ANGLO–DUTCH THEATRES:
Problems and Possibilities

David Mills

In 1988 Tom Pettitt proclaimed that: 'The student of any one nation's medieval drama may learn much from what survives in others and from what is made of it'.[1] The need for such a statement perhaps requires explanation. The pioneer scholars in the subject, such as E.K. Chambers, adopted a generously wide definition for their studies which allowed them to draw upon records from across western Europe. That perspective, while never entirely absent from subsequent research, tended to acquire lower priority from the early 1960s when the exposure of the assumptions underlying their work generated a sort of dramatic Euroscepticism and the focus of studies, under the influence of critics from England and North America, narrowed towards detailed examinations of particular texts and performance–circumstance, predominantly from Britain. But from about the mid–seventies the subject has returned, better informed, to its comparative roots.

Nevertheless, our critical past haunts as well as informs us and we need to define carefully the goals of any comparative study. Tom Pettitt's claim may seem uncontroversial, but his phrasing, that we '*may* learn much', lacks confidence. Perhaps significantly, Lynette Muir, in her ambitiously ranging account of European biblical drama, refuses to discuss how we are to exploit the considerable data she places at our disposal.[2] What *do* we want of a comparative approach? The juxtaposition of plays from different countries and in different languages may well provide mutually illuminating insights, but 'compare and contrast' is always the last refuge of the desperate examiner. We need to examine the twin processes of transfer and of transformation — the channels of communication and transmission; and what happens when a text, subject, mode of performance, critical approach even, is translated — 'carried across' — from one culture, society, and theatre into another.

The phrase 'Anglo–Dutch Context' brings these issues into sharp focus. Here are two nations linked throughout the later Middle Ages by political marriages, trading alliances, and cross–settlement. One might reasonably suppose that the drama of the economically less prosperous and culturally less developed nation, England, would look to the example of the Netherlands for some of its models. And, at court level, there is ample evidence that that was the case. The influence of the Low Countries upon royal entertainment and

pageantry, as on tapestry, painting, and miniatures, from the Middle Ages through the Tudor period has been comprehensively documented by Gordon Kipling, Sydney Anglo, and others.[3] But what of other kinds of drama, music, and pageantry?

My own concern is with the familiar relationship between *Everyman*, in this paper that atypical 'English' morality play, and its generally accepted source, the Dutch *Elckerlijck*.[4] Does the English play 'mean' in the same way as the Dutch, and would its audience have detected anything vaguely foreign or distinctively Dutch in it? In considering those problems, I want to glance briefly at the London printing industry as channel of transmission; and at the different theatres, genres, and audiences predicated by the two plays; and, finally, I want to propose that *Everyman* might have appeared rather less 'medieval' to a contemporary audience than is usually supposed.

'Everyman' and the London Printing Industry

For Arthur Cawley, who edited *Everyman*, the trade in books from the Low Countries to England in the later fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries provided the necessary context for the English translation. Accepting that the English version is based on the Antwerp print of *Elckerlijck* of c.1518–25, he concludes:

> Antwerp was a typographical centre of greater importance than London, and Dutch printers were busy printing English books (often translated from Dutch) for the English market.[5]

Everyman becomes another of the translations from the Low Countries and, for Cawley, takes its place among several play–texts that were beginning to appear around that time:

> *Everyman* is one of the first plays printed in England, the earliest known edition of it dating from the same period as *Fulgens and Lucrece* (c.1512–16) and *Hickscorner* (c.1515–16).[6]

Everyman keeps strange company here. Whatever the underlying agenda, the two latter plays can both be appreciated as comic entertainments; no–one would claim that of *Everyman*! And there are at least circumstantial associations of the two latter plays with noble English households, *Fulgens* with the household of Cardinal Morton and, as Ian Lancashire suggests, *Hickscorner* with that of Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk.[7] No similar patronage, offering personal and commercial advantage, has been postulated for *Everyman*. Moreover, as Nelson says, John Rastall's decision to print *Fulgens* was a pioneering one; a market for plays was not established, and the

format of a play on the printed page was still experimental,[8] though Pynson, the first known printer of *Everyman*, must have had the Dutch text before him as model. As a commercial proposition the venture was initially risky, though the survival of four editions suggests that the play sold well.[9] One function of the title–page, in Dutch and English, 'Here begynneth a treatyse ... in maner of a morall playe', may have been to reassure the first English readers about the intended genre and explain what might have seemed an unfamiliar format.

