'Not barren of invention': Texts, Contexts and Intertexts of the London Lord Mayors' Shows, 1614-1619

Emma Kennedy

PhD

University of York
English

October 2014

Abstract

This thesis analyses the printed texts of six London Lord Mayors' Shows, of the years 1614-1619, demonstrating how the two authors – Thomas Middleton and Anthony Munday – innovated textually within this genre. Its methodology is original in two ways. Firstly, it examines the Shows as whole entities, analysing how they function as individual texts. This helps to identify the development of textual strategies across the genre, differentiating the strategies within each Show. Secondly, and most importantly, the thesis examines the Shows as texts, applying textual and literary analysis to identify authorial strategies in each work. This textual perspective allows the thesis to identify three principal strategies in the Shows examined. Firstly, it shows that writers used the Show's 'occasionality' – that is, proximity to a real event – in innovative ways, utilising a variety of strategies to respond to the works' historical and cultural context. 'Occasionality' is thus demonstrated to be more variable than scholars have previously assumed. So too, the thesis identifies diverse ways in which authors use strategies of intertextuality, showing that this concept, too, is unstable as used in this genre. Finally, two of the Shows are shown to challenge and complicate the relationship between the printed text and the event of performance which it supposedly commemorated – that is, the actual procession of the newly-elected Lord Mayor with Company and City dignitaries through London after signing his oath to the King on October 29th. The thesis uses close analysis of historical and textual detail to outline the nuanced and different ways in which Shows responded to their immediate context, utilised other textual sources and interrogated the then-vexed issue of print's relationship to an event of performance. The thesis thus shows that in these three textual areas, Lord Mayors' Shows are much more variable and complex than scholars have previously acknowledged.

Contents

Note on Textual Practice and Referencing

Modern editions of early modern primary texts have been used where reliable editions exist: David Bergeron's edition of Munday's *Pageants and Entertainments* has not been used owing to the typographical issues of the book, as it lacks even italic font and thus does not represent Munday's text adequately. Bergeron's valuable editorial comments have been cited, however, as a secondary source. Line numbers are used for modern editions of Shows (that is, those from the Oxford *Complete Works* of Thomas Middleton), but signature numbers are used for the quotations from Munday's Shows, which are from the original seventeenth-century editions.

Where Lord Mayors' Shows have been quoted, italics have been reproduced as they are included in the original printed text.

I have deviated from the Chicago Manual of Style in two ways, both in the interests of textual accuracy. The first is that I include square brackets around parentheses ('[...]'), in order to differentiate those which I have used to shorten quotations from parentheses originating in the quotations themselves.

The second deviation is that I end quotations with a punctuation mark outside the quotation marks, rather than within it. Again, this is to clarify the distinction between my own punctuation and that of the original quotation.

Acknowledgements

Author's Declaration

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is her own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

Introduction

> [...] establishing the validity of work on popular texts as an
> aspect of literary criticism rather than social history.[1]

The Lord Mayor's Show hardly qualifies as 'popular' in print, given its limited distribution and specialised readership (though of course it was seen by many thousands more in performance). Nevertheless, John Simons' statement captures usefully the project to which I wish to contribute. One of the most vexed issues that crop up in scholarship on this genre is its value (or lack thereof) in literary terms, and likewise the value of literary-critical approaches. While Tracey Hill mounts a spirited defence of the genre's value, she does so in terms more reminiscent of social history, '[u]tilising a diverse methodology that includes textual, historical, bibliographical and archival material' to 'explore the Shows in all their manifold contexts'.[2]

In challenging us to expand our concept of worth beyond the literary, Hill has done much to move the critical field beyond Bergeron's apologetic 'one would never choose a Lord Mayor's Show over, say, *King Lear*'.[3] Acknowledging the Shows' importance beyond the archaic ideal of 'literary' and indeed beyond the text itself is a useful step. Nevertheless, by dismissing literary value as an issue we lose the opportunity to affirm the Shows' worth as texts – and, more importantly, to allow them to expand our sense of what constitutes literary quality. As the collection in which Simons is quoted shows, criticism has been greatly enriched by expanding its reach to texts previously excluded from the 'literary' canon. I hope that a similar benefit can be obtained from attending to the Lord Mayor's Show in these terms.

---

[1] John Simons, 'Open and Closed Books: a semiotic approach to the history of Elizabethan and Jacobean popular romance,' in Clive Bloom, ed. *Jacobean Poetry and Prose: Rhetoric, Representation and the Popular Imagination* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1988), 22. Quoted in Andy Kesson and Emma Smith, 'Introduction: Towards a Definition of Print Popularity,' in *The Elizabethan Top Ten: Defining Print Popularity in Early Modern England*, ed. Andy Kesson and Emma Smith (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013), 5-6.

[2] Tracey Hill, *Pageantry and Power: A Cultural History of the Early Modern Lord Mayor's Show, 1585-1639* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), 7.

[3] David M. Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry, 1558-1642*, revised edn. (Tempe, AZ: Arizona University Press, 2003), 4.

The 'literary' techniques that I elucidate from the Shows in the main body of the thesis are many and varied, but they can be boiled down into three principal categories. Firstly, the Shows demonstrate that authors could display different levels of engagement with contemporary events. While the richness of their context is constant, its influence upon the text is not. 'Occasionality' – that is, the relationship of a literary work to a real event – is thus shown to be a less stable category, and more interesting, than many earlier critics have claimed. Despite writing in a work entitled *Poetry and Politics*, C.M. Bowra claims not only that one can distil 'essential poetry' from 'transitory occasions' but that this enterprise 'gains by the omission of a reference to the actual shape of the occasions themselves'.[4] In the early modern period, too, Douglas Bush contrasts Jonson's 'troubled explorations of the individual soul' with 'the accepted sententiousness of public occasions'.[5] Jonathan Kamholtz is less explicitly anti-occasional, claiming to follow the values of Jonson himself, who 'actively evades the occasions that produce his poems', but states that by doing so 'Jonson has dramatically increased the importance of the poet's role in occasional poetry. He no longer merely bears witness'.[6] By implication, writers who admit their work's closeness to the event it commemorates deny their own literary creativity. However, I will argue in this thesis that responding to context was, at least in the Shows, much more than mere reportage, and instead invited innovative and challenging work; an invitation which both Middleton and Munday accepted.

As well as different relationships to their context, Shows also display variable kinds of intertextuality. In analysing these Shows I detect several different ways in which authors could employ relationships between texts for a literary purpose. Some Shows locate themselves at the intersection of texts on a particular theme or myth, using a specific relationship to their source materials in order to construct a particular political message. Another utilises a phrase with particular associations in order to import those associations into the Show and thus affect its

---

[4] C. M. Bowra, *Poetry and Politics 1900-1960* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 77; cited in Marian Zwerling Sugano, *The Poetics of the Occasion: Mallarmé and the Poetry of Circumstance* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992), 11.

[5] Douglas Bush, *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959), 169.

[6] Jonathan Z. Kamholtz, 'Ben Jonson's *Epigrammes* and Poetic Occasions,' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 23, no. 1 (1983): 91.

meaning. Relationships between the Shows themselves are also important, affecting the political resonances of particular images or assumptions. Intertextuality is a particularly germane issue for early modern literature, shaped as many new modes of cultural expression – including, though not limited to, printed books and theatrical drama – were by a rich cultural and literary context. Mary Orr notes that for literary scholars to move beyond 'traditional historiography', they must establish 'interdisciplinary interpretative frameworks to recuperate and describe elements that are deeply ingrained in a given cultural fabric, such as genres, narrative modes or plots'.[7] This is what I hope to do with the Lord Mayors' Shows. Exploring intertextual literary strategies helps to demonstrate precisely how writers selected from and responded to their rich cultural contexts, while also maintaining the sense of the writer's creative agency. To put it simply, writers like Munday did respond to events like the Cockayne Project, but they could shape that response as they wished, and as the following chapters will show, they did so in several different ways.

The third category is the issue of the text's relationship to performance, which two particular Shows – *The Triumphs of Honour and Industry* (1617) and *Sidero-Thriambos* (1618) – explore in detail, using this vexed relationship as a way to examine the genre's boundaries and strengths. The printed text of the Lord Mayor's Show had a relationship to performance which distinguishes it both from printed drama and from other 'occasional' texts, such as court masques and reports of public processions such as royal entries. In both of the latter 'occasional' categories, the printed text aimed to disseminate the work beyond the socially exclusive audience of the court masque or the chronological and geographical limits of the public occasion. They therefore reported on events for those who either had not seen them or had seen them from afar, as part of a huge crowd. So too, theatrical drama could be printed for those who had not seen a play as much as those who had, and though Bruce Smith argues that plays' title pages could have a mnemonic function (of which more in Chapter Four, below) drama's readership was too varied for this to be constant.[8] Printed Lord Mayors' Shows, in contrast, were most likely distributed to those who were involved in the Show in some way (though this need

---

[7] Mary Orr, *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003), 87.

[8] Bruce Smith, 'Speaking What We Feel About *King Lear*,' in *Shakespeare, Memory and Performance*, edited by Peter Holland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 33.

not have been the end of the texts' journey), many of whom also constituted its primary audience in performance. Writers of the Shows were therefore in the rare position of reporting on a performance to those who had not only seen but sponsored it (at least in the case of the first readers), and who were therefore invested in its success. As with other aspects specific to the Shows, both Middleton and Munday used this seeming restriction as a spur to creativity, exploring the different relationships between performance and text that they could tease out of this hybrid genre.

All these literary tactics demonstrate that the mayoral Show, perhaps because of its uniquely hybrid aspects, encouraged literary experimentation rather than dulling it. Focusing on the texts as literary works might seem to sacrifice one of the genre's most distinctive aspects: its status as the high point of London's ritual calendar, which gave it a popularity in performance unrivalled by other dramatic forms. In fact, however, I will argue that literary focus only allows us to be more precise about the role of performance. Tracey Hill has rightly noted that 'most of the commentary on these texts is predicated on the assumption that the printed text mirrors the Show unproblematically', and scholarship on the Shows is often deliberately vague as to whether, when speaking of a particular work, it refers to the series of allegorical tableaux and speeches which lined the route of the annual procession of civic dignitaries every 29th October through the City of London, or the printed texts linked with that series.[9] These texts have been linked to the processional event as the mere blueprint of them, a more florid memorialisation, or more commonly a hybrid of both. Evidence is unclear, but what we do know is that they were both related to the event and quite distinct from it, printed for a much smaller and more specialised audience. I argue that it was in this shift 'from street to print', constructing the *texts* of the Shows, that authors could display the literary creativity which has often been denied them.[10]

Many assume that the overt political concerns of Shows' civic and mercantile sponsors preclude them from possessing aesthetic qualities. Peter Lake, for example, dismisses the Shows as mere 'celebratory rant', implying that their authors – hired to 'tell the elite and populace [...] what they were supposed to believe' – were mere

---

[9] Hill, *Pageantry and Power*, 214.

[10] *Ibid.,* title of Chapter 3.

Company mouthpieces, displaying no creativity of their own.[11] In this view, the Shows' texts tell us only about what the Companies' and City's upper echelons wished the 'populace' to believe. I agree that we should not seek to extract the personal views of Middleton, Munday or other authors themselves from Shows, owing to the complex convergence of interests involved in their production. However, this does not mean that they are in themselves artistically worthless. Ceri Sullivan has shown decisively that a mercantile context does not preclude literary and artistic value:

> Though literary patronage (unlike political patronage) is usually seen from the author's position before the patron's, it would seem reasonable to add in writers' expectations of merchants not only as an income stream but also as a literate, experienced, and intelligent readership.[12]

That authors were responding to a set of sponsors with specific political desires and investments does not preclude us from allowing for literary creativity in that response. As Sullivan's work shows, authors were writing for a sophisticated readership used to appreciating many different kinds of art.

Earl Miner's 'taxonomy' of genres and 'kinds' which can be 'mingled' and 'distorted' excludes what he calls 'occasional kinds', under which banner Shows would presumably come should they be considered worth mentioning.[13] The binary which is sometimes drawn between 'literary' and 'occasional' genres relies on a post-romantic notion of creativity as inhering in the author's being unfettered by economic concerns or the demands of sponsor and/or occasion. Even while defending civic pageantry's cultural influence, Richard Dutton claims that 'given the limitations of the form [...] it is difficult to say that there was any real development

---

[11] Peter Lake, 'From Troynovant to Heliogabulus's Rome and Back: "Order" and Its Others in the London of John Stow,' in *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stow to Strype, 1598-1720*, ed. J. F Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 221.

[12] Ceri Sullivan, 'London's Early Modern Creative Industrialists,' *Studies in Philology* 103, no. 3 (2006): 328. For more on merchants' self-fashioning, see Ceri Sullivan, *The Rhetoric of Credit: Merchants in Early Modern Writing* (London: Associated University Presses, 2002).

[13] Earl Miner, 'Some Issues of Literary "Species, or Distinct Kind," ' in *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation*, ed. Barbara Kiefer Lewalski (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986), 43.

in it'.[14] Alistair Fowler gives a valuable corrective to the view that limits to form exclude creativity, arguing that 'prescriptive genres encourage the writer to break new ground' and 'Far from inhibiting the author, genres are a positive support. They offer [...] a proportioned mental space'.[15] Though Fowler does not address genres of pageantry such as the Shows, his work offers a valuable framework within which to examine them. I will argue that those restrictions that others see as limiting Shows' value in fact help to make it a literary genre in its own right, encouraging authors to respond with skill and creativity. This creativity is what my thesis hopes to identify in the Shows, combining textual analysis with comprehensive attention to changing contexts.

Previous criticism of the Shows

The plurality of 'contexts' signifies an important advancement that I hope to make on current critical work, viewing the Shows' 'occasionality' as more nuanced than merely closeness, or lack thereof, to a static context. Scholarship on the Lord Mayor's Show can be divided into two main approaches: firstly, that which examines several (sometimes all) of the Shows, analysing them in bulk in order to draw conclusions about the genre as a whole; secondly, those which view one or two Shows as expressions of a particular short-term problem or historical moment. The former approach risks eliding the differences between Shows, identifying trends at best rather than particular moments of innovation; conversely, examining individual Shows in isolation risks attributing the work's meaning entirely to its context, ignoring the author's role and viewing the text as neutral container rather than literary construction. I hope to advance on this by outlining the *variation* possible in Shows' responses to current events, illuminating not only authors' creativity in producing these texts, but also the complexity of the generic framework within which they did so.[16]

---

[14] Richard Dutton, ed., *Jacobean Civic Pageants* (Staffordshire: Keele University Press, 1995), 8.

[15] Alastair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 29, 31.

[16] For a more general review of Lord Mayors' Show scholarship, see Sara Trevisan, 'The Lord Mayor's Show in Early Modern London,' *Literature Compass* 11, no. 8 (2014): 538-548.

Such a combination of long and short-term arguments naturally draws on both multiple-show and single-show approaches. The single-show method has the advantage of relating a Show to its particular historical moment, demonstrating how authors did not select myths and tropes merely for their grandeur but rather responded, often with incisive specificity, to the culture, society and debates within which the Show was embedded. However, many of these studies fail to address how the printed Show works as a whole text, instead picking out themes or parts which seem most 'relevant' to the historical context. The 'en masse' approach, in contrast, demonstrates what Shows have in common and in the process highlights the factors which directed pageant-authors' creativity. It thus helps us to outline how Shows worked as printed texts, how they enabled writers to shape and direct political comment using myths, legends and history in a way more distinct from other genres than previously assumed.

Literary creation in a civic context

These factors helped to distinguish the Shows as a genre from even other forms of pageantry, such as royal entries: the regularity of their performance, and the exclusively civic sphere within which they took place, gave them a particular significance within the ritual and political life of the city. This counters Gail Paster's claim that 'the image of its ideal self must have seemed less readily available to the city than it was to the court'; in fact, pageant-writers had a wealth of existing traditions from which to construct London's 'ideal self', and accordingly the Lord Mayor's Show was embedded within a complex network of custom, ritual and socio-political beliefs – all of which were vital to civic life.[17] Michael Berlin's essay proves just this, viewing the Shows as 'part of the social history of the city'.[18] Berlin shows that the Shows were important not merely as literary and dramatic works, but as a demonstration of 'good order', especially as individual decorum was increasingly viewed as an indication of political stability.[19] Ironically, this extra-

---

[17] Gail Paster, 'The Idea of London in Masque and Pageant', in David M. Bergeron, ed., *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1985), 52.

[18] Michael Berlin, 'Civic Ceremony in Early Modern London,' *Urban History* 13, no. 1 (1986): 15.

[19] *Ibid*., 23.

literary focus can sharpen our sense of Shows' value as literary texts, delineating the different (but equal) burdens placed upon performance and text.

