Theta VIII

est publié par le Centre d'Études Supérieures de la Renaissance,
dirigé par Philippe Vendrix,
Université François-Rabelais de Tours, CNRS/UMR 6576

Responsables scientifiques

André Lascombes & Richard Hillman

Mentions légales

Date de création

Juillet 2009

Playing the Monster: Changing Conventions in the Wit Plays

Roberta Mullini
Università di Urbino "Carlo Bo"

I n early modern times the belief in wonders and miracles was increasingly questioned, especially on the religious level. In his *Dialogue Concernynge Heresyes* (1528) Sir Thomas More, while talking with the Messenger, his fictitious interlocutor, stresses the role of reason and nature in the process of believing in God's miracles, and the relevance of one's eyes in the acceptance of the truth of events:

> In good faith quod I, I mene good ernest now, and yet as wel as ye dare trust me, I shal as I said if ye wyll go with me prouide a couple of witness of whome ye wyll beleue any one better than twaine of me, for they be your nere frendes and ye have been better acquainted with them, and such as I dare say for they be not often wont to lye. Who be they, quoth he I pray you. Mary, quod I, your owne two eyen. (More, p. 127, col. 2 [bk. 1, chap. 6])

According to More, to see something corresponds to believing in its truth, unless there is evidence of falseness.[1] The focus of the whole treatise is the belief in the veneration of saints and the role of images and pilgrimages in religion, so deeply controversial after the beginning of the Reformation.[2] More is not concerned

[1]   When commenting on the Messenger's tale about two false miracles, More is so strict and severe as to invoke the stake for the abusers (p. 134, col. 1 [1.14]).

[2]   For the continuing debate about the interrelation of fact and evidence in religion up to the eighteenth century, see Daston.

with "natural" wonders, such as monstrous births and fabulous creatures, but his stress on the correct use of one's eyes in detecting truth and falseness can be transferred to the world of nature, especially when—as happened in later decades—the new geographic and scientific discoveries started to call "all in doubt", thus questioning the link between seeing and believing. What medieval travellers had written about far-off lands and their inhabitants began to be put to trial, because for the fanciful eyes of the former new scientifically modern eyes were substituted, eyes that dissolved the aura of mystery and monstrosity grown around what was far and unknown. Nevertheless, the Renaissance continued to trust collections of images of monsters and strange creatures. (For example, as late as 1581 Stephen Batman published *The doome warning all men to the iudgemente wherein are contayned for the most parte all the straunge prodigies hapned in the worlde, with diuers secrete figures of reuelations tending to mannes stayed conuersion towardes God,* "in maner of a generall chronicle"—as the title goes on to declare—where historical events are still linked to portentous signs, and where sciapods and pygmies are listed, and the images of Siamese twins and hairy children are engraved.) Cheaply printed broadsides (but rich in illustrations), on the other hand, widely contributed to the diffusion of news about curious beings and events, so that what had been "seen" by somebody might be believed by many. Print, in its turn, helped enormously to spread images that once were relegated to expensive illuminated manuscripts. Furthermore, "print created a great need for sensational materials to be broadcast, and this need caused ideas that formerly had been lurking in the dark recesses of men's minds to come floating to the surface" (Smith, pp. 280-81). Showing monsters, then, was a way to make people believe in them, even if "the Renaissance was less interested in the far-off monstrous races of Africa and Asia than in the monsters they could see about them—anomalous births, strange events, occurrences contrary to nature" (Smith, p. 267).

All of the three so called "Wit plays" have a monster among their characters, slightly differently defined in the various texts: what follows in this article is devoted to enquiring what creature it is and what its role is within these more-or-less mid-sixteenth-century plays. This monster lives in the world of drama, and is therefore shown to, and seen by, its spectators as fictitious, an "unbelievable" creature only theatre can make "real". Performance substitutes for print, then, in satisfying the Renaissance need for sensation.

I. The Three Plays

A manuscript datable before 1550 (B.M. Add. MS 15233) contains a partially incomplete dramatic text (what remains consists of 1106 lines) whose colophon states title and author: "Thus endyth the play of Wit and Science made by Master Ihon Redford". Little is known of this man, but it is possible to locate him culturally and historically: he was St Paul's choirmaster between 1531 and 1547 (the year of his death), and almost certainly he wrote *Wit and Science* for a children's performance in front of the court or of a courtly audience.