Possibly the circumstances of the English printing industry at the time of the translation played a part in the choice of *Elckerlijck*. When Caxton set up his shop in Westminster in 1476, there were no restrictions on his craft. His claim of printer to the nobility was a selling point for his books to upwardly mobile merchants and courtiers of the city of Westminster. In the next decade the situation changed. Astutely recognising the importance of the new craft, Richard III's only Parliament, of 1483–4, removed all levies on imported books and, in a move reminiscent of that by which Edward I had encouraged Flemish weavers to settle in English towns to improve woollen manufacture, foreign stationers and printers were invited to set up their businesses in England.

The comparison with the Flemish weavers is not inapposite. In the fourteenth century their presence in London had generated deep hostility because of the privileges granted to them by the King. Similarly, immigrant printers were exempt from the regulations of the Stationers' Company and were given privileges of which the Company was jealous. They were therefore particularly beholden to the King for their protection and continuation in business. Indeed both Richard Pynson, a Norman, and Wynkyn de Worde, the Dutchman who came to England with Caxton and who took over Caxton's Press on his master's death in 1491, served Henry VII in the rôle of royal printer. It was Richard Pynson who issued our first extant prints of *Everyman*, which, though undated, post–date his press's move to Temple Bar c.1510; the *terminus ad quem* is set by Pynson's death in 1530. The two later extant prints come from John Skot's press in St Paul's Churchyard, some time between 1521 and 1528. Cawley dates the Pynson prints c.1510–25 and c.1525–30; and Skot's as c.1528–9 and c.1530–35.

Part of *Everyman*'s attraction to these printers, especially to Pynson as a vulnerable foreigner, must have been its Catholic conservatism. Concerned by the import of Lutheran books to England, mainly from the Low Countries, on 14 May 1521 Cardinal Wolsey issued an order to his bishops ordering that all such books should be delivered to them; book burnings

followed. In response to the order, Cuthbert, Bishop of London, summoned all the London printers and booksellers to meet him and issued the first licensing order, banning the import of unlicensed books and setting up a board of censors to vet all new books before publication.[10] My own inclination is to date the extant prints of *Everyman* after Wolsey's 1521 order, and certainly before new orders came in from 1530 with the changing political and religious climate. *Everyman* was a safe and orthodox text for a royal dependant such as Pynson, and one moreover which could serve as an addition to the propagandist output counteracting the growing swell of Reform. Since the Low Countries were a major source of Protestant material, it may be that it was not prudent to advertise the play's Dutch origins. At the very least, a Dutch original was evidently not considered a selling point in the 1520s as it had been in the 1480s. The complete prints make no reference to the fact that the play is a translation. It is offered to the English audience as if a product of an English playwright working in the English tradition.

Probably some, perhaps the majority, of the readership, bought *Everyman* for private, devotional reading, which the term 'treatise' implies. But the information that it is set in the form of a moral play seems to invite others, with a stronger visual imagination, to translate the text into their own imagined theatre, based upon experience of performances in England. Possibly even, for some, the text was an acting text for practical performance. Whatever the actuality, the text predicates performance and has evidently been reconceived with such performance in mind.

The printing of *Elckerlijck* may result from very different considerations. The earliest extant text of *Elckerlijck* was printed in Delft in c.1495; there are two other extant printed texts, both from Antwerp, one early sixteenth century and the other c.1518–25, and a sixteenth–century manuscript text. On the sole authority of one of its later translators, authorship has been attributed to a Peter van Diest and the play is said to have won a prize at a rhetoricians' competition in Antwerp, although that, too, is uncertain.[11] It seems likely that, though it too proclaims itself a 'treatise' and would provide suitable devotional reading, a part of its appeal was as 'the book of the play' and a familiar and successful play at that. Its immediate market was the burgess class that supported the competitions and was at the centre of urban economy and display. That class is addressed directly at 879–83:[12]

