as deliberately fantastic as the Mummer's Play *renouveau*. (Interestingly, considering the conspicuously fairy-tale cast of the overall plot, this resurrection has nothing in common with returns

from the dead in the romance.)⁴⁸ Part of this is due to the practical deliberation with which the rescuers set about reviving him.

Not of course that Wit is hypothermic, drowned, or strangled. If anything, he is probably concussed, given Tedioussness' enthusiasm for beating his victims over the head: 'Pash hed! Pash brayne!' (185). He does rather suggest that he might be about to decapitate Wit: 'Of goth thy hed | At the fyrst blow!' (190–191), but that would be difficult, though not impossible, to stage-manage. (Even Wit's final decapitation of Tedioussness happens off stage.)⁴⁹ The giant's victim is left lying there senseless, presumed dead.

Redford does not present the resuscitation of Wit as a fully-fledged clinical procedure. Honest Recreation and her companions sing him back to life. But they do this in a pattern which suggests that Redford might well be thinking of Elisha's therapeutic methods. Elisha 'put his mouth vpon his mouth, & his eyes vpon his eyes, and his handes vpon his handes'. Honest Recreation and her team appeal to two out of the three; because they are not, presumably, attempting mouth-to-mouth resuscitation, but aural stimulus, 'ear' is substituted for 'mouth'.

Wit's four rescuers start off by recommending a general principle to the audience:

When travelles grete in matters thycke
 Have duld your wyttes and made them sycke,
 What medson then your wyttes to quycke?
 Yf ye wyll know, the best phisycke
 Is to geve place to Honest Recreacion ... 225–9

So far so pharmaceutical; the allusion to 'medicine' may sound rather like the bottled cure-all of the Quack Doctor in the putative Mummers Play. But Honest Recreation does not administer a physical potion — 'Come, Jack, take a little of my flip-flop' — and Wit does not immediately leap to his feet magically restored. It is a slow process, and their methods are a mix of allegorical action and practical-sounding techniques.

Note that they are concerned with reviving his wits: but which ones? His inner intellectual wits, imagination, reason, and memory, which he would need for the learning process (so allegorical), or his exterior wits, 'Seynge in ye iyen / Smellynge in ye nose / Tastyge in ye tonge / Herynge in ye eares / & Fylynge [*feeling*] ouerall ye body',⁵⁰ which he needs for the plot? It is left nicely ambiguous. In this stanza, for the sake of the allegory, we could read them as being the inner faculties. Plot-wise, by the time we

get into the revival proper they are definitely the external senses. This is however an artificial distinction: according to medical theory, they were all physically connected to and in the brain, ‘there be wayes from the one to ye other / to the tent that ye spirytis may haue theyr fre course from one to another’,⁵¹ and to revive the one might lead to reviving the others. There is a possibility that by selecting the ears (hearing) and the eyes (sight), Redford is alluding to the observation that these two faculties are the gates of memory, the key faculty in learning.⁵² There were various ranking systems in operation.⁵³ Most handbooks, however, stress that all forms of sense-perception have a part to play in the process.

As far as one can tell, narrative practicality now takes over from detailed allegory. The sequence has a certain hands-on feel: one wonders if Redford had come into contact with it as part of his work as Cathedral Almoner and Master of the Choirboys.⁵⁴ The team locate their patient, and swing into action. The process feels very familiar, though if we compare it with modern methods, it is more like a recovery-room medic monitoring the patient’s return to consciousness from anaesthesia, or a first-aider working on someone who has fainted, than a full-blown resuscitation procedure. An early-sixteenth-century handbook of surgery (Jerome of Brunswick) explains ‘Howe you shal helpen hym that is fallen or betyn’, initially by checking for vital signs:

it is needly to serche / if he be deed or alyue / whych ye shal knowe
by felynge the pulse / callyng hym / & pullyng hym by the eeres
[ears? hairs?]/ and take fyne tow / or kemyd wolle [combed wool] /
and holde it at his mouth / & afore his nose holys and so shall ye
see yf the wynde come out or not.

If you see any sign of chest movement, you should then make him sneeze with pepper and euphorbium (spurge — could be dangerous in unskilled hands), rub his limbs with vinegar and herb of grace (rue — also to be treated with caution), bleed him, then when he has come to himself, bleed him again, and administer the appropriate glyster (enema).⁵⁵ Chauliac, from which this is adapted, concludes, ‘If he be dede forsothe, touche hym nocht, but go fro hym, and leue hym in pece’.⁵⁶

One can see why much of the resuscitation procedure recommended in this second part would be unsuitable on stage. Honest Recreation’s team make selective use of the traditional stimuli, bringing him round gently but in a recognisable order. They start by calling his name: ‘O Wyt, how doest thou? Looke up, man!’ (234), and repeating it several times (235, 238, 250).

This is still usual practice: our brains are hardwired to recognise and respond to our own name, which is probably the first thing we learn. It is also such a natural reaction in concerned bystanders that we hardly need to look for early written examples to back it up: to take a case at random, when Thurkill's soul had gone on its tour of Purgatory with St Julian, leaving his body at home in bed, his wife attempted to rouse him *cum clamosa voce ... nomen eius crebro ingeminans* ('with a very loud voice ... frequently repeating his name') and shaking him violently.⁵⁷

The team then monitor the return of his senses, each referred to, as in the story of Elisha, by the relevant organ. First they concentrate on his hearing: 'Gyve an eare, o Wyt, now we thee pray / Gyve eare to that we syng and say' (638–9). This is a familiar order of proceeding: patients can often hear what is going on around them even when they appear to be still unconscious. The song also possibly stimulates a different area of his brain that responds to music as opposed to speech. But at the period, it is more likely that the singing was perceived as working its well-known curative effects: 'by swete songes of armonye and acorde of musyke, sicke men and frantyeke come ofte to theyr wytte ayene and helthe of bodye'.⁵⁸ According to contemporary theory, music and physic both work to restore man's innate harmony. Stephen Hawes, whose *Pastime of Pleasure* may have been a direct source for *Wit and Science*, maintains that also helps the brain:

And musyke selfe it is melodyous
 To reioyce the yeres [ears] / and confort the brayne
 Sharpynge the wyttes / with sounde solacyous ...
 It is good recreacyon / after study.⁵⁹ 1576–82

They then move on to his sight: 'now gyve an eye' (Glasgow Coma Scale 3: 'Opens eyes in response to voice'), checking that he can make sense of what he sees; 'Behold thy freendes abowte the lye' (244). In a return to consciousness, vision is likely to return some time after hearing, just as it may go just before you faint ('black-out'). He is clearly emerging from deep unconsciousness, as they have moved onto the level of issuing commands to check if he can respond to them voluntarily: 'Gyve an eare', 'gyve an eye'.

With his eyes open and focussed, next comes his touch/feeling, and again a command inviting a physical response: 'Gyve a hand, O Wyt, feele that ye see' (250). Though the organs of touch are situated all over the body, it is popularly associated with the hands, being translated into English as 'þe wit of groping'.⁶⁰ Here they ask him to 'feel' each of them in

turn: ‘Recreacion feele; feele Comfort fre, | Feele Quicknes here, feale Strength to the’ (251–2). On the allegorical level he is being made aware of the psychological influx of these qualities (one after the other in a causal sequence?); on the medical level, he is being asked to offer his hand to each one in turn to show that he is capable physically of obeying a command. They might be rubbing them with various stimulants, as prescribed by the handbooks, though presumably not seizing the opportunity to push pins under his fingernails, which was also recommended; but again, it sounds more as if they are encouraging Wit to fit his various perceptions together (‘feel that ye see’) into a coherent consciousness (his ‘common sense’). At each stage, as recommended today, they reassure him (one of the paramedics is Comfort): they point out that they bring help (233, 240), that they are his friends (244), and that what they are doing will make him feel better (‘for thy consolacion’ as a refrain); and they familiarise him with their names (245–6, 251–2), which also identify them to the audience.

Finally they decide he has recovered his senses sufficiently to be lifted back onto his feet again. This is possibly clinically premature, but the resuscitated subjects in saints’ lives tend to walk sheepishly out of the death chamber behind the saint to bear witness to the miracle, as St Peter roused Dorcas to lift her up and present her alive to ‘the saints and widows’ (Acts 9:41). They have succeeded in restoring Wit to his wits, or at least overtly to the three which are most relevant to honest recreation and, at second hand, to learning. Smell and taste might be a bit suspect in this context, so no hartshorn or aqua vitae, or even sternutatory pepper.

At this point some critics have been tempted to identify Honest Recreation theatrically with the Quack Doctor.⁶¹ Even if we shake off the image of the eighteenth-century Doctor of the Mummers Play, here is surely another promising contemporary candidate, both in real life and as a theatrical stereotype?

