‘Eene schoone engelsche troupe’: William Durham and his company of travelling performers in Ghent (1713) and Germany (1724-1728).

J.P. Vander Motten

Verzamelband Theater in Gent 1600-1809, preserved in the holdings of Ghent University Library, is a one-volume, extensive collection of handwritten notes and printed documents, all chronologically ordered and relating to the history of the Ghent stage. Although unattributed in the catalogue, there can be little doubt that the collection was at one time the property of Prosper Claeys (1834-1910), consisting as it does of a large portion of the materials for this local historian’s three-volume *Histoire du Théâtre à Gand* (Ghent, 1892), a work covering the period from the 16th-century Chambers of Rhetoric down to the author’s own days. Claeys’ papers include transcriptions of archival documents, such as records of receipts and expenditures, requests for permissions to act, and licences granted by the authorities, as well as 18th- and 19th-century newspaper notices, theatre bills, and printed programmes. Acclaimed as a pioneer work upon its publication in 1892, Claeys’ *Histoire* in the past one hundred and thirty years has been mainly drawn upon by historians of the Ghent and Brussels theatres (Liebrecht, 270; Hoppe, ‘New Light’; Schrickx). But on the whole, as Harry Hoppe observed as long ago as 1949, Claeys’ work ‘appears to have escaped the attention of historians of the English drama’ (Hoppe, ‘English Actors’, 20). Even today, some of the evidence which the *Histoire* contains with respect to British travelling performers has remained entirely unnoticed in English-language annals of the stage.

In volume 2 of his work, dealing with the theatre companies operating between 1598 and 1841, Claeys cast a cursory glance at performances given in the city by 17th-century English acting troupes, including those of John Wood in 1604, William Pedel (or Peadle) in 1608, 'John Grim' [i.e. Greene] in 1624, and Thomas 'Rogiers' [Rogers?] in 1625 (Claeys, II, 4-5, 7-12).[1] It is in this context that the author repeatedly called attention to the popularity enjoyed by visiting bands of (mostly unidentified) foreign acrobats and rope dancers, who indefatigably continued to entertain local audiences throughout the 17th and well into the 18th centuries. Of two or three of such companies more distinct traces have fortunately been left in the city records. In the summer of 1713, one William Durham appeared in Ghent at the head of 'eene schoone engelsche troupe van Dansers, springhers ende andere groote liefhebbers' ('a fine English troupe of dancers, jumpers [i.e. vaulters?] and other great practitioners'), which had arrived from England, as the manager himself specified in his request submitted to the city's head-bailiff and council of aldermen (Claeys, II, 68-9).[2] How long this company had been in existence; whether it included stage actors in addition to dancers and jumpers; how many performances they gave and whether they ever returned to the city in after years—all of these must remain moot points.

Three interesting particulars contained in the manager's request, which Claeys copied out in full in his notes, did not find their way into the paragraph he devoted to Durham in the printed edition of his work. First, having come from England Durham's company had, 'to everyone's great satisfaction', displayed their capers 'in other cities in this country.'[3] Whether this should be taken to mean the Spanish Netherlands only or the Low Countries as

[1] On these three actors, see Bentley, 451, 522, and 625.
[2] Ten years before the publication of Claeys' work, Durham's visit had been briefly noted by the historian Frans de Potter (IV, 307).
[3] The (translated) quotations in the next few paragraphs are from Claeys' notes in the unpaginated *Verzamelband Theater.*

a whole, i. e. including the Dutch Republic, cannot be ascertained. Perhaps Durham had not taken his company on a continental tour until after the signing of the Treaty of Utrecht in April 1713, which virtually ended the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714) and initiated a period of peace and stability in Europe. By August 1713, five years after the 1708 campaign, which had seen the allied armies of the Duke of Marlborough and Prince Eugene of Savoy lay siege to and take the French-occupied nearby cities of Oudenaarde, Lille, Tournai, and Ghent itself, the political climate would have been more propitious for travelling performers to exercise their trade undisturbed by the rumblings of war (Jensen, 166-78)—even if in the previous years theatrical activity had by no means come to a grinding halt.[4] Second, it was no doubt on account of the acclaim they had received elsewhere that Durham felt encouraged to seek the consent of the authorities to perform in Ghent as well, and to be permitted the use of the theatre building 'op den Cauter' ('on the Cauter', the present-day 'Kouter'), a stately, tree-lined square in the centre of town. And third, the applicant's own promise that while occupying this theatre he would 'conform himself to the ordinary conditions'—no doubt those requiring occupants upon their departure to return the house to its original state—suggest that he was well-informed about the local municipal rules governing travelling actors' visits and may not have been a neophyte in the profession. (The city authorities' injunction that Durham's players use caution while accommodating the house for their shows proved both justified and premonitory. Just over two years later, on 16 December 1715, the building was completely destroyed by a fire probably started by

[4] Ghent had surrendered on 30 May 1706. Under the short-lived directorship of Jean-Jacques Quesnot de La Chênée (ca. 1664-1708), from July 1706 until January 1707, two of the director's own plays were performed celebrating the allied victories against the French, at Blenheim in 1704, and at Ramillies in 1706: the 'comic-heroic pastoral' *La Bataille de Ramelie ou les glorieuses conquestes des alliez* (Ghent, performed April 1707) and the 'tragic opera' *La Bataille de Hoogstet* (Ghent, 1707). See: Ahrendt, 185-88.

candles, which actors of Ghent's permanent theatre company had left burning the previous night) (Claeys, II, 72).

William Durham's decision to try his fortunes at Ghent must have been influenced by the very availability of a municipal theatre, which had opened on 31 May 1698, and which although fitted out for operatic spectacles had also been used by visiting funambulists.[5] Converted from a roofed-in riding school, these fixed premises would have saved the manager both time and money, obviating the need to construct, and subsequently dismantle, one or more expensive booths large enough for acrobatics displayed by what the archival evidence suggests was a sizeable troupe—'dancers, jumpers, and others'. Just as importantly, an indoor theatre allowed travelling troupes to stage their shows irrespective of the season and the weather conditions, as is demonstrated by the extant requests made by various other applicants appearing at Ghent during the traditional off-season periods—in February, March, and November (see below). Durham's request, dated 20 August 1713, was granted on the 25th, with the proviso that each time they performed the company contribute three guilders (or 'pound Flemish') to the city treasury and that they cede the full takings of one performance for the benefit of the local poor-house.[6]

For more than a decade, whenever troupes of rope dancers frequented the city and used the so-called 'new comedy place on the Kouter', the going rate of the rent had been ten shillings (*schellingen*) per performance. This is how much one Danneel Viellart (or Vollaert?) had paid when he 'acted' for 15 days as of 27 February 1701 and when he 'began to dance

[5] In the 1660s, the city had three theatres, including the so-called 'Comediantencaemer' or 'comedians' room', located in the city hall, all of which were used for acrobatic performances of all kinds. In 1674 this number was reduced to two, the premises at city hall having been turned into an arsenal. By the late 1680s, only the theatre off 'Magelein' street was still in operation (Claeys, II, 28-29, 31-32, 34-35).