> Ey Elckerlijck, hoe moechdi wesen
> Hoverdich, nidich! seer uut gelesen,
> Merct desen spiegel, hebten voer ogen,

Ende wilt u van hoverdien poghen
Ende oec van allen sonden met. 885–9

'Oh Everyman, how canst thou be
Envious and proud | — Fair company,
Mark this Mirror, fix on it your glance,
And wean yourselves of arrogance,
And of all sins and wickedness . . .' 879–83

Elckerlijck constructs an audience rooted in the sins of contemporary prosperity — materialistic, competitive (envious), and proud.

While *Everyman* has devotional interest for the wider readership, one likely niche market was that of the schools. Other, later translations of *Elkerlijk* were made by schoolmasters — Christianus Ischyrius in 1536 and Georgius Macropedius in 1538.[13] A market for school–texts existed in England; in fact, with the refounding of St Paul's School by Dean Colet in 1512, a major customer was at the printers' doorstep. Some of the English 'translations' suggest a learned and thoughtful translator who hoped for a similar responsiveness from his audience/readership. Thus, in translating *Elckerlijck*'s:

Oec moetic rekeninge doen bi bedwange
Voir den hoechsten coninc almachtich 223–4

'I must also give an accounting to Him
Who is the Almighty and Highest Lord' 224–5

Everyman uses the Jewish name for the Deity, translated in English as 'Lord' and only attested in English usage by *OED* in two earlier works:

And gyue a strayte counte, without delaye
Before the hye Iuge, Adonay 244–5

Elckerlijck's:

Rekeninge doen voer den oversten here

'Give an accounting to the Most High' 369

is rendered with an unparalleled and daring use of classical reference by the English translator as:

To gyue a strayte counte generall
Before the hyest Iupytere of all. (405–6)

Strength, in *Everyman*, self–consciously slips in a biblical allusion:

Eueryman, I wyll be as sure by the
As euer I dyde by Iudas Machabee (786–7)

which has no counterpart in the Dutch play. An audience who might recognise the reference to the Jewish leader who defeated the Syrians must have known the biblical history of the Jews. This and other readings and modifications suggest that the English translator requires a knowledge from his audience that is not demanded in *Elckerlijck*.[14]

The Envisaged Theatres of the Plays

Femke Kramer has rightly emphasised that:

> In the fifteenth and sixteenth century ... playtexts were considered to be mere drafts, adaptable, if necessary, to all sorts of circumstances and open to textual and other interventions by those involved in a stage production.[15]

Nevertheless, I believe that these texts were 'composed' with different kinds of theatre in mind, and that the theatrical context, including the kind of audience and their wider cultural and social values, determines the meaning of the play. Without prejudice to other possibilities, I want now to notice some indications of difference between the theatres of *Elckerlijck* and *Everyman*.

Creiznach's idea of the rhetoricians' theatre as an open stage with curtained recesses accords with some features of *Elckerlijck*. Characters enter to the speaker on cue:

Hi coemt hier gaende	63
Ic sien, des ben ic recht verhoecht	184
Waer sidi, vrienden ende magen	291
'Here cometh the man'	64
'Oh joy! I see him coming'	184
'Where are ye, kinship'	290

In contrast, the usual entry–reference in *Everyman* suggests that the character is already present, in full view of the audience:

Loo yonder I se Eueryman walkynge	80
I se hym yonder, certaynely	202
I wyll go saye, for yonder I se them	317

The implication seems to be that Everyman moves among actors already 'on stage'.