There were in the Middle Ages real itinerant medical practitioners with a dubious reputation, male and female, who specialised in selling medicines, pulling teeth, and treating a range of ailments. They were later to be labelled *quacksalvers*, *moudebanks*, and *charlatans*.⁶² They moved from town to town, set up their stalls, stages, or benches (hence *moudebank*, literally ‘climb on a bench’), and attracted attention with a market trader’s patter (*ciarlatani* — ‘those with the gift of the gab’), and other theatrical tricks. Poets and playwrights were intrigued and impressed by their rhetorical skills, and tried their hand at creating their own

versions. They thus become literary and theatrical stock characters, admiration at their verbal expertise tempered with distancing satire about the extravagance of their claims and the lethal effects of their cures.⁶³ One of their earliest theatrical manifestations was as the *unguentarius* of the liturgical *Quem Quaeritis* plays.

Two things might link Honest Recreation with this figure, either in real life or in theatre. The first is her association with music. She enters with her assistants singing. Mountebanks, says the Jesuit John Rastell (no relation), writing in Leuven in 1566, ‘do either by Singing, or plaieng vpon Instrumentes, so hold the people in the meane tymes, whiles they looke for their merchantes [*customers*], that for theyr fitte of mirth onely, they are worthy of somewhat’. In fact, says Rastell, the civic worthies think the entertainment they provide is itself therapeutic: it ‘doth a farthing worth of good, at y^e least, in relieuing their [the audience’s] spirits, and mouing their Affections’ — as recreation, in fact.⁶⁴ Her song could be read as an advertisement: ‘What medson than your wyttes to quicke? Yf ye wyll know, the best phisycke ...’

Secondly, she brings Wit back to life. In 1540 Erasmus says of the *pharmacopola*e that on their stalls in the market place they show, along with the piles of drawn teeth and extracted kidney stones, ‘testimonials from important people whom they [claim to] have called back from the dead’ (*diplomata magnatum quos a morte reuocarint*).⁶⁵ Literary pharmacists also make this extravagant claim. In *Le Dit de l’Herberie*, by the French poet Rutebeuf (mid thirteenth century), a herbalist claims to have gathered precious stones from the realm of Prester John, *Qui font resusciteir le mort*.⁶⁶ In the *Passion du Palatinus* the *Espiciers* boasts to the Three Maries that one of his herbs, picked in the Earthly Paradise, would bring back a dead man to life (1892–7),⁶⁷ in somewhat dubious taste, considering the context.⁶⁸

But there are drawbacks to this identification. Most literary portraits of medical personnel tend to be satirical, of quacksalvers inevitably so. They kill rather than cure: ‘whome have ye knowen dye honestlye | Without helpe of the potycary?’⁶⁹ As for Master Brundyche of Braban from *The Croxton Play of the Sacrament*, ‘What dysease or syknesse þat euer ye haue, | He wyll neuer leue yow tyll ye be in yowr graue’ (610–11). Honest Recreation makes no extravagant claims, indeed, she is rather low-key about the whole affair; but her medicine works. If she is meant to be a quacksalver, this is topsy-turvy: and it would cast a very odd light on her operations in the allegory.

Despite the Potycary of Heywood's *Four PP*, which was adapted from the French, it may also be a little early for a fully fledged quacksalver in English literature and theatre. Meriasek's quack doctor is Cornish (MS written 1504); he is also clearly a real doctor, though a venal one, not a mountebank.⁷⁰ Master Brundyche of *Brabant* may be a later interpolation in an otherwise rather uncomic narrative. The heyday of English quacksalver descriptions comes later.⁷¹

However, when we take a few more steps into the world of contemporary medicine, it comes as something of a surprise to discover that there is no reason why *Honest Recreation* should not have been seen as a perfectly respectable medical practitioner. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, medical services were provided by a much wider range of both official and unofficial practitioners than we tend to allow for, and a lot of them were women.⁷² At one end were the officially recognised professionals: not the legendary Trotula and her sisters of Salerno, but the minority of women who became part of the (very small) licensed establishment by being admitted to a Barber Surgeons' Guild, as at York and London.⁷³ At the other were the *vetule*, the 'grete sorte of olde wytyches that vseth medecynes and fals charmes' who brought the poor people on whom they batted into danger of 'some greuous maladye / or peryl of dethe'.⁷⁴ In between were several groups. In the home, wives and mothers were expected to have a considerable amount of medical skill.⁷⁵ Then there was the sizeable company of what the medical historian Margaret Pelling designates 'female irregulars', women who hired out their services.⁷⁶ They were not regulated, but in practice were only called to account if official complaints were made against them. Their skills were fairly comprehensive, certainly not limited, as we have tended to imagine, to obstetrics and gynaecology. If she is to be perceived as this kind of practitioner, *Honest Recreation* should be perfectly capable of dealing with an emergency.

Redford sets up her character early in the play, when Reason decides to ask her to be on standby to Wit's expedition in case of emergency. She has an excellent reputation as a practitioner:

As men report, for Wytes consolacion
 She hath no peere: yf Wyt were halfe deade
 She cowlde revyve hym — thus is yt sed.

36–8

She is clearly a professional, as Reason wonders if she would be willing to take on the post: 'yf monye or love can hyre her' (39). Medical fees, either

in cash or in kind, could be alarmingly high, but some practitioners would provide services out of charity.⁷⁷ She is respectable: ‘an honest woman’ (34). And as we have seen, the fact that she is female would not be a difficulty.

So far, for the sake of clarity, I have traced the line of descent directly back from *Neque vox neque sensus* to the Vulgate and the story of Elisha. It might of course not have been so direct a route. The phrase seems to have become a moderately common tag. A trawl through the *Patrologia Latina* drags up twenty-five exact verbal parallels (with either *neque* or *non erat*) and several adaptations. Of those, two are direct versions of the story, and five refer to it explicitly. The others (supplemented by other search methods, including Google, which can be extremely useful on Latin phrases) range from copycat miracles to exegetical treatises to throwaway remarks. The first two categories at least implicitly refer to Elisha; it is virtually impossible to tell exactly how far this is true of some of the examples in the last category. What is interesting is the type of context in which they are used.

It may have been adopted because it was a useful shorthand phrase for the signs of impending death. When on 26 September 1186 Fulk of Anjou, King of Jerusalem, was thrown from his horse, smashing his head on the saddle ‘so that the brain came out of his ears and his nostrils’, William of Tyre describes him as *exanimem* (‘lifeless’) ... *cui neque vox erat, neque sensus*. He lived on for three days, senseless but with a pulse.⁷⁸ Four centuries later (28 June 1598), Gilles Schondonck sends Justus Lipsius the news of the sudden death of the geographer Ortelius. He had a stroke, and though he came somewhat to himself, *Heu! Quod spectaculum! Neque vox neque sensus*.⁷⁹ He did not recover.

At other times it is applied to people who appear in all respects to be dead, but who are fortunately revived, almost always by miracle. Here the echoes of Elisha are much stronger, and the range of clinical conditions of the victims is the same, if somewhat wider, as in the saint’s lives from the *Legenda Aurea*. St Wilfrid revived a monk who had fallen from building works in the church at Hexham; he was taken up with all his bones broken, and his rescuers feared he was dead *cui neque vox neque sensus inesset*.⁸⁰ (In the previous miracle, Wilfrid had resuscitated a dead child at the importunity of its mother; it signalled its return to life by yawning.) St Francis did the same (though posthumously) to a young man in whom there was equally *neque vox neque sensus* because he had been suffocated in a building collapse.⁸¹ Aelred of Rievaulx cured a monk of fainting fits

(*syncopis passio*) in which he appeared to have *neque vox neque sensus*.⁸² At Micy near Orléans, a whole group of monks were struck by ball lightning which set the church on fire and charred them, so that they smelled worse than newly scorched pigs (presumably to remove the bristles after they had been butchered); not surprisingly, *in illis non erat vox neque sensus*. By the merits of St Maximinus they were revived, though bearing the interesting scars of their electrocution.⁸³ And so on. The body of Thurkill, whose soul was taken by St Julian on a tour of Purgatory, was kept just visibly alive when the saint considerably blew a little into his sleeping mouth (*paululum insufflavit in os quiescentis*) so that he would not be thought dead by friends and family. Nonetheless, 'it lay insensible and immobile as if weighted down by a heavy sleep' (*insensibile et immobile quasi gravi sopore depressum jacuit*). When the entire parish crowded into his bedroom trying to wake him by shouting his name at him, there was no response: *non erat vox neque sensus aut motus aliquis membrorum, nisi gravis et continuus sopor* ('there was no voice, nor feeling, or movement in any limb, nothing but heavy and continuous sleep/stupor').⁸⁴