Understanding the precise political demands placed upon the Shows allows us, in turn, to identify authors' responses to those demands – and both Munday, as a Draper, and Thomas Middleton, later City Chronologer, were sensitive to the issues surrounding civic politics. James Knowles moves towards just such a synthesis of the historical and literary, enriching his analysis of the texts by reinserting them into 'the variety of civic rituals that punctuated the ceremonial calendar', reorienting our sense of 'the place of the shows within the culture that produced them'.[20] While I disagree with Knowles's suggestion that the Shows function to 'justify the wealth and power of the mercantile elite', his work valuably integrates analysis of the Shows' content with a sense of their wider political resonance: something especially important to our understanding of this genre's unique literary capacities. [21]

Curtis Perry's *Making of Jacobean Culture* exemplifies the benefits of this approach, broadening his historical vision to take account of London's changing relationship with the crown and 'the growing autonomy and boastfulness of [...] civic self-fashioning'.[22] Perry's work demonstrates just how important it was, for the Shows' patrons and creators alike, to create a specifically *civic* version of magnificence. Far from being ersatz masques, aping the myths used by their betters, mayoral Shows articulated a grandeur that belonged to London alone, shaping the city's sense of its own culture. This contradicts Angela Stock's claim that 'Comparing the lord mayor to a mythological hero and his boat trip to Westminster to an adventurous quest at sea is sailing very close to the wind of the same kind of Quixotian bathos as that with which Beaumont's Rafe, [...] turns a shop in the Strand into a scene for chivalric romance'.[23] Stock misunderstands the intention of writers

---

[20] James Knowles, 'The Spectacle of the Realm: Civic Consciousness, Rhetoric and Ritual in Early Modern London,' in *Theatre and Government under the Early Stuarts*, ed. J. R Mulryne and Margaret Shewring (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 157–58.

[21] *Ibid*., 162, 169.

[22] Curtis Perry, *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the Renegotiation of Elizabethan Literary Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 198.

[23] Angela Stock, ' "Something Done in Honour of the City": Ritual, Theatre and Satire in Jacobean Civic Pageantry,' in *Plotting Early Modern London: New Essays on Jacobean City Comedy*, ed. Dieter Mehl, Angela Stock, and Anne-Julia Zwierlein (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 130.

like Munday in using figures from classical mythology. He does not seriously compare the Lord Mayor's role to Jason's quest, but rather uses the figure to position the Show within a particular set of intertextual networks, framing it in specific relation to its intertexts in order to articulate a political position for the Show. The experienced Munday could trust that his audience, and particularly his specialised readers, had in Kiefer's phrase 'a habit of mind accustomed to seeing symbolism' and could read with attention to the political ramifications of allegory.[24]

Stock's view of such strategies as mere *bathos* highlights the distinctive way that Shows utilise images from myth and history. The form combines the power of performance, particularly on the ritually-significant stage of the processional route through London, with an opportunity for textual exposition not afforded to other performative genres like drama or even the court masque. Thus Munday can undermine the usually-heroic Jason by describing his effeminate performance, with Medea 'playing with his love-locks' and controlling the 'Argo' pageant. This staging is ambivalent enough in handing agency almost entirely to the controversial figure of Medea, but is lent even more significance by the fact that it was staged in such a well-known political ritual. That Munday did all this in order to articulate civic opposition to royal policy (specifically, the Cockayne Project – of which more later) suggests that perhaps the Companies' willingness to use experienced playwrights came from a more sophisticated understanding of the Shows' needs than what Leinwand claims was an 'uneasy alliance between capital and those who articulate its ideologies'.[25] The Shows' use of mythology was much more distinct from theatre than this statement implies, and I hope to show just how adept both Munday and Middleton were at exploiting this.

Leinwand notes, valuably, that the Shows' quality should not be judged according to theatrical criteria alone.[26] This corrects Sergei Lobanov-Rostovsky's claim that the Companies' fear of theatricality led them to reject Middleton's 'superior' *Triumphs of Truth* and demand the more 'static' style of Munday's work,

---

[24] Frederick Kiefer, *Shakespeare's Visual Theatre: Staging the Personified Characters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 12.

[25] Theodore B. Leinwand, 'London Triumphing: The Jacobean Lord Mayor's Show,' *Clio* 11, no. 2 (1982): 138.

[26] Leinwand, 'London Triumphing', 139.

accounting for what Lobanov-Rostovsky (and others) view as a 'decline' in Middleton's Shows after 1613.[27] This assumption does a disservice both to Munday, who as an experienced dramatist was perfectly capable of producing theatricality should it have been required, and Middleton, viewing his later Shows as a decline rather than a development. Middleton's Shows in 1617 and after certainly do draw on Munday's techniques, as I hope to demonstrate, but this is not a submission to civic antitheatricality. Rather, it is a recognition – made, as Stock notes, by a professional playwright accustomed to innovation – that the strategies available to the pageant-writer go beyond the theatrical ones of suspense and plot.[28]

Philip Robinson recognises the power of the Shows' intertextual relationships in examining the various uses of 'Troy' as an image and concept across the genre.[29] The Shows' regularity meant that the same images could have a completely different meaning depending not only on when they were staged, but how they were articulated: as Robinson notes, 'the retelling of the Troynovant figure in the mayoral shows is not in competition with, but actually designed to recall, a range of other (and often very different) versions of the story to memory'.[30] Richard Rowland also notes that Thomas Heywood, in his mayoral Shows, deliberately used images seen as particular to the art and culture of the Caroline court, reappropriating them for the City to establish a particular, and often rather radical, political position.[31]

Rowland's argument that classical imagery in the Shows is seldom merely 'flamboyant self-aggrandizement' but 'serves, more often than not, a serious cultural and political purpose' captures the benefits I hope come from examining texts of the Shows in their entirety, rather than extracting particular sections.[32] Just as the meaning of an image or trope is determined by its intertextual relationships, contemporary events and the way an author positions it, all of these things are

---

[27] Sergei Lobanov-Rostovsky, 'The Triumphes of Golde: Economic Authority in the Jacobean Lord Mayor's Show,' *ELH* 60, no. 4 (1993): 880.

[28] Stock, ' "Something Done in Honour of the City" ', 126.

[29] Philip Robinson, 'The Multiple Meanings of Troy in Early Modern London's Mayoral Show,' *The Seventeenth Century* 26, no. 2 (2011): 221-39.

[30] *Ibid.*, 225.

[31] Richard Rowland, *Thomas Heywood's Theatre, 1599-1639: Locations, Translations, and Conflict*, Studies in Performance and Early Modern Drama (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), 302.

[32] *Ibid.*, 301.

affected by the content of the rest of the Show. This can tell us not only how an author was responding to a particular occasion (in a much more comprehensive way than merely looking at the image in isolation) but we can also use our understanding of that response to illuminate how he might have been positioning the image in relation to its intertexts – and why. Michelle O'Callaghan's claim that Middleton 'fashions and promotes a civic ideology that champions trade and industry through his pageants' thus underplays the extent to which individual Shows can vary.[33] Only by looking at the Shows as individual entities can we appreciate the genre's unique capacities, and use it to reassess current thinking on issues such as occasionality, intertextuality and the text/performance relationship.

The Shows and their audiences

One potential disadvantage of my approach, particularly from a historical perspective, is that it might be seen as rather 'top-down'. The deeper we dig into the intertextual networks and potential meanings of classical and historiographical allusion, the more politically intriguing the Shows become, but the envisaged reader also becomes more cultured and better-read. This necessarily excludes a majority of the Shows' audience; indeed, given the texts' limited circulation, so does my primarily textual focus. This is where approaches such as Lawrence Manley's, Tracey Hill's and especially Ian Munro's, can be useful, allowing as they do for the perspective of the crowds who lined the streets as well as the writers and patrons. Michael Witmore's perspective is entirely focused on the Show as a visual spectacle, stating that 'the allegory of motion would have been more universal because it was so much more immediate', but would perhaps have benefited from awareness of the purpose of the Shows as set by their patrons and principal audience.[34]

Combining these two perspectives is where Manley's work becomes especially useful. He takes into account the genre's elevated political purpose, but in approaching the Show as a rite of transition between Lord Mayors he also provides a

---

[33] Michelle O'Callaghan, *Thomas Middleton: Renaissance Dramatist* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 94.

[34] Michael Witmore, 'Arrow, Acrobat, and Phoenix: On Sense and Motion in English Civic Pageantry,' in *The Automaton in English Renaissance Literature*, ed. Wendy Beth Hyman (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013), 123.

broad anthropological sweep, relating the intentions of the Shows' writers and patrons to London's populace as a whole. I disagree that the printed Shows were 'fraught with messages for a variety of constituencies', and will explain in more depth below why the Shows were more than mere Company propaganda.[35] However, Manley's approach takes into account how the Shows might have been viewed by crowds lining the streets, noting that 'annual variations in an ever-widening repertoire of myths, motifs, and ideas reinforced a sense that history, the community and its values were all human productions, arising from an ongoing civilising process'.[36] Combining this perspective with a vital awareness of the significance of particular locations along the Show's route (such as St Paul's and the Great Conduit), Manley gives a valuable indication of the genre's potential meaning as an annual ceremony to the City's sense of itself as a political community.

This methodology, assessing long-term trends in civic pageantry rather than individual Shows, might seem to be diametrically opposed to my own approach. However, it is vital to my argument in one aspect: my assessment of how writers conveyed the ceremony in print is founded on a sense of what that ceremony meant in performance, and Manley's understanding of this is therefore a vital underpinning. In particular, his emphasis on the Show's place in collective memory and its importance for London's political self-articulation does not undermine but lends a vital urgency to my assessment of individual Shows' provision of a civic response to a particular political occasion. William Hardin, too, notes that texts of Shows could unite the 'emblems of the pageant with the physical features of the city.'[37] As I will argue below, part of the Show's unique capability as a genre, and one of the aspects that made it so ripe for authorial innovation, was the aura that each text carried of broad political significance, massed audiences and collective memory.

The phrase 'collective memory' recalls one of the disadvantages of anthropological approaches like Manley's: the broad sweep means that they tend to ignore, or gloss over, conflict and difference within a political community. This is

---

[35] Lawrence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 215.

[36] *Ibid.*, 215.

[37] William Hardin, 'Conceiving Cities: Thomas Heywood's *Londini Speculum* (1637) and the Making of Civic Identity,' *Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 28, no. 1 (1997): 30.

something that Ian Munro is keen to acknowledge when contrasting the ideal London of the Shows' texts with its more violent, heterogeneous reality, highlighting 'the distance between the ideal and real performance of the civic ritual'.[38] The requirement for writers to present London as a univocal political entity, contrasted with what Munro calls the 'destabilizing effect of the contemporary city', both limited their freedom and sparked their creative ingenuity, as I hope to show.[39] Munro's work demonstrates a great advantage, and one disadvantage, of the multiple-show approach. The disadvantage is his inattention to the texts as individual works, which leads him to ignore not just their particular contexts (as he himself admits) but also their authors' creative agency. Nevertheless, combining the chronologically disparate eyewitness accounts of the Shows, drawing out a sense of the general year-on-year experience, and the common themes, is an important addition to the more text-centred approach as it allows us to gain an insight into the 'popular' experience of the Shows' performance – which in turn has important ramifications for how we read the texts.

Monographs: Bergeron and Hill

This broader perspective, and ability to combine disparate sources, is displayed to its fullest advantage by the two book-length studies of the Shows. Both of these studies combine many different forms of evidence in order to paint a rich cultural picture, cementing our sense of the Shows' important cultural standing in the early modern period. Although I disagree with David Bergeron's statement that we must 'consider civic pageants within the limitations of their form' – it is not that the form has limitations so much as different strengths – he takes an important step towards valuing civic pageantry, and Shows in particular, for factors other than those used for drama.[40] Instead of taking aesthetic cues from theatrical drama, Bergeron argues that 'In the best entertainments, a consistent theme envelops the whole production; and

---

[38] Ian Munro, *The Figure of the Crowd in Early Modern London: The City and Its Double* (New York; London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 61; see also Benjamin Klein, ''Between the Bums and the Bellies of the Multitude': Civic Pageantry and the Problem of the Audience in Late Stuart London,' *The London Journal* 17, no. 1 (1992): 18–26.

[39] Munro, *The Figure of the Crowd in Early Modern London*, 66.

[40] Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry, 1558-1642*, 4.

when one puts the several parts together, the structural theme emerges'.[41] Bergeron's stated preference is for thematic unity, so for instance he praises Munday's *Chrysanaleia* (1616) because all its devices relate to the Fishmongers' Company. However, his statement can also be read to mean not merely that we can draw all the devices of a Show together under one theme, but that we can combine seemingly disparate parts in order to infer an argument, even a political position. Taking the genre seriously like this is perhaps the greatest contribution of Bergeron's book, and the foundation for much of the criticism that followed. Indeed, Bergeron's many articles on civic pageantry have helped establish its relevance to many fields of study, emphasising, among other things, the role of emblem books in pageantry; the Bible's equal importance as a source; symbolic landscapes; and, perhaps most importantly, refuting the supposed rivalry between Munday and Middleton by placing it in the context within which Shows were commissioned.[42]

A regrettable consequence of Bergeron's wide perspective is that his use of the rich evidence could not go far beyond rudimentary analysis and rather general conclusions. This is ably corrected by Hill's book, which adds a valuable sense of literary nuance to our sense of the Shows. Viewing them as a genre ripe for literary and historical analysis, as well as one of the most vital (yet understudied) aspects of early modern culture, *Pageantry and Power* represents a huge step forward in our understanding of the Shows and paves the way for more complex analysis than has previously been attempted, showing us that, in Hill's phrase, the genre 'offers a treasure trove of symbolic meaning and contemporary resonances'.[43] Unlike many others, Hill pays equal attention to the Shows' status as a 'manifestation of collective practices' which were 'attuned to the power structures of the City' while also allowing them considerable status as literary works.[44] This allows her to combine use of many types of evidence (Company records, other records of civic history,

---

[41] *Ibid.*, 7.

[42] David M. Bergeron, 'The Emblematic Nature of English Civic Pageantry.',' *Renaissance Drama, New Series,* 1(1968): 167-98; David M. Bergeron, 'The Bible in English Civic Pageants,' *Comparative Drama* 20 (1986): 160–70; David M. Bergeron, 'Symbolic Landscape in English Civic Pageantry,' *Renaissance Quarterly* 22, no. 1 (1969): 32–37; David M. Bergeron, 'Thomas Middleton and Anthony Munday: Artistic Rivalry?,' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 36, no. 2 (1996): 461–79.

[43] Hill, *Pageantry and Power*, 4.

[44] *Ibid.*, 7, 8.

eyewitness accounts) with literary-critical analysis, showing that the Shows' political function was not a limitation on creativity but may have been a spur to it.

This point is one of my most obvious debts to Hill, as it is here that she demonstrates the genre's unique capacities. However, it is by no means the only one. Her use of Company records to outline the process of producing and performing the Shows illuminates my sense of the printed text's importance as *remembered* performance: a sense of the spectacle's importance to Company officials allows us to see that authors of Shows were writing for an audience with specific memories and desires, distinguishing them not just from non-pageant genres but from other texts such as royal entries, which were aimed at a much broader audience. She combines this with a sense of authorial response, analysing for example John Webster's seeming distaste in the preface to *Monuments of Honour* (1624) for the Merchant Taylors' wish to control the Show's content.[45] This approach, combining many different texts and authors, allows Hill to contrast different authors' attitudes and strategies, thus highlighting the importance of authorial agency in the Shows as a genre. Although the methodology seems antithetical to mine, then, my analysis owes much to Hill's.

Hill pays unprecedented attention to the Shows as performance experience, arguing that 'a focus on the printed text can give only a limited or perhaps even misleading sense of the full range of the day's festivities' and instead using eyewitness records to gain 'a taste of the incidental, impromptu aspects of the Shows'.[46] While this thesis will aim to show that the printed text has other value, Hill's focus on the contingency of performance and the distance between the day's performance and the text that survives leaves a valuable space for the texts to be analysed as more than mere performance reports. She is thus right to bemoan that 'most of the commentary on these texts is predicated on the assumption that the printed text mirrors the Show unproblematically'.[47] In Hill's study of the printed texts' bibliographical qualities, another advantage of the multiple-show approach becomes apparent: she is able to outline, as she herself states, 'the full range of these

---

[45] *Ibid.*, 82–83.

[46] *Ibid.*, 184, 122.

[47] *Ibid.*, 214.

texts, as a genre, in bibliographical terms'.[48] This allows her to articulate both those aspects which were common to the Shows and those which varied, establishing the range of those variations.

Of the common aspects, she notes usefully that the titles were invented solely for the printed works and that the Shows' print runs roughly corresponded with the sponsoring Company's livery membership.[49] Although she speculates that it is '*possible* that the bulk of the copies were designed for [Company] recipients' [Hill's italics], she also identifies several variations which allow us to see a range of possibilities for the Shows. For instance, although in 1623 the Drapers' Company paid 'Mr Mondayes man for bringing the bookes', suggesting that the Company distributed the texts themselves, three other Shows (*Descensus Astraeae* (1591), *Troia-Nova Triumphans* (1612) and *The Sunne in Aries* (1621)) cite publishers, suggesting that they were distributed and even sold (as claimed on the 1612 title page) by other means.[50] Hill's work allows me to analyse individual texts with this range in mind, lending my year-by-year viewpoint an awareness of the genre's diversity in the longer term. The same is true of her final chapter, an analysis of the Shows' political contexts: by establishing a variety of possible contexts to which authors could respond, Hill's work helps me to locate my shorter-term analysis within a sense of the possibilities that the genre left open to its authors.

Where Hill opens up a plurality of different contexts for the Shows – historical, political, socio-economic – I wish to explore a variety of *degrees* to which, or indeed ways in which, authors could respond to a context. For example, three of my chapters, covering four Shows (those of 1614, 1615, 1616 and 1619) cover what seems to be the same 'context': the Cockayne Project. However, I argue that the 1616 and 1619 Shows each responded to the Project on a very different level than the short-term response of the 1614 and 1615 Shows, exploring the *range* of possible responses to the same context. Hill's acknowledgement that the genre was 'capable of responding to more immediate [political] concerns' and 'receptive to

---

[48] *Ibid.*, 215.