Elckerlijck seems to envisage a restricted stage in which characters enter serially and properties are introduced and removed. Goods are/is located 'in this vile place' (356) 'in muten' (360), which, given the immediately preceding reference to 'unlocking' grace (*gracie op mi ontsluten*: 359), might suggest some sort of safe, a portable property. Charity is found:

> Ic legghe hier al verdwenen
> Te bedde, vercropelt ende al ontset.
> Ic en kan gheroeren niet een let. 452–4
>
> 'cast away,
> Bedridden, crippled, and sore.
> I cannot move my limbs any more' 447–9

Charity lies bedridden; again, perhaps, we are to envisage a movable property, the bed, revealed. But *Everyman*'s stage is more spacious, an area to be traversed. Good who 'lye here in corners' (394), apparently refers to an enclosed space, a room. And Good Deeds describes how:

> Here I lye, colde in the grounde: 486

'colde in the grounde' suggests that Good Deeds is lying in a grave. The probability must then be that it is the same grave into which she will return with Everyman at the end of the play. It would seem that the *Everyman* translator is reconceiving the acting space in specific terms, perhaps with the grave as the central point between the Goods that lie in the corner and the House of Salvation.

Such details encourage me to believe that the envisaged theatre of the English play is the Tudor hall. A hall–setting lends added significance to the play. Everyman can turn to Fellowship, Kindred and Cousin as contemporary figures among the 'audience' around him, and progress to one end of the hall before turning back to journey towards the 'house of salvation' at the opposite end.[16]

The English translator adds touches to his play suggestive of the mystery cycles. While the idea of a general judgement is built into the opening of the play in both versions, *Everyman* invites the audience to envisage in some concrete detail the crucified Christ:

> My lawe that I shewed, whan I for them dyed,
> They forgete clene / and shedynge of my blode rede.
> I hanged bytwene two theues, it can not be denyed;
> To gete them lyfe I suffred to be deed;
> I heled theyr fete, with thornes hurt was my heed. 29–33

This recall of the Passion, which has its parallels in the longer recapitulations of His sacrifice by Christ at the Judgement, is an extended and specific development of the merest hint in *Elckerlijck*:

> Mijn puer geloef is al vergeten,
> Dat ic hem selve geboot te houden.
> Het cranct, het dwijnt, het staet te couden,
> Daer ic so minlic om sterf die doot. 30–33

> 'My faith is lost, for not a soul
> Recalls the commandments that I gave,
> It languishes, dies, goes to its grave,
> The faith for which I died on cross.' 30–33

Is God in *Everyman* the Christ of Judgement? Good Deeds, rising from her grave as Everyman scourges himself, recalls the dramatically effective resurrections of Lazarus, Christ, and the dead at Doomsday from the cycles. Everyman refers to Death blowing his blast (843), indicating that Death sounds a trumpet like the angels in the Doomsday plays. Finally, the Doctor recalls the words with which God despatches the damned to Hell: 'God wyll saye, *Ite, maledicti, in ignem eternum*' (915).

In the context of early Tudor drama, the middle section of *Everyman*, the life of its hero, recalls the *Youth*–interludes which treated the social issues of law and order. The picture of riotous Youth, the unruly gallant, indulging in extravagant dress, gluttony, whoring, rioting, and murder points to a social reality. The genre is well established — *Mankind*, *Mundus et Infans*, *Hickscorner*, and *Youth* handle the theme, but as Bevington says: 'The church announces its campaign to shackle wildness and to reform it by simply preaching'.[17] *Everyman* presents a more subjective impulse to reform, the fear of death, which affords the Church a more active rôle than in the English interludes. *Elckerlijck* is similarly defensive of the centrality of the Church and its sacraments, but is concerned with the problems of wealth itself rather than with social order.

How the Plays Mean

Writing of Burgundian ceremonial, Joseph Calmette comments that:

> It is almost as if (the Burgundian state) were trying, by its display of wealth, its brilliant festivities, impressive tournaments, and lavishly abundant banquets, to make good the lack of a royal crown.[18]

Similar insecurity in prosperity is reflected at civic and at personal levels. Socially, the Dutch towns were more prosperous and sophisticated than their

English counterparts. They enjoyed more local autonomy and the merchant class was both ostentatiously prosperous and locally powerful. The quality of life for that distinctive class was, by the fifteenth century, far beyond anything that could be enjoyed by their English counterparts. Moreover, the towns were close together and similar in social configuration, and were competing for a fluctuating market which, by the sixteenth century, was in decline. These conditions generated regionalism and internal urban tensions, an unstable situation that could be exploited by outside forces. The *Rederijkers* competitions can be read as another manifestation of a channel for this regional competitiveness and display.[19]