[6] There were 20 shillings to the so-called 'pound Flemish', which had more or less the same value as the English pound sterling. See Guide to Seventeenth Century Dutch Coins, Weights and Measures : New Netherland Institute.

on the rope' again on 3 March 1703—the first of a string of no fewer than 27 performances in that year. This is also the amount an unnamed troupe had paid for each of their 20 performances, starting on 21 November 1709. Even as late as 22 October 1715, shortly before the theatre was destroyed by fire, one Jacobus Gardenier, a manager of unknown nationality, whose sizeable company of Italian actors and rope-dancers had repeatedly visited Ghent since 1709, was charged this identical amount (Claeys, II, 66, 68, 70). There is no reason, then, to assume that the rates were any different in August 1713, when Durham made his appearance in the city. Since no information is available about the capacity of the Ghent theatre, let alone the ticket prices for rope dancing or other performances, it is unclear how much of a drain on the company's takings the various amounts owed would have been.[7] But as troupe after strolling troupe continued to visit Ghent, one can only conclude that the charges imposed by the authorities did not constitute a major financial obstacle.

* *

*

At the time when Prosper Claeys was researching his *Histoire du Théâtre à Gand*, he appears to have been unaware of the fact that German theatre historians, whose names were no doubt familiar to him, had already brought to light archival evidence relating to William Durham's theatrical activities elsewhere in Europe, thirteen to fifteen years after his stay in Ghent. Like Claeys' mention of Durham, this evidence, too, has remained unnoticed in English-language reference works and accounts of the 18th-century stage and deserves

[7] The only indication about takings at the box-office is offered by the sums collected by the treasurer of the local poorhouse from three different benefit productions, including an opera, given *once* each in the course of the year 1696 at the Magelein theatre (see note 5): these ranged from more than 20 to over 23 pounds, after deduction of the operating expenses (Claeys, II, 40)—considerable amounts indeed.

examination as an interesting episode in the history of transnational theatre exchanges in early modern Europe.

What, then, are the available facts about Durham's movements? Quoting notes made by the historian Anton Balthasar König (1753-1814), Johannes Bolte (1858-1937)—the prolific folklorist and writer on Flemish literature, who had spent time working in libraries in Belgium, including Claeys' native city of Ghent in 1885 and 1890 (Koepp, 136-37)—reported in 1887 that William Duhram (sic) and his 'band of comedians', operating under a privilege issued by King Frederick William I of Prussia (ruled 1713 – 1740) on 5 December 1724, appeared in Stettin (present-day Poland) on 11 November 1727 (Bolte, 'Zur Stettiner').[8] According to the playbill prepared on this occasion, the programme was a very diverse one, consisting of a main-piece, a so-called 'Haupt- und Staats-Action', entitled *Der in einen Französischen Cavallier, Astrologum, Morian, Statua und Mumie, transmetamorphosirte Arlequin*, ('*Harlequin metamorphosed into a French Cavalier, an Astrologer, a Moor, a Statue, and a Mummy*'), and a comic afterpiece, 'replete with Harlequin's merry-making' (my translation). In true 18th-century fashion, the acts of the 'gallant' main-piece were to be interspersed with a remarkable display of 'Posituren, Springen, Voltisiren, Degen-Dänzen' ('postures, jumps, vaults, and sword-dances') by a famous 'Meisterin', a female performer, as well as with 'new ballets' on a daily basis. In a separate note, also published in 1887, Bolte called attention to an article by the historian Julius Opel (1829-1895), published in 1881, in which the latter recorded the visit paid by 'the comedian Wilhelm Duhram (or Durham)' to the city of Halle an der Saale in January 1728, only two months after his stay in Stettin (Bolte,

[8] It may be noted that French-born Quesnot de La Chênée, the director of the Ghent opera in 1706-1707 (see above), who had made Brandenburg his adoptive state, had styled himself 'Intendant des Plaisirs du Roi de Prusse [i.e. Frederick I]', or 'Manager of the Prussian King's Divertissements'.

'Zu dem Stettiner'). Having obtained permission to give several representations in the local ball house, Durham's company performed three plays, apparently to great public acclaim: the Harlequin play, which had been staged at Stettin, and two more, which had been given at an unspecified point in time in Berlin, namely, *Das durchlauchtigste Müllermädchen* (*The most noble maid of the mill*) and *Genovefa, oder die auf dem Probierstein der Geduld geprüfte eheliche Treue* (*Genoveva, or marital fidelity the touchstone of patience*) (Opel, 'Der Kampf'; Meyer, 24). In his history of the Danzig stage, finally, Bolte later noted that (otherwise unidentified) archival acts preserved at Riga revealed that Durham, leading a 'complete troupe of comedians', gave performances in this city on 6 April 1726, shortly after having visited Danzig and Königsberg, probably in 1725 (Bolte, *Danziger Theater*, 161-62).

A number of 19th-century as well as modern German historians have taken notice of Durham's brief stay in Halle in early 1728 in the context of the 18th-century Pietistic movement (Kawerau, 289-91; Hertzberg, 108-10; Meyer, 19-26; Petig, 184). With its roots in late 16th- and early 17th-century English Puritanism, this revivalist brand of Protestantism had spread to Switzerland, France, Scandinavia, and Germany, where the city of Halle became 'the centre for German Pietism during the eighteenth century' (Petig, 17). In Halle the fierce war which Pietism waged against all types of secular literature and theatrical representations derived its strength in large part from the unrelenting support of the University and the successive bans on play acting issued by King Frederick. Although in the course of his 27-year reign, the King occasionally lent his protection to troupes of strolling rope dancers, the anti-theatrical regulations were on the whole so strictly enforced that the city of Halle was not visited by actors or performers of any kind between 1720 and January 1728, when Durham somehow succeeded in circumventing the ban for a brief period of time. According to Gustav Hertzberg, the restrictions under which Durham was allowed to

act prohibited the display of obscenities, as well as 'Pickelhärings- und Gaukelpossen' ('Pickleherring-' [a clownish dramatic figure] and 'conjuring tricks') (Hertzberg, 110). Even so, the enthusiasm generated by the performances of this 'berühmte Englische Compagnie' ('famous English company')—a mixture of rope dancing, comedies, ballets, and burlesques—soon proved a thorn in the side of the university professors, who persuaded the King to issue an order, dated 20 February 1728, banning the group from Halle (Meyer, 24, 147).