In 1569 the Stationers' Register recorded the licence for printing of an anonymous play entitled *The Marriage of Wit and Science* (1563 lines),[3] later attributed to Sebastian Westcott, who was Redford's successor at St Paul's (perhaps as early as 1548).[4]

Another, later, manuscript appears to be the handwritten copy of a lost printed play, *The Marriage between Wit and Wisdom* by Francis Merbury (B.M. Add. MS. 26782, *c.* 1579), a text which seems to be addressed, not to a courtly or school audience, but to a popular one, and whose players are not children, as is the case for the previous two works. With regard to this version, David Bevington observes that "Perhaps the most fascinating inference to be drawn … is that the dramatist apparently felt it necessary to rewrite the 'Wit and Science' plot for the conventions of the popular stage" (p. 23). This manuscript (770 lines) offers the doubling scheme, a device that was not necessary when a play was performed by a school group, given the abundance of students available. Trevor Lennam does not totally agree with this position, and—taking into consideration Merbury's permanent situation at Cambridge University[5]—maintains that this play also was written for students: "It is doubtful that he [Merbury] wrote it for the popular stage. On the other hand, the supposed printed version, in so far as it is reflected by the existing manuscript, may well have been arranged to make its appeal to a small professional troupe and to audiences that such a company would entertain" (Lennam, *Sebastian Westcott*, p. 111).

Certainly, it is possible to suppose the existence of a much more complete and consistent text, of which what survives is but a mangled version, adapted

---

3   Actually, the number of lines is smaller, since Lennam, whose edition is used here, assigns a number also to speech headings, stage directions and act and scene divisions.

4   See Lennam, *Sebastian Westcott*, p. 14.

5   See Lennam, "Francis Merbury", p. 210.

for a popular audience. Nevertheless, the very survival of *this* text may be attributed to a contemporary reception more favourable than that reserved for the hypothetical first version of the play. When compared with the two other Wit-entitled plays, Lennam admits, *The Marriage between Wit and Wisdom* "quickly loses interest in the pedagogical allegory" (Sebastian Westcott, p. 110), whereas Hanna Scolnicov maintains that this play is such a coherent "humanist parable" as to express "the educational ideals of humanism" (p. 1). Lennam, for his part, after highlighting that the text as we have it shows a certain weariness of the humanist educational themes, declares that the plot changes from Wit's adventures to the Vice Idleness's intrigues.

Within a forty-year period, then, English culture produced three plays overtly related to each other, which showed the audience's particular interest in their topic and their transformation of it. An interest also manifested in the 1590s, when William Shakespeare, Anthony Munday, Thomas Dekker, Thomas Heywood, and Henry Chettle wrote *The Book of Sir Thomas More*. In Scene Nine of that play, when a company of strolling players visiting More's house offers to perform a play from a list they quote, More exclaims:

> *The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom*! That, my lads,
> I'll none but that; the theme is very good,
> And may maintain a liberal argument:
> To marry wit to wisdom, asks some cunning;
> Many have wit, that may come short of wisdom. (ix.64-68)

Even if the play-within-a play performed later by the "four men and a boy" of the little company will result in a *collage* of various dramatic texts,[6] More's enthusiastic choice of this title testifies to its familiarity to the 1590s authors, and to the links between the title role and the humanist content of the plot.

The overt intertextuality of the three interludes ("a fortunate survival", in Happé's words [*English Drama*, p. 144]) is shown first of all by their titles, which mirror the main theme of the plot, so that the three plays, all of them interludes, offer a real workshop of intertextual transformations able to provoke genre variants, and also changes which can be attributed to cultural attitudes at large.[7]

---

6   See Happé, ed., *Tudor Interludes*, pp. 417-18.
7   The three plays are analysed as an *unicum* in English drama by Spivack, Habicht ("The Wit Interludes" and *Studien*), Mullini, and Norland. Scherb has recently devoted a long article to Redford's interlude only; for *Wit and Science*, see also Lombardo.