And what obtained at national and regional level is reflected also at the personal and domestic level of the individuals who constituted the audiences for *Elckerlijck* and other 'Rhetoricians' drama'. As they grew in increasing economic and political power, the merchant classes reflected their prosperity in their dress, their houses, and their furnishings and possessions. As such, they became both consumers and patrons of luxury goods, including objects of art. Artists, who in earlier centuries might have looked to noble patronage and sought to satisfy noble tastes, now found their commissions among the wealthy merchants who sought to reflect and memorialise themselves and their wealth and power. Art represents worldly wealth as a symbol of power; the much discussed realism of the Netherlandish painters is usually attributed to the need to satisfy the requirements of their bourgeois patrons. Their subjects are portrayed with the accoutrements of wealth — exotic foods, rich dishes, fine furniture, rich robes; and in many of the pictures there are pictures, for art is itself a commodity and takes its place among the other possessions.[20]

Moreover, commodities become art; this is the age of Dutch still–life, which provides the symbols of wealth, but which in consequence attaches a new intrinsic value to material goods. In response to this preoccupation, the ostensible counter–genre of the *vanitas* painting developed. The genre uses images of transience and death, sometimes symbolic, at other times explicit. Almost negatively, such paintings betray a worldly obsession. Ironically, the *vanitas* painting itself, as commission and possession, becomes a symbol of affluence and power on the wall of its commissioner, a sort of 'designer' *contemptus mundi*.

Elckerlijck provides a dramatic counterpart to the *vanitas* painting. Instead of the inert chests, sacks, bags, and packs of the English Good, *Elckerlijck* locates Property in the filth of a miser's strongroom:

Ic legge hier in muten,
Versockelt, vermost, als ghi mi siet,
Vertast, vervuult. 361–3

'In this vile place,
Discarded, all in a heap, and thick
Under mould and dirt'. 356–8

Such wealth cannot be considered the fruits of one's labours for worldly treasure is God's test of Humankind:

Swijcht elkerlic, ic en ben u mer gheleent
Van gode; proeft claer alst is voer ogen,
Hoe ghi sult in weelden poghen. 406–8

'Silence, Everyman. I'm but a loan
From God to test you and to see
How you manage your life in luxury.' 402–4

The warning has particular point for an entrepreneurial mercantile society; less directly so, perhaps, for an English audience. *Everyman* replaces it by the commonplace idea of the transitory nature of earthly joy:

As for a whyle I was lente the;
A season thou hast had me in prosperyte 440–1

which points towards inherited wealth and the obsessive dynastic need to transmit the family estate to one's heir. Death warned Everyman:

Another a whyle shall haue it, and than go therfro,
Euen as thou hast done, 166–7

which gives added significance to the making of Everyman's will. The same idea is found in 'I Wot Neuere Who' in *The Castell of Perseverance* (2908–68) who brings tardy realisation to Humanum Genus that he does not control the disposal of his 'possessions'.

The accounting image establishes a common bond of communication between the mercantile society and a like–minded God; only the currency is different. The auditing of accounts would be as familiar to the owner of a large English estate as to the merchant in a Dutch town, since both were running businesses. *Elckerlijck* is able to extend the image by developing the idea of the bank of God's grace at the start of the play:

Hoe menich goet ic hem vri heb verleent
Uut mijnder ontfermherticheidens tresoer,
Dat hem recht toe hoert; nochtans sijnse soe door
Ende verblent int aertsche goet. 40–3

> 'I gave them many a boon in hand
> Out of my mercy's treasury
> To be their own, but foolishly
> They crave in their blindness earthly gold.' 40–3

Everyman's God is less banker than betrayed human–being, despairing of his creation:

> I coude do no more than I dyde, truely. 34

The play connects Man and God primarily through the word–play on God and Good. Good, rather than Goods, is used in the text as a singular collective, with ironic overtones; this Good is morally neutral and is transformed by Everyman into a instrument for moral corruption. Good Deeds combines worldly and spiritual aspects of the term. The 'God/Good' word–play echoes through the play and probably explains why the *Everyman* translator preferred to render 'Doecht' as 'Good Deeds', 'goodness in action', rather than as 'Charity'.