[49] *Ibid.*, 216, 220.

[50] *Ibid.*, 228–29.

changing times' in its representation of the Crown-City relationship is therefore germane to my argument, but as a springboard rather than a governing framework.[51]

Using Hill as a springboard means that my work is, I hope, complementary to hers rather than contradictory, and the same is true for many of the critics who examine individual Shows in relation to their context. I am undoubtedly indebted to their pioneering scholarship, and to historicist methodologies, in asserting the importance of context to a work's meaning. However, as Hill has pointed out, context alone is not enough: to understand the full complexity of any genre, particularly one as tricky as the Shows, requires a much more nuanced point of view. It is here that I hope to go beyond the current understanding of the Shows' relationship to their context: current work, as I will demonstrate below, tends to view a Show's response to context either as rather general and thematic (using the same theme as the 'event' to which it supposedly responds) or so specific as to entirely erase authorial creativity, merely mirroring debates in the images it creates – and, as with some of the above criticism, only looking at parts of the Shows and dismissing others.

Individual Shows in their contexts

Despite the value of Kara Northway's work on verse forms in the Shows, her interpretation of Middleton's *Triumphs of Honour and Industry* (1617) and others displays both these flaws.[52] Northway claims that Companies were using the Shows 'to stimulate wealthy traders to work harder', owing to 'increasing demand for items such as food and clothing'.[53] Aside from its historical inaccuracy – increasing Grocers' labour did not increase food supply – this utilitarian view of the Shows undermines the Shows' real importance to the civic government. By making it a servant of context rather than an active response to multiple contexts, Northway ignores the Show's ability to articulate the city's sense of its political and social self. A. A. Bromham's examination of Middleton's *Triumphs of Truth* (1613) provides

---

[51] *Ibid*., 271, 279.

[52] Kara Northway, ' "To Kindle an Industrious Desire": The Poetry of Work in Lord Mayors' Shows,' *Comparative Drama* 41, no. 4 (2007): 167–92.

[53] *Ibid*., 179, 174.

more historical rigour and authorial agency, connecting Middleton's choice of a moral allegory with contemporary scandal at court.[54] While the substance of the context is disputable – Middleton's concerns were arguably more civic in nature – Bromham usefully illuminates its role in the Show's construction. This goes to the heart of my engagement in this thesis with the issue of occasionality: I argue that what seem like oft-repeated, conventional pageant tropes can in fact take on particular implications when examined in relationship to the relevant set of historical and cultural contexts.

Ceri Sullivan and Su Mei Kok demonstrate equally rigorous attention to historical context, as well as a more convincing argument for Middleton's central concern with respect to *Truth* and the concurrent New River Project, which linked the new Lord Mayor, Thomas Myddelton, with his brother Hugh. Sullivan deserves particular praise for refusing to subordinate the Shows to theatrical drama, something which others have done, deeming the latter genre more 'literary'. She contends that reading Middleton's *Truth* and his *New River Entertainment* (written for the New River's opening) allows us to reassess his contemporaneous comedy *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*: the play's 'interests in money, sex and water have a more local, literal and positive value. They imply a mild defence by Middleton of his patrons' engagements in the city'.[55] Sullivan thus demonstrates how paying attention to Shows can enrich our understanding of other works by an author. Moreover, by placing *Truth* within its rich context of London politics, she illuminates how the mayoralty of Myddelton in particular would have affected the meaning of two factors: Error's constant challenges to the procession and the speeches' warning against nepotism. Kok also analyses the importance of the New River entertainment to *Truth*, though her view of Middleton is a little more oppositional than Sullivan's.[56] Nevertheless, both works illustrate how rigorous attention to a Show's context can enrich our understanding of its meaning and even allow it to challenge prior notions of a writer's affiliations.

---

[54] A. A. Bromham, 'Thomas Middleton's *The Triumphs of Truth*: City Politics in 1613,' *The Seventeenth Century* 10, no. 1 (1995): 1–25.

[55] Ceri Sullivan, 'Thomas Middleton's View of Public Utility,' *The Review of English Studies* 58, no. 234 (2007): 162.

[56] Su Mei Kok, ' "How Many Arts from Such a Labour Flow": Thomas Middleton and London's New River,' *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 43, no. 1 (2013): 173–90.

A strength of both Sullivan's and Kok's work is its chronological specificity: both critics use a Show's rich contextual fabric to enumerate the concerns of a particular historical moment, confirming Robinson's point that, while images appear in several Shows, their meanings may be radically different according to various Shows' contexts.[57] This is a flaw in Karen Newman's otherwise valuable 'Celebrating the City'.[58] While Newman usefully illustrates what she calls 'a distinctive urban discursive space', adding to our understanding of the Shows' performance, she uses evidence from a single Show and eyewitness thereof – Middleton's *Honour and Industry* (1617) and Busino's account of it respectively – to support her point about the genre's cosmopolitan leanings.[59] While the conclusion is not in itself unconvincing, making broad conclusions from a narrow evidence base deprives us of the opportunity to examine differences between the Shows. So too, Nancy Wright valuably examines Shows' relationship to the court and courtly literature, but focuses on a feast given by the Merchant Adventurers given for Prince Henry in 1607, giving little sense of how Shows could respond to different contexts in different ways.[60] It is this understanding of the variations between them that I hope to gain by examining several Shows, but as whole works rather than *en masse*.

As with Sullivan and Kok, Leah Marcus's analysis of Munday's *Chruso-Thriambos* (1611) demonstrates the rich benefits to be reaped by understanding a Show's short-term contexts, but, mirroring Wright and Newman, she uses her short-term analysis to make assumptions about the rest of the genre. 'City Metal' thus showcases the advantages and drawbacks of historicist approaches. Marcus makes a convincing case for seeing Munday's Show as a reappropriation of authority over gold (and thus the determination of value), since it mirrored the King's own actions in drawing the pyx earlier the same year, and is still one of the most convincing

---

[57] Robinson, 'The Multiple Meanings of Troy in Early Modern London's Mayoral Show,' 225–26.

[58] Karen Newman, 'Celebrating the City,' in *Thomas Middleton in Context*, ed. Suzanne Gossett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 90–97.

[59] *Ibid.*, 97.

[60] Nancy Wright, ' "Rival Traditions": Civic and Courtly Ceremonies in Early Modern London,' in *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*, ed. David M. Bevington and Peter Holbrook (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 197–217.

interpretations of this particular Show.[61] However, she extends this to assuming not only that city-court relations conditioned *all* civic pageantry but that court masques and Shows had a 'common stock of politically charged motifs which could be traded back and forth [...] in accordance with shifts in the contemporary situation'.[62] This idea of shifting power balances between the two institutions belies the fact that authors of Shows had several different contexts to which they could respond, and that the genre had an identity distinct from court masques. Shows might well have responded to masques or other courtly literature, but the court was only one of many sources of inspiration that shaped this hybrid genre.

Roze Hentschell's *The Culture of Cloth* gives a rich sense of the 'historical moment' surrounding Munday's 1614 and 1615 Shows, painting them accurately as a response to the Cockayne Project.[63] Hentschell's work is important in advancing our sense of the Shows as targeted responses to broader political events, and as having a specific political message rather than merely praising the civic elite who sponsored them. She gives a particularly useful contextualisation of Munday's praise of 'Old Drapery' in *Himatia-Poleos* (1614), noting that 'recalling the past becomes, for Munday, a radical act where current policies can be challenged'.[64] This highlights that what some dismiss as 'standard' praise of a trade or figure could in fact become radical at a particular historical moment. However, in her emphasis on the importance of the Cockayne Project as a theme for the two Shows, she overstates the continuity between them, and like Marcus underestimates the genre's capacity for variation. As I will argue in Chapter One, while the two Shows respond to the Cockayne Project they are responding to two different stages of it, and as a consequence *Metropolis Coronata* (1615) represents not a continuation but an inversion of the previous year's Show. Although there are themes that run across the two Shows, they mean different things, and are framed differently, within each work – and thus have an entirely changed significance.

---

[61] Leah S. Marcus, 'City Metal and Country Mettle: The Occasion of Ben Jonson's *Golden Age Restored*,' in *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater*, ed. David M Bergeron (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1985), 26–47.

[62] *Ibid*., 44.

[63] Roze Hentschell, *The Culture of Cloth in Early Modern England: Textual Construction of a National Identity* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 153-78.

[64] *Ibid*., 162.

This is something that Daryl Palmer also fails to realise, though his work on the theme of resurrection in the Shows is extremely valuable in other ways. Palmer examines how two of Munday's Shows, *Chruso-Thriambos* (1611) and *Chrysanaleia* (1616) employ the trope of resurrection, providing an intriguing analysis of how this genre could 'assimilate the ancient labor of preaching about resurrection and, in so doing, authorize a new metropolitan community'.[65] Palmer's work shows us how a genre could assimilate a trope from elsewhere and thus utilise its history while subtly changing its function, something which I build upon in Chapter Two, discussing intertextuality in *Chrysanaleia*. However, it has one disadvantage, which is that, having analysed in detail one aspect of the two Shows, he assumes that other devices in the same works had a similar, or subsidiary function. He thus claims that Munday's tale of crusading merchants in *Chrysanaleia* 'embody a vision of Christian abundance' in the service of 'metropolitan theodicy'.[66] In my view, as I will outline below, this section has a quite different function, related to the Show's context regarding class divisions and the social history of knighthood. Munday does not use it merely to give a theological sheen to the Show but rather to embed his work in specific intertextual debates. Nevertheless, Palmer's work is invaluable for discussing just such intertextual debates, as he proves a vital point that Marcus misses: the Shows could draw on and assimilate tropes from a broad and unexpected range of sources.

Richard Rowland's work combines the sensitivity to context displayed by Hentschell and Marcus with a welcome attention to Shows as a serious genre in their own right. Where Marcus and Wright, in particular, subsumed civic pageantry beneath the umbrella of court masques, viewing its every change as dictated by city-court relations, Rowland's work is subtly different. He demonstrates that while Thomas Heywood utilised 'courtly' figures such as Orpheus in his mayoral Shows, he did so in order to reappropriate them for civic purposes, and not just in dialogue with the court on the city's behalf but also in engagement 'with the political identity of the incumbent mayor he was addressing'.[67] I would question Rowland's assertion

---

[65] Daryl W. Palmer, 'Metropolitan Resurrection in Anthony Munday's Lord Mayor's Shows,' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 46, no. 2 (2006): 373.

[66] *Ibid.*, 380.

[67] Rowland, *Thomas Heywood's Theatre*, 301.

that in 'bringing [political] tensions to the surface' Heywood 'effectively reinvented the genre' of Shows, since as I argue below it is possible to detect political tensions in much earlier Shows.[68] Nevertheless, Rowland's work is pivotal not only in giving pageant-writers unprecedented political agency but also in recognising the potential of mayoral Shows to question prevailing assumptions in civic politics, challenging rather than merely expressing the *status quo*.

The Shows in text and performance

Rowland also opens up the question of the printed text's relationship to performance, asserting that in Heywood's first pageant, *London's Ius Honorarium* (1631) 'In the very act of invoking the constraints under which he is working, he sidesteps them, asserting his own authorial control over the text he is producing'.[69] Heywood highlights the constrained nature of the Show in performance in order to differentiate it from his own text. While this is a different strategy from those used in the earlier Shows that I analyse, it provides two points which are foundational to my argument. Firstly, that the Show's printed text could be substantially different to the performance, and secondly that that difference was constituted not by print's mere inadequacy in conveying the details of performance but by authorial agency in constructing the Show as a literary text. The first point was made by David Bergeron, but where Bergeron argues that the printed Show contains 'digressions, descriptions, and discourses on sometimes arcane topics' Rowland argues, as do I, that these 'extra' elements in the printed Shows are not mere window-dressing but play an important role in the text's overall message.[70]

Paula Johnson mirrors Bergeron: where the latter describes Thomas Dekker's *Magnificent Entertainment* (1604), as 'an idealized text, a Platonic text [...] textual performance here fantasizes theatrical performance', Johnson attributes the printing of Shows to an 'impulse to turn ephemeral entertainment into enduring texts'.[71]

---

[68] *Ibid*., 305.

[69] *Ibid*., 304.

[70] David M. Bergeron, 'Stuart Civic Pageants and Textual Performance,' *Renaissance Quarterly* 51, no. 1 (1998): 167; see also Rowland, *Thomas Heywood's Theatre*, 301.

[71] Bergeron, 'Stuart Civic Pageants and Textual Performance,' 167; Paula Johnson, 'Jacobean Ephemera and the Immortal Word,' *Renaissance Drama: New Series* 8 (1977): 158.

Johnson compares Dekker's work to Ben Jonson's *The Coronation Triumph*, which also textualised King James's 1604 entry, arguing that while Dekker is, in Johnson's words, a 'retailer of experience', Jonson seeks a more readerly page, filled with classical references rather than details about performance.[72] Both gesture towards the literary development of printed Shows, but neither moves beyond the concentration on performance, placing pageant-texts on the scale between more or less experience-focused. Palmer's assertion that 'whereas the evanescent performance was neatly contained [...] the pageant text generically admits anyone into the interstices of political and social negotions' is equally binary (and aguably overstates the containment of performance) but nonetheless pays useful attention to the Shows' texts as a distinct genre. [73]

Caitlin Finlayson moves beyond such binaries in viewing Heywood's *Londini Emporia* (1633) as constructed 'for the private sphere of its readership [as] a forum for intellectual reflection and spiritual mediation'.[74] In acknowledging the text's potential to have a function independent of spectacle, Finlayson's work advances the field considerably and is foundational to my argument. Ironically, my one dispute with her is motivated precisely by her work's relevance: she claims that Heywood's text is 'radically different from the best of Middleton and Dekker, whose merits lie mainly in their success in 'dramatizing' a largely static form'.[75] Presumably this refers to the more theatrical works of *Troia-Nova Triumphans* (1612) and *The Triumphs of Truth* (1613), which indeed are theatrical. However, I would argue that they are unusual in being so, and that most Show texts were more nuanced than merely mirroring performance to a greater or lesser extent. When Finlayson argues that 'from a textual standpoint [*Londini Emporia*] is *not* a conventional Lord Mayor's Show', therefore, she underestimates previous mayoral Shows. As I will argue below, several of the Shows – including the ones analyzed in this thesis – engage so deeply with the construction of the text as a piece apart from,

---

[72] Johnson, 'Jacobean Ephemera,' 155.

[73] Daryl W. Palmer, *Hospitable Performances : Dramatic Genre and Cultural Practices in Early Modern England* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1992), 120.

[74] J. Caitlin Finlayson, 'Mercantilism and the Path to Spiritual Salvation in Thomas Heywood's *Londini Emporia, or Londons Mercatura* (1633),' *English Studies* 91, no. 8 (2010): 839.

[75] *Ibid*., 844.

though informed by, the event of performance, that by 1633 the 'conventional' Lord Mayor's Show was far more varied than Finlayson assumes.

Other dramatic genres

The sheer variety in the above body of scholarship proves that Shows were more than mere subsidiaries to the court masque, and I echo Tracey Hill in viewing their relationship as one of equal art forms (if anything, the Shows had a longer history), each with its own traditions and conditions for innovation.[76] Although I acknowledge the influence of masque criticism, particularly New Historicist critics such as Martin Butler, on pageant criticism as a whole, it should be apparent from the previous section that work on the Shows has already adapted these methods specifically for this genre, making an assessment of Butler's work irrelevant here. Accordingly, the most useful criticism of the court masques and entertainments for my argument goes beyond pageant-criticism in addressing one of the main themes of this thesis: the relationship between printed text and performance.

One of the most comprehensive assessments of courtly entertainments in print is Lauren Shohet's *Reading Masques*, which contains several ideas that can be usefully adapted to my arguments on the printed mayoral Shows. Shohet argues convincingly that, while a text's 'occasional inflections' are important, so too are 'genre and allusion [...] operating as they do in history'.[77] I hope to move beyond the orthodox sense of occasionality in our understanding of Shows in the same way that Shohet has done for the court masque, bringing 'literary' concepts such as genre and intertextuality together with a sense of the works' place in a particular historical moment. Genre is particularly important for Shohet, who views 'individual masques in mutually enriching dialogue with a dynamic tradition [...] not maverick outliers whose eccentricities only underscore the genre's essential narrowness'.[78] This is a useful corrective to the methodology of Finlayson, whose work, as I note above, is fascinating in relation to single Shows but insists on viewing those Shows as

---

[76] Hill, *Pageantry and Power*, 19.

[77] Lauren Shohet, *Reading Masques: The English Masque and Public Culture in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 20.

[78] *Ibid.*, 66.

somehow departing from 'tradition', which is constructed by implication as the dull orthodoxy of writers such as Munday. As this thesis will argue, viewing works as individuals but also attending to innovation between them will prove that, as Shohet has shown of the court masque, the Lord Mayor's Show was a dynamic genre whose constraints encouraged, rather than inhibited, authorial innovation.