II. The Variants in the Plot

The events of *Wit and Science* and those of *The Marriage of Wit and Science* are very similar: Wit, a young student, wants to marry Lady Science, but before achieving this goal, he has to defeat her most terrible enemy, Tediousness. At the first rough duel with Tediousness, Wit is left dead on the ground, but he is soon revived by Honest Recreation, only to fall into Idleness's lap, who blackens his face and dresses him like a fool with Ignorance's costume. Helped by the "glass of reason" given him by Reason (the girl's father), Wit can recognise his situation and get ready to fight with Tediousness once more. The enemy is beaten and beheaded, and the interlude ends with the encounter of the protagonist with Science. *The Marriage of Wit and Science* differs from its direct hypotext because of its division into acts and scenes and, especially, the presence of Wit's young and cheeky servant called Will, who has a relevant part in the play also as love messenger between Wit and Science.

The Marriage between Wit and Wisdom, on the other hand, presents various differences from the previous texts: first, the names of some characters are changed (among them Tediousness is "translated" into Irksomeness); then, the action has a mainly episodic structure, pivoting around Idleness ("the Vice" of the play, a man and not the female character of the other two interludes). Irksomeness is quickly defeated offstage, while the plot thickens with the misfortunes of the Vice himself, so that this interlude also shows the decline of this character, since—instead of being the main device of the action—Idleness becomes the victim of minor thieves, newly introduced. Obviously, allegory remains the principal feature in all three interludes, together with their humanist and pedagogical interests, but it is clear that, especially in the latest example, things have undergone significant cultural changes, the allegorical layer being mainly limited to the characters' names.

Love and adventures are the main aspects of the romantic plot in all three interludes, which also verge on folk drama for the quick reviving of the title hero. According to Spivack, Wit resembles an errant knight, Lady Science is "a proper damosel of romance", and Tediousness is "a Saracen Knight [who] swears by Mahound" (p. 219). The latest version of the story incorporates characters and language from a lower world than the humanist milieu of the other two interludes,

while making full use of the dramatic qualities of the Vice, including his capacity for disguise (Idleness boasts of being able to be "all colours like the chameleon").[8]

III. Monsters and Giants

In *Wit and Science* Tediousness is called "your enmye" by Instruction at line 79, and "that tyrant" by Wit (l. 81). He is said to be able "to brayne or to gore ye" (l. 80), and, on his first appearance, he is introduced by the following stage direction: "*Tedyousnes cumth in with a vyser over hys hed*" (l. 140). In his monologue of self-introduction (ll. 141-92), he often mentions his body both as a whole and in its parts, as if to attract the audience's gaze to his physical aspect (a monstrous body?), complaining that some "kaytyves" are disturbing him out of his own "nest" (ll. 142, 146). He also laments that he is sweating "in my skin" (l. 182), thus introducing a subtle metatheatrical dimension, since the phrase simultaneously refers to the character and to the actor's costume, the latter encumbering the player with its weight and thickness. Taken all together, what Tediousness says about himself and what the stage direction suggests make him a visually striking spectacle: he has a "head" and a visor on it, is covered with a heavy "skin", goes about the playing area shaking his "ioyntes" and "lynkes" (l. 167), speaks of his "nose" (later called "snowte" [l. 217]), and menaces with killing—actually with beheading—those who disturb him ("Of goth thy hed / At the first blo!" [ll. 190-91]). He is also armed with a club (he threatens to hit Wit with "this mall" [l. 161]), and blunders through the audience shouting, "Make roome, I say! / Rownd evry way!" (ll. 175-76), like a mummer. Towards the end of the play he is called "feend" (l. 956), a term connecting him with the devil. He boasts of his strength, exactly like a tyrant or evil character in the mystery cycles (Herod, perhaps?), and swears "by Mahowndes" (l. 214, 216), exactly like Herod in the N-Town *Death of Herod*, the Coventry *Shearmen and Taylors' Play*, and the York *Slaughter of the Innocents*, thus signalling that he is a non-Christian, perhaps a "Saracen knight" indeed, as stated by Spivack.[9] As for his vocabulary, it is not romantic at all: Science is called "drab" and "whore" (ll. 155-56), showing in this way that the speaker is against all romance, or rather that he is the classic opponent in a romantic story. Besides that, he employs the Vice's and the devil's way of express-

---

8   The text of *The Marriage between Wit and Wisdom* is quoted from Merbury, ed. Wickham. For a detailed analysis of the changes in the plot, see Mullini, pp. 103-10.