Between December 1724 and February 1728, then, eleven to fifteen years after having toured the (Spanish?) Netherlands, William Durham, his career as a 'Prinzipal' or troupe manager in full swing, was taking his company on tours through large swaths of Germany. In so doing he followed in the footsteps, by now nearly erased by the winds of time, of at least three generations of British stage actors and other performers, who had visited Elbing, Danzig, Königsberg, and other places in Prussia in the first half of the 17th century (Hagen, 43-52).[9] It is in this connection that the only guess about Durham's family origins has been made. Bolte suspected that he was a son of Wilhelm Duhram or Düram (1658 – 1735), a judge of the Prussian Royal Supreme Court of Appeal (Bolte, *Danziger Theater,* 162). This in turn would have made him the grandson of William Durham (born 1624?), a Scotsman of noble descent, who had emigrated from Britain and established himself as a merchant in Elbing, East-Prussia, around 1650 (Bajer, 250). A 19th-century genealogical note, however, based on information provided by one of the last descendants of the Durham family, failed to make any mention of a William Durham who pursued an acting career in the late 17th- and early 18th-centuries (Crecelius). One wonders how likely it would have been for the son of a

[9] Dušan Ludvik notes that the 'English' comedians who are known to have performed in Germany around 1695, were no longer associated with either the 'early' or 'late' generation of English comedians (Ludvik, 64). Despite his long professional career, Durham's name is not included in Eike Pies's extensive lexicon of German company managers from the 17th to the 19th century (see *Prinzipale*).

father who rose to such influential positions in the Prussian state, including membership of the Elbing Consistory, to have embarked upon the insecure career of a wandering entertainer. But if our William was the son of the well-connected Wilhelm Duhram indeed—and the possibility cannot be ruled out—it is easy to see how he managed to secure a royal acting privilege in December 1724 as well as a license issued on 6 November 1727 by General-Major Jean de Forcade de Biaix (1663 – 1729), the military governor in Berlin (Meyer, 24)—both of these at a time when the King's own 1715 ban on all 'comedians, Harlequins, and hawkers' was still in full force (Petig, 181).That Durham's troupe had come from England in 1713 and that both then and in 1728 it was described as an English company does not reveal the nationality of its members or of their manager. The self-descriptive title 'English comedians' had long been used by companies of mixed nationality or even by troupes anxious to signal that they had recently toured England, as Durham's had (Bosman, 563).[10] To date, no new evidence has emerged in connection with the composition of Durham's troupe or his whereabouts before August 1713 and in the early 1720s. Yet the evidence brought to light in the late 19th-century German histories of the theatre cited above is specific enough to afford us a cursory glimpse of Durham's repertoire.

The dramatic taste of his German audiences, changes in the composition of his company, and varying scenic facilities in Stettin, Berlin, Halle, and elsewhere, would have made Durham's offerings in the mid-1720s utterly different from those he staged at Ghent in 1713. What the Stettin playbill and the other information gleaned from the German archives reveal is that his programme was characterized by variety and very much in line with that offered by contemporary strolling players in Germany—and by the professional theatre in England.

[10] The name 'Engelsche troupe' in the city records may have been Durham's acknowledgement of Marlborough's successes on the battle-field, which had led to the relief of Ghent—and thus a subtle bid for the city fathers' benevolence.

In George Brandt's words, 'the *chief* item in a programme of several entertainments presented in one afternoon' was the so-called 'Haupt- und Staatsaktion', a mainpiece combining matters of state with 'non-literary improvisation' and 'vulgar touches of comedy' (Brandt, 62-3). At Stettin, and probably elsewhere, the added and entr'acte entertainments consisted of a comic afterpiece, various types of acrobatics, and ballets changing on a daily basis—an unmistakable example of the type of 'whole show' that had become the regular fare on the London stage in the past two decades (Hughes). That the acrobatics were not looked upon as mere appendages to the main offering may be inferred from the playbill's announcement that they were to be displayed by a reputable female star, whose 'postures' and 'sword-dances' undoubtedly lent extra titillation to the programme.

By the late 1720s it would have been unusual for a company of strolling players not to include among its members one or several performing women. The English actor-manager George Jolly, who spent much of his career in Germany, is known to have employed German actresses as early as the mid-1650s (Puschmann, 36). By the mid-18th century, it has been pointed out, almost all of the seventy German itinerant companies 'had equal numbers of male and female performers' (Harris, 180-81). The presence of actresses has been documented in prominent troupes such as those of Michael Daniel Treu (c. 1634 - 1708); Andreas Elenson (1650 - 1706?), whose wife Marie Margarethe and sister Marie Christine were members of his company; and Johannes Velten (1640 - 1692 or 1693), whose widow Catherina Elisabeth (d. 1712) was to lead their itinerant troupe for many years after his death, while at the same time playing 'the comical episodes of the *Haupt- und*

Staatsaktionen' (Pies, 120-23, 370, 372-74; Harris, 179-80; Brandt, 59-62; Puschmann, 37).[11] If Durham was in any way indebted to the British rope-dancing tradition, which had seen women take on the roles of co-directors, financiers, and indeed active performers, the employment of a female dancer and acrobat must have seemed a matter of course (Vander Motten and Roscam Abbing, 22-23; Vander Motten, 'More'). Unfortunately, no particulars are available about the identity of Durham's *Meisterin* vaulter and sword-dancer, except that she must have been one of the specialized artists that he employed to present the mixed bag of entertainments making up an afternoon's programme.

The over-all generic mixture of this programme may also be illustrated by the two plays Durham's company allegedly performed in Berlin, one dealing with the 'Maid of (or in) the Mill', the other with 'patient Genoveva'. Both seem to be periphrastic phrases rather than actual titles, and of neither can the genre, let alone the authorship, be established. Johannes Bolte ventured the guess that the former was an (unattributed) tragicomedy about the 'Duke of Ferrara and the miller's daughter', an adaptation of *The Maid in the Mill* by 'Beaumont and Fletcher' (Bolte, Zu dem Stettiner; Fürstenau, 227-28), which had been produced at the Dresden court in September 1668. Included in the 1647 Beaumont and Fletcher Folio and republished in 1711 and 1718, *The Maid in the Mill* was actually a comedy long since accepted to have been the work of John Fletcher and William Rowley (*The Works; The Maid*). As has been recently demonstrated, the play was most probably revived at Lincoln's Inn Fields in the autumn of 1702, eighteen months before its first recorded performance at the same theatre in April 1704 (Lowerre). Although neither of the lists of 'Dramatis Personae' in the early 18th-century editions feature a Duke of Ferrara, the