Gabriel Heaton's perspective is broader, viewing the masque as part of a courtly tradition that included royal progresses and coronation entries, and in the process I would argue loses Shohet's valuable sense of generic dynamism. For example, Heaton takes a rather simplistic view of the relationship between performance and print, arguing that either 'the primacy of the performance can be acknowledged and the text legitimated as a faithful report of a spectacular and important event; or the text can be claimed as [...] an expression of artistic unity which may in fact have been imperfectly realized in performance'.[79] Shohet proves that much more nuance is possible, arguing that in Campion's *Lord Hay's Masque* 'detail certainly can offer readers a "you were there" experience. But journalistic re-creation is not the only function such passages can serve'; she sees rather 'something literary, indeed mock-heroic' in Campion's richly detailed account.[80] Much of my analysis in the proceeding chapters will depend upon a similar movement beyond Heaton (and others') binary between experience and 'artistic unity', arguing that while writers have ambitions beyond re-creating performance, this does not mean that the *fact* of performance was unimportant. On the contrary, much of the Shows' power in print comes from their position as the high point of London's calendar of civic festivities, their significance as a transition rite and the sheer size of their audience.

Metropolitan scholarship: the importance of London

This huge audience was one of the factors that made Shows so important to the City, and this importance in civic politics is one of the elements, I will argue, that make this genre so encouraging of authorial innovation, since it anchors each work within its historical moment and offers an established path by which it can relate to

---

[79] Gabriel Heaton, *Writing and Reading Royal Entertainments: From George Gascoigne to Ben Jonson* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 227.

[80] Shohet, *Reading Masques*, 103.

contemporary debates. Previous scholars of pageantry, especially (but by no means limited to) Hill, have emphasised the importance to the genre of its London context. Hill acknowledges both this, noting that the Shows were 'a manifestation of collective practices [...] aided by its regularity' and, conversely, the Shows' importance to London, calling them 'the apex [...] within the *ongoing* processes of civic government'.[81] As well as continuing the critical tradition of placing the Shows firmly within their civic context, my thesis is also indebted to the work of historians of London, such as Ian Archer and Valerie Pearl, who although taking opposite views as to the city's relative stability in the early modern period, are united in emphasising its governors' wish to maintain that stability.[82] This is particularly important to my argument in Chapter Four that Middleton's *Triumphs of Honour and Industry* (1617) and Munday's *Sidero-Thriambos* (1618) contest the extent to which a Show can represent a stable city.

I contend that the printed texts reflect this importance of the Show to the Company members, and possibly civic dignitaries, to whom the printed texts were likely distributed. The political messages that I discern in these texts were important *precisely* because they had been performed in front of thousands of Londoners. For example, Ian Archer notes that, more than merely legitimating wealth, the Shows were seen as reminding the civic elite of the importance of charity, emphasising that group's obligations to the city's less fortunate.[83] This is a vital aspect to my argument in Chapter Two that Munday's *Chrysanaleia* (1616) emphasises the visual reminders of civic philanthropy in London's built environment in order to 'rehabilitate' the city's political elite after what many saw as Sir William Cockayne's undeserved knighthood. If the Shows were seen not merely as speaking *for* the elite but also in maintaining their sense of civic duty, then the texts' emphasis on this duty became *de facto* evidence that the Company and City elite would still fulfil their social obligations – thus underpinning the printed texts' importance.

---

[81] Hill, *Pageantry and Power*, 8.

[82] Ian W. Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Valerie Pearl, 'Change and Stability in Seventeenth-Century London,' *The London Journal* 5, no. 1 (1979): 3–34.

[83] Ian W. Archer, 'The Nostalgia of John Stow,' in *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre, and Politics in London, 1576-1649*, ed. David M. Bevington, David L. Smith, and Richard Strier (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 25.

In the same collection, Lawrence Manley astutely remarks on the ritual significance of 'the portion of West Cheap between the Great Conduit and Paul's Gate' and notes that the Show 'reached its culminating phase' there.[84] Many critics of the Shows have already acknowledged that the rich ritual space in which they were performed was an important factor in their creation and reception. I wish to move beyond this by also asking how that richness was transmitted to the printed text, and in examining the transfer of space to text I draw on the work of critics such as Andrew Gordon. Gordon asks, 'What is the relationship between the myriad experience and materials which constitute the city in all its specificity, and the process of textualisation?' and while he only brings in the Shows as part of a broader essay on Middleton's interest in memory, I believe that the Shows have a great deal to offer us, particularly with the approach of this thesis.[85] Just as Gordon views Stow's *Survey of London* as offering a 'textual experience of urban community', the political systems that I detect within individual Shows gain crucial importance from having been mapped processionally onto London's politically-significant sites.[86]

Munday and Middleton: critical traditions

I argue that this political dimension to the genre affected how authors worked within it, providing a constraint but encouraging a creative response to it. This was particularly true for Munday and Middleton, both of whom were involved in City politics – albeit in different ways – and were aware of the Shows' political role. Though Munday has received much less critical attention than Middleton, criticism of his work has acknowledged more readily the Shows' importance in his repertoire. Even Donna Hamilton's work, though it strikes an odd note in many respects and pursues a clear agenda, admits that after 1602 'work for the City not only provided

---

[84] Lawrence Manley, 'Of Sites and Rites,' in *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre, and Politics in London, 1576-1649*, ed. David L Smith, Richard Strier, and David M Bevington (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 46–47.

[85] Andrew Gordon, *Writing Early Modern London: Memory, Text and Community*, Early Modern Literature in History (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 2.

[86] *Ibid.*, 112.

Munday's livelihood, but afforded him repeated public recognition'.[87] I disagree with both Hamilton's central thesis – that Munday was a Roman Catholic – and her contention that Munday displayed merely a 'focus on the representation of City ideology'.[88] Rather, I would contend that Munday used his considerable interest in London's community and history to provide an active response to, rather than passive restatement of, civic ideology.

My view is thus much closer to that of Tracey Hill, who maps Munday's varied creative career onto his multiple positions within London's communities, showing that the city played a significant part in his authorial development and self-definition.[89] Hill reminds us that Munday's 'status as a Londoner, a freeman of the City and a resident of certain locales of London [...] permeates his texts'.[90] Though true for the many genres in which Munday became proficient, this was especially true of his Shows, which 'strive to represent London's particular history as having an authoritative status quite dissimilar to that of any other (especially foreign) ancient past'.[91] This contradicts Lobanov-Rostovsky's dismissal of Munday as a 'conventional' (by implication, unimaginative) constant against which to measure Middleton's innovation. Enthused and inspired by the genre's civic connections, Munday was keen to put his own stamp on works therein, employing not only a distinctive sense of history but also a sensitivity to contemporary concerns. I utilise Hill's identification of both these factors in order to assess Munday's Shows as responses to the civic *zeitgeist* as well as meditations on the role of various types of history in affecting contemporary politics.

While Middleton has received much more critical attention, relatively little of this has focused on his Shows. After R.C. Bald's early recognition of the City's substantial role in Middleton's career in 1933, relatively little attention was paid to them in discussions of Middleton until the 1990s – ironically, given the

---

[87] Donna B Hamilton, *Anthony Munday and the Catholics, 1560-1633* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005), 153.

[88] *Ibid*.

[89] Tracey Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture: Theatre, History and Power in Early Modern London, 1580-1633* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004).

[90] *Ibid*., 19.

[91] *Ibid*., 157.

disproportionate attention paid to his *Triumphs of Truth* (1613) by scholars of civic pageantry.[92] Middleton scholarship nonetheless contributes several germane points to my discussion here. Though Swapan Chakravorty sees no need to mention the Shows when writing of Middleton's concern with social and political networks, he usefully points out the utility of genre, stating that 'formal and historical concerns in cultural analysis are inseparable'.[93] Just as Chakravorty analyses Middleton's stage-plays, I hope to show that he was equally attuned to the Shows' potential as a genre ripe for exploration and innovation.

Chakravorty makes space for literary *and* historical nuance, a strategy lacking in Margot Heinemann's exploration of Middleton's 'Puritanism', which is based largely on his plays and the sympathies of his patrons.[94] Analysis of Middleton's civic activities would have shown that, as O'Callaghan points out, the decidedly non-Puritan Sir William Cockayne was one of his most prominent employers.[95] O'Callaghan herself conducts a more convincing analysis of Middleton's religious sympathies in his Shows, analysing their relationship to the morality play and noting that their emphasis on work gives them a 'distinctly Protestant aspect'.[96] This work provides a useful example of how close-reading texts of Shows can elucidate political and social arguments that might not be immediately apparent from surface facts like their patronage. However, I disagree with O'Callaghan's assumption that we can analyse all of Middleton's Shows to extract a single, albeit mutable, 'civic ideology'; rather, I view the Shows as separate entities, relating to one another but fundamentally distinct.

The distinction between Shows is much better served by the Oxford edition of Middleton's works. This is due as much to form as to editorial choice, but nonetheless in including a range of scholarly perspectives on the Shows the edition

---

[92] R. C. Bald, 'Middleton's Civic Employments,' *Modern Philology* 31, no. 1 (1933): 65–78.

[93] Swapan Chakravorty, *Society and Politics in the Plays of Thomas Middleton* (Oxford University Press, 1996), 9.

[94] Margot Heinemann, *Puritanism and Theatre: Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama Under the Early Stuarts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980). See also N. W. Bawcutt, 'Was Thomas Middleton a Puritan Dramatist?,' *The Modern Language Review* 94, no. 4 (1999): 925-39.

[95] O'Callaghan, *Thomas Middleton: Renaissance Dramatist*, 93.

[96] *Ibid.*, 96.

acknowledges Middleton's diverse and changeable views, supporting my claim that as a pageant-author he was able to sense and extend the genre's capacity, as well as creating very different arguments and/or meditations on particular issues, depending on the demands of context. Gary Taylor explains that the work's chronological arrangement of texts allows some readers 'to follow the author's own development; but it also enables others to situate each work in its historical and social moment [and] [...] shows the range of genres Middleton could juggle at one time'.[97] For reasons explained below, this thesis is not quite chronological. Nevertheless, it also aims to situate Shows in their historical context, and beyond this to demonstrate Middleton's capacity for combining several different literary strategies in one work. Analysing his Shows as a whole thus allows us to see the full extent to which this genre left space for, and indeed encouraged, a huge variety of literary strategies.

Despite the utility of such author-centred criticism, its very nature presupposes that individual authors have particular views and writing styles. The methodology of this thesis demands that I move beyond the author as defining feature, examining instead how the same author could produce very different work should the genre and/or occasion demand it. Though Munday and Middleton both had their own authorial identities, the printed Show as a genre subsumed those identities under many other factors which also shaped creativity. In practical terms, this means that though we can identify a certain political message in one of Munday's or Middleton's Shows, we should not necessarily extract that message and view it as part of that author's own opinion. Rather, a Show's political message is shaped by a particular, time-bound set of factors. I will be arguing therefore that creativity functions slightly differently in the Shows than in other genres, especially less 'occasional' ones. For both authors studied here, each Show represented an opportunity to explore particular aspects of the genre, and the nature of this exploration was determined as much by occasional demands as by authorial preference. This is not to deny the role of creativity in the Shows, nor indeed to deny the importance of authorship. However, in this genre the skill of authorship lies in versatility more than consistency: Munday's ability to explore different approaches in each of his Shows is the sign not of a 'hack' but of a writer taking control of a genre and pushing it to its very limits.

---

[97] Gary Taylor, 'How to Use This Book' in Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino, eds. *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 19.

Scope and structure

That four of the six Shows analysed here are by Munday will demonstrate, I hope, that Lobanov-Rostovsky is wrong to view his work as the static, 'formulaic' background against which Middleton supposedly innovated in *The Triumphs of Truth* (1613).[98] *Truth* was indeed an innovative work, but this has arguably been emphasised at the expense of other Shows. This is why the thesis begins in 1614, showing that after Middleton's innovation came not a return to formula but a series of equally fascinating innovations. The overall scope is short, spanning just the six Shows from 1614 to 1619, but the limited chronological breadth leaves room for thematic breadth, allowing me to examine in adequate depth the multiple issues to which each of the Shows reaches out. Each of the Shows, I argue, is innovative in part because it reached out and responded to these multiple contexts, but also because it responded to and helped stretch the limits of the printed mayoral Show as a literary genre. The sheer variation within such a narrow band of years surely challenges our previously limited ideas of what constitutes innovation, both within this genre and in literature as a whole – and shows that Munday was at least as skilled as Middleton, if not more so, in navigating the complexities of this hybrid genre.

The first chapter focuses on the Shows of 1614 and 1615, Munday's *Himatia-Poleos* and *Metropolis Coronata*. These two Shows represent Munday's response, on behalf of his fellow Drapers (especially the higher, merchant echelons) to the notorious Cockayne Project. Though Hentschell analyses them as similar responses to the Project, I view them as polar opposites, arguing that Munday responds to the change in the Project's status by entirely inverting the world view of *Metropolis Coronata* from that of *Himatia-Poleos*. The earlier Show, staged at the Project's very beginning in October 1614, defended the English cloth trade against the attacks it had received from pro-Cockayne propaganda, arguing instead that the merchant clothiers who headed London's government (including that year's Lord Mayor, Sir Thomas Hayes) helped to maintain a *status quo* that sustained England's regional clothworkers and its national economy.

---

[98] Lobanov-Rostovsky, 'The Triumphes of Golde,' 879.

Metropolis Coronata confronted a radically different situation the following year. The Cockayne Project had gone from inception to obvious failure in just twelve months, and by October 1615 both city merchants and regional labourers were protesting against the lost trade links and stagnating cloth market. Munday's position changed accordingly, from one of defence to one of defiance, and the very structure of the Show changed too. *Himatia-Poleos* had used imagery of the regional trade such as the 'Cotswold Shepherd', presenting London's pivotal role in *English* national prosperity. *Metropolis Coronata* inverts this, presenting London as independently great, transcending Englishness and conducting foreign trade on its own behalf. Many view the Show's combination of characters, especially Medea, Jason and Robin Hood, as odd: I reassess the meaning of this combination in the light of King James's own political self-fashioning. I argue that the contrast between these two Shows demonstrates the genre's capacity to respond to short-term political change, and to combine and frame a seemingly-odd variety of images to create an incisive political message.

The second chapter, Chapter Two, focuses on Anthony Munday's *Chrysanaleia* (1616). Despite being sponsored by a different Company, the Fishmongers, this Show was as concerned with Cockayne as the previous two had been. However, Munday took the genre in an entirely new direction, developing its response to context, its framing of sources and its use of aspects beyond performance, such as textual description. Perhaps more than any other text, *Chrysanaleia* demonstrates how seemingly disparate elements of a Show can intertwine in crucial ways. The text foregrounds three main themes or sets of images: merchants' role in the Crusades; the self-sacrifice of a pelican mother; and the Fishmonger Lord Mayor William Walworth's role in defeating the 1381 rebellion. These are much more than merely relevant praises of London and the Fishmongers; Munday moulds them so that they all, when read together, form a debate on issues of merit, just reward, and its intersections with social class and political responsibility.

I argue that this thematic and complex response reached out to the knighting of Cockayne in June 1616 – an honour which contrasted noticeably with his project's disastrous consequences and his unpopularity among Londoners – but also participated in concurrent debates around political themes, so that the Show was not merely 'occasional' in the sense of responding to an event, but acted as a link between that event and concurrent cultural concerns. Munday thus recognises, and

utilises, the Show's power as an 'occasional' genre not merely to pass comment of an event but to reframe it entirely. He also uses the Show's allegorical framework to rethink issues of intertextuality, linking it to contemporary texts in different ways and angling those links so that they too carry a political message. Finally, he also creates a text that is separable from performance, adding and reducing particular elements in order to create a specific, complex political response on the city's behalf.

The Show examined in Chapter Three, Middleton's *Triumphs of Love and Antiquity* (1619), displays an ostensibly more obvious response to its occasion: it responds to the identity of the new Lord Mayor in whose honour it was staged. That that Lord Mayor was Cockayne, however, encouraged Middleton to respond to a great deal of what previous works, including *Chrysanaleia*, had implied about Cockayne and his activities. *Love and Antiquity* thus showcases the different types of intertextuality available to the Shows as a genre, including intertextuality *between* Shows themselves. Responding to both the themes and the value-system that Munday had brought to the forefront in 1616, Middleton creates a rival system that contests the assumptions underlying *Chrysanaleia*, replacing just reward with freely-given service as the ultimate political and moral duty. He creates this system using a concept borrowed from Calvinism and its associated writings: 'free love', originally denoting God's divine agency in electing the Saved, is here adapted to a political meaning of freely-given service, implicitly opposed to service given in expectation of reward.

Where reward, for Munday, was (when used correctly) a valuable part of politics, an incentive to service, for Middleton it is a distraction, encouraging venality in the place of authentic devotion to duty. Making politics into a labour of faith allows Middleton to rehabilitate Cockayne, disassociating his (lack of) popularity from his implicit worth as a political leader. That 'free love' appears mainly in theological writings demonstrates just how wide was the range of sources that the Shows were able to utilise, as well as another kind of intertextuality – that of bringing a phrase associated with one particular concept to bear on the political arena, in the process changing its meaning and yet still retaining echoes of the original, in this case Calvinist, sense. I argue that looking at the Show as a whole, but also in reference to others, allows us to see the particular way in which Middleton extends the genre's potential, exploring the different varieties of intertextuality which could be combined therein.