9   See Velz and Daw, pp. 637-38, for the characterisation of Tediousness as Herod.

ing either wrath or joy ("oh, oh, oh"),[10] which links him back to the moral play tradition. Finally, he is killed offstage, after which "*Wyt cumth in, and bryngth in the hed upon his swoorde*" (l. 964 SD). After all this, one can legitimately wonder what kind of character Tediousness is. But before trying to answer this question, the other two plays must also be taken into consideration, in order to see whether the characteristics of Tediousness outlined by *Wit and Science* remain the same from text to text or are somehow changed.

In *The Marriage of Wit and Science* it is Science herself who first speaks of Tediousness. Even before naming him, she calls him "enemy" and "mortal foe" (l. 687), and some lines later she explains to Wit:

> Hear out my tale: I have a mortall foe
> That lurketh in the woode hereby, as you come and goe,
> That monstrous Giant beares a grudge to me and mine,
> And wyll attempt to kepe you back from this desire of thine.
> The bane of youth, the roote of ruin and destres,
> Devouring those that sue to me, his name is Tediousness. (ll. 700-5)

Continuing her speech, Science attributes "strong hands" (l. 708) and "rage" (l. 717) to this "monster", and says that in a year "ten thousand suters" have been destroyed (l. 711), thus adding a fabulous quality to Tediousness; she also asks Wit to bring her Tediousness' head after the fight (l. 720), and, in a following speech, adds that the monster's might is great and that he "is monstrous to behoulde" (l. 737). He lives in a "deadly denne . . . in drowsy darkness hydde" (l. 946, 948) and is armed with a club (l. 1486). His language is not so offensive as his predecessor's, but he similarly boasts and uses the "hoh, hoh!" expression to underline his own words (ll. 967, 980). Just before their second fight, Wit also calls him "monster fell" (l. 1476) and Tediousness declares his will to devour his enemies ("I will eate them by morsels two and two" [l. 1483]). The "Giant" is killed and beheaded on stage, and his head (of which no mention has been made in the text, apart from Science's general observation that he is "monstrous to behold"[11]), is hoisted onto Wit's spear (l. 1524).

In *The Marriage between Wit and Wisdom*, Wit's father, Severity, when advising his son about the perils of his enterprise, calls Irksomeness "a monster fell" (l. 71). The character arrives only after l. 414 (Scene Three), coming out of his "den" to fight with Wit (who, in this play, succumbs quite quickly to his enemy, remain-

---

10   See Débax.
11   Unfortunately, this interlude has scant original stage directions, and none relevant for the gestures and appearance of Tediousness.

ing dead "*on the stage*" [l. 419 SD]): the stage direction says nothing but "*Irksomeness enter like a monster and shall beat down Wit with his club*" [l. 414 SD]). Irksomeness' speech is very short (four lines only), and its main feature, I think, is the first line, "What wight is that which comes so near his pain?" (l. 415), for its linguistic and rhythmic choices, since it is alliterative and contains a word ("wight") more typical of Middle English romances than of the late 1570s. Soon, after thirty-odd lines (in this play Wit's resurrection, too, takes a very short time and is limited to a brief healing encounter between Wit and Wisdom), Wit is ready to attack Irksomeness for the second time. The two exchange a short dialogue, then

> Here they fight awhile, and Irksomeness must run in a-doors, and Wit shall follow, taking his visor off his head, and shall bring it upon his sword, saying [*Wit.*] The Lord be thanked for his grace, this monster is subdued. (l. 456)

As is clear from these notes, if, on the one hand, the character is overtly called "monster"—thus getting an ontological status, so to speak—on the other hand, he is deprived of most of the features he is endowed with in the other two interludes. What we know of Irksomeness is that he has a visor over his head; he is very similar, then, to his namesake in *Wit and Science*, as if to stress the continuity of a performing tradition about the representation of monsters and the like, especially the devil (Titivillus in *Mankind* is "A man wyth a hede þat ys of grett omnipotens" [l. 461]). What is interesting is that the stage directions mention a *stage*, i.e., a well-defined playing area, by using a word more appropriate for the newly authorized public playhouses of the 1570s than for St Paul's school hall, where the performances of both *Wit and Science* and *The Marriage of Wit and Science* supposedly took place.