Bernard of Clairvaux and his reputation may well have popularised the phrase. He descants on it in two of his *Sermons on the Song of Songs*, numbers 15 and 16. In Sermon 15, *Qualiter nomen Jesus est medicina salubris fidelibus Christianis in omnibus adversis*, the theme of the Name of Jesus as a medicine and the contrast between Christ and the prophets who went before him suddenly made him think, though he had not planned it, as he confesses engagingly, of the story of Elisha and Giezi and the prophet's staff. Under the prophets, when the staff is laid upon it, the soul remains dead, without voice or sense: *non erat vox, neque sensus*. When Christ himself comes, *Jam vox, jam sensus est* ('Now there is a voice, now there is feeling'). In Sermon 16 he embroiders inventively on the seven times that the child yawned.⁸⁵ Other exegetes referred it to the death of the soul;⁸⁶ the graven images of the false gods;⁸⁷ even to the winds and the waves which obeyed Christ.⁸⁸ The circle of Thomas Becket seem to have bandied it about casually as a catchphrase:⁸⁹ John of Salisbury, in his fifth year of exile with Becket, complains that he does not know whether his friends in England are alive or dead; he fears the latter, since when he tries to get in touch, they show no signs of life, *quibus, cum pulsantur, non est vox neque sensus*.⁹⁰

It could also be used of people immobilised by grief, shock, or fear. In the *Liber de passione Christi et planctibus matris eius*, a popular and influential affective work ascribed in the later Middle Ages to Bernard, the

Virgin Mary reports that when she saw Christ in his Passion, she collapsed, *et non erat mihi fere vox, neque sensus*.⁹¹ In a rather different experience, the Black Book of Paisley version of the *Scotichronicon* reports that in July 1307 the knight William Banister, with the army of Edward I at Burgh by Sands on the Solway coast, was granted a vision of devils carrying off the dying king's soul with whips and scorpions. He was paralysed by the sight of the demons' horrible eyes, and *mecum neque vox neque sensus remansit*.⁹² He gave up his military career for a life of prayer: a spiritual resuscitation.

The contexts in which it is used give us the sense of a halfway house in which the victim is not quite alive and not quite dead; or who seems to be dead while still alive. This raises an interesting question. Scholars who write about the resuscitation of Wit seem sooner or later to get involved in an argument as to whether or not he is 'really dead'.⁹³ The same argument develops around Elisha's miracle, and indeed around the raising of Jairus' daughter and of the widow's son of Nain.⁹⁴ Did the fact that Christ said, 'The damsel is not dead, but sleepeth' (Mark 5:39) mean that she was really alive?

The answer is of course that it all depends on what you mean by 'death'. Aquinas points out that we use the word for two different things: the process of dying and the state of being dead.⁹⁵ Nowadays we are aware of the uncertainty of the process, partly because it can, in a very few cases, be reversed if it has not gone too far; and have devised a new set of guidelines for the determination of legal death, though these differ in different countries, reflecting a continuing uncertainty about its limits, and the attitude towards organ transplants.

We tend to think that the dividing line between life and death was much more cut and dried in previous eras, but this was not in fact so. Cornelius Celsus (c.25 BC–c.50 AD), after giving a comprehensive list of the signs of approaching death, admits that medicine is a conjectural science (*coniecturalem artem*), and one may be mistaken: tales are told of those who have revived at their own funerals.⁹⁶ In the eighteenth century this led to a major moral panic about being buried alive, fostered by the Franco-Danish physician Jacques-Bénigne Winsl w in his 1740 dissertation *Morte incertae signa*, published in English in 1746 as *The uncertainty of the signs of death, and the danger of precipitate interments and dissections*, with delightfully gruesome illustrations.⁹⁷ It ultimately led to both the Royal Humane Society and the Gothic horror story.⁹⁸ Even nowadays, with a battery of sophisticated tests at our disposal, there are instances of the

Lazarus Syndrome, where the heart starts again spontaneously after failed CPR, sometimes when the patient has been declared dead and transferred to the morgue. It is noticeable that the early textbooks list the signs of approaching death, and suggest tests to determine whether there are signs of life,⁹⁹ but fight shy of diagnosing the state itself.

The solution seems to be that the patient is dead if he does not come back to life, and not dead if he does. Or perhaps, as in the case of Wit, he is dead until he is brought back to life. The stage direction is unambiguous enough: *Here Wyt falleth downe and dyeth* (sd at 210). After the event, Reason is suitably subjunctive: ‘What marvell though Tedyousnes had kyld ye?’ (272), while *Honest Recreation* talks of ‘Savyngge your lyfe when I you revyved’ (394). To us the use of *revive* suggests conclusively that he was not dead, but at the time *revive* (‘bring back to life’) and *resuscit[at]e* (‘rouse again, raise from the dead’) were practically synonymous: ‘Christ therfore dyed and rose agayne and revived’ is Tyndale’s 1526 translation of Romans 14:9, while George Joye in 1535 suggests that a more appropriate translation for *resuscitantur* would be ‘are reuiued or resuscited’.¹⁰⁰ *Honest Recreation* then sidesteps the issue by reverting to the literal allegory: ‘When Tediousnes to ground hath smytten them, | *Honest Recreation* up doth quyken them’ (398).

The saint’s lives may explain the continued appeal of resuscitation stories in literature and theatre, not to mention television. Obviously they did not depend upon the fast-paced excitement and tension of a CPR episode in a modern medical soap.¹⁰¹ They appeal to a deeper sense of narrative justice. They are generally about people who have died before their time: ‘the only son of his mother, and she was a widow’ (Luke 7:12). Newly married brides and husbands are another favourite category. In several cases there is something specific left undone. In the early saint’s lives, it is often baptism, like St Martin’s catechumen. Later on there is a whole subset of tales of babies who are revived just long enough to be baptised and then relapse into the far preferable bliss of the heaven for which they are now qualified. Nowadays, statistically it appears that the victims in British medical soaps are disproportionately ‘likely to be in a younger age group than in real life’, though their recovery rate is about right.¹⁰² Wit is young, has unfinished business, and is necessary to the story. Naturally his resuscitation is successful.

It is also (temporarily) unexpected, and theatrically exciting. Successful intervention provokes a seismic shift in the story line. Non-intervention leaves the victims dead and their story at an end, though a playwright

determined to wring the last drop of suspense can make them quiver on the edge. Desdemona was suffocated; Cordelia was hanged:¹⁰³ their hearts might just have restarted permanently. Their plot imperative decides otherwise. Wit is in a different kind of story.

I set out to show that there was probably an alternative source for the episode than a now discredited ‘medieval’ mummers’ play. I did not know that it was going to lead me into such diverse but apparently equally relevant areas as the history of medicine and hagiography. It made me wonder what we expect to get from the pursuit of literary sources and their contexts. A more informed reading? A sense, probably ultimately illusory, of how the audience might have taken it? Or the ultimate imponderable, the opportunity to eavesdrop on the author’s creative processes? Could an Old Testament story have sparked off the theatrical image of a return to life? Or did Redford think of the return to life because of his allegory and then fortuitously find a template for it? Was he remembering an actual medical event he had seen or heard of? What sort of medical assistance would he have expected himself? Did he think of resuscitation as a miracle or a clinically plausible event, or both — as we still say, a medical miracle? Did he see his play as primarily a literary construct or a reflection of real life? As literary scholars we tend to be biased towards the former, but which is more likely? One thing is certain, judging from the ongoing script conference that takes place in our own heads every time we try to write — or direct — something, it is unlikely to have been based on just one single thing.

Just because I think it unlikely on historical grounds that Redford was adopting a Hero/Combat scenario, either to appeal to ‘the rougher element in his audience’ or to his chorister actors, or because he had an atavistic attachment to the *renouveau* theme, does not mean that I want to discount all popular (*folk* is a loaded word) sports and pastimes as ingredients in the play. Idleness lists Honest Recreation’s ‘dawnsyng, her maskyng and mumming ... Her cardyng, her dycyng, daylye and nyghtlye’ (373, 375), and suggests that they and ‘her syngyng, pypyng, and fydylyng’ (379) are part and parcel with the low-life behaviour of the taverns. The first two sets at least suggest Christmas games, permitted over the season as honest recreation but officially out of bounds during the rest of the year. Wit’s blackened face does not have to be associated with a mummers’ *play* (or the Bacup Nutters): it was a common scratch form of disguise at the lower end of the market for the Christmas mumming house-visit. Incidentally, its purpose was to negate identity, which is precisely what it does for Wit: he becomes unrecognisable even to himself.¹⁰⁴

But equally this does not mean that they were the only source of inspiration. Tedioussness may have been costumed as a woodwose or Magog out of a civic pageant or a Lord Mayor's Show, while simultaneously owing his role as antagonist and his giant stature to Hawes' *Pastime of Pleasure*. The Fool character and costume may have been suggested by a Lord of Misrule's Christmas entourage, or by the recent success of Sebastian Brant's *Narrenschiff*, or both: but Redford's characterisation of Ignorance suggests that he had actually met someone like that.¹⁰⁵ Theatre is an omnivorous medium. We should not forget that it also reflects real life.