[11] According to Katy Schlegel, the strong-man and performer Johann Carl von Eckenberg (1685-1747/48?) headed a numerous company of rope-dancers, singers, and actors, including his English-born wife Caroline, a dancer herself (Schlegel).

character of the nobly born Florimel, raised as a miller's daughter, could well have served as a model for the *Müllermädchen* of the play in Durham's repertoire—the German term indeed denotes more accurately Florimel's family relationship than the phrase 'the maid *in* the mill' itself.[12] In the English play Florimel, the honey flower, manages shrewdly but jealously to guard her honour against all attempts at seduction by Otrante, a Spanish count. Towards the end, she confesses to Don Philippo, King of Spain: 'I am yet a Maid: / By all that's white and innocent, I am, Sir: / Only I suffer'd under strong Temptations / The Heat of Youth; but Heav'n delivered me…' (act 5). Nearly martyred for her unblemished reputation, Florimel in this respect is not unlike Genoveva, the innocent and long-suffering central character in another of Durham's plays, discussed below. The interspersed dances and songs in *The Maid in the Mill,* along with its potential to be performed as a tragicomedy (as it possibly had been in Dresden), may have made it suitable for inclusion in a travelling company's mixture of offerings.[13] Merely judging by the play titles, then, Bolte's suggestion that Durham's company had a German-language version of the Fletcher and Rowley comedy in their repertoire should not be discounted. Revivals of the play on the London stage and two recent editions, in 1711 and 1718, indicative of a renewed interest, may have helped convince Durham to produce the English play before German audiences—but this, admittedly, must remain a matter of informed speculation.

---

[12] Bolte's adduction of a Duke of Ferrara character has the virtue of reminding us that—presumably English-inspired—plots revolving around Italian dukes had occurred relatively frequently in the extant 17th-century German play-lists and had therefore enjoyed some popularity, long before the staging of the play about the Duke of Ferrara at Dresden in September 1668. In 1604, a company of English itinerant actors had in their repertoire at Nördlingen (Bavaria) a German-language play about 'Annabella, eines hertzogen tochter vonn Ferrara'; and in June and September 1626, John Greene's troupe performed 'eine Comoedia vom Hertzog von Ferrara' at Dresden, a play believed to have been indebted to John Marston's *Parasitaster, or the Fawn* (1606). Greene also staged productions of plays about a Duke of Venice, on 23 July 1626, and on the Duke of Mantua and the Duke of Verona, on 4 September (Haekel, 106, 111-13, 135-36).

[13] In the second act, together with shepherds, nymphs, and other female characters, Florimel sings and dances as Venus, the goddess of love; and in act 5 she sings five (rather lubricious) songs (*The Maid,* pp. 20, 50-52).

We are on less shaky ground with respect to the materials treated in the play advertised in Berlin as being about the legendary Genoveva. Although the exact origins of her story remain obscure, it seems to have been based on that of the 13th-century Marie of Brabant, who was falsely accused of infidelity and ordered to be executed by her husband, the Count Palatine of the Rhine (Bemong, 43-44). When her innocence was posthumously established, her repentant husband founded a convent in memory of her. In fictional adaptations of Marie's history, servants of Genoveva, as she had come to be renamed, took pity on her and, instead of carrying out the death sentence, helped her escape into hiding in the woods, where she miraculously survived together with her son. After many years, she was happily reunited with her husband, who belatedly came to see the error of his ways. Variants of the legend proved tremendously successful in many European national literatures as of the 15th century. The French Jesuit René de Cerisiers (1603-1662) gave the widest circulation to the Genoveva materials with his *L'Innocence reconnue* (*Innocence vindicated*), *ou la Vie de Sainte Geneviève de Brabant* (Paris, 1638), a highly imaginative and expanded version of older stories, which in its turn was to serve as a source of inspiration for 'des romans, des chansons populaires, des tragédies, des drames, des mélodrames ou opéras, des pantomimes' (Seuffert, 40-41, 50, 58; Schneider, 20-25).

That Durham's company should have performed a play on this subject for German audiences in the mid- to late 1720s hardly comes as a surprise. *L'Innocence* was first translated into German by the Jesuit writer Michael Staudacher (1613-1672), who produced a thoroughly adapted version of the French original, written as early as 1647 but not published until 1660. The second, anonymous, and more faithful translation of de Cérisiers appeared in 1685, preceding by two years the third one, an edifying *History-Buch* by the Capuchin Father Martinus Cochemius (d. 1712). This proved by far the most important of

German versions, in time rising to the status of a *Volksbuch*, a genre appreciated by a wide reading-public for its simplicity and great verisimilitude (Schneider, 25-7). In the course of the 17th and 18th centuries, the Genoveva story also became the subject of a large number of adaptations in Jesuit school drama as well as in a variety of plays given by wandering actors (Golz, 10-15). 'Genovefa', as Albert Schneider has observed, like Faust, Fortunatus, and other characters, was one of those legends 'aimés par le people et fréquemment joués sur les scènes de foire et de village', with performances taking place in no fewer than 21 German localities, including Danzig, Königsberg, Riga, Stettin, Berlin, and elsewhere (Schneider, 30). As preserved in local archives, the summary descriptions of some of these Genoveva plays—very few if any of the texts have survived—closely resemble the title of Durham's play but some were apparently given as a tragedy, others as a comedy. To German audiences, however, the story of Durham's *Genovefa,* in whichever form the manager chose to produce it, would not only have been immediately recognizable but have enjoyed the status of a near-perennial favourite.

The same material was if anything even more successful in the Low Countries in the 17th century. The first Dutch-language translation of Cerisiers' work, by the Jesuit writer Carolus van Houcke (1593-1650), advertised as the story of 'the holy Netherlandish Susanna', was published at Ypres in 1645. In the same year an English version by 'J. T.', or John Tasburgh, entitled *Innocency Acknowledg'd in The Life and Death of S. Genovefa Countesse Palatin of Trevers*, appeared in Ghent.[14] French-language versions of de Cerisiers' biography of the saint continued to be published throughout the century in Brussels, Liège, and Tournai. The

[14] The dedicatory epistle, signed 'Your most dutifull Sonne I. T.', was addressed 'To My Ever Honoured and Deare Mother the Lady Tasburgh' (J. T., pages (-)2r-4r.). Tasburgh's translation was one of the items (no. 104) in the *Catalogue of the Valuable Library of a Roman-Catholic Gentleman,* which were sold by auction at Sotheby's in February 1863, proving that as late as the 19th century the play was still considered edifying Catholic reading-matter.