IV. Playing the Monster

From the previous lists of features, one can observe that Tediousness/Irksomeness belongs to the long series of monsters in which the Middle Ages is so rich. But he is a syncretic monster, so to speak, since he is a giant and a cannibal, according to Westcott's play, a woodwose and, why not, a green man (if not a Green Knight!). His appearance must be "monstrous", his height taller than human beings', his body very probably hairy or leafy, his weapon a club. The "wondrous Middle Ages" still live on during the Renaissance (as is testified by the many treatises devoted to

this cultural aspect),[12] even if "monsters" are progressively losing their menacing Otherness. Monsters are still used as a way to visualize contemporary fears (e.g., of witches), in spite of all the new discoveries and travel literature which confirm that the new lands are not inhabited by the mythical monsters described in the Middle Ages. The many illuminated sources for our ideas of medieval monsters testify that "seeing is believing"—so much so that, when on a stage, a "monster" keeps all its imaginative power, because the performance substitutes for any drawing or illumination. It is the show to which a monster is transferred which is responsible for the visualization of terribleness. It is necessary, then, for the actor playing the monster to wear a costume able to work on the spectators' imagination.

Wild men are common in medieval manuscripts, and so are green men in sculptures and bas-reliefs, but certainly, precisely because of its spectacular origin, what is most famous is the illumination from Jean Froissart's *Chroniques* (*c.* 1450-80) portraying the incident that occurred on 28 January 1397 at the court of Charles VI of France, when a group of persons dressed in wild men's costumes caught fire and died. The well-known "Bal des Ardents" shows that the mummers wore costumes made of green stuff (coloured threads, furs, but also rushes, perhaps), and matching head-gear.[13] The size of the unfortunate players does not appear to be, at least in the illuminations I have seen, larger than that of the people surrounding them. Later images of woodmen can be seen in German culture, but their size is always "human", as it were.[14] If, on the one hand, we can rely on these pictorial sources in order to visualize the costume of Tediousness, on the other, something must be added, precisely that on which the three interludes so much insist—that is, the monster's head. Actually, such a device, beyond showing the character's monstrosity, also increases the actor's height, since it is not a simple visor to be worn on the actor's face, but a big head, thus making a man into a "giant", to be detached later from Tediousness' body in the beheading.[15]

The English court was keen on pageants and disguisings with monsters and giants: documents relate, for example, that there were wild men in the "ryche

12   See, e.g., Boaistuau (1560), Paré (1573), and Aldrovandi (1642). It is worth noting, however, that in 1564 François Desprez had published his vast collection of engravings reproducing contemporary people from the various parts of the then-known world, including Brazilians, Africans and Asians, with no hint of wonders or strange features.

13   There is more than one pictorial version of the event: see BL MS Harley 4380, fol. 1ʳ, and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Fonds Français 2646, fol. 176ʳ.

14   See Kinser.

15   The tradition of parading giants was well known all over Europe, and is still practised on many festive occasions.

Mount" prepared by Richard Gibson at Greenwich on 6 Janurary 1509; woodwoses in a masque on 4-5 June 1522; monsters and wild men in the Lord Mayor's water pageants for Ann Boleyn on 29 May 1533. Another document makes it clear that giants were made of wood and canvas.[16] Because of the school (if not courtly) performance of both *Wit and Science* and *The Marriage of Wit and Science*, one can surmise that similar structures were used also for the two interludes, or even hypothesize a direct use of props prepared for courtly festivities. If *The Marriage between Wit and Wisdom* was thought of for (or performed by) a troupe of strolling players, perhaps such apparatus was too cumbersome to be carried around the country and a simple larger-than-life head was sufficient to make a giant.[17] What is certain is that the "monster" has a detachable head and a visor, or only a visor to be shown at the end of the fight, in order to make the beheading manifest (and therefore credible), even if it actually takes place offstage.[18]

V. Conclusion

Tediousness/Irksomeness in the three Wit plays is not only that sort of syncretic creature which I have tried to bring forth from the texts: since, being Lady Science's enemy, he must be defeated by Wit, he also occupies the role of the dragon in the popular story of St George, the iconography of which is ample and might have been drawn upon for a rendering in performance. At the same time, Tediousness in *Wit and Science* makes use of the entry style of folk drama, thus reminding the audience of exactly that kind of performance (which is also very much present in the "resurrection" of Wit by means of Honest Recreation's song).[19] Besides that, he employs the Vice's and the devil's way of speaking, which links him with the moral play tradition, even if the pedagogical milieu in which the original play was born tends

16   See Lancashire, pp. 141n702, 143n717, 198n1016, 292n1550. See Duffy for connections between *Wit and Science* and court disguisings.