Chapter Four goes back two years, exploring Middleton's *Triumphs of Honour and Industry* (1617) and Munday's *Sidero-Thriambos* (1618). I examine these two Shows last partly because, unlike the others, they do not address issues linked to Cockayne, but also because of their extreme metatextuality. Just as the 1616 and 1619 Shows showed Munday and Middleton contesting political issues of reward and virtue, these two Shows represent two very different meditations on the genre's literary and dramatic qualities. Both authors explore the genre as a hybrid of text and performance, contesting the way in which the printed text relates to the performance that it ostensibly memorialises. Drawing on early modern drama and critical work thereon, as well as scholarship on early modern print culture, I analyse how each author gives a very different take on the printed Shows' ability to convey the lived experience of performance.

Both Middleton and Munday were sufficiently civic-minded to be aware of their specialised audiences' particular investment in the Shows' success as events – how they would remember it, and how they wanted to remember it – and both exploit this fact, but in very different ways. In the text of the 1617 Show, Middleton provides an idealised performance, using practical detail to invoke his audience's memories of the event but rewriting them to smooth over its uncontrolled reality. Munday is aware of, but much less amenable to his audience's wish for an idealised Show, providing a more challenging text whose descriptions evade visualisation even as they promise it. Where Middleton shows how the printed Show could *complement* the performance, Munday highlights both the text's capacities and its limitations, reminding his readers of of aspects of perfomance that the medium could not deliver. Both Shows, then, meditate on the form's unique benefits and drawbacks, providing a fitting end to the thesis by showcasing exactly how creatively, and how differently, it inspired writers to work.

Chapter 1. Responsive Occasionality: Anthony Munday and the Mutable Politics of the Cockayne Project.

> seeing […] that Drapery triumpheth now two yeers together, by succession of two Lord Maiors in one and the same Society: I held it not fit (finding my selfe not barren of invention, in a Theame of such scope and large extendure) to runne againe the same course of antique honour: but rather to jumpe with the time, which evermore affecteth novelty [...].[1]

Anthony Munday's introduction to the Lord Mayor's Show of 1615, promising 'to jumpe with the time', seems at first to belie this Show's close relation to its precursor. Far from introducing 'novelty' *Metropolis Coronata* was, as the Show itself would make clear, written in direct response to the same historical events which had shaped the 1614 Show, and both were sponsored by the Drapers' Company. Indeed, the two successive Draper Lord Mayors of London to whose election Munday refers had quite possibly been elected as part of the City's own response to the same event; the Cockayne Project. However, their two inaugural Shows were far from continuous. Both were related to the Project, but were entirely distinct, responding to a similarly drastic change in the Project's circumstances. These two Shows thus demonstrate the genre's capacity for 'responsive occasionality'. Simultaneously mutable, flowing with the changing circumstances to which they respond, each one is also perfectly *occasional*, matched sensitively to the particular demands of the historical moment in which it was staged.

The Cockayne project, initiated in late 1613 by the eponymous Sir William Cockayne (an alderman and merchant), aimed ostensibly to make the export trade more egalitarian and efficient by dissolving the wealthy Company of Merchant Adventurers, who had previously held a monopoly on exporting undyed and undressed woollen cloths, and restricting exports to finished cloths. The projectors claimed that by breaking up this company they would increase access to the trade and create jobs in dyeing and dressing, but they merely replaced the old Merchant Adventurers' Company with another company, called the New (or sometimes

---

[1] Anthony Munday, *Metropolis Coronata* (London: George Purslowe, 1615), sigs A3r-v. Subsequent references are to signature numbers in this edition and will be integrated into the main text.

'King's') Merchant Adventurers. This company failed to match the old company's exports – monopoly having allowed the old Adventurers to accumulate substantial capital and expertise – and the Project was ultimately a disaster, causing widespread job losses (particularly in wool-producing regions such as the Cotswolds) and making Cockayne unpopular with traders and producers alike.

The Drapers' Company was one of the most affected by this disaster. Not all members of the Drapers' Company were drapers, of course, since the 'custom of London' allowed livery company members to practise any trade. However, many were involved with the textile trade in some capacity and thus vulnerable to its disruption in late 1614. Many senior Drapers were also personally affected by the demise of the old Merchant Adventurers' Company, including the new Lord Mayor in 1614, Sir Thomas Hayes, who was a member until the company's dissolution. In addition, many of those at the Drapers' Company's lower levels were affected by fluctuations in cloth prices and the job insecurity caused by uneven sales. Quarterage payments for the Drapers in 1624 record that, out of 528 members of the yeomanry, over 150 – that is, over a quarter – were involved with textiles in some way, with 116 tailors, 25 drapers, 8 mercers, 4 clothworkers and 5 haberdashers listed.[2]

 It was therefore only natural that Anthony Munday, himself a freeman of the Company, should respond to the Project in the two Shows he wrote for them during that period, especially given that – unlike many writers who were free of livery companies – he had himself been involved in the trade of drapery.[3] Both *Himatia-Poleos* (1614) and *Metropolis Coronata* (1615) are vehemently anti-Cockayne, arguing against the project and defending both the old state of the cloth trade and the role of the merchant and draper therein. Their similarity ends there. They use completely different tactics to discredit the reforms and those who supported them, demonstrating the potential of this genre in tracing and responding to sudden alterations in the political landscape. *Himatia-Poleos* defends the role of the old cloth trade in maintaining England's wealth, depicting London and its merchants as sustaining the national economy and relating them to 'ordinary' clothiers from the city and from outlying regions. In direct contrast, *Metropolis Coronata* presents

---

[2] Robert Ashton, *The City and the Court, 1603-1643* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 49.

[3] Tracey Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture: History, Power and Representation in Early Modern London 1580-1633* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 28.

London as an economic entity in itself, disconnected from the rest of England and participating in international trade on its own terms. The latter Show therefore did not, as Roze Hentschell claims, merely continue the previous year's tactics and message, but in fact inverted them.[4] Where Munday had been defensive, claiming the city's support for the nation and merchants' support for regional clothworkers, now he was defiant, asserting the London merchants' ability to trade independently of the king who had overtly sacrificed them for the sake of a dubious reform.

The explanation for this shift is contained in the very text of *Metropolis Coronata*. Introducing the Show (as quoted above) Munday remarks that 'the time […] evermore affecteth novelty'. Partly a sharp comment on the Cockayne Project's unjustified shattering of long-established structures, this observation also illuminates an otherwise-puzzling shift. Although both Shows were responding to the same project, the nature and effects of that project had changed dramatically between October 1614 and October 1615. Around the time of *Himatia-Poleos*, the reforms had been announced but their predicted failure was still only theoretical. A proclamation banned unfinished cloth exports in July 1614, but the old company was slow to dissolve and, while exports dropped a little, October levels were buoyed by those remaining from the peak-season spring and summer sales at Blackwell Hall.[5] Within the space of less than a year, however, the cloth export trade (and indeed the trade as a whole) changed beyond recognition. Exports were down to less than half of the 1614 peak, few cloths had in fact been dyed and dressed (and those few remained unsold), and all this despite the fact – surely galling for the old Merchant Adventurers – that the new company had obtained almost exactly the same privileges as the old, permitted to ship unfinished cloths in unlimited quantities in order, so they claimed, to ease the transition.[6] This failure caused serious economic hardship in London and beyond, and in the words of Nathaniel Brent, writing to Sir Dudley Carleton in 1616, 'some few curse Alderman Cocken […] & hope [for] his

---

[4] Roze Hentschell, *The Culture of Cloth in Early Modern England: Textual Construction of a National Identity* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 162.

[5] Barry Supple, *Commercial Crisis and Change in England, 1600-1642: A Study in the Instability of a Mercantile Economy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 41–44.

[6] Hentschell, *The Culture of Cloth in Early Modern England*, 161.

hanging'.[7] These changing circumstances allowed Munday to use extremely different methods to achieve the same thing; that is, to discredit Cockayne and his project on the Drapers' behalf.

The Cockayne Project: anti-merchant rhetoric

Cockayne's project was initiated by a proposal submitted to the King and Privy Council in late 1613, but the ideas which made it plausible originated in the previous reign. The Merchant Adventurers had long been accused of monopolising the trade to the detriment of others, and the Privy Council admonished them several times in the 1580s for buying insufficient quantities of cloth. In a 1586 Council meeting, as Lord Burghley (Sir William Cecil) recorded, the 'ordinary vent' of cloth was described as 'most necessary in this tyme…specially for kepyng of great multitudes of poore people in work'.[8] The Merchant Adventurers had thus long been held responsible for averting the problems of uneven employment which inevitably arose in a seasonal industry. The capital wealth which allowed them to do this, however, was viewed as evidence of their dishonest trading practices. Sir Edwin Sandys's report to Parliament on behalf of the committee for the Free Trade Bill (introduced shortly after the parliament had met in 1604) accused the merchants of buying only when it suited them 'by a complot among themselves', which resulted in 'the utter ruin of … poor workmen, with their wives and children'.[9] Of course, the workmen's welfare was no more the merchants' responsibility than it was their clothier employers', but this report – and its acceptance by much of Parliament (though the

---

[7] 'Nath. Brent to [Carleton]'. 29th November, 1616. MS Secretaries of State: State Papers Domestic, James I, 1603-1640. SP 14/89 f. 105. The National Archives of the UK. *State Papers Online*. Web. 12 Oct. 2013. Document URL: http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/mss/i.do?id=GALE|MC4323684676&v=2.1&u=uniyork&it=r&p=SPOL&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript

[8] 'Minute, in Burghley's hand, of an Order in Council touching the matters in controversy between the clothiers of Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, and Somerset, and the Merchants Adventurers'. 24th December, 1586. MS Secretaries of State: State Papers Domestic, Elizabeth I. SP 12.195 f. 123. The National Archives of the UK. *State Papers Online*. Web. 12 Oct. 2013. Document URL: http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/mss/i.do?id=GALE|MC4304283644&v=2.1&u=uniyork&it=r&p=SPOL&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript

[9] Wallace Notestein, *The House of Commons, 1604-1610* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1971), 113–14.

bill ultimately failed) – exemplifies the way in which discourse surrounding the cloth trade both vilified merchants and laid responsibility at their feet.

As well as being seen as both scourge and potential saviour of the cloth trade, the Merchant Adventurers were also viewed as hindering reform, which was seen as necessary long before 1614 . Hentschell rightly notes that despite the upward trend in cloth exports – 1614 was a peak year, so the trend was broken by reform, not by stagnation – the clothing trade, particularly in 'old' draperies (woollen broadcloths) was viewed through a permanent lens of crisis.[10] A speech by Thomas Hedley in the House of Commons in June 1610 referred to the 'general decay of trade and traffic', while on February 17th in the same session 'a grievance was remembered against the decay in making of cloth'.[11] Even in 1614, a peak year for cloth sales, the pro-free trade Sir John Sammes complained that 'the reason of cloth [being] at a stand [is] because the Merchant Adventurer keeps [it] so'.[12] Such interest groups argued that the Merchant Adventurers used their monopoly to leach money from the cloth market rather than reinvesting, allowing the situation to stagnate despite growing labour crises because it suited them to have suffering clothworkers ready to take up the slack whenever demand increased.

However, the reality differed somewhat. Rather than causing unemployment, the Merchant Adventurers' monopoly allowed them to prevent it. As wool production was seasonal and demand fluctuated, demand for labour also varied, but the Merchant Adventurers' business advantage allowed them to accumulate enough capital to purchase cloth from regional producers even when overseas demand was slack, and likewise buy up the cloth during seasonal peaks and sell it on at a more steady rate if required. Unemployment among clothworkers, therefore, usually reflected broader economic circumstances, and often would in fact have been worse were it not for the Merchant Adventurers' wealth.[13] Despite this, their attempt to

---

[10] Hentschell, *The Culture of Cloth in Early Modern England*, 2.

[11] Elizabeth Read Foster, *Proceedings in Parliament, 1610*, 2 vols. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1966), vol. 2: 183, 359.

[12] Maija Jansson, ed., *Proceedings in Parliament, 1614 (House of Commons)* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988), 299.

[13] See Supple, *Commercial Crisis and Change in England, 1600-1642*, 40.

regulate employment meant that any job losses, however small, were ascribed to merchant greed rather than market forces.

This model of greedy merchants hoarding capital and allowing the market to stagnate, refusing the competition and reforms needed to revitalise the trade, underpinned most of the rhetoric which surrounded the Cockayne Project. John May, the Deputy Alneger, wrote *A Declaration of the Estate of Clothing* (1613) in response to King James's request that he investigate how best to reform the cloth trade. May blamed 'corrupting time' for the trade's decay, setting up a binary opposition between reform and (damaging) stagnation.[14] He argued that '[m]any Merchants are of that disposition, that they more respect their present gain than the good of all others [...] casting vpon their gaine of money, and not on their gaine of credit' (sig. B4r). Merchants have, he implies, privileged short-term gain at the expense of the cloth trade's long-term health. Those who export cloth are implicitly separated from the honest workers who produce it.

May's rhetoric was mirrored in the discussions of cloth trade reform in the Parliament of 1614. Despite that year being a peak one for undressed cloth exports, Sir John Savile described the cloth trade as in crisis, claiming that 'the state of [clothiers'] country [i.e. region] cannot endure a month'.[15] Sir John Sammes said that '[the clothiers of his region] could suffer no delays in their sale without hazard of starving; and if this stop of cloth continue but one 14 days, he knows not what will follow'.[16] 1614's cloth sales in fact outperformed those of 1613, but these parliamentary accounts nevertheless display a palpable sense of crisis – for which the Merchants Adventurers were, as usual, blamed. The discussions did not question the project's feasibility but rather assumed that any reform was better than no reform, framing the crisis as one of stagnation.

This demonization of the Merchant Adventurers continued in the official rhetoric of the royal proclamations which brought the reforms into force. A proclamation introducing the reforms made on 20th May 1614 began by placing them

---

[14] John May, *A Declaration of the Estate of Clothing Now Used Within this Realme of England* (London: Adam Islip, 1613), sig. B3r. Subsequent references are to signature numbers in this edition and will be integrated into the main text.

[15] Jansson, *Proceedings in Parliament, 1614 (House of Commons)*, 300.

[16] *Ibid.*, 304.

in a long history of royal improvements, reminding subjects that King Edward III 'set our owne people on worke for their better sustentation and comfort'.[17] The proclamation then framed the Cockayne reforms as a continuation of this historic process of royal economic stewardship. Following Edward's example, it announced: 'it is likewise our desire [...] that all Broad Cloaths may bee Died and Dressed within Our Kingdome before they bee Exported'.[18] By linking the new reforms to such an example from the cloth trade's history, the proclamation's official rhetoric figured the current situation under the Merchant Adventurers as an anomaly, separating it from the trade's previous emphasis on the common good. This logic suggested that the Cockayne project was a return to the glorious past rather than a break with it. A proclamation later that year took a similar approach: announcing the withdrawal of the old company's patents and privileges, the proclamation of 23rd July 1614 'promise[d] […] that neither the present Charter of the Merchant Adventurers, nor any other Licences or Dispensations … shall be any maner of prejudice, impeachment, disturbance, or interruption to such as shall, after the time aforesaide, vent the saide Clothes Dyed and Drest'.[19] This framed Cockayne's reforms not as radical change but as removal of impediment to a trade that had been there all along – ready, implicitly, to flourish. Such rhetoric constituted an official claim that the Merchant Adventurers and their associates had been conspiring to slow down the nation's greatest source of trade, sacrificing the national economy for their own capital gain.

Himatia-Poleos: merchants and the English commonwealth

Among the merchants demonized in such rhetoric were many leading Drapers, including the 1614 Lord Mayor Sir Thomas Hayes, who as I have already noted was a member of the old Merchant Adventurers. Munday was therefore unable to escape the shadow of the Cockayne Project in *Himatia-Poleos*, and as the phrase 'old

---

[17] *By the King. A Proclamation Conteyning his Majesties Royall Pleasure, concerning the proiect of Dyeing and Dressing of Broad Cloathes within the Kingdome, before they be exported.* (London: Robert Barker, 1614).

[18] *Ibid*.

[19] *By the King. A Proclamation against the Exportation of Clothes, undyed and undressed contrary to Law* (London: Robert Barker, 1614).

drapery' in the subtitle suggests, he confronts the situation directly. He did not merely 'remind the audience of the privileges of "Old Drapery" '; although the Show does do this, it goes far beyond it in engaging not merely with the reforms themselves but with the rhetoric which surrounded them.[20] By challenging the rhetoric as well as the changes it supported, Munday is able to refute the reformers' claims regarding the Merchant Adventurers and the relationship of merchants to producers, and of London's relationship to the regions, reappropriating their rhetoric of national pride and using it to rehabilitate the Adventurers' role in the cloth trade.

Emblematic of this is the Show's very title, *Himatia-Poleos.* Munday explains this as an Ancient Greek way of conceptualising civic defence: 'the walles of any Citty, were termed by the *Grecians* […] *Himatia Poleos*, the Cloathing or Garments of the Cittie'.[21] This is an obvious play on the Show's textile theme, but also mirrors both the Speaker's acceptance oration in the 1614 Parliament, which mentioned the 'Spartan' view of the city walls as representing social unity and the first section of Stow's *Survey of London*.[22] Munday attributes the phrase *Himatia-Poleos* to the ancient Greeks and not the Spartans in particular, but does mention 'the *Lacedemonians'* in the very first section of the text (sig. A3). He also links the 'clothes' of the city to social unity, stating that '*Draperie* the rich Clothing of England* […] clothed both Prince and people all alike' (sig. B1r). This is a fitting emblem for a Show whose main message concerns the role of merchants and merchant governors in uniting London and England as a whole in a commonwealth characterised by economic interdependence.