most seminal Dutch-language dramatic rendering, however, was *De Heylige Genoveva ofte Herkende Onnooselheyt,* a tragicomedy by the Jesuit writer Antoon Frans Wouthers (1641-1676), first performed at Antwerp on 21 April 1664. 'A L'Autheur de la Tragicomédie', one of the poems by 'B. G. Sossa' prefixed to the 1664 edition, spoke in praise of the dramatist and the moralizing dimension of his subject: 'C'est assez Genoviefve avoir pleuré vos maux, / On voit briller par tout vostre innocence, / Vous regneres encore apres tant de travaux, / Et viveres malgrè la mesdicance…' (We have sufficiently bewept your misfortunes, Genoveva, / Your innocence shines out everywhere, / You will still reign after so many travails, / And live on despite all slander' (Wouthers, 1664, unnumb. page). Wouthers' play was re-edited at Amsterdam in 1666, 1680, 1684, 1687, 1708, 1709, and well into the 1770s. It has been asserted that this was one of the most popular plays performed in the Amsterdam theatre from 1637 to 1772 (Salman, 303-04). In 1716, the 'young men' of the local Chamber of Rhetoric 'De Fonteine' produced Wouthers' play in Ghent—according to the title-page its first performance in the city—just three years after Durham's stay in the city (Wouthers, 1716).

Given the unabated interest in this devotional tale about a legendary character, not only in the Catholic Spanish Netherlands but also in the Protestant Dutch Republic (a destination possibly included in the manager's tour), a Genoveva play may have been part of Durham's repertory in the Low Countries as early as 1713, twelve to fifteen years before the German version was staged in Stettin, Berlin, and Halle. Brought out by the local publisher and bookseller Cornelis Meyer, the text of the augmented 1716 Ghent edition of Wouthers' play, incorporating music and songs in between the acts and a chorus and a ballet at the end (Wouthers, 1716), might actually have lent itself to a visually spectacular treatment of the subject, one in accordance with the generic mixture typical of Durham's later productions in

Germany. What the play title in the German sources establishes beyond any doubt is that Durham drew on materials that had a wide European circulation. By the early 18th century, the setting, the characters, the plot line, and the outcome of Genoveva dramatic adaptations would have long since crystallized into a form that was part of the literary and dramatic tradition in different European countries, and that could even be understood and enjoyed irrespective of the language of the play or of any musical or choreographic additions. To a company of itinerant players a Genoveva play, in whatever version, was undoubtedly an item rewarding enough to be included in their repertoire.

The protagonist of Durham's main-piece on the *transmetamorphosirte Arlequin* was in his turn anything but unknown to German audiences. Ever since the 16th century, the influence of the Italian *commedia dell' arte* had made itself felt in Germany (Brandt, *German and Dutch Theatre,* 7; Brandt, 62). Sebastiano de Scio (before 1687 – d. after 1742), an Italian quack, puppet-master, and rope-dancer, travelled through Germany, Austria, and Denmark as Harlequin between 1687 and 1711, making him a popular character in performances given at market-places by travelling mountebanks ('Scio, Familie Sebastiano'). Leonhard Andreas Denner (1683 – 1736) became the first recorded Harlequin to make his appearance on a professional German-language stage, in the ball-house at Vienna on 16 October 1707. And in September 1709, the theatre programme of the 'Hochteutsche (High-German) Comödianten' at Nuremberg was one of the earliest featuring a Harlequin (Hansen, 16, 27, 183-84). Around 1716, it has been argued, as a result of the growing German interest in 'more up-to-date forms[s]' of the *commedia,* the Harlequin character acquired 'increased versatility' and began to 'impersonate many characters in different disguises' (Brandt, 62). There is no point in enumerating Harlequin's numerous appearances in the 1710s and 1720s, many of which have been traced by modern theatre historians (Hansen, 183-84, 197;

Puschmann, 54-5, 69, 92).[15] Suffice it to say that by November 1727, when a Harlequin entertainment featured in Durham's repertoire, the character had been leading a rather vigorous stage life in Germany and the German-speaking lands. And if, as seems likely, Harlequin's metamorphosis into an astrologer in Durham's play was an allusion to, or indeed drew on, the story of Dr Faustus, this would have increased Harlequin's appeal to audiences in Berlin, Stettin, Halle, and elsewhere, given the familiarity of the Faustus legend, which was of German origin and had actually been re-introduced into German-speaking countries by late 16th- and early 17th-century English players on the continent (Chovanec), probably starting with Robert Browne's Faustus drama performed in Frankfurt in 1592. From that point on, Elizabeth Butler has noted, the play, or versions of it, 'maintained itself for nearly two centuries on the [German] boards' (Butler, 69-70).[16]

Yet, however firmly entrenched Faustus was in the German imagination, Durham's *Arlequin* may also have owed a solid debt to current English theatrical practice (Hayden). Not only did early 18th-century English Harlequin plays far outnumber the German ones. Before the mid-1720s and the performance of Durham's entertainment the explicit association of Harlequin with Faustus in German plays was quite rare—even though dramatic metamorphoses of Harlequin, perhaps unassisted by Faustus' magic, have been recorded (Hansen, 161-75). If Durham's company toured Britain in the early 1720s, as they had done in 1713, or if the manager was alive to London theatrical trends, it is not unlikely

[15] Around the time when Durham visited Ghent, the Harlequin character was not only known to Flemish audiences but also viewed with some trepidation by the local authorities. One of the conditions under which Jacobus Gardenier (already mentioned) was allowed to perform in Ghent in October 1715 was that the manager was expected to keep a tight rein on 'Arlequyn or any other of his troupe' and prevent them from engaging in 'scandalous discourse or acts', at the risk of having their performances suspended (Claeys, II, 71-2). Is it imaginable that a Harlequin character had already appeared in Durham's own productions in Ghent two years earlier?