17   Actually, in Meg Twycross's production with the Joculatores Lancastrienses (1993), Tediousness—with a head which made him taller than the other characters—wore a rough unnaturally bluish-grey fur, had a long red nose, a big mouth, goggled white eyes, and bones hanging from his waist. There was also a little branch of ivy (or another green plant) stuck in his long hair (or beard): all this contributed to suggesting the syncretism of the "creature" as a cruel anthropophagus, a woodwose, and a green man.

18   Craik, p. 53, observes that "in all three plays he [the monster] has a false head" and that, besides *Three Ladies of London* (*c.* 1581), the "Wit plays" are the only examples of Tudor interludes which specify "the use of vizards and false heads". For the construction of masks and heads, see Twycross and Carpenter, esp. pp. 311-26.

19   See Axton and Petitt.

to transform allegory into metaphor. Tediousness is neither the devil nor a Vice, nor the Turkish knight of folk drama, but the educational interludes embed all the traits of these previous (and contemporary) roles and sub-genres to represent the story of learning under the guise of other well-known plots: "learning is like morality play salvation or like a chivalric quest" (Cartwright, p. 55). Furthermore, one must not forget that both Redford and Westcott were school teachers, almost certainly proud of the performing abilities of their pupils: to play the monster was surely a feat for a child, and both schoolmasters "had a primary purpose of displaying the talents of their young performers" (Mills, p. 164).[20]

Tediousness in *Wit and Science* is the best developed monster of all, but some features are also added to the character by the later adaptations of the play, such as his being a cannibal and a monster—better, a monstrous giant—by *The Marriage of Wit and Science*. This latter detail may well be a metatheatrical aside referring to a very tall chorister who played the role, in a cast formed by such young boys (when asked by Science about his age, Will says he is "between eleven and twelve" [l. 467]).

In the Table (see Appendix), I have listed (in modernised form) words and phrases related to Tediousness/Irksomeness, so that recurrent items common to the three plays are highlighted. What strikes one most, beyond the significantly different number of lines reserved to this character in the three interludes, is that *Wit and Science* never calls him "a monster", while equipping him with other interesting features concerning his appearance and language. On the contrary, *The Marriage of Wit and Science* stresses Tediousness' monstrosity, the only characteristic of his later inherited by Irksomeness. Among the three "monsters", Irksomeness appears to be a stage freak, there only for the sake of the old plot, marginalized by the new stories of petty thieves and prostitutes surrounding the Vice Idleness. All the chivalric aura still present in the previous interludes has been lost, together with the remnants of folk drama, while Merbury has been able to build up a text that draws on other contemporary "hits", such as *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, *Cambises* and *Misogonus*, reworking the now episodic plot for "public audiences (who demanded amusement rather than instruction in return for their money)" (Wickham, p. 164).

---

20   The present article was written before the publication of Mills's study of the "Wit plays", in which a wider perspective on the three interludes can be found, with special attention to the issue of the identity of the young protagonist.

To play the monster, then, seems to have lost all its allegorical and meta-phorical strength in early Elizabethan times: Renaissance culture has progressively "destroyed" monsters and cleared the horizon of their menacing and fanciful pres-ence.[21] Travel literature recorded no monsters in the colonies, so that a play written (and perhaps performed) in the late 1570s, while still paying homage to its old main source, cannot ask its audience to believe in its onstage monsters. What it does is simply to use one of them as an obsolete, fabulous and fairy-tale character, once necessary to the story of the nuptials between Wit and Science in a humanist and pedagogical environment, but no longer so for the new urbanized spectators made up of workers and apprentices. What can be noticed is that all three "Wit plays" represent a creature in whose existence Renaissance pedagogy did not believe any longer, and that—when another monster later appears on the English stage—it will be Caliban, repeatedly called "monster", but too human to be true, the real "thing of darkness" able to express the feeling of Otherness of the Renaissance, rather than a figment of the imagination.

21   In spite of all this, Smith speaks of "the monster-obsessed Renaissance", because "The monstrous races are still found in Renaissance geographies and histories" (pp. 268, 267). On monsters in early modern times, see also Huet, esp. pp. 13-35.