Lancaster University

NOTES

I would like to thank Drs Neil Hall and Pam Duncan for their help on all aspects of resuscitation and the possible diagnoses of Elisha's patient. My misunderstandings of their lucid explanations are entirely my fault. Also Rosemary Phizackerley for pointing out to me the case of Kate Ogg, mother of a prematurely born twin who came back to life after several hours of cuddling and stroking, thus starting me off on an epic journey through the history of early resuscitation theory and methods which I think I am glad I have taken. And Sarah Carpenter, without whose wise advice this would have been even more of a baggy monster than it is.

1. Calculated from the video of the 1993 performance. Since the beginning of the script is missing, we might need to add up to 5 more minutes. It is still proportionately extremely early. References are to the text edited by Peter Happé in *Tudor Interludes* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972).
2. *The English Folk Play* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933) 63.
3. There is a possible report of a St George/Quack Doctor/Beelzebub folk play in a letter said to have been written in 1685 from County Cork, quoted by Alex Helm in *The English Mummers' Play* (Folklore Society Mistletoe Series 14; Woodbridge: Brewer, 1981); 7; but it only exists in a transcription of c. 1800. Tom Pettitt has his doubts about the dating: 'Cork Revisited: A Reconsideration of some Early Records of the Mummers' Plays', *Traditional Drama Studies* 3 (1994), 15–30. The next account was written in 1738, but again, not published until 1770 (Helm *Mummers' Play* 7).

Chambers' other examples are the decapitation motif in *Mankind*, first suggested by Walter K. Smart 'Mankind and the Mummings Plays' *Modern Language Notes* 32:1 (1917) 21–25, though Chambers is tentative about that; and the three appearances of a quack doctor in *Meriasek*, the *Croxtton Play of The Sacrament*, and Machyn's account of a London Jack o' Lent procession in 1553.

4. Charles Read Baskerville 'Mummers' Wooing Plays in England' *Modern Philology* 21 (1924) 225–72 at 230–1. The second two are of course reworkings of *Wit and Science*.
5. Charles Read Baskerville 'Conventional Features of Medwall's *Fulgens and Lucre's*' *Modern Philology* 24 (1927) 419–42 at 426.
6. For a very useful account, see Peter Millington *The Origins and Development of English Folk Plays* (PhD thesis, National Centre for English Cultural Tradition, University of Sheffield, May 2002) published online at <http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/13/1/MillingtonP_Thesis_with_hyperlinks.pdf>. See also Thomas Pettitt "'This Man is Pyramus": A Pre-History of the English Mummers' Plays' *Medieval English Theatre* 22 (2000) 70–99.

For the more general theory of the relation between Tudor drama and the Mummers' Play, see e.g. Bob Potter in his influential *The English Morality Play* (London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975) 12; on the death and revival of *Wit*, see 13. Peter Happé in his early 'The Vice and the Folk-Drama' expresses a similar view of the origins of the Quack Doctor of the Mummers' Play and of the death and revival of the hero/antagonist; *Folklore* 75 (1964) 161–93, especially 174.

On the other side, Glynne Wickham is sceptical about the influence of the mummers' play on 'more sophisticated types of drama', pointing out that if it existed, any influence would be likely to be in the opposite direction; *The Medieval Theatre* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1974) 145 and 149. T.W. Craik *The Tudor Interlude* (Leicester: Leicester UP, 1967) does not mention it, because he is more concerned with the practicalities of staging.

7. E.g. A.P. Rossiter *English Drama from the Earliest Times to the Elizabethans* (London: Hutchinson, 1950); John W. Velz and Carl P. Daw 'Tradition and Originality in *Wyt and Science*' *Studies in Philology* 65 (1968) 631–46, at 637 note 15; also 639 note 21; Trevor Lennam *Sebastian Westcott, the Children of Paul's, and 'The Marriage of Wit and Science'* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975) 92; Howard B. Norland *Drama in early Tudor Britain, 1485–1558* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995) 57, 59.

Peter Happé's note to this episode in his edition of *Wit and Science in Tudor Interludes* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972) 399 says 'The resurrection of *Wit* after his defeat by the monster *Tediousness* has an obvious parallel in the reviving of *St George* in the folk-play, where the hero is also slain by a monster, or by the Turkish Knight'. Statistically I am not sure how often this is the case: my impression is that *St George* slays his antagonist rather more frequently than the other way round, and it is the antagonist who has to be revived.

8. Arthur Brown 'Folklore Elements in the Medieval Drama' *Folklore* 63 (1952) 65–78, at 71–2. It is not clear who this 'rougher element' were. *The Marriage* is usually believed to be a court play. Peter Happé in 'The Vice and the Folk-

- Drama' explains the comedy of the Doctor scene in *The Croxton Play of the Sacrament* by postulating that perhaps 'the Doctor was already familiar, or becoming familiar in the folk-play as a comic figure' (175–6), and attributes part of the theatrical success of the Vice figure to his similarity to the comic insubordinate servant, 'Jack Finney', of the Mummings' Play (80–81).
9. In 'the educational interludes ... folk play is used to suggest forces hostile to learning': Richard Axton 'Folk Play in Tudor Interludes' in *English Drama: Forms and Development* edited Marie Axton and Raymond Williams (Cambridge UP, 1977) 1–23 at 10. He also invokes the folk-play 'model of the fool's wooing'.
 10. Victor Scherb 'Playing at Maturity in John Redford's *Wit and Science*' *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 45 (2005) 271–97: 'Redford's artful handling of popular traditions reveals how students could sometimes be their own worst enemies'. He refers to the Hero-Combat plays as 'a particular type of mumming', and seems to classify it with other, recorded, forms of mumming and disguising (282). However, he relates Tediousness to the giants of romance rather than the antagonists of the Mummings' Play, emphasises Wit's demise rather than his recovery, and extends the range of 'popular traditions' well beyond the Play.
 11. *OED sv recreation*. The verb *recreate* (*OED* 1b), could even mean 'To restore to life, resurrect', though this is marked as obsolete and rare, and the earliest example is from 1631.
 12. Rossiter *English Drama from the Earliest Times* 115.
 13. '*Wit and Science* by Mr John Redford', in the forthcoming *Oxford Handbook of Tudor Drama* edited Greg Walker and Tom Betteridge.
 14. In the manuscript (BL Additional MS15233) it is written in an italic hand. The rest of the play is in secretary.
 15. This is in the Douai translation of 1609; the 1603 Vulgate reads *Caput meum doleo, caput meum doleo*. In the 1540 Great Bible, it is, 'And he sayde vnto his father, my heade, my heade' (in Coverdale it is 'Oh my heade, my heade'), following the standard Vulgate version, *ait patri suo, caput meum, caput meum*.
 16. *The Byble in Englyshe that is to saye, the content of all the holye scrypture, bothe of the olde and newe Testament, truly translated after the veryte of the Hebrue and Greke textes, by the diligent studye of dyuers excellent lerned [men] e]xperte in the foresaide] tongues* (London: Richard Grafton, 1540).
 17. The prophet's bed. His mother had taken him into the prophet's room and closed the door, perhaps so that his spirit should not escape.
 18. Strictly speaking, *oscito, oscitare* is 'to gape' or 'to yawn'.