Munday visualises this paradigm of commonwealth most effectively in the device containing the figure of London. King Richard I (who, as Munday had explained earlier in the text, had appointed London's first Lord Mayor) sits at the head of a chariot:

---

[20] Tracey Hill, *Pageantry and Power: A Cultural History of the Early Modern Lord Mayor's Show, 1585-1639* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), 295.

[21] Anthony Munday, *Himatia-Poleos: The Triumphs of Old Draperie* (London: Edward Allde, 1614), sig. B1r. Subsequent references are to signature numbers in this edition and will be integrated into the main text.

[22] See Stow, *A Survey of London* (London: John Windet for John Wolfe, 1598), sigs. B3v-B5r. Munday's 1618 edition of the *Survay* adds a paragraph to Stow's work regarding the remaking of a section of the wall in 1477; perhaps the wall was on his mind after composing *Himatia-Poleos* and other Shows. See Stow, *The Survay of London*, ed. Anthony Munday (London: George Purslowe, 1618), sig. B6v.

> …with the severall figures of so many citties in *England*
> about him … Those Citties are discipherd by their
> Eschuchions of Armes, and that their best advantage ever
> ensued by making of woollen Cloathes, for the continuall
> maintenance of *Englands* Draperie. But *London* [is] sitting
> nearest unto [the king] himself, as chiefe Mother and
> matrone of them all.
>
> (sigs. B1v-B2r)

This measures London's greatness in relation not only to the king but to other English cities. It was of course customary in the Shows to assert the city's power and feature the King, but here Munday emphasises not just that London is great but that it is made so by its place in the hierarchy of English cities, which seldom featured in mayoral Shows. Even King Richard, who had appeared in *Chruso-thriambos*, Munday's Show for 1611, is presented differently here. In *Chruso-thriambos* his character framed a specifically civic history, legitimating – and elevating – the Lord Mayor's political position by explaining its historic connection to the monarch.[23] Here, however, he moves beyond civic politics toward a broader role, displaying London's primacy within England as a whole.

King Richard's favouring of the Drapers in conferring the first title of Lord Mayor on Sir Henry Fitz-Alwin, Draper (although, as Munday sheepishly admits, his 1611 Show had presented Fitz-Alwin as a Goldsmith), moves the Show's subject beyond civic glory to magnificence on a national scale. This is also the effect of Munday's claim regarding Sir Francis Drake. It was of course only natural that the Drapers should boast that Drake, the famous seafarer and hero of 1588, had been free of their Company, but Munday presents this glory as a source of national pride, and national pride as the Company's principal desire:

> Sir *Frances Drake*, who having rounded the whole world,
> and noated the riches and best endowments of every nation,
> founde none to equall the Draperie and cloathing of *England*.
> In regard whereof, he chose to be a loving Brother of the
> *Drapers* Societie, before all other Companies of the Citty.
>
> (sig. B1v)

---

[23] Anthony Munday, *Chruso-thriambos: The Triumphes of Golde* (London: William Jaggard, 1611), sigs. A3r-A4v, B3r.

Drake is not proud of the drapery, or indeed the trade, of 'London', but of 'England', and it is this national pride that draws him to the Drapers' Company. Their principal source of pride is thus presented as national, rather than civic. They exist to promote England's drapery, not London's, and their superiority within the city is conferred by a national hero's pride in a fundamentally English product. The London Drapers were not the only cloth traders in the country, as many of those who favoured free trade had pointed out in the parliamentary debates quoted above, but their pride here comes from Drake's choice of them to represent the country's trade – rather than London's portion thereof. Munday's mention of Drake comes just after his assertion that the title of *Himatia-Poleos* denoted national as well as civic unity: he had also noted that English clothing gave the country 'the admiration of forraigne nations' (sig. B1v). This combination of images thus associates the London Drapers with a specifically national pride, presenting their members' overseas trade – usually carried out as Merchant Adventurers – as a way of asserting English superiority among other countries. According to this Show, then, the Drapers who traded as Merchant Adventurers did so not merely to increase their own wealth but to reinforce England's international standing.

To underline this, Munday portrays the cloth trade itself as a fundamentally national undertaking. The character of the Cotswold shepherd links the merchants who sold English cloth to its regional producers. Sitting by 'a goodly Ramme, or Golden Fleece' which recalled the Drapers' coat of arms, the Cotswold shepherd was linked visually with the merchants who, according to pro-reform works such as May's, had impoverished rural workers such as him in pursuit of their own wealth. The Shepherd's speech makes clear his dissociation from the City: 'Why gaze yee so upon me? [...] in these silken sattin Townes, are poore plaine meaning Sheepheards woondred at, like Comets or blazing Starres?' (sig. B3v). The shepherd claims to feel out of place, and his costume surely reflected this. He even draws attention to the contrast between his own simple dress and the Golden Fleece by asking 'is it this goodly beast by me, that fills your eyes with admiration?' (sigs. B3v-B4r). Munday highlights this contrast not to separate the rural shepherd from the urban merchants, however, but to illustrate their interdependence.

While the pro-reform rhetoric had used the poverty of rural cloth producers to paint the Merchant Adventurers as venal, Munday reappropriates their image in the old Company's favour. In using the shepherd in the Draper-sponsored Show and

visually associating him with the Company's coat of arms, he reminds his audience and readers that the two were not opposed but in fact depended upon one another for the maintenance of their trade. The Shepherd's explanation of how he came to be associated with a Company symbol epitomises this relationship:

> my Father […] when S.[ir] *Martin Calthrope* (a Brother of the same Society) was Lord Maior, brought then the like goodly Ramme as his oblation; and I hearing [that a Draper Mayor was to be elected] have brought this as my hearts free offring.
>
> (sig. B4r)

Critics of the Merchant Adventurers often attempted to dissociate them from regional cloth producers. In the 1604 Commons free trade debates, for example, several argued that among the benefits free trade would bring was geographical equality, pushing capital into the regions from its previous concentration in London under the Merchant Adventurers' monopoly.[24] More germane perhaps for Munday and his readers was John May's nostalgic vision of the English cloth trade in its heyday, in which producers and retailers 'who might have beene strangers one to another in regard of their distance in dwelling, yet proved brethren by reason of their profession' (sig. B2v) – which, May claimed, helped maintain honesty within the trade. May contrasted this unfavourably with the recent past, in which the Merchant Adventurers' dominance had allowed dishonest men to usurp and corrupt the trade. Munday's Shepherd, however, counters this, linking the Adventurers' recent success to secure and steady employment for all. The London merchants' continuing dominance of the trade has not eroded this security but in fact maintains it, linking export merchants such as Hayes himself and rural producers such as the Shepherd. By including the Shepherd's father, Munday can refigure the Merchant Adventurers' recent success as supporting the rural clothworkers rather than endangering them, as the pro-reform rhetoric claimed.

Complex economic networks: the dangers of sudden change

---

[24] Notestein, *The House of Commons, 1604-1610*, 114.

Munday intensifies the effects of this reframing in the Shepherd's verse, outlining in concrete terms the precise connections between City merchants and the rural producers whom they allegedly kept in poverty. This creates a chain linking the Shepherd's work with cloth exports:

> *From the Ramme*
> *we have the Lambe*
> *From both our finest*
> *woolles are shorne*
> *Wooll had thus from*
> *the Ramme and Lambe,*
> *Makes the best Cloath,*
> *that can be worne.*
> *Thanke then the Draper*
> *that began:*
> *To make such Cloathing,*
> *meete for man.*

(sigs. B4r-v)

In this verse Munday lays claim, on the Drapers' behalf, to a connection with the producers whom the old Merchant Adventurers had supposedly been impoverishing. He elides the function of the Draper with that of the cloth trader in order to utilise the link to the Company coat of arms, but the message is still clear. He outlines a concrete link between effective management of cloth exports, which only experienced merchants with access to plenty of capital could achieve, and secure employment in other regions – the very employment which the free traders in the 1614 Parliament had accused the old Merchant Adventurers of destroying. By concretizing these links in such pithy verse, Munday animates the very economic reciprocity by which 'old Drapery' sustained England's national economy.

The rest of the verse makes the two sectors' interdependence even clearer, as the Shepherd summarises:

> if wee have no Ramme, wee are sure to have no Lambe: no
> Lambe, no Wooll: no wooll, no Cloth: no Cloth, no Draper.
> [...] *Heaven graunt that we may never see these noes,*
> *For we shall then feele twise as many woes:*

(sig. B4v)

Munday's description of the complex web of interdependence that characterises the cloth trade, and indeed the English economy, within *Himatia-Poleos* (and implicitly

in the real world) makes starkly clear how far-reaching the consequences of reform may be. Far from stimulating the trade to increase employment, they will endanger the very networks on which it is founded. Within the logic of the pro-Cockayne rhetoric, the interests of merchants and rural producers had been at odds. Although they had compounded with wealthy 'clothiers', merchants had (supposedly) used their vested interests to avoid maintaining the employment of the very poorest. Here, however, an attack on the merchants is not a blow for the rural workers but against them, endangering the trade network on which their livelihood relies.

Munday stages the network's fragility in what he calls the 'Pageant […] figuring the whole estate of *Londons* olde Draperie' (sig. B2r). Following on from the Chariot in which London had been presented as the greatest among other English cities, this device creates an economic equivalent of the Chariot's geographical representation of the commonwealth at large. 'Himatia', in the most elevated position, is 'Mother' to the rest of the device just as London had been to the lesser English cities represented on the chariot. Here, though, the device's emblems correspond to different parts of the clothing trade: 'Carding, Spinning, Weaving, Rowing, Fulling, Shearing, Dressing, Dying, Tentering' (sig. B2r). The presence of dressing and dyeing does not denote approval for the Cockayne reforms here, as they are presented as part of a long-held set of clothmaking traditions which need no reform. The visual impact of having nine different occupations, most or even all of which Munday's audience (and readers) would have known, brings out the sheer complexity of the 'commonwealth' of English drapery. By stressing this, Munday reminds his audience and readers that the cloth trade's primacy, assumed to be natural, in fact depended upon the convergence of a large number of factors.

Underlining this, '*Peace, Plentie, Liberalitie, Councell* and *Discreet Zeale*, doe support the flourishing condition of *Himatiaes* Common-wealth' (sig. B2r), illustrating the fragile networks on which the 'commonwealth' depended. While we have no information on the device's appearance, Munday's description tells the reader that although this 'commonwealth' is currently 'flourishing' (as indeed it had been earlier in 1614) it is represented as a complex and multifaceted entity which requires support in order to sustain itself. The device of '*Londons* olde Draperie' both defends the Merchant Adventurers and warns against potentially damaging reforms, dramatizing exporters' success in maintaining a huge 'commonwealth' of occupations while emphasising the precarious nature of that success. Munday

describes the five supporting virtues as 'striv[ing] to prevent all occasions which may seeme sinister or hurtfull' to the trade, reminding his readers that, while the trade flourished currently, it faced an impending threat in the shape of Cockayne's reforms.

The device featuring Sir John Norman, the Draper Lord Mayor of 1453, exemplifies how this network functioned within London, too, channelling merchants' wealth for the common good and helping maintain employment beyond the cloth trade. Munday's story of how the Lord Mayor's travelling by water to Westminster originated in a wealthy magistrate's concern for London's workers frames the very performance of *Himatia-Poleos* as evidence of the good that a community-minded merchant magistrate can do. The John Norman of this Show combines a good governor's attributes with those of a capital-minded merchant. He is wealthy enough that the practice could be instituted 'at his owne cost and charge', but also conscientious enough that he undertook the charge 'for the relief of poore Watermen, who were much distressed in those daies' (sig. B2r).

Criticism of the old Merchant Adventurers had assumed that their accumulation of capital by definition indicated disregard for the poor, and that what they earned came at the expense of those lower down in the trade's hierarchy. However, Munday presents Norman as proving the exact opposite – that is, that wealthy merchants such as Hayes were in fact ideally suited for governance. Far from sacrificing the common good for their own wealth, they could put their wealth to collective use. Norman is also surrounded by figures representing the seven liberal sciences, which, his speech explains, are 'in memorie of the love I ever bare to learning, and no meane bounties by me extended for the maintenance thereof' (sig. B3r).

As well as being a standard charitable donor, though, Norman has created employment which will last well into the future. Although watermen often bemoaned their low pay and poor treatment, the industry supported many steady jobs in London and its suburbs.[25] This is where he differs from the usual exemplar of merchant charity, proving not just that rich men can be socially responsible but that successful merchants may become pillars of government and society. Munday reinforces this

---

[25] For useful statistics on London watermen, particularly numbers in different city parishes and suburbs, see Jeremy Boulton, *Neighbourhood And Society: A London Suburb in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 70–72, 155–60.

case by having the character of Norman himself accompanied and supported by representatives of those he claims to have helped. Although the 'sweet singing youths, belonging to the maister […] [of] the yong Quiristers of *Pauls*' (sig. B3r) represent the real Thames Watermen only loosely, their song features in Robert Fabyan's *Concordance of Hystoryes,* published as *The New Chronicles of England and France* in 1516, 1533, 1542 and 1559.[26] Munday might well have been familiar with this, especially since Fabyan himself had been a Draper, and if so takes 'Rowe thy boat Norman', along with its having been sung by watermen, from the chronicle. The fact that Norman instituted the custom as a reaction to contemporary unemployment is, however, Munday's own addition, and turns the song from generic praise to evidence that merchants' ability to read economic situations makes them into skilful civic governors.

With this device Munday rehabilitates both the *status quo* and the recent past of cloth exports. Writers such as May had painted historical narratives in which there was a decisive break between the ancient past, in which the cloth trade was the pride of the English economy, and the recent past, in which merchants had become dishonest and caused the trade to founder. May refers to 'corrupting time (more apt in stooping to vice than in mounting to virtue)' (sig. B3r), implying that maintenance of the *status quo* must necessarily lead to corruption, and that the old Merchant Adventurers were by virtue of their long-held position less likely to trade honestly. However, throughout *Himatia-Poleos* Munday utilises historical figures not merely as a decorative way to celebrate London but as a way of challenging and reappropriating the conception of history perpetuated by pro-Cockayne writers. By dividing the wool trade's 'glorious' ancient past from the supposedly damaging recent past, they had implied not only that wholesale change was necessary to prevent the trade's demise but that this change would bring back the past glories much praised in popular literature.

Munday reappropriates this idealised past, changing it from a framework in which the potential for return to ancient glories lies buried under recent stagnation and dishonesty to one in which the glories have been maintained by a stable and healthy export trade. This stability, he implies, allowed figures such as Norman to innovate for the city's economic good, as well as maintaining the many interlinked

---

[26] The most recent edition for Munday was Robert Fabyan, *The Concordance of Hystoryes* (London, 1559).

trades on the Pageant of Old Drapery and the relationships between London merchants and regional producers like the Cotswold Shepherd. This continuity links the ideal 'ancient' past with the recent past and present and by extension with the future, turning praise of the past into an implicit warning about what might be lost if these complex relationships, built up over time, were to be torn apart by the Cockayne Project.

The speech of Henry Fitz-Alwin, supposedly the first Lord Mayor, exemplifies this, presenting the recent past as related to – and just as glorious as – the 'ancient' past in which the wool trade had been England's primary economic pillar. Although the speech begins by invoking '*times of olde Antiquitie*', the values ascribed to those times of '*[d]etesting sloth and idlenesse*' and '*mens best weare [being]…Woollen Cloath*' (sig. C1r) recall the values espoused in the rest of the Show and thus link the ancient 'times' to the present rather than distancing them from it. The character gives a gradual history of the position's development, from 'Portgreaves [with] *strict command*' to 'Provosts *with a sterner hand*' and thence to 'Bayliffes' (sig. C1v). This flow of history, developing according to the commonwealth's changing needs, is the antithesis of the drastic reform espoused by the Cockayne projectors.[27]

While May and others had characterised time as 'corrupting' and change as necessary – the more drastic, the better for breaking up established structures – Munday strikes a blow for the kind of gradual change that was anathema to what Cramsie describes as 'the most significant development under James' , by which 'the projecting mentality of contracting, farming, and proto-privatization became the conceptual basis of crown finance'.[28] Under this logic, there existed untapped reserves of wealth that could only be reached by radical change, and the latter existed in a binary with stagnation. The 'projecting mentality' viewed institutions such as the Merchant Adventurers as hampering change rather than (as they themselves claimed) maintaining stability.

---

[27] A 'portgreave', alternatively spelt 'port-reeve' or 'portgrave', was a name for the highest officer in a town or borough. The term originates from the Norman Conquest. See: 'portreeve, n.'. *Oxford English Dictionary Online*. September 2014. Oxford University Press. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/148244?redirectedFrom=portgrave (accessed October 06, 2014).

[28] John Cramsie, 'Commercial Projects and the Fiscal Policy of James VI and I,' *The Historical Journal* 43, no. 2 (2000): 347.