The Alterity of Everyman

Cawley marvelled at the 'medieval' features of the play:

> *Everyman* is untouched by either Renaissance or Reformation.[21]

The play's appeal to commonplace views of the world and the Church were undoubtedly advantages in its transplant from one culture to another.

But in one important respect the play is a product particularly of contemporary Dutch culture, and might well have seemed a daring extension of native English genres to the English audience. The Dutch realist painters used possessions and family as indices of status and identity. Elckerlijck defines himself initially by those properties. A typical English morality presents a struggle for control of the acting area by vices and virtues. But in *Elckerlijck* the allegorical figures serve as objective correlatives to the central character's emotions and values. They do not themselves corrupt but serve his will. As Good says, 'Mary, thou brought thy selfe in care' (*Everyman* 454). By enabling the individual to control the stage and direct the action, the Dutch playwright has shown him capable of determining his own destiny, rather than seeming at the mercy of dramatically and theologically external powers. A drama results of recognisable psychological progression, without the battle for control of the acting area characteristic of the standard English morality or moral interlude. The emphasis upon the power of the individual,

realised dramatically through choice, lends the play suspense and draws its emphasis closer to a Renaissance sense of individualism.

I look to others to tell me whether *Elckerlijck* would strike a contemporary Dutch audience as similarly unusual. Perhaps a focus on death is inherently a component in the realisation of the self. But I find compatibility between the play's concern with the individual and the realism of Dutch portrait–paintings. The play as metaphor, the 'illusory' play of Man within the 'real' theatre of God, accords well with the 'painting within a painting' of the Dutch interiors. And, in treating of the vanity of earthly things, it shares in the irony of the *vanitas* paintings commissioned by the wealthy and hanging on their walls as tokens of their wealth.[22] For theatre is itself a form of ostentatious display. While condemning worldliness and materialism, *Elckerlijck* was potentially a contender in a competition, to gain fame for its author and its company. The play was designed to serve worldly ends. Such competitions did not exist in England. The decision to print *Everyman* was likewise undoubtedly driven by commercial as well as by strategic considerations; printers sought to make money. But translated into the England in the sixteenth century, into a context of growing concern about Lutheran activity and urban crime, it cannot 'mean' in the same way. Located within the spectrum of English theatre, its stagecraft takes on a different significance. The English translator was astute enough to recognise the implications of the change and adapt his text accordingly.

To say that *Everyman* derives from or is a translation of *Elckerlijck* seems to me, then, to be at best only a beginning. Like all comparative study, the purpose is not to answer questions but to expose specific processes of cultural interaction.[23] Exceptional though this case may appear to be, the issues that its investigation raises reach out into the wider social, economic, and cultural life of two connected but significantly different peoples.

University of Liverpool

NOTES

1. Tom Pettitt *Introduction to Popular Drama in Northern Europe in the Later Middle Ages: A Symposium* (Odense 1988) 13.

2 Lynette R. Muir *The Biblical Drama of Medieval Europe* (Cambridge University Press, 1995).

3 Gordon Kipling *The Triumph of Honour: Burgundian Origins of the Elizabethan Renaissance* (Leiden University Press, 1977). On miniatures, see Maurits Smeyers, 'Flemish Miniatures for England' translated Michael Shaw in *The Low Countries:*

Arts and Society in Flanders and the Netherlands: A Yearbook 1995–9 (Flemish–Netherlands Foundation, Rekkem 240–50)

4 David Mills 'The Theatres of *Everyman*' in *From Page to Performance* edited by John A. Alford (Michigan State University Press, East Lansing 1995) 127–50.

5. A.C. Cawley *Everyman* (Manchester University Press, 1961) xiii. It is perhaps easy to overestimate the importance of the book trade with the Low Countries. Lotte Helinga 'Importation of Books Printed on the Continent into England and Scotland before c.1520' in *Printing the Written Word: The Social History of Books circa 1450–1520* edited Sandra L. Hindman (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 1991) 205–24, notes that of a sample of 1000 books imported before 1500 to England and Scotland, only 11.6% came from the Low Countries, whereas 40.4% came from Italy, 3.5% from Germany and even 16.5% from France.