19. See below note 22, although many commentators are anxious to dissociate the Old Testament prophets from the charge of magical practices, which were generally repudiated as pagan.
20. Among others, see John A. Paraskos 'Biblical Accounts of Resuscitation' *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 47 (1992) 310–21. He analyses the vocabulary of the different versions, in Syriac, Aramaic, Latin, and the Greek of the Septuagint: some versions suggest 'blowing' into the child's mouth.
21. Paraskos 'Resuscitation' 318; A R. Colón with P. A. Colón *Nurturing Children: A History of Pediatrics* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999) 30; L. Wislicki 'A Biblical Case of Hypothermia-Resuscitation by Rewarming (Elisha's Method)' *Clio Medica* 9:3 (September, 1974) 213–14.
22. Edward Reichman relates the Hebrew concept of 'innate heat' to the breathing, suggesting that rather than providing 'rescue breaths', the prophets were trying to raise the innate heat of the patient by blowing warmed air into them: 'The incorporation of pre-modern scientific theories into biblical literature: the case of innate heat' *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 32:2 (2004) no page numbers given; online at <http://jbq.jewishbible.org/32-2-april-june-2004>.
Others, usually biblical commentators, refer to 'a world of curative magic': Burke O. Long *2 Kings* (The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 10; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991) 58. John Gray in *I and II Kings: A Commentary* (London: SCM Press, 2nd edition, 1970) 382–3 and 498–9, calls it 'contactual magic'.
23. John Tercier 'From Aer to Air: 'The Kiss of Life'' *Critical Quarterly* 44 (2002) 1–24, at 4. He is mainly concerned with our contemporary perceptions of mouth-to-mouth resuscitation, especially in literature, film, and television. His detailed historical evidence is largely from Greek, and thence to the Early Modern period.
24. See note 20.
25. These variants appear throughout the history of the Vulgate and its commentators. Hrabanus Maurus states that Elisha breathed seven times into the child's mouth: *Commentum in Libros IV Regum*, PL 109 (Paris: Migne, 1852) col. 229. The 1603 Venice edition of the Vulgate, with an enlarged *Glossa Ordinaria* and the commentary of Nicholas de Lyra and other scholiasts (*Biblionum Sacrorum cum Glossa Ordinaria iam ante quidem a Strabo Fulgensi collecta nunc autem novis, cum Graecorum, tum Latinorum Patrum expositionibus locupletata ... Et Postilla Nicolai Lyrani: Additionibus Pauli Burgensis asd ipsum Lyranum: ac ad easdem Matthiae Toringi Replis ...* (Venice: 1503) cols 820 and 833), annotates 3 Kings 17:17, *aegrotavit filius ...* with a passage from the early fifth-century Syrian bishop and exegete Theodoretus: *Cum propheta post preces ter insufflasset in adolescentem, eum reduxit ad uitam* ('when the prophet after his prayers blew three times into the boy, he brought him back to life'). He relates

the three breaths to the creation by the Trinity of the breath of life in Adam. The annotation by the same scholar on the Elisha story points out that there is a variant reading to *incubuit super puerum* (4 Kings 4: 34): *Alii, insufflavuit* ('Others [read] "he blew"'), and again, relates this to Genesis 2:7, adding *Sed creator insufflando creavit animam, quæ non erat. Propheta autem eam quæ erat in suum reduxit corpus* ('But the Creator by blowing created a soul which had not existed. The prophet, on the other hand, led a soul which did exist back into its body').

26. *Missale ad usum insignis et præclaræ ecclesiæ Sarum* edited Francis Henry Dickinson (Burntisland: Pitsligo, 1861–1883) cols 225–7.
27. *Missale ad usum ... Sarum* cols 228–32.
28. *Biblia pauperum* edited Avril Henry (Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1987) 68, 70.
29. *Pictor in carmine* edited Deirdre F. Baker (PhD thesis, Toronto, 199) 424, 439. *Pictor in carmine* could be read to suggest mouth-to-mouth: *Ad uitam reuehi puerum facit os Helisei* (line 1769: 'the mouth of Elisha brought the boy back to life'), but it could merely be contrasting the power of prayer to God with the direct command of Christ as God: *Virgo voce dei, puer ut meritis Helisei* (line 1772). The twelfth-century *Pictor* was probably out of fashion by the sixteenth century, superseded by the *Biblia pauperum* and the *Speculum humanæ salvationis*.
30. Mickey S. Eisenberg, Peter Baskett, and Douglas Chamberlain 'A History of Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation' in *Cardiac Arrest: The Science and Practice of Resuscitation Medicine* edited Norman A. Paradis, Henry R. Halperin, and Karl Kern (Cambridge UP, 2007) 3–25 at 11. The history of its adoption, with the twinned techniques of chest compression and mouth-to-mouth breathing, is quite complex: see Mickey S. Eisenberg *Life in the Balance: Emergency Medicine and the Quest to Reverse Sudden Death* (New York: Oxford UP, 1997); John Tercier 'The Lips of the Dead and the Kiss of Life' *Journal of Historical Sociology* 15 (2002) 283–327 at 283–6; Richard V. Lee 'Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation in the Eighteenth Century: A Historical Perspective on Present Practice' *Journal of the History of Medicine* 27:4 (1972) 418–33.
31. Jacobus de Voragine *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints* translated William Granger Ryan, 2 vols (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993) 1 128; *Legenda aurea* edited Theodor Graesse (Dresden and Leipzig: Arnold, 1846) 143.
32. There are several accounts of the use of warming to promote resuscitation in Jacques-Bénigne Winslow's *The uncertainty of the signs of death, and the danger of precipitate interments and dissections ...* (London: Cooper, 1746). Earlier, the traditional layout of medical and surgical works meant that certain types of trauma and accident were missed out.

33. Richard Watkins *Newes from the Dead or A True and Exact Narration of the miraculous deliverance of Anne Green Written by a Scholler in Oxford* (Oxford: Thomas Robinson, 1651); for a summary, see J. Trevor Hughes 'Miraculous Deliverance Of Anne Green: An Oxford Case of Resuscitation in the Seventeenth Century' *British Medical Journal* (Clinical Research Edition) 285, no. 6357 (December 18–25, 1982) 1792–1793.
34. Paolo Bagellardo *Libellus de egritudinibus puerorum* ([Padua: Bartholomaeus Valdezochius, 1472]) sig Aij^r-v. Bagellardo is as far as I can tell unique in mentioning it. He is reprinted, slightly altered, as *Opusculum ... de morbis puerorum* (Lyons: Germain Rose, 1538); see page 4. Many authors state this confidently, but give no references: it seems to be assumed from rabbinical commentaries. Early obstetrical handbooks tend to leap straight from breech and other difficult presentations to cutting the cord. 'Trotula' does not mention it: *Medieval Woman's Guide to Health* edited and translated Beryl Rowland (Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 1981). The earliest English example I have found is Nicholas Culpeper's *A Directory for Midwives* (London: J. Churchill, 1716) which says 'When the Child is still born, let the Midwife chew Spice, and blow in its Mouth, or drop Aqua-vitæ in it, or anoint it with Honey' (296). Jacques Gélis gives some examples of midwives taking a mouthful of brandy and then blowing it into the baby's mouth: *History of Childbirth* translated Rosemary Morris (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991) 175–6, but cites nothing before the seventeenth century. For a historical summary, see C.P.F. O'Donnell, A.T. Gibson, and P.G. Davis 'Pinching, electrocution, raven's beaks, and positive pressure ventilation: a brief history of neonatal resuscitation' *Archives of Disease in Childhood Fetal and Neonatal Edition* 91 (2006) F369–73; downloaded from <http://fn.bmj.co/content/91/5/F369.full.html>.
35. Eisenberg, Baskett, and Chamberlain 'History of cardiopulmonary resuscitation' 4. See F. Vallejo-Manzur, Y. Perkins, J. Varon, and Peter Baskett 'Andreas Vesalius, the concept of an artificial airway' *Resuscitation* 56:1 (January 2003) 3–7, quoting a translation of Vesalius *De humani corporis fabrica* (Basel: 1643) lib. 7 cap. 19, page 656. I have not been able to see a copy of Vesalius. For Paracelsus, see 'Paracelsus and mechanical ventilation' *Resuscitation* 47:1 (September 2000) 3–5. I have not been able to trace a primary source which mentions Paracelsus' experiment; it seems to be one of those 'facts' which all medical historians know but none can reference.
36. William Tossach 'LV: A Man dead in Appearance, recovered by distending the Lungs with Air' in *Medical Essays and Observations published by a Society in Edinburgh Volume V Part 2* (Edinburgh: Philosophical Society of Edinburgh, fourth edition 1752) 108–111. Accessed from ECCO, Gale Document Number: CB130663793.
37. Marc Alexander 'The Rigid Embrace of the Narrow House: Premature Burial and the Signs of Death' *Hastings Center Report* 10:3 (June 1980) 25–31 at 28–9.