Fitz-Alwin's history of the mayoral office refutes such anti-Adventurer rhetoric in the political as well as economic sphere. Pro-reform literature often described co-operation between merchants and cloth producers as inevitably corrupting. May's *Estate of Clothing* warned that 'Let a Clothier have a new trick of deceit […] these Merchants have infinit deuises to make it walke inuisible' (sig. B4v) – that is, they collude in dishonest trading practices – but praised the trade's early days in which both merchants and clothiers were careful to 'suppresse falshood' and 'Happiest was he that could win most commendation by desert' (sig. B2v). While Craig Muldrew has effectively analysed the importance of this personal credit, May brings out the competitive elements within this credit-based system. Rather than co-operate, the merchants and clothiers competed amongst themselves in order to win more 'commendation by desert' than the others, which in turn would confer an advantage in trade.[29]

Fitz-Alwin's speech, however, frames the Lord Mayor's historic role as discouraging conflict, explaining how, when the king had no civic deputy (but a succession of semi-independent civic rulers):

> *In two mens rule grew varying,*
> *By leaning to what each part listed,*
> *So might by might was still resisted.*
> *Wrongs unredrest, offences flowing,*
> *Garboyles and the grudges each where*
> *growing.*
>
> (sig. C1v)

Within the framework used by May and others to demand reform, resistance of might by might would have been beneficial, preventing monopolies like the (old) Merchant Adventurers and maintaining honesty through competition. Munday, however, uses the customary Fitz-Alwin legend to refigure such conflict not as a necessary corrective to complacency and vice but as impeding effective government. If the city or the nation were governed by a set of competing deputies, institutions would be worn down, and they could only be maintained by co-operation.

---

[29] Craig Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998).

By this logic, if a trade as important as woollen cloth exports were to be broken up and made competitive rather than collaborative, this would threaten the job creation and regional relationships that the old Merchant Adventurers had worked together to maintain. Munday highlights the connection between political and economic stewardship by placing Fitz-Alwin's speech between speeches by the Cotswold Shepherd and Sir John Norman . Both of these models exemplify the abilities unique to such a large and long-established company as the (old) Merchant Adventurers. Only a merchant as rich as Norman could have used his power in public office to create employment for watermen, and the Cotswold Shepherd's current respect for the Drapers rests on both their historical links with the regions and those links' continuance into the present. Indeed, the speech by Norman that follows Fitz-Alwin rounds off his assertion of historical continuity with a reminder of just how many occupations have emerged from the origins of 'old Drapery', implying that this depended upon the stability which the monopolistic Adventurers' brought to the wool trade.

Metropolis Coronata: from defence to defiance in 1615

Hentschell has suggested, plausibly, that the disaster following the Cockayne reforms led the City to elect another Draper Lord Mayor in 1615.[30] Whatever the reason, the 1615 Show certainly engaged as closely as the previous year's with the Drapers' opposition to the project, but took a rather different approach. While *Himatia-Poleos* had, as discussed above, warned against wholesale reform by emphasising the connection between the cloth trade's success and its long-term structural unity, *Metropolis Coronata* moves from defending merchants as pillars of the national commonwealth to defiantly staging London's strength as an economic commonwealth and trading centre in its own right. It does not merely continue the previous year's themes, therefore, but rather inverts them. What Hill views as 'idiosyncratic' imagery in 1615 begins to make more sense when we view it as a conscious departure from *Himatia-Poleos*, in which the odd combination of Medea, Jason and the Argonauts with Robin Hood and his Merry Men replaces the seemingly-conventional Sir John Norman and the Cotswold Shepherd. That said, the

---

[30] Hentschell, *The Culture of Cloth in Early Modern England*, 153.

contrast here is not exactly between conventional and idiosyncratic. The opposition on which it turns is exemplified by the way in which both Shows stage London's allegorical persona. In *Himatia-Poleos* 'she' sits among the shields of other English cities, displaying her position in relation to the rest of the country, and is supported by King Richard I. In *Metropolis Coronata,* by contrast, she controls the entire pageant-chariot and sits surrounded not by other cities, but by representations of the Great Twelve livery companies, allegorised as London's daughters. In the first representation, London's greatness exists only in relation to the rest of the nation, but in the following year's she is a commonwealth in her own right.

In making this contrast, Munday fulfilled the promise he made in the preface to *Metropolis Coronata* 'to jumpe with the time, which evermore affecteth novelty' (sig. A3r-v). The 'novelty' of the 1615 situation gave him the incentive to make this drastic jump in theme from nationalism to defiant urban triumphalism, as the effects of the Cockayne Project had become all too apparent between its 1614 inception and the Show's composition in mid- to late-1615. The project was effectively unstoppable by October 1614, since the proclamations had already been made and the old Merchant Adventurers had been ordered to dissolve, but – despite Munday's and the Drapers' pessimism – the reforms had not yet produced concrete effects. The parliamentary records of 1614 showed, as I have noted, a pervasive uncertainty about the cloth trade's future and a desire for change at any cost. The mood at the Cockayne Project's inception was therefore largely uncertain, even among those who opposed and feared it.[31] Munday's best tactic was therefore to warn of the risks attendant on reform, since he lacked enough evidence about their effects to criticise Cockayne as directly and defiantly as he would in later Shows.

The following year's events, however, confirmed the suspicions of Munday and other doubters. Popular hatred had begun to transfer from the Merchant Adventurers (although the Company was by no means popular) to Cockayne. Since the New Merchant Adventurers had taken over the unfinished cloth trade (including the Earl of Cumberland's license), Cockayne could no longer claim to be saving the trade from the old Adventurers' monopolist grasp, as the 50% decline in sales

---

[31] For details on the project, its origins and effects, see Astrid Friis, *Alderman Cockayne's Project and the Cloth Trade : The Commercial Policy of England in Its Main Aspects, 1603-1625* (Copenhagen: Levin & Munsgaard, 1927); for a briefer but more modern account see Joel D. Benson, *Changes and Expansion in the English Cloth Trade in the Seventeenth Century: Alderman Cockayne's Project* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2002).

showed that in early 1614 the cloth trade had in fact been in no need of revitalising through large-scale reform.[32] John Chamberlain reported to Dudley Carleton in April 1615 that the old Merchant Adventurers 'thincke they are hardly dealt with' since they had been deprived of their trade on the grounds that it was harmful to the national economy but the 'new companie' had already 'undertaken that they are not able to performe'.[33] It was not just the old Merchant Adventurers who lost out, however. Those who had headed the old Company may have made the greatest individual losses, but the sudden fall in investment in the textile industry as a result of their largely taking their capital elsewhere (usually the trade in precious metals and bullion) meant that the broader wool trade began to grind to a halt, putting many out of work in all occupations. A month after the above-quoted letter, Chamberlain wrote again to Carleton that 'the great project of dieng and dressing of cloth is at a stand … and the cloth workers and diers wearie the King and counsaile with petitions wherin they complaine that they are in worse case then before'.[34]

The clothiers did indeed petition the Privy Council, and the parlous state of the trade was sufficiently obvious that to continue the warnings of 1614 would have been redundant for Munday. The zeitgeist had moved on, to popular anger at what was plainly an instance of the king placing the desires of a few merchants above the needs of the trade as a whole. More than this, to merchants such as those at the head of the Drapers' Company, this was an instance in which those who schemed to obtain James's personal approval could usurp a level of influence over the national economy and London's trade which, by the criteria of experience, capital wealth and business success, rightfully belonged to others. Even when the projectors were allowed to cheat by having the same monopolistic advantages that they claimed to be purging from the entire cloth market, they still lacked the enormous capital and credit to which the old Merchant Adventurers had had access and were therefore unable to fulfil their promises to the council. Chamberlain surely captured the City's mood when he noted that 'yt is thought straunge that so auncient and so wel setled a

---

[32] Benson, *Changes and Expansion in the English Cloth Trade in the Seventeenth Century*, 49; Hill, *Pageantry and Power*, 295.

[33] John Chamberlain, *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. Norman Egbert McClure (Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society, 1939), vol. 1: 593.

[34] *Ibid*., vol. 1: 599–600.

societie as the marchant adventurers, shold be so sodainly overthrowne, upon weake surmises'.[35] Munday's Show for 1615 expresses this renewed feeling of defiance among London's more experienced merchants. Though it does so by asserting the value of London and the old trade just as it had in the previous year, this time the assertion is placed within an entirely inverted framework. From being part of a national commonwealth, London became the centre of its own economic commonwealth. Accordingly, the merchants whom Munday had previously praised as upholding England's international status and their king's reign are praised as supporting London as itself an international trading centre. Perhaps most radical of all the changes, Munday moves from traditional images of 'old English drapery' to an unsettling pair of figures whose only uniting factor is their antagonism to the political iconography of King James himself.

Mourning lost stability: detaching London from England and the present from the past

The optimism about the English cloth trade which had been such a powerful strategy in *Himatia-Poleos* became, in *Metropolis Coronata*, a regretful acknowledgement of change. In the former Show, the speech of Fitz-Alwin's character had functioned to link the trade's past glories to the present, asserting historical continuity in order to argue for the maintenance of the *status quo*. The crisis which Munday confronted in 1615 forced him to replace this with a much less optimistic speech. The character praises the City, the Drapers and the new Lord Mayor as convention dictated, but gives only a perfunctory history, stating that '*Royall* Richard [...] *in me / First stilde the name of* Maioraltie' (*Metropolis Coronata*, sig. A4v). Where the Fitz-Alwin of 1614 had related the trade's glorious history and predicted that 'Time reserveth […] for the like honour, many more' Draper Lord Mayors, this Fitz-Alwin contrasts the glorious past with a grudging future:

> *The Draper and the Stapler then*
> *I tell yee were right worthy men,*
> *And did more needy soules maintaine,*
> *Then I feare will be seene againe.*
> *But times will have their revolution,*
> *And each their severall execution.*

---

[35] *Ibid*., vol. 1: 600.

The cloth trade may once have maintained 'needy souls', but, Munday implies, that possibility is now lost. Just as anti-Adventurer rhetoric had figured change as unequivocally positive and stasis as stagnation, here Munday presents it, equally unequivocally, as a loss. For May and others, change had promised a return to past glories, and the cloth trade's strength in ancient times proved that it could be brought back to that strength, thus supporting their narrative of stagnation and justifying the proposed reforms.

Munday uses Fitz-Alwin to distance the Show from this narrative just as he had in *Himatia-Poleos*, but inverts his tactics entirely in response to the new situation. When the change was proposed but had not yet taken effect, he had linked historical continuity to strength over time, crediting the Adventurers' maintenance of the *status quo* with the trade's current success and implying that change would endanger this. Once the change (and its disastrous results) had occurred, however, Munday needed to change his methods too. He therefore uses *Metropolis Coronata*'s Fitz-Alwin speech to paint a narrative of lost potential and past glory. Here change and reform are the antithesis of stable progress, which consists in a gradual buildup of strength upon strength. In confronting the reforms, Munday rejects both change itself and the passage of time which the pro-Cockayne arguments had viewed as requiring change. May's *Estate of Clothing* had blamed 'corrupting Time' for the decline of 'old drapery', but the 1615 Fitz-Alwin transferred this view of time as inevitably corrupting onto the change itself. For May and others, reform had been a way to prevent the damage caused by the passage of time; for Munday in *Metropolis Coronata*, it is the very vehicle by which age-old industries such as cloth exportation weaken over time.

Describing the pageant-devices which follow his speech, Fitz-Alwin refers to '*Eight Royall Vertues*' which function '*Eight honoured Ensignes to sustaine* / *Of eight Lord Maiors*' (sig. B2r). Although he has just described the method by which London's Lord Mayor is the king's deputy, Fitz-Alwin's connection of royal virtues to the maintenance of the supposedly subordinate position is rather revealing in the context of this defiant Show. In a complete reversal of the previous year's performance, neither *Metropolis Coronata*'s merchants nor its governors serve a national agenda. What they achieve for civic glory stays firmly in London. The Lord

Mayor may derive some personal pride from being the king's deputy, therefore, but his care is for London's collective good, not England's.

Where the 1614 Show had celebrated the regional employment maintained by the cloth trade by featuring the Cotswold Shepherd and an assortment of wool-related occupations, the nearest the following year's comes is the two 'housewifely Virgin[s]' which sit 'Carding and Spinning' on the ship named the 'Joel' (sig. B2v). Like the Cotswold Shepherd, they sit by a 'goodly Ramme or Golden Fleece', but they do not create the same visual contrast between regional simplicity and civic splendour. These figures are much more abstract than the shepherd, and unlike him do not represent a particular position with the same specificity as that with which the Shepherd would have recalled the regional clothworkers' complaints which had become a regular feature of debate in and regarding the wool trade. Aside from the oxymoron contained in the phrase 'housewifely Virgin', these characters seem self-consciously abstract. They symbolise clothworking women but are not located in a particular area of textile manufacture. The figures also lack the voice that Munday had given to the Cotswold Shepherd. The wool trade may produce employment, but this no longer links the Drapers' Company (or other London merchants) to those further down the production line or beyond the city.

London's determined independence from both regional and national needs becomes especially clear in the device which Munday calls the 'Monument of London'. Here he distances this Show precisely and radically from the previous year's. The image of London surrounded by representatives of the Great Twelve livery companies recalls the 'Monument […] of Londons Olde Draperie' in *Himatia-Poleos* only to overturn its governing framework, replacing a visual representation of English unity, and London's place therein, with one where London is figured as a commonwealth in and of itself. As with its 1614 counterpart, the 'Monument of London' refers back to the Show's title: 'as also that other Monument of *London* and her twelve daughters, at this time imploying *Metropolis Coronata* […] most desertfully crowned' (sigs B2v-B3r). As Time describes it:

> [the device] presents yee *London* in the supreme place of
> eminence, and the twelve Companies (her twelve Daughters)
> all seated about her in their due degrees [and] As supports to
> *Londons* flourishing happinesse […] foure goodly Mounts
> (as strong and defensive bulwarkes) are raysed about her,

> bearing Emblemes of those foure especiall qualities, which
> make any Commonwealth truly happy: Learned Religion,
> Militarie Discipline, Navigation, and Homebred Husbandrie.
>
> (sig. B4r-v)

This exemplifies the difference between the two Shows. While the 'Monument of Old Drapery' had placed 'Himatia' at the summit because she – that is, Drapery – supported the commonwealth as a whole, this Monument celebrates and elevates 'Metropolis Coronata' – the crowned city. London is no longer praised as a support to the crown but is itself crowned. While in 1614 it had been praised for its elevated position within the broader context of England's national economy, in 1615 London's elevation signifies that it *constitutes* the economy at hand. London here functions as an independent economic system, and within *Metropolis Coronata* an entity's virtue and value, or lack thereof, is constituted by its contribution to or detraction from London's commonwealth, rather than England's.

Medea and Robin Hood: undermining Jacobean political ideology

London's separation from the rest of the kingdom continues in Munday's presentation of seemingly-irreconcilable characters: Medea and Robin Hood. Both of these characters' legends had been used at times for nationalist, even imperialist purposes. Robin Hood and his men had been associated with 'merry England' in works from ballads to stage plays, and had been a virtuous English aristocrat in Munday's two plays for the Admiral's Men, *The Downfall of Robert Earl of Huntington* and *The Death of Robert Earl of Huntington* (both published in 1601 and performed in the 1590s).[36] Although Medea herself had exotic associations, Jason's quest for the Golden Fleece had been used in texts such as Walter Raleigh's *History of the World* , which presented the legend as an allegory of nautical hardships, viewing the Argonauts as pioneers in early navigation.[37] Munday, however, presents them both in a highly specific way that turns them from nautical heroes into figures

---

[36] Anthony Munday, *The Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntington* (London: printed for William Leake, 1601) and *The Death of Robert, Earl of Huntington* (London: printed for William Leake, 1601). Subsequent references are to signature numbers in these editions and will be integrated into the main text.

[37] Sir Walter Raleigh, *The History of the World* (London: for Walter Burre, 1614), sigs. Mm1v-Mm3r.

which praised the city but were inaccessible to either national or, more importantly, James's royal iconography – thus framing London with its own separate mythology.

Munday links the Argo to the golden fleece of the Drapers' Company coat of arms: ' [the new Lord Mayor] being both a Draper and a Stapler [... I] made use of that Creast or Cognizaunce of the Golden Fleece given by auncient Heraldrie to them both' (sig. A3v). This fleece, and the Argo carrying it, are part of a device that in its quasi-Eastern exoticism is a far cry from the water-pageant of 1614, which celebrated the very English Sir John Norman for the practical achievements of employment creation and responsible governance. Gold and silver had been associated in earlier Shows, such as *Chruso-thriambos* (1611), with London's trade with the east, and this would likely have been the Argo's visual impression too. The Argonauts are 'attired in faire guilt Armours' and when those on the Argo 'passe under the fleece of Golde […] all their garments [are] immediately sprinkled over with golde' (sig. A4r).

Reinforcing this sense of exoticism is the fact that the boat is rowed (in something of a contrast to 1614's Thames watermen) by 'diuers comely Eunuches' (sig. A4r), characters frequently associated with the East. Although Munday describes the Argo as 'shaped so neere as Art could yeeld it, to that of such auncient and honourable fame' (sig. A3v), this ship covered in gold and rowed by eunuchs is reminiscent less of the heroic voyage of Raleigh's *History* than Shakespeare's description of Cleopatra's barge in *Antony and Cleopatra*: as in Enobarbus' description, 'like a burnished throne [in which] the poop was beaten gold [and which contained] pretty, dimpled boys, like smiling Cupids'.[38] J.R. Mulryne has already established a link between this description and Italian river pageantry, and Munday's readers might well have noticed a similarity between Cleopatra's exotic barge and this unusual Argo.[39]

The 'faire guilt Armours' which the heroic Argonauts wear may therefore undermine the masculinity indicated by their shields and 'triumphall Launces' (sig. A4r), since it associates them here with the exotic eunuchs and sorceress Medea.