[16] Elizabeth Butler (xi) records 8 Faust dramas in various cities between 1626 and 1696, in addition to a puppet-play in 1698.

that in his own *Arlequin* he had an eye to the success of similar pantomimic 'Harlequin Faustus' entertainments in England. William Mountfort's *Life and Death of Doctor Faustus*…*With the Humours of Harlequin and Scaramouche* had paved the way for the new vogue: it was performed several times at Dorset Gardens between 1684 and 1688, and again at Lincoln's Inn Fields in 1697. In his farcical skit, Mountfort had severely curtailed Faustus' tragic life story and given full scope to Harlequin's and Scaramouche's pranks and disguises, thus ensuring that 'the comic sub-plot was achieving a degree of emancipation from the tragic theme which rendered the latter unnecessary and incongruous' (Butler, 59). Soon afterwards, Christopher Marlowe's hero, by now bereft of all his tragic greatness, and the buffoonish characters of the Italian Renaissance stage became inseparable bedfellows on the London stage. Professedly initiated by John Weaver around 1702, pantomimes featuring *commedia dell'arte* characters were to derive their growing success in the next decades to no small extent from the rivalry between the theatres at Drury Lane and Lincoln's Inn Fields (Avery, 430-32; Sawyer; O'Brien, 491-92).[17] The development of the genre was given its strongest impetus by John Thurmond's enormously successful production of *Harlequin Doctor Faustus* at Drury Lane on 26 November 1723. In this play, Harlequin 'is a conjurer and magician, a trickster and a dancer', possessing the ability to transform himself and others into whatever shape he finds convenient (Avery, 440). Vying for audience approval with his rival at Drury Lane, John Rich on 20 December 1723 produced *The Necromancer; or Harlequin Doctor Faustus* at Lincoln's Inn Fields, a farcical piece 'exploiting the adventures of the legendary German magician' (Hughes, 63) that, except for Harlequin's silent part, was

[17] As is attested to by the list included in Nicoll's *History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama* and the countless entries in *The London Stage. Part 2: 1700-1729* and *Part 3: 1729-1747*, the sheer number and variety of Harlequin plays and entertainments, not a few of them of French origin, produced in the first part of the century were truly baffling (Nicoll, Appendix C).

probably similar to Thurmond's, including the capers of the *commedia dell'arte* characters and their many transformations (Avery, 441-42).

Is it no more than coincidence that by November 1727 at the latest, and possibly as early as December 1724 (a year after Rich's hit), when he secured his licence to act from the Prussian King, Durham should have offered German audiences a Harlequin-Faustus entertainment? In the absence of a play-text of *Arlequin,* no definite answer can be given. But the hypothesis should at least be considered that the manager introduced into his 'German' repertoire a London-inspired novelty, that may have rung a change on existing Harlequin plots while being adapted to the scenic limitations imposed by the *Wanderbühne*.[18]

We may perhaps more fruitfully consider the over-all nature of Durham's Harlequin piece. A long time ago Emmett Avery distinguished three 'main classes' of pantomimes: (1) 'those which … consisted of a "serious" part containing a mythological or traditional story often presented in dancing alone'; (2) 'those which … lacked a "serious" or mythological part and presented only the "grotesque," usually dancing and antics by *commedia dell'arte* characters'*;* and (3) *'*those which … consisted of alternate "scenes" of "serious" material, usually the mythological stories in dancing and often with song and dialogue, and of "grotesque" parts' (Avery, 437-38). In the Stettin theatre-bill Durham's *Arlequin* was

[18] Although there are no clues as to the authorship of Durham's *Arlequin,* it may be noted that, merely judging by the descriptive title, *Der transmetamorphosirte Arlequin* was perhaps a German version or adaptation of *Arlequin feint Astrologue, Statue, Enfant, Ramoneur, Nègre* (*Harlequin a Sham Astrologer, a Statue, a Child, a Chimney-Sweep, and a Moor*). One of many early 18th-century French theatre-pieces shown in London, this was a comedy by Louis-François DeLisle de la Drevetière (1682-1756), first performed at the King's Theatre on 26 March 1720 (Burling, 82; Rogers, 204). *Arlequin feint Astrologue* proved very successful, if not immediately, at least in years to come, for it was frequently revived at the Haymarket Theatre in 1725, 1726, 1734, and 1735 (*The London Stage*, II, 809-10, 861; III, 429, 432, 439, 442, 448, 456).

advertised as a 'Haupt-Aktion' (as already noted, a plot frequently dealing with matters of state, treated in a satirical manner), followed by a comic afterpiece highlighting Harlequin's buffoonery. Whether Durham's mainpiece, with all of Harlequin's metamorphoses as well as the interspersed acrobatics, sword-dances, and ballets, even aspired to a mild modicum of satirical comment must be seriously doubted. It needs to be borne in mind that Durham could have ill afforded in the mid- to late 1720s to have presented an entertainment critical of the King, the government, or some or other political figure when he and his company depended for their livelihood on the privilege granted them by the Prussian monarch. I suspect that Durham's *Arlequin* mainpiece belonged to the second category distinguished by Avery, having little or no serious content to contrast it with the tenor of the afterpiece. Both may indeed have been designed to show to best advantage the pantomimic talents of whatever actor or actress took upon him- or herself to play the part of Harlequin. What may safely be inferred from Harlequin's successive transformations as advertised in the German play-bill is that Durham's mainpiece, like Thurmond's and Rich's plays, had an episodic structure, one calculated to arouse the spectators' astonishment at the stagecraft involved in these spectacular metamorphoses. These purely visual aspects of Durham's Harlequin play(s), likely accommodated to the theatrical practice of the wandering actors, would have captivated the imagination of his German-speaking spectators just as much as the English Harlequin-Faustus entertainments, which did not cease to astound London audiences.

* *

*

A 1640s-style (tragi)comedy, a sentimental drama centring on a distressed wife, and a farcical harlequinade in the form of a main- and afterpiece, incorporating (rope) dancing, music, singing, and ballet : on closer examination, this is how diverse the items in Durham's repertory prove to have been. Each piece may have catered to different segments of the contemporary audience, or indeed, for reasons that are difficult to fathom today, have caught on better in one geographical area than in another. In the early 18th century, there was indeed still 'considerable variation in authority, custom, laws, currency, and religion' in what we think of as the 'German theatre' (Chovanec, 127). But there was one element that all three pieces appear to have had in common: the reliance on materials that were not the exclusive property of German literary culture. The play dealing with the vicissitudes of the *Müllermädchen* may have drawn its inspiration from English drama; the subject of the Genoveva play enjoyed a decidedly 'pan-European' reputation, well-known as it was to French, Flemish, and Dutch as well as German readers and theatre audiences; and it is my contention that *Arlequin-Faustus* may have had English as well as German theatrical antecedents. Unlike his early 17th-century English predecessors in German-speaking regions, Durham presumably did not face the problem of how to bridge a language gap. Unless we are grossly misled by the language of the playbills advertising his offerings, the latter were all performed in the local language. In order to counterbalance any linguistic problems, Durham would therefore not have felt the need to give added emphasis to such performative aspects of his productions as stylized action and gesture—all part of a theatrical 'language' long since shared by different European cultures (Chovanec, 133-135). The visual and aural trappings in his Harlequin pieces—the dances, ballets, songs, and the central character's tomfoolery—were conventions of the genre rather than a producer's tools helping uncomprehending, German-speaking audiences to decipher the 'meaning' of

the play. But in one important respect, what was true of the English actors visiting the continent in the 1590s and 1600s was no less true of a troupe like Durham's a century later: 'most of the plays in their repertoire were drawn from internationally popular legends, religious stories, and popular culture'. Indebted to various European literary cultures, his highly eclectic repertoire seems to have been carefully selected on account of its 'transnational popularity' (Chovanec, 130, 137-138).