- Its prime target was the drowned. The first Society for the Recovery of Drowned Persons was founded in Amsterdam in 1767; Eisenberg *Life in the Balance* 59–63.
38. Craig Blomberg and David Wenham *The Miracles of Jesus* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986) 562–3.
 39. Vincent of Beauvais cites resurrection miracles by SS Andrew, John the Evangelist, Martial, Peter, Benedict, and Herculanus; *Speculum morale* lib. 2, dist. 3, pars 2, cols 772–4; vol. 3 of *Speculum quadruplex sive Speculum maius* (Graz: Akademische Druck und Verlagsanstalt, 1964; facsimile reprint of Douai: Balthazar Bellerus, 1624).
 40. Sulpicius Severus *De vita beati Martini liber unus*; Migne *PL* 20 col. 164. The general opinion seems to be that Martin’s miracles are exaggerated, but if you take his encounters with the devil in various forms to refer to the possessed (i.e. mentally ill, possibly schizophrenic) they make perfect sense.
 41. *Incumbere* often has the sense of ‘pressing down on’.
 42. It is not clear whether the *virtus* is in Martin or the dead man.
 43. Though *in defuncti ora defixus* is potentially ambiguous.
 44. Jacobus de Voragine *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints* translated William Granger Ryan, 2 vols (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993); *Legenda aurea* edited Theodor Graesse (Dresden and Leipzig: Arnold, 1846). Drowning: Andrew (forty victims) *GL* 1 15–16, *LA* 15–16, Martha *GL* 2 24, *LA* 445, Peter Martyr *GL* 1 262, *LA* 286, Dominic *GL* 2 55, *LA* 480, Clement *GL* 2 332, *LA* 786–7, Elizabeth of Hungary *GL* 2 315–6, *LA* 767–8); strangling and hanging: Martin *GL* 2 294 (mistranslated), *LA* 742 (at more length in Sulpicius Severus, *PL* 20 col. 164), Nicholas *GL* 1 26, *LA* 28, Elizabeth *GL* 2 315, 316, *LA* 767, 768–9; choking due to a fishbone in the throat: Blaise *GL* 1 152, *LA* 167; crushed by masonry: Benedict *GL* 1 189 (a rather exaggerated account of the state of the corpse), *LA* 207–8, Dominic *GL* 2 50, *LA* 473; road traffic accidents: Stephen *GL* 2 43, *LA* 465, Dominic *GL* 2 50, *LA* 473; falls from high windows: Paul *GL* 1 351, 357, *LA* 380–1, Peter Martyr *GL* 1 260, *LA* 283; poisoning: John the Evangelist *GL* 1 53, *LA* 59–60, Giles *GL* 2 147 (snakebite), *LA* 582. Further information about the methods used can often be picked up from the *Legenda Aurea*’s longer and more detailed sources.
 45. *Cyurgie* 403–7
 46. Chaucer *Canterbury Tales* A2453–2469. Saturn instances ‘the drenchyng in the see’ (2456), ‘the stranglyng and hangyng by the throte’ (2458), ‘the pryvye empoysonyng’ (2460), ‘the fallynge of the toures and of the walles | Upon the mynour or the carpenter’ (2465). Complications in the resulting injuries would be attributed to the melancholy humour. Arcite, who suffers what could be termed a traffic accident, dies of the medical effects of a Saturnian injury (2742–60).

47. Life of St Thomas of Canterbury, in Voragine *Golden Legend* 1 61; *Legenda aurea* 69. A combination of Christ's command to the apostles in Matthew 10:8 and his reply to John the Baptist in the following chapter: 'The blind receive sight, the lame walk, those who have leprosy are cured, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the good news is preached to the poor' (Matthew 11:5). Died from unspecified causes: Stephen (six men) *GL* 1 48, *LA* 54; Julian *GL* 1 126, *LA* 141; Peter *GL* 1 163, *LA* 179–80 (had been dead fourteen years), *GL* 1 341, *LA* 370 (had been dead forty days), and in competition with Simon Magus *GL* 1 343–4, *LA* 372–3, Apollinaris *GL* 1 384, *LA* 418; Stephen *GL* 2 43, *LA* 465. Formulaic list: Thomas as above, Matthias *GL* 1 170, *LA* 187.
48. There are remarkably few of these in English romances: Gerald Bordman only finds two resuscitation episodes in the English metrical romances, one the children in *Amis and Amiloun*, who are brought back to life by miracle, and the other the princess in *Sir Gowther* who falls from the top of a tower, is taken up for dead, and revives spontaneously on her bier as she is being carried to her funeral: Gerald Bordman *Motif-Index of the English Metrical Romances* (Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1963) 32; *Amis and Amiloun* edited MacEdward Leach *EETS OS* 203 (1937 for 1935) lines 2417–24; *Sir Gowther* in *Six Middle English Romances* edited Maldwyn Mills (London: Dent, 1973) lines 631–54. Neither of these is particularly close. Return from the dead in British folk tales is more usually connected with snatchings (as in *Sir Orfeo*), which call for a great investment of love and persistence in the rescuer, or with improving visions of the afterlife, as with Thurkill and *St Patrick's Purgatory*.
49. It is possible to enact a convincing beheading, as in *Apius and Virginia*, but the victim has to stay dead. For a conjuror's decapitation trick which enables the victim to come to life again, see [William Vincent] *Hocus Pocus Junior: The Anatomy of Legerdemain* (London: T.H. for R.M., 1635) chapter 34: 'How to seeme to cut off a mans head, it is called the decollation of John Baptist'. It has been argued that this is what is going on in Breughel's drawing of 'The Fall of the Magician Hermogenes' (1564), which may depict a quacksalver's fairground trick; Pieter Bruegel the Elder *Drawings and Prints* edited Nadine M. Orenstein (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art and New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2001) 232–4, images on 233. The suggestion that this is the beheading trick is made by Clark "The Onely Languag'd Men" 544. She draws a comparison with 'Epistemon's beheading and reheading' in Rabelais' *Pantagruel* (1532) chapter 30.
50. Hieronymus Brunschwig (Jerome of Brunswick) *The noble Experyence of the vertuous handy warke of surgeri ...* (London: Peter Treveris, 1525) sig B j^v.
51. Brunschwig *The ... vertuous handy warke of surgeri sig B j^v*. A fascinating fourteenth-century medical drawing of the 'anatomy of the head for physicians' shows the interconnectedness of the inner and outer senses; reproduced by

- Elizabeth Sears ‘Sensory Perception and its Metaphors in the Time of Richard of Fournival’ in *Medicine and the Five Senses* edited W.F. Bynum and Roy Porter (Cambridge UP, 1993) 17–39, at 38.
52. Elizabeth Sears ‘Sensory Perception’ 17–39. This refers to a theory current in the thirteenth century. I have not so far been able to find evidence that it was around in the sixteenth. In any case, it misses out the third sense, touch, which was considered the basest and yet most essential of the senses.
53. E.g. sight, hearing, smell, taste, touch, based on Aristotle *De anima*; see C.M. Woolgar *The Senses in Late Medieval England* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2006) 23–4.
54. The lease printed in *REED: Ecclesiastical London* edited Mary C. Erler (London: British Library, 2008) 130, shows that there was a ‘Chamber ... for the sycke Chyldren’ attached to the Almoner’s official house. Redford’s sister Margaret Cox lived with him (his will speaks of ‘my suster Margaret Cockes now being with me’) and may have acted as Matron.
55. Brunschwig *The ... vertuous handy warke of surgeri* sig R iiij^v. Chauliac’s instructions on preventing syncope are to feed the patient bread soaked in warm wine and rosewater, shake him, throw cold water or rosewater in his face, slap his limbs, pull his hair, his nose, and his ears, shout his name, and perform ‘other actions recommended by the physicians’; *The Major Surgery of Guy de Chauliac* edited E. Nicaise, translated Leonard D. Rosenman ([Philadelphia PA:] Xlibris, 2005) 294. Others suggest that ‘You may pricke their legges, and their extreme parts, and pull them by the haire violently to awake them’; Philip Barrough *A Method of Physick, containing the causes, signes, and cures of inward diseases in mans body* (London: Richard Field, 1601) 15, on how to arouse the patient from a lethargy.
56. The fifteenth-century English translation of Chauliac, *The Chyrurgie*, edited by Margaret S. Ogden *EETS* 265 (1971) 406. The equivalent passage on how to discern signs of life in the victim of a fall reads:
- Neuerpelatter he shall firste be examyned if he be dede or alyue in touchinge his pulse, in clepyng hym, in drawyng hym by þe heres and by þe nose and in byholdyng þe sternes of þe eyzen if þai be movede, in puttyng a flokke of wolle or of cotoun in his mouthe and in his nose pirls and a disshe ful of water if the brest be movede, in prouokyng fnesyng wip piper and wip euforbe and soche pinges.
- He then proceeds to treatment, as in Brunschwig.
57. Ralph of Coggeshall ‘The Vision of Thurkill’ edited H. L. D. Ward *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 31 (1875) 420–59 at 443.
58. Bartholomeus Anglicus *On the Properties of Things: John Trevisa’s translation [from the Latin] of Bartholomaeus Anglicus ‘De proprietatibus rerum’: a critical text*