Appendix: The qualities of the "monster" in the Wit plays

Lines	Tediousness in W&S*	Lines	Tediousness in MWS*	Lines	Irksomeness in MWW*
79	Enemy	687	Enemy	70	Enemy
80	"Brain or gore you"	687, 700, 1516	Mortal foe	71	Monster fell
81	Tyrant	701	Lurks in the wood	74, 75	Foe
140 (SD)	Visor over his head	702	Monstrous giant	414 (SD)	Den, like a monster, club
141, 148	"Body"	704	Bane of youth, root of ruin and distress	415	"What wight …"
146	"Nest"	705	Devours those…	455 (SD)	Visor off his head, [visor] on Wit's sword
155, 158, 163	"Drab"	708	Strong hands	456	Monster
156	"Whore"	710	Drowns in despair		
161	"Bones", "mall"	711	Destroyer of Science's suitors		
167	"Joints", "links"	714	Monster		
169	Shakes [his body]	717	Rage		
175	"Make room!"	720	Head		
182	"my skin"	727	Wretch, common foe		
190	Boasts	737	Monstrous to behold, full of might		
192	"Ho, ho, ho, ho"	946	Deadly den		
214, 216	"by Mahound"	948	hides in darkness		
217	"Snout"	948, 1476	Monster fell		
222	"Horeson"	967, 980	"Hoh, hoh, hoh!"		
956	Fiend	1483	Eats [people]		
956, 963	"Oh! ho! ho"	1486	"Club"		
964 (SD)	Head upon Wit's sword	1524	Head upon Wit's spear		
Lines spoken and %**	70,5 / 1106 (6,37%)		24,5 / 1563 (1,57%)		5,5 / 770 (0,71%)

* W&S: *Wit and Science*; MWS: *The Marriage of Wit and Science*; MWW: *The Marriage between Wit and Wisdom*
** The following totals include mostly full lines, but also the sum of half-lines attributed to the character. The percentages are calculated on the total number of lines per play.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Aldrovandi, Ulysses. *Monstrorum Historia cum Paralipomenis Historiae omnium animalium.* Bononiae: Typis Nicolai Tebaldini, 1642 (posthumous publication).

Batman, Stephen. *The doome warning all men to the iudgemente wherein are contayned for the most parte all the straunge prodigies hapned in the worlde, with diuers secrete figures of reuelations tending to mannes stayed conuersion towardes God: in maner of a generall chronicle, gathered out of sundrie approued authors by St. Batman professor in diuinite.* [London]: Ralphe Nubery for Henry Bynneman, 1581.

Boaistuau, Pierre. *Histoires prodigieuses les plus mémorables qui ayent esté observées, depuis la Nativité de Iesus Christ, iusques à nostre siècle: Extraites de plusieurs fameux autheurs, Grecz, & Latins, sacrez & profanes.* Paris: Jean Longis and Robert le Mangnier, 1560.

Chettle, Henry, Thomas Dekker, Thomas Heywood, Anthony Munday, William Shakespeare. *The Book of Sir Thomas More.* Ed. V. Gabrieli and G. Melchiori. Bari: Adriatica, 1981.

Desprez, François. *Recueil de la diversité des habits, qui sont de present en usage, tant es pays d'Europe, Asie, Affrique & Isles sauvages, le tout fait apres le naturel.* Paris: Richard Breton, 1564.

Happé, Peter, ed. *Tudor Interludes.* Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1972.

Mankind. The Macro Plays: The Castle of Perseverance, Wisdom, Mankind. Ed. Mark Eccles. Early English Text Society, 262. London: Oxford University Press for the Early English Text Society, 1969.

Merbury, Francis. *The Marriage between Wit and Wisdom. English Moral Interludes.* Ed. Glynne Wickham. London: Dent, 1976.

More, Thomas. *A Dialogue Convernynge Heresyes* (1528). *The Workes of Sir Thomas More Knyght, sometyme Lorde Chauncellour of England, wrytten by him in the Englysh tongue.* London: John Cawed, John Waly, and Richarde Tottell, 1557. 104-288.

Paré, Ambroise. *Des monstres tant terrestres que marins. Deux livres de chirurgie.* Paris: André Wechel, 1573.