The evidence about William Durham unearthed by 19th-century German theatre historians, no matter how valuable, provides us with no more than a very fragmentary view of the manager's repertoire. In the absence of detailed information about his professional activities, which covered a period of at least fifteen years, we may never be able to arrive at a correct assessment of what he owed to, or indeed contributed to, the *Wanderbühne* in the Netherlands, northern Europe, and possibly elsewhere. But the type of plays and the over-all nature of the spectacles which he is known to have staged in the 1720s suggest that he acted as an intermediary or broker, bridging several literary and dramatic traditions by means of stories and plots which were accessible to spectators in different countries or regions. His repertoire indicates that he was of some importance as a figurehead of what has been called a 'transnational theater' (Chovanec, 139)—an institution in the process of evolving into a German 'national' theatrical tradition, properly speaking, in the decades to come. And although William Durham followed in the footsteps of his early 17-century wandering forebears, his name has unfortunately remained unrecorded in all modern annals of the 18th-century British theatre, and received only passing mention in those of the German wandering stage.

Works Cited

Ahrendt, Rebekah Susannah. *A Second Refuge. French Opera and the Huguenot Migration, c. 1680-1710.* Ph. D. dissertation. University of California, Berkeley, 2011.

Avery, Emmett L. 'Dancing and Pantomime on the English Stage, 1700-1737', *Studies in Philology*, 31 (1934), no. 3, 417-452.

Bajer, Peter Paul. *Scots in the Polish – Lithuanian Commonwealth, 16th - 18th Centuries.* London: Brill, 2012.

Bemong, Nele. 'Genoveva van Brabant in de Nederlandse letteren, en de unieke rol van volksboeken in de negentiende eeuw', *Zacht Lawijd*, 8 (2009), 43-44.

Bentley, G. E. *The Jacobean and Caroline Stage. Dramatic Companies and Players. Volume II.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.

Bolte, Johannes. *Das Danziger Theater im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert.* Hamburg-Leipzig : Leopold Voss, 1895.

Bolte, Johannes. 'Zur Stettiner Theatergeschichte', *Monatsblätter. Herausgegeben von der Gesellschaft für Pommersche Geschichte und Althertumskunde*, 1 (1887), no. 4, 57-58.

B[olte], J[ohannes]. 'Zu dem Stettiner Theaterzettel', *Monatsblätter. Herausgegeben von der Gesellschaft für Pommersche Geschichte und Althertumskunde*, 1 (1887), no. 7, 112.

Bosman, Anston. 'Renaissance Intertheater and the Staging of Nobody', *English Literary History*, 71 (2004), 559-85.

Brandt, George. 'German baroque theatre and the strolling players, 1550-1750', in: Simon Williams and Maik Hamburger, eds, *A History of German Theatre.* Cambridge: UP, 2008, chapter 2.

Brandt, George, ed. *German and Dutch Theatre, 1600-1848.* Compiled by George W. Brandt and Wiebe Hogendoorn. Cambridge: UP, 1993.

Burling, William J. *A Checklist of New Plays and Entertainments on the London Stage, 1700-1737* (London, 1993).

Butler, Elizabeth M. *The Fortunes of Faust.* Cambridge: UP, 1952; repr. Phoenix Mill, 1998.

Catalogue of the Valuable Library of A Roman-Catholic Gentleman, Deceased; Containing an Important Collection of Lives of Saints, and of the Principal Works of Roman-Catholic Controversial Divinity… London: J. Davy, undated [1863].

Chovanec, Kevin. '*Faust mit Springen:* On the English Players Returning *Faustus* to the German-Speaking Lands', *Renaissance Drama*, 44 (2016), no. 2, 125-155.

Claeys, Prosper. *Histoire du Théâtre à Gand*, 3 vols. Gand: Vuylsteke, 1892.

Crecelius, W. 'Ein Zweig der Durham in Preussen', *Der Deutsche Herold. Zeitschrift für Heraldik, Sphragistik und Genealogie*, 9 (1878), no. 2, 16-17.

Fürstenau, Moritz. *Zur Geschichte der Musik und des Theaters am Hofe zu Dresden. Nach archivalischen Quellen. Erster Teil.* Dresden: Rudolf Kunze, 1861.

Golz, Bruno. *Pfalzgräfin Genoveva in der deutschen Dichtung.* Leipzig: Teubner, 1897.

Haekel, Ralf. *Die Englischen Komödianten in Deutschland. Eine Einführung in die Ursprünge des deutschen Berufsschauspiel.* Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2004.

Hagen, Ernst August. *Geschichte des Theaters in Preussen, vornämlich der Bühnen in Königsberg und Danzig von ihren ersten Anfängen bis zu den Gastspielen J. Fischer's und L. Devrient's.* Königsberg: E. J. Dalkowski, 1854.

Hansen, Günther. *Formen der Commedia dell' Arte in Deutschland.* Emsdetten: Lechte, 1984.

Harris, Edward P. 'From Outcast to Ideal: The Image of the Actress in Eighteenth-Century Germany', *The German Quarterly,* 54 (1981), no. 2, 177-187.

Hayden, Judy A. 'Of Windmills and Bubbles: Harlequin Faustus on the Eighteenth-Century Stage', *Huntington Library Quarterly,* 77 (2014), no. 1, 1-16.

Hertzberg, Gustav F. *Geschichte der Stadt Halle an der Saale von den Anfängen bis zur Neuzeit. Nach den Quellen dargestellt. III: Halle während des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts. (1717 bis 1892).* Halle a. S.: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1893.

Hoppe, Harry R. 'English Actors at Ghent in the Seventeenth Century', *Review of English Studies,* 25 (1949), no. 100, 305-321.

Hoppe, Harry R. 'New Light on French Actors in Belgium in the Seventeenth Century', *Modern Philology,* 63 (1965), no. 1, 52-60.

Hughes, Leo. 'Afterpieces: Or, That's Entertainment', in G. Winchester Stone, Jr., ed., *The Stage and the Page. London's "Whole Show" in the Eighteenth-Century Theatre.* Berkeley-Los Angeles : U of California Press, 1981, chapter 3.

Jensen, Lotte. 'Visions of Europe: Contrasts and Combinations of National and European Identities in Literary Representations of the Peace of Utrecht (1713)', in Renger E. de Bruin, Cornelis van der Haven e.a., eds, *Performances of Peace: Utrecht 1713*. Leiden : Brill, 2015.