- edited by M.C. Seymour and others, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975–1988) 1 213.
59. Stephen Hawes *The Pastime of Pleasure* edited William Edward Mead EETS OS 173 (1928 for 1927) 62–3.
60. Bartholomeus Anglicus *On the Properties of Things* 1 199. See also the charming thirteenth-century drawing of a Homer-Simpson-like scholar showing the internal and external senses reproduced as FIG 3 in Woolgar *Senses in Late Medieval England* 20.
61. Victor Scherb ‘Playing at Maturity’: ‘If one applies this pattern to *Wit and Science*, in the first encounter Honest Recreation can be seen as performing the doctor’s role, while Wit and Tediousnes are the hero and the agonist, respectively’ 283.
62. See M.A. Katritzky ‘Marketing medicine: the image of the early modern mountebank’ *Renaissance Studies* 15:2 (2001), and her *Women, Medicine, and Theatre, 1500–1750: Literary Mountebanks and Performing Quacks* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007); Carol Clark “‘The Onely Languag’d Men of all the World’ — Rabelais and the Art of the Mountebank’ *Modern Language Review* 74 (1979) 538–52. None of these terms entered English until the mid to late sixteenth century: *mountebank* in 1566, describing Italians in Leuven; John Rastell *The third booke, declaring by examples out of auncient counsels, fathers, and later writers, that it is time to beware of M. Iewel* (Antwerp: John Fowler, 1566). *Charlatan* first appears in 1611, again referring to Italians; *quacksalver* from 1579 and not much earlier in the original Dutch; see *OED* svv *charlatan*, *quacksalver*. Chaloner’s translation of the *Praise of Folly* (1549) renders Erasmus’ *circulatores* (travelling salesmen? hawkers who collect a circle around them?) as *Ceretans*, not in the *OED*, and seems to refer to a village in Piedmont: Desiderius Erasmus *The praise of folie — Moriae encomium ... Engliſhed by ſir Thomas Chaloner knight* (London: Thomas Berthelet, 1549) sig. Oj^r.
63. He was probably the source of the German quack-doctor *Fastnachtspiele*, and of the various French apothecary farces of which Heywood’s *The Four PP* is an offshoot: Martin W. Walsh ‘Rubin and Mercator: grotesque comedy in the German Easter Play’ *Comparative Drama* 36 (2002) 187–202; P. Abrahams ‘The Mercator-Scenes in Mediaeval French Passion Plays’ *Medium Ævum* 3 (1934) 112–123. Despite featuring in the French *Passions*, however, the *unguentarius* does not turn up in English biblical plays.
64. John Rastell *The third booke, declaring ... it is time to beware of M. Iewel* sig. A v^r.
65. Erasmus of Rotterdam *Ecclesiatae, sive, de concionandi ratione libri quatuor* (Lyon: Seb. Gryphius, 1543) liber 2, pages 265–6: *Deforme exemplum est pharmacopolarum, qui mensa in foro posita ostentant dentes eductos, lapides è uesicis exectos, diplomata magnatum quos à morte reuocarint, magnáque uanitate denarrant sua præclara gesta quæstus gratia.*

66. *Mimes français du xiiiè siècle* edited Edmond Faral (Paris: Champion, 1910) 62 (line 33).
67. *La Passion du Palatinus* edited Grace Frank (Les Classiques français du Moyen Âge 30; Paris: Champion, 1922). See also *The Passion de Semur* edited Lynette Muir (Leeds Medieval Studies 3; Leeds: University of Leeds Centre for Medieval Studies, 1981) line 8169.
68. The most extreme form of the motif is in the fourteenth-century Old Czech play, in which the apothecary Master Severin revives a dead boy called Isaac at the plea of his father Abraham by pouring shit over his backside; this in order to prove the efficacy of his medicines to the three Maries. This was clearly felt to be extremely funny. See Jarmila Veltrusky 'The Old Czech Apothecary as Clown and Symbol' in *Festive Drama* edited Meg Twycross (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1996) 270–8.
69. John Heywood *The Four PP* in *The Plays of John Heywood* edited Richard Axton and Peter Happé (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1991) lines 171–2.
70. *Beunans Meriasek: The Life of Saint Meriasek, Bishop and Confessor* edited and translated Whitley Stokes (London: Trübner, 1872) lines 1378–1485. He has elements of the quack: an assistant whom he asks to praise him, a display of medical learning, and the confession that he is in it for the money.
71. Those described in later histories of medicine as 'quacks' are probably those who at the time were classed as *empirici*, 'empiricists', which merely means practitioners who depended on observation and experience rather than book-learning and thus theory: Margaret Pelling with Frances White *Medical Conflicts in Early Modern London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003) 152.
72. Pelling *Medical Conflicts* chapter 6.
73. *York Memorandum Book Part I (1376–1419)* edited Maud Sellers *Surtees Society 120* (1912 for 1911) 207–210, undated ordinances of the Guild of Barber-Surgeons, at 209: *nec vir nec mulier aliqua occupabit in arte sirurgica nec in dentium extractione nec in aliqua re alia artem barbitonsorom pertinentente infra civitatem istam, nisi fuerint sub regimine alicujus magistri barbitonsorom ejusdem civitatis ...* A named female surgeon, Isabella Warwick, was licensed by the guild to practise in the city on 3 June 1572: G.A. Auden 'The Gild of Barber Surgeons of the City of York' *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine* (1 February 1928) 1400–1406, at 1403. London: Sidney Young *The Annals of the Barber Surgeons of London compiled from their records and other sources* (London: Blades, East, and Blades, 1890) 38, 260, 268, 270. Women could be admitted as barber-surgeons because it was a manual craft; physicians, 'doctors', were as their title suggests, university graduates.

Chauliac mentions women practitioners, but disparagingly: it is difficult to tell whether he is dismissing all women surgeons, or merely the branch who depends entirely on prayers and charms; Guy de Chauliac *The Cyrurgie* edited

- Margaret S. Ogden *EETS* 265 (1971) 10; *The Major Surgery* edited E. Nicaise (Paris: Alcan, 1890) and translated Leonard D. Rosenman (Bloomington IA: Xlibris, 2007) 125.
74. Sebastian Brant *The shyppe of fooles* (London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1509) cap. 52 'Of folysshe physycyens'. The accusation of witchcraft was not however confined to women; e.g. Pelling *Medical Conflicts* 160.
 75. John of Arderne mentions a couple of cases in which 'ladies' had in his opinion pursued the wrong kind of treatment: *De fistula in ano* edited D'Arcy Power *EETS OS* 139 (1910) 44–5, 49. They seem to have depended on medicines (like our pharmacists) rather than the necessary surgery practised by Arderne.
 76. Pelling *Medical Conflicts* chapter 6.
 77. Pelling *Medical Conflicts* chapter 7.
 78. William of Tyre *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum* book 15 chapter 27; *PL* 201 col. 638. Fulk died on 29 September 1186.
 79. *Syloges epistolarum a viris illustribus scriptarum* edited Pieter Burman, 5 vols (Leiden: Samuel Luchtmans, 1727) vol. 2, p. 40; online at http://www.uni-mannheim.de/mateo/cera/burman1/Burman_sylloge_tom_2.html.
 80. Written 1125. William of Malmesbury *De gestis pontificum anglorum libri quinque*, *PL* 179 col. 1557; *History of the English Bishops: Volume I: Text and Translation* edited and translated Michael Winterbottom and Rodney M. Thomson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007) 3 100: 31, pages 338–9.
 81. St Bonaventura *Legenda maior beatissimi patris francisci* (Paris: Claude Chevallon and London: St Paul's Churchyard, 1511–14) section 2, chapter 2, section 6; online at <http://www.rilievo.poliba.it/bsc/bsc/st/cc/orc/francescani/index.html>.
 82. *Vita Beati Aelredi auctore incerto*, *PL* 195 cap. 2, col. 201.
 83. Letaldus of Micy (died c.1010) *Liber miraculorum S Maximini abbatis Micianensis*, *PL* 137 chapter 11 cols 814–815. They were presumably electrocuted. Electric shock causes cardiac arrest. When speculating about the cause of Elisha's patient's demise, my doctor friend considered but discounted a lightning strike on the grounds that it would surely have been mentioned.
 84. Ralph of Coggeshall 'Vision of Thurkill' 443. The word in the printed edition is *supor*: is this meant to be *sopor* or *stupor*?
 85. Bernard of Clairvaux *Sermones in Cantica Cantorum*, *PL* 183 cols 848 and 852. Translated by Kilian Walsh as *On the Song of Songs I* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1977) 110–125, especially 112, 120 for *neque vox neque sensus*, 114–116 on Elisha's actions in resuscitating the boy.
 86. Biblical exegesis focussed on Giezi and Elisha as the Old and New Law, the Old Law with its staff which fails to resurrect the soul until the New Law in Christ arrives. Hrabanus Maurus *Commentum in libros IV Regum*, *PL* 109 col. 229: the

staff is the terror of the Old Law, Elisha lying exactly upon the boy is Christ taking on the similitude of man to heal him; Gerhoh of Reichersperg *Expositionis in Psalmos continuatio*, PL 194 col. 293 (commentary on Psalm 70), 788 (commentary on Psalm 118, AV 119).