6. Cawley *Everyman* ix.

7. *Two Tudor Interludes: The Interlude of Youth: Hickscorner*, Revels Plays edited Ian Lancashire (Manchester University Press, 1980) 33–34.

8. *Two Tudor Interludes* 28.

9. Cf H.S. Bennett *English Books and Readers 1475–1557* (Cambridge University Press, 1969). (153). 'There is no lack of evidence that many of these new works were produced at the 'command' or 'exhortation', of the printer, and it is reasonable to assume that he did the same with translations because the original convinced him that it was a work upon which he might take a fair risk'. The format of *Elckerlijck* would have been familiar to its readers; indeed, many prose texts were rewritten to look like dramatic texts. I am grateful to Dr Bart Ramakers for this and other information.

10 David Loades *Politics, Censorship and the English Reformation* (Van Gorum, Assen, London and New York, 1991) 110–11.

11. See Reinder P. Meijer *Literature of the Low Countries* (Cheltenham, 1978) 54–55.

12. Quotations from *Everyman* from Cawley. From Elckerlijck, from Adriaan J. Barnouw *The Mirror of Salvation: A Moral Play of Everyman c.1490* (Nijhoff, The Hague, 1971: English), and R. Vos *Der Spieghel der Salicheit van Elckerlijck Hoe Dat Elckerlijck Mensche Wert Ghedaecht Gode Rekeninghe Te Doen Van Sinen Werchen* (Wolters–Moordhoff, Groningen, 1967).

13. Barnouw xiv.

14. On the relative complexity of *Everyman*'s style and versification in comparison with those of *Elkerlijk*, see John J. Parker *The Development of the Everyman Drama from 'Elckerlyc' to Hofmannstal's 'Jedermann'* (Drukkerij Ratio, Doetinchem, 1970) 19–22.

15. Femke Kramer '*Rederikers* on Stage: A Closer Look at Metatheatrical Sources' *RORD 35* (1996) 99–100.

16. See further, my essay 'The Theaters of *Everyman*' in *From Page to Performance: Essays in Early English Drama* edited John A. Alford (Michigan State University Press, East Lansing, 1995) 127–49.
17. David Bevington *Tudor Drama and Politics* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1968) 41.
18. Joseph Calmette *The Golden Age of Burgundy: Magnificent Dukes and their Courts* (London, 1949) 222.
19. Notably, Gordon Kipling *The Triumph of Honour: Burgundian Origins of the Elizabethan Renaissance* (Leiden University Press, 1977).
20. See Dirk De Vos 'Painting' in *Flemish Art from the Beginning till Now* (London, 1985) 97. 'The new social class which took its place between the common people and the nobility or clergy, namely the urban bourgeoisie, gradually increased in importance and soon became the driving force of society, productive and progressive in both the economic and the artistic sphere ... (Art) could be acquired, ordered, bought and sold by individual people, and was a piece of cultural merchandise of a private character'.
21. Cawley *Everyman* xx.
22. Cf E.H. Gombrich 'Tradition and Expression in Western Still Life' reprinted in his *Meditations on a Hobby Horse and Other Essays on the Theory of Art* (Phaidon, London,1963): 104 'Any painted still life is *ipso facto* also a *vanitas*'.
23. I have in mind here Tom Pettitt's own defence of the comparative study of English and Dutch medieval drama:

    > Sporadic early references in England to plays on romance matters (like the 'play of a knight cleped fflorence' at Bermondsay in 1444) appear less idiosyncratic in this company than among the overwhelmingly biblical and moral corpus of surviving texts, and the Dutch instances of what might be termed fabliau interludes provide a generic home for those odd pieces ('Robene and Makyne', 'Gilote et Johane', 'De Clerico et Puella') which are hard to place within a purely English (and Scottish) context.

    which effectively proposes the conflation of the drama of various countries into a single generic paradigm.