Katritzky, M. A. 'English Troupes in Early Modern Germany: The Women', in: Robert Henke and Eric Nicholson, eds, *Transnational Exchange in Early Modern Theater.* Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008, 35-46.

Kawerau, Waldemar. *Culturbilder aus dem Zeitalter der Aufklärung. Zweiter Band: Aus Halles Literaturleben.* Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1888.

Koepp, Johannes. 'Johannes Bolte (Berlijn, 11 Februari 1858 – Berlijn, 25 Juli 1937)', *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde te Leiden* (1937-1938), 135-38.

Liebrecht, Henri. 'Les "Comédiens de campagne" à Bruxelles, au XVIIe siècle', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 1 (1922), no. 2, 265-281.

The London Stage, 1660-1800: A Calendar of Plays, Entertainments & Afterpieces, Together with Casts, Box-receipts and Contemporary Comment. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1960-68. *Part 2, 1700-1729* (1960), 2 vols., edited with a critical introduction by Emmett L. Avery*; Part 3, 1729-1747* (1961), 2 vols., edited with a critical introduction by Arthur H. Scouten.

Lowerre, Kathryn. 'Musical Evidence for an Early Eighteenth-Century Revival of *The Maid in the Mill* at Lincoln's Inn Fields', *Theatre Notebook,*54 (2000), no. 2, 86-97.

Ludvik, Dušan. 'Zur Chronologie und Topographie der "Alten" und "Späten" Englischen Komödianten in Deutschland', *Acta neophilologica,* 8 (1974), 47-65.

The Maid in the Mill. A Comedy. Written by Mr. Francis Beaumont, and Mr. John Fletcher. London: printed J[acob] T[onson], 1718.

Meyer, Günter. *Hallisches Theater im 18. Jahrhundert.* Emsdetten: Lechte, 1950.

Mountfort, William. *The Life and Death of Doctor Faustus, Made into a Farce. With the Humours of Harlequin and Scaramouche.* London: E. Whitlock, 1697.

Nicoll, Allardyce. *A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama 1700-1750.* Cambridge: UP, 1929.

O'Brien, John. 'Harlequin Britain: Eighteenth-Century Pantomime and the Cultural Location of Entertainment(s)', *Theatre Journal*, 50 (1998), no. 4, 489-510.

Opel, Julius. 'Der Kampf der Universität Halle gegen das Theater', *Blätter für Handel, Gewerbe und soziales Leben. Beiblatt zur Magdeburgischen Zeitung,* 7 June 1881.

Petig, William E. *Literary Antipietism in Germany during the First Half of the Eighteenth Century.* New York: Peter Lang, 1984.

Pies, Eike. *Prinzipale. Zur Genealogie des deutschsprachigen Berufstheaters vom 17. Bis 19. Jahrhundert.* Düsseldorf: Aloys Henn, 1973.

Potter, Frans de. *Gent, van den Oudsten Tijd tot Heden. Geschiedkundige Beschrijving der Stad. Vierde Deel* (Ghent: Annoot-Braeckman, 1882).

Puschmann, Claudia. *Fahrende Frauenzimmer: Zur Geschichte der Frauen an deutschen Wanderbühnen (1670-1760).* Herbolzheim: Centaurus, 1999.

Rogers, Vanessa. 'John Gay, Ballad Opera and the *Théâtres de la Foire', Eighteenth-Century Music,* 11 (2014), no. 2, 173-213.

Salman, Jeroen. 'Vormvast en Betekenisvol. Populaire Beeldverhalen in de Nederlandse Literatuurgeschiedenis', *Spiegel der Letteren*, 59 (2017), 291-319.

Sawyer, Paul. 'The Popularity of Various Types of Entertainment at Lincoln's Inn Fields and Covent Garden Theatres, 1720-1733', *Theatre Notebook,* 24 (1970), no. 4, 154-163.

Schlegel, Katy. 'Johann Carl von Eckenberg', in *Sächsische Biografie*, herausgegeben vom Institut für Sächsische geschichte und Volkskunde. https://saebi.isgv.de/biografie/22749 [accessed 11.10.2023].

Schneider, Albert. *La Légende de Geneviève de Brabant dans la Littérature Allemande (Volksbuch, Müller, Tieck, hebbel, Ludwig).* Nancy: Société d'Impressions Typographiques, 1954.

Schrickx, Willem. 'French, Italian, Spanish and German Actors and Other Artists at Ghent (1575 – 1700), *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire / Belgisch Tijdschrift voor Filologie en Geschiedenis*, 44 (1966), no. 3, 859-899.

'Scio, Familie Sebastiano' (musiklexikon.ac.at).

Seuffert, Bernhard. *Die Legende von der Pfalzgräfin Genoveva. Habilitationsschrift der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Würzburg.* Würzburg: Thein'sche Druckerei, 1877.

Tasburgh, John. *Innocency Acknowledg'd in The Life and Death of S. Genoveva Countesse Palatin of Trevers. Translated into English.* Gaunt: Iohn vanden Kerchove, 1645.

Vander Motten, J. P. 'More on the Rope-Dancing Couple Jacob Hall (fl. 1670-1681/2) and Susanna Roy', *Notes and Queries*, 69 (2022), no. 4, 297-301.

Vander Motten, J. P. and Michiel Roscam Abbing. 'Seventeenth-Century English Rope Dancers in the Low Countries', *Theatre Notebook*, 74 (2020), 8-31.

Van Gent, M. 'Prosper Claeys'. https://openjournals.ugent.be/gt/article/67908/galley/192156/view/, 31-32.

Van Houcke, Carolus. *De H[eylige] Nederlantsche Susanna, ofte Het Leven van de H. Princesse Genoveva Huys-vrauwe van den Doorluchtigsten Palatijn Sifridus.* Ypre: Philips de Lobel, 1645.

Verzamelband Theater in Gent, 1600-1809. https://lib.ugent.be/catalog/rug01:000817317.

The Works of Mr. Francis Beaumont and Mr. John Fletcher. Volume the Seventh. London: Printed for Jacob Tonson, 1711.

Wouthers, Frans Antoon. *De Heylige Genoveva ofte Herkende Onnooselheyt. Bley-eyndende Treurspel Vertoont op de Antwerpsche vertooghplaets den 21. April 1664.* Antwerp: Godtgaf Verhulst, 1664.

Wouthers, Frans Antoon. *De Heylige Genoveva ofte Herstelde Onnooselheyt. Bly-eyndig Treur-spel … Gelijck het selve voor de eerste mael vertoond is geweest op het Gentsche Speel Tonneel in den jaere 1716.* Ghent: Cornelis Meyer, 1716.