Nicholas de Lyra's gloss on the clause says:

Expositores autem nostri dicunt, quod hoc fuit ds designandum quod lex vetus quæ per baculum designatur, non conferebat gratiam viuificantem, sed hoc facit verbum incarnatum, quod significabatur per extensionem Elisei super puerum, vnde dicitur Ioan. I. b. Lex per Moysen data est, gratia & veritas per Iesum Christum. Bibliorum sacrorum cum Glossa ordinaria ... Tomus secundus (Venice: 1603) gloss on cols 883–4.

87. Hrabanus Maurus *Expositio super Jeremiam prophetam*, PL 111 col. 168, on Jeremiah 10:14, where *et non est spiritus in eis* (Douai, 'there is no spirit in them'), is amplified to *nec vox, neque sensus, neque ulla efficacia operum inest* ('there is no voice, nor feeling, nor any ability to do anything').
88. Paschasius Radbertus *Expositio in Evangelium Matthei*, PL 120 col. 361. They are characterised as *insensibilia ... quibus neque auditus, neque loquela, neque sensus est ullus* ('things without sense ... in which there is neither hearing, nor speech, nor feeling at all').
89. Herbert of Bosham uses it in his *Life of the archbishop*; Bosham *Vita Sancti Thomae Archiepiscopi et martyris*, PL 190 book 4 chapters 12 (col. 1191) and 16 (col. 1201); in *Materials for the history of Thomas Becket* edited James Craigie, 7 vols (Rolls Series 67; London: Longman, Brown, Green, 1875–1885) 3 368, 384.
90. *The letters of John of Salisbury Volume 2 (1163–1180)* edited and translated W.J. Millor and H.E. Butler, revised C.N.L. Brooke (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979) 457. The editors do not pick up the reference.
91. The *Patrologia* text reads *non erat mihi fere vox neque sensus*; PL 182 col. 1135. A slightly different text was translated in the Caxton edition of 1493 as 'I was as thenne past weping / wyt or voys': *This trefyse is of loue ...* (London: Caxton, 1493) sig. D iijv. It quotes a Latin text which runs *defecit spiritus meus / & non erat michi flere / neque sensus neque vox*, though it says that the book 'was lately translated oute of frensh in to englisshe by a Right well dysposed persone'. Possibly at some point *fere* was misread as *flere*.
For a modern edition, see Thomas H. Bestul *Texts of the Passion: Latin Devotional Literature and Medieval Society* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1996) 168–9. He does not however pick up the reference to 4 Kings 4:31.
92. David Murray *The Black Book of Paisley and other manuscripts of the Scotichronicon* (New Club Series 8; Paisley: Alexander Gardner, 1885) 74. Edward died on 7 July 1307.

93. Brown 'Folklore Elements in the Medieval Drama' cites 'one learned commentator on the play who came to the conclusion that Wit was not dead but in a stupor, and that the stage direction which clearly says that Wit is to die was a foolish mistake on the part of a scribe' (71–2); Potter *English Morality Play* says: 'Wit ... is *apparently* slain' (13); Lennam *Sebastian Westcott*: 'Wit is slugged insensible by Tediousness' (97); Victor Scherb 'Playing with Maturity' seems to veer between both positions: 'Wit has two encounters with the giant Tediousness, each resulting in an *apparent* death' 273 ; but then 'Wit [is] a singularly ineffective knight-errant who is killed rather quickly in his first fight ... [he] commits a kind of psychic suicide, manifested by his motionless body onstage, a physical representation of scholarly ennui' (276); but then returns to an '*apparent* resurrection from the dead' 277. Folklorists are much more ready to accept a 'real death'.
94. Gray *I & II Kings*: on Elisha, 'Popular tradition might also have exaggerated the unconsciousness of the boy to actual death' (499); on Elijah, 'neither in this verse nor the sequel to it is it said that the lad was actually dead' (382); also *The Miracles of Jesus* edited Craig Blomberg and David Wenham (Gospel Perspectives 6; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986) 564–75. Josephus provides the 'rational' explanation for Elijah's revival of the son of the woman of Sarephtha: 'her son fell ill so seriously that he ceased to breathe and seemed to be dead': Wendy Cotter *Miracles in Greco-Roman Antiquity: A Sourcebook* (London: Routledge, 1999) 49. She also cites a medical miracle by Apollonius of Tyana, where the author Philostratus himself debates whether the victim was or was not dead (45).
95. *Summa Theologiae Volume 44: Well-tempered Passion* edited Thomas Gilby (London: Blackfriars / Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1972) 2a2æ 164, 1; pages 170–1.
96. Aulus Cornelius Celsus *De medicina* edited F. Marx and translated W.G. Spencer vols 1 and 2 (Loeb Classical Library; London: William Heinemann, 1935 and 1938) 1 98–117 (Book 2 6: 3–18).
97. Jacques-Bénigne Winsløw *The uncertainty of the signs of death, and the danger of precipitate interments and dissections, demonstrated ...* (London: M. Cooper, 1746), a translation of the Danish/French physician's *Dissertation sur l'incertitude des signes de la mort et l'abus des enterremens & embaumemens précipités* translated with commentary by Jacques-Jean Bruhier (Paris: Morel and others, 1742), an edition of his 1740 *Morte incertae signa*. See also Alexander 'Rigid Embrace' (note 37).
98. Steven B. Harris 'The Society for the Recovery of Persons Apparently Dead' *Cryonics Magazine* (September 1990); online at www.alcor.org/Library/html/PersonsApparentlyDead.htm. The paper argues for post-mortem cryonics, at the moment the ultimate attempt to overcome clinical death.

99. Chauliac's list of vital signs to be tested for, quoted above in note 58, is referred to later as 'þe tokenes and þe examynacion of a dede man' (411). Death is a negative state, defined by absence of life.
100. *OED* svv *revive* v. 2b and *resuscite* v. *Resurrection* seems to have been more of a technical term, confined to Christ's Resurrection and the General Resurrection.
101. See John Tercier 'The Lips of the Dead and the "Kiss of Life": The Contemporary Deathbed and the Aesthetic of CPR' *Journal of Historical Sociology* 15:3 (2002) 283–327.
102. P.N. Gordon, S. Williamson, P.G. Lawler 'As seen on TV: observational study of cardiopulmonary resuscitation in British television medical dramas' *British Medical Journal* 317 (19 September 1998) 780–3. This survey was undertaken because it appears that the British public gets most of its information on CPR from medical soaps, and the authorities were worried that their clients might be making the wrong decisions about asking for or refusing resuscitation. It transpired that the survival rate *through the arrest* (it does not take into account the lower figure for resuscitated patients who survive to go home) is statistically about right at around 25%; American soaps are much more optimistic at 77%, and *Baywatch* apparently had a nearly 100% success rate. Tercier 'Lips of the Dead' 308 quotes a different set of statistics for American hospitals; he is looking at long-term survival rates, and points out the preponderance of elderly patients with heart disease in cardiac arrest statistics, whereas on 'television, 65% of the cardiac arrests occur in children, teenagers or young adults; as opposed to a figure of around 6% in real life' and '72% of arrests are due to some form of trauma: gunshot wounds, motor vehicle accidents, or near drowning, which are "diseases" of the young and healthy'. Statistics are subordinated to dramatic effect.
103. Desdemona comes round fleetingly to exculpate Othello, then relapses. It does not matter whether Lear is mistaken or not in thinking that Cordelia stirs. Clinically, she could have.
104. See Meg Twycross and Sarah Carpenter *Masks and Masking in Medieval and Early Tudor England* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002) 10–11, 85–6. There is no need to take it a step further and suggest that he is a potential burglar or political rebel, or that it is a comment on the smutty face of an unwashed schoolboy: Scherb 'Playing at Maturity' 283–4.
105. See my 'Idleness teaches Ignorance to read', *Medieval English Theatre* forthcoming.