Redford, John. *Wit and Science. Tudor Interludes.* Ed. Peter Happé. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1972.

Twycross, Meg, dir. *Wit and Science. An Allegory of Education by Master John Redford.* Joculatores Lancastrienses. Introd. D. Blacow and M. Bowen. Lancaster University Television, 1993.

Westcott, Sebastian. *The Marriage of Wit and Science*. Ed. Trevor N. Lennam. *Sebastian Westcott, the Children of Paul's, and the Marriage of Wit and Science*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.

Secondary Sources

Axton, Richard. "Folk Play in Tudor Interludes". *English Drama: Forms and Development: Essays in Honour of Muriel Clara Bradbrook*. Ed. Marie Axton and Raymond Williams. Introd. Raymond Williams. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977. 1-23

Bevington, David. *From "Mankind" to Marlowe*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Cartwright, Kent. *Theatre and Humanism: English Drama in the Sixteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Craik, T. W. *The Tudor Interlude: Stage, Costume, and Acting.* Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1958.

Daston, Lorraine. "Marvelous Facts and Miraculous Evidence in Early Modern Europe". *Critical Inquiry* 18 (1991): 93-124.

Débax, Jean-Paul. "*Oh, oh, oh. Ah, ah, ah.* The Meaning of Laughter in the Interludes". *Tudor Theatre 6: For Laughs (?)*. Introd. Roberta Mullini. Bern: Peter Lang, 2002. 81-94.

Duffy, R. A. "*Wit and Science* and Early Tudor Pageantry: A Note on Influences". *Modern Philology* 76 (1978): 184-89.

Habicht, Werner. *Studien zur Dramenform vor Shakespeare: Moralität, Interlude, romaneskes Drama*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1968.

____. "The Wit-Interludes and the Form of Pre-Shakespearean 'Romantic Comedy'". *Renaissance Drama* 8 (1965): 73-88.

Happé, Peter. *English Drama before Shakespeare*. London: Longman, 1999.

Huet, Marie-Hélène. *Monstrous Imagination*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Kinser, Samuel. "Why Is Carnival So Wild?". *Carnival and the Carnivalesque*. Ed. Konrad Eisenbichler and Wim N. M. Hüsken. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1999. 43-87.

Lancashire, Ian. *Dramatic Texts and Records of Britain: A Chronological Topography to 1558*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.

Lennam, Trevor. "Francis Merbury 1555-1611". *Studies in Philology* 65.2 (1968): 207-22.

____. *Sebastian Westcott, the Children of Paul's, and the Marriage of Wit and Science*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1975.

Lombardo, Agostino. *Il dramma preshakespeariano.* Venice: Neri Pozza, 1957.

Mills, David. "Wit to Woo: The Wit Interludes". Interludes and Early Modern Society: Studies in Gender, Power and Theatricality. Ed. Peter Happé and Wim N. M. Hüsken. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007. 163-90.

Mullini, Roberta. La scena della memoria: Intertestualità nel teatro Tudor. Bologna: CLUEB, 1988.

Norland, Howard B. Drama in Early Tudor Britain 1485-1558. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995.

Petitt, Thomas. "'This man is Pyramus': A Pre-history of the English Mummers' Play". Medieval English Theatre 22 (2000): 70-99.

_____. "Tudor Interludes and the Winter Revels". Medieval English Theatre 6.1 (1984): 16-27.

Scherb, Victor L. "Playing at Maturity in Redford's Wit and Science". Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900 45.2 (2005): 271-97.

Scolnicov, Hanna. "To Understand a Parable: The Mimetic Mode in The Marriage of Wit and Wisdom". Cahiers Élisabéthaines 29 (1986): 1-10.

Smith, Norman S. "Portentous Births and the Monstrous Imagination in Renaissance Culture". Marvels, Monsters, and Miracles: Studies in the Medieval and Early Modern Imaginations. Ed. T. S. Jones and D. A. Sprunger. Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, 2002. 267-83.

Spivack, Bernard. Shakespeare and the Allegory of Evil. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

Twycross, Meg, and Sarah Carpenter. Masks and Masking in Medieval and Early Tudor England. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002.

Velz, John W., and Carl P. Daw, Jr. "Tradition and Originality in Wyt and Science". Studies in Philology 65 (1968): 631-46.