---

[38] William Shakespeare, *Antony and Cleopatra*, ed. Michael Neill (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), II. 2. 192-93, 203.

[39] See J. R. Mulryne, 'Cleopatra's Barge and Antony's Body: Italian Sources and English Theatre' in Michele Marrapodi, ed. *Shakespeare, Italy and Intertextuality* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 198-202.

Jason's masculinity is also placed in doubt, even as Munday hails him as a hero and Fitz-Alwin lauds the new Mayor as '*our* Iason, *Londons glorie*' (sig. B1v). Despite their armour matching the eunuchs' attire, the Argonauts at least brandish shields and lances. Jason himself, however, is presented much less heroically:

> aloft sitteth *Medea*, whose love to *Iason*, was his best meanes
> for obtaining the Golden fleece: […] she sitteth playing with
> his love-lockes, and wantoning with him in all pleasing
> daliance, to compasse the more settled assurance of his
> constancy.
>
> (sigs. A3v-A4r)

Not only is Jason seated below Medea, but she is 'playing with his love-lockes', an image which would call to mind, for many onlookers or readers , two things. The most general, which might have been obvious even to those unfamiliar with classical legend, was Samson's defeat by Delilah, which was often portrayed as a warning of the power of lust to defeat masculine strength. Of course, Medea is playing with the hair, not cutting it, but this image of a woman touching a warrior's hair surely evoked a lust that could threaten martial strength.

A second, more specific association relates to the Golden Fleece legend itself and to what was widely perceived as Jason's weakness and inconstancy. While early modern depictions of Jason and Medea varied widely in their view of both, there is a tangible current of thought that views Jason as an inconstant lover who lured Medea from Colchis only to abandon her for Creusa. Robert Greene, for example, asks 'Who more beautifull then Jason? Yet who more false', in *Mamilia* (1583), while John Lyly's *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit* (1578) asks 'who more fickle to Medea then Jason'.[40] As Mark Breitenberg notes, in the view of early modern theorists 'sexual desire for women drags men down to the level of base corporeality, dangerously equalizing hierarchies of gender and social status', and 'overthrows reason and leads to destructive excess'.[41] By placing Jason in a pose which recalled Samson's and his own character's lust, then, Munday is able to invoke a particular

---

[40] Robert Greene, *Mamilia: a Mirrour or Looking Glasse for the Ladies of England* (London: William Ponsonby, 1583), sig. B4r; John Lyly, *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit; and Euphues his England*, ed. Leah Scragg (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), 67.

[41] Mark Breitenberg, *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 49–50, 99.

strand of classical interpretation which affected how his audience viewed the pageant's supposed hero.

He does not merely undermine Jason's power, however, but equally enhances Medea's agency over both the pageant in performance and the legend retold in the Show. The eunuchs who row the boat 'continually attended on *Medea*' (sig. A4r), not on Jason, and it is she who provides the boat's governing aesthetic, by (according to the description) sprinkling their garments with gold. The only versions of the myth, classical or early modern, in which Medea possesses any power view her as an evil sorceress, and where she controls any of the events surrounding the Fleece and its capture their destructiveness reflect her malice. This is only natural, since Medea commits most (if not all) of the murders in the standard Golden Fleece myth. With this in mind, writers have tended to portray her either as in control, and therefore capable of deliberate murder, or as a victim of Jason's scheming and her own desire. The least negative early modern representations of Medea adopt the latter position, making her a passive character. Thomas Heywood's *The Brazen Age*, for example, paints Jason as a villain who schemed to use Medea's lust for his own purposes:

> JASON.[...] I haue obseru'd Medea
> Retort upon me many an amorous looke,
> Of which I'le studdy to make prosperous vse. [42]

Heywood's only alternative to fully blaming Medea is to paint her as a victim of Jason's cunning. The classical source with which Munday's readers and audience would have been most familiar, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, also deprives Medea of agency in order to make the blame more ambiguous. The moment at which Jason accepts Medea's help – on which hangs the question of whether she uses her witchcraft to ensnare him, or he uses his looks to ensnare her – is described thus in *Metamorphoses* VII: 'creditus accepit cantatas […] herbas' ('having been believed, [Jason] received the enchanted herbs').[43] Jason, not Medea, is the subject of this sentence: it is he who has 'been believed'. In *Heroides XII*, too, Medea castigates

---

[42] Thomas Heywood, *The Brazen Age* (London: Nicholas Okes for Samuel Rand, 1613), sig. F4r.

[43] Ovid, *Metamorphoses* VII. 98-99, in *Metamorphoses Books I-VIII* (London: William Heinemann, 1971), 348. My translation.

Jason with 'et vidi et perii' ['and I saw you, and I was destroyed']: here she must give up agency in order to claim innocence.[44]

A character who kills as often and as willingly as Medea cannot feasibly be a positive force and have agency in her own actions. It is therefore surely significant that Munday both praises her character and gives her control of the Argo's voyage. Although Munday refers to the Argo device as 'Jasons triumph' (sig. A4r), Fitz-Alwin's speech credits the entire enterprise to Medea:

> Medeas *powerfull charmes prevailde,*
> *And all those dreadfull Monsters quailde,*
> *That kept the Fleece in their protection,*
> *Which then was wonne by her direction.*
>
> (sig. B1v)

In contemporary sources, as shown above, even where Medea was more powerful than Jason she still helped him to win the fleece according to his plan. Here, however, it is Medea herself who controls the direction of the plan, and the speech does not even mention Jason's role in putting her sorcery to use. Such unmitigated praise would have left an elephant in the room for anyone familiar with any part of, or source for, the Golden Fleece legend: Medea was a witch – illegal and threatening to seventeenth century society – and a serial murderer. As Diane Purkiss notes, to the extent that a standard Renaissance Medea existed, the character centred around threats to 'the construction of male identity through lineage and the birth of sons'.[45] If we take the *Metamorphoses* alone, Medea kills her brother, her father's only heir, incites King Pelias' daughters to kill him and kills her two sons, Jason's heirs. She thus represents not merely sorcery and murder but the systematic destruction of the male line.

This made her a threatening character in any situation, but in celebrating her in London's principal civic occasion, and connecting her with the man who (as the Show would later claim) was a deputy to the King, Munday positions *Metropolis Coronata* in defiance of King James himself. Medea stood in opposition to two of

---

[44] Ovid, *Heroides* XII. , in *Heroides and Amores* (London: William Heinemann, 1914), My translation; the frequent 'both...and' meaning of 'et...et' does not apply here.

[45] Diane Purkiss, 'Medea in the English Renaissance' in Edith Hall, Fiona MacIntosh and Oliver Taplin, eds., *Medea in Performance 1500-2000* (Oxford: Legenda, 2000), 33.

the King's most cherished political ideals. The first was his hatred of witchcraft, as demonstrated in his anti-witchcraft treatise *Daemonologie* (1598) and instigation of the 1604 Witchcraft Act, which was much harsher than its precursor of 1563. The second was his self-image as a monarch who conceived of his power as inextricably linked to male primogeniture on a personal as well as a political level – if indeed they could be separated for him.[46] In his speeches and his works James often refers to himself as father to the kingdom, equating the monarch-subject relationship to that between a *paterfamilias* and his children. In the *Basilikon Doron* – probably one of the more familiar political texts to Munday's audience, since it was translated into English and printed on a large scale, as Doelman shows – James explicitly linked the roles of *paterfamilias* and *pater patriae*, warning that 'it is onely by the force of [marriage] that your children succeed to you, which otherwayes they could not do'.[47] To praise a character who, as outlined above, was famous for destroying monarchical power via male primogeniture through the use of witchcraft, positioned the Show in direct opposition to the king's personal iconography.

The Show's final character is Robin Hood (and his band of huntsmen) seen by many as an especially odd figure to include in the same pageant as Jason and Medea, inciting Hill to describe *Metropolis Coronata* as especially 'eclectic' and 'anachronistic'.[48] This was Munday's third Robin Hood, coming after he had given the character a much fuller treatment in the two plays *The Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntington* and *The Death of Robert, Earl of Huntington* (both 1601). The Robin Hood of those plays was, as Nelson has pointed out, a much more conventional character than the Robin Hood character which had featured in anarchic May-Games and in such plays as the anonymous *George a Greene* (1593) and George Peele's *Famous Chronicle of Edward I*.[49] That character had represented the inversion of

---

[46] King James VI and I, *Daemonologie, in forme of a dialogue diuided into three bookes* (Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1597). This was reprinted in London on the king's accession in 1603.

[47] *Basilikon Doron* (1599) in King James VI and I, *Political Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 41; James Doelman, 'A King of Thine Own Heart': The English Reception of King James VI and I's *Basilikon Doron*', *Seventeenth Century* 9 (1994): 1–9.

[48] Hill, *Pageantry and Power*, 161, 183.

[49] Malcolm A. Nelson, *The Robin Hood Tradition in the English Renaissance* (Salzburg: Inst. f. Engl. Sprache u. Literatur, Univ. Salzburg, 1973), 130-31.

social norms in a festival atmosphere. Robin Hood games involved the election of a Robin Hood character and an accompanying band, usually taken from local young men, and were sometimes associated with social unrest, especially in the Middle Ages.[50] Munday's Robin Hood seemed much more conventional, as Stephen Knight notes, representing in the Huntington plays 'true order, aristocratic, religious, and royal'.[51] Even as an outlaw, the displaced Earl of Huntington seeks only to eradicate corruption and does not threaten the established order. He seems, in short, no challenge at all to the establishment – and the very opposite of Medea. Munday's presentation of the character in *Metropolis Coronata*, however, does not merely reprise the Earl of the Huntington plays. Rather, he utilises precisely the chequered and contested history that he had glossed over in the plays, invoking aspects of Robin Hood – and even of the Earl of Huntington – that may not have threatened monarchy *per se* but challenge the particular ideology that King James had built up around himself.

By referring to the Robin of the Show as 'Earl' Munday does remind readers of the figure's appearance in his own plays, but in doing so he also invokes themes of intertextuality and challenges to historical convention. Tracey Hill and Liz Oakley-Brown have both noted that the Huntington plays problematise the writing of history even as they seemingly iron out the more challenging aspects of the Robin Hood legend itself. Hill points out that although Munday 'attempts to impose a kind of biographical framework on the Robin Hood story', in fact 'its historical chronology is not at all straightforward', and Munday deliberately layers early sixteenth-century culture on top of the twelfth-century setting of the Hood legend, while simultaneously referring his audience to aspects of the political context of the 1590s.[52] For example, the characters of Friar Tuck and Skelton overlap conspicuously: at one point Robin recognises Tuck from his 'skeltonicall' speech, exclaiming 'Why then it seemes that thou art Frier Tucke'.[53] In a similar vein,

---

[50] See Jeffrey L. Singman, *Robin Hood: The Shaping of the Legend* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1998), 158.

[51] Stephen Knight, *Robin Hood : A Mythic Biography* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), 54.

[52] Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, 59.

[53] *Ibid*., 61.

Oakley-Brown notes that 'the complex temporal structure that frames these plays draws attention to ways in which history itself is constructed'.[54] Although we cannot know whether these plays' readers and audiences understood them with such fine historical and textual nuance, these interpretations open up the possibility that the Robin Hood legend, in Munday's hands, could remind readers not of noble virtue and [support of the king], but of the challenges that such intertextual techniques as he had been using in *Metropolis Coronata* could pose to established assumptions regarding historical narrative and perspective.[55]

Although the Earl himself in the Huntington plays supports established political structures, Munday is conscious in those plays of the complex tradition from which his narrative departs, and builds upon this in framing the Show's Robin. Jeffrey Singman views this rich intertextuality as an aesthetic hindrance, claiming that while the plays feature 'a complex and comprehensive intertextuality that interweaves the diverse strands of the tradition with one another' chaos results, and 'Munday is in the position of a Renaissance architect faced with the challenge of turning a medieval castle into a stately home [...] the resulting edifice is full of disjunctures'.[56] Oakley-Brown rightly challenges Singman's architectural analogy, protesting that the plays 'are not solid structures; they are, in Barthesian terms, *texts*: spaces "where no language has a hold over any other, where languages circulate" '.[57] The verb 'circulate' does not quite do justice to Munday's nuanced presentation, however, since the 'disjunctures' do not merely result from clashing sources, but often perform complex and valuable functions. That Huntington co-opts the May-game identity of Robin Hood does not merely make for an inconsistent, 'fatuous' (in Singman's phrase) character but arguably interrogates – and given the play's patronage by the Earl of Nottingham, Lord High Admiral, may even reclaim – the

---

[54] Liz Oakley-Brown, 'Framing Robin Hood: Temporality and Textuality in Anthony Munday's Huntington Plays,' in *Robin Hood : Medieval and Post-Medieval*, ed. Helen Phillips (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005), 125.

[55] See David Womersley, *Divinity and State* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 359-368 for a potential popular reading of the Huntington plays, focused more on confessional than historiographical issues.

[56] Jeffrey L. Singman, 'Munday's Unruly Earl,' in *Playing Robin Hood: The Legend as Performance in Five Centuries*, ed. Lois Potter (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1998), 65, 71.

[57] Oakley-Brown, 'Framing Robin Hood,' 128.

ability of those from higher social echelons to utilise populist traditions such as this one.[58]

If languages collide productively in the plays, so too do textual histories and strands of tradition. Hood/Huntington himself oscillates between the cunning outlaw and huntsman portrayed in May-games and other plays, and a pro-monarch character who despite his outlawry is aware of his place and duty within English society. Early on in the *Downfall*, for example, Huntington uncovers the plot to outlaw him and curses the assembled company: 'the Queene except, I doe you all defie' (sig. B3r). His plotting with Little John suggests that he is already halfway to assuming Robin Hood's trickster mantle, yet even as he embraces the status of outlaw and curses local dignitaries, he cannot resist excepting the queen – despite having only a page earlier stated that Queen Elinor 'hath a hande in this' (sig. B2r).

Munday's ability to utilise historical sources is as famous as his willingness to deviate from them, as Hill and others have noted in relation to his other civic pageants. His substantial and diverse output, along with his ability to handle and manipulate sources to suit his own artistic ends, make it likely that where such disjunctures appear, in pageantry as well as stage plays, they are deliberate – and their effects, even if unintentional, often palpably go beyond Singman's sense of poor fit. The Robin Hood section of *Metropolis Coronata*, then, surely signalled to contemporaries both Munday's use of sources in the Huntington plays and its own connection to the Hood tradition. The length of the Huntington plays allowed Munday's use of tradition to be much more nuanced, connecting to longer-term political and cultural issues, and questioning, as Hill notes, the very foundation of historical drama.[59]

The Robin Hood device in 1615, however, comes at the end of a Show whose aim had already been well-established (in text and surely also in performance): to express the City's opposition to – and claim to have no need of – Crown policy. We thus come to his speech, which in the words of Munday's description came after 'all other employments are calmly ouerpast', in the knowledge that several of these devices have already been framed in such a way as to undermine King James's most prominent iconographical and political philosophies. Robin's past incarnation as a

---

[58] Singman, 'Munday's Unruly Earl,' 73.

[59] Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, 58–63.

challenge to authority is thus as evident as his noble ancestry, particularly as he is only called 'Earl' twice in the speeches. While the Earl of Munday's plays was only a temporary outlaw, the song sung by Hood and his companions implies that he is a permanent fugitive from society:

> They will not away from merry *Shirwood,*
> In any place else to dwell:
> For there is neither City nor Towne,
> That likes them halfe so well.

(sig. C3v)

At the end of the *Downfall* Robin is nothing if not conventional, offering Marian to the king 'as tenants do their lands/ With a surrender, to receiue againe' (sig. L1v). Although Munday's text, as noted above, does invoke the more disordered May-game tradition, it ultimately returns to conventionality by having the Earl return to his king and express loyalty to the Crown. This Huntington's enemies are ultimately presented as 'the corrupt and the dishonest, the enemies of an loyal lord' as Knight points out, which is what allows Munday to provide a conventional resolution to a text which in other places threatens to challenge those conventions.[60] This song, however, foresees no geographical or social return for the band. An outlaw who does not intend to return to society, whatever his noble origins, is much closer to the carnivalesque May-game character than one who has implicitly remained loyal to his king throughout his self-imposed exile.

King James himself had experienced both loyal and threatening Robin Hoods, and Munday pitches his Robin of 1615 to intersect precisely with both. Travelling to claim the English throne after Queen Elizabeth's death, James had been greeted by a figure of Robin Hood when he stopped near Sherwood Forest. In Thomas Millington's description, 'there appeared a number of Huntes-men all in greene: the chiefe of which with a woodmans speech did welcome him, offering his Maiestie to shew him some game, which he gladly condiscended to see'.[61] James had

---

[60] Knight, *Robin Hood*, 54.

[61] T.M., *The true narration of the entertainment of his Royall Maiestie, from the time of his departure from Edenbrough; till his receiuing at London* (London: Thomas Creede for Thomas Millington, 1603), sig. E1r. Quoted in Michael Wheare, ' "From the Castle Hill They Came with Violence": The Edinburgh Robin Hood Riots of 1561,' in *Images of Robin Hood: Medieval to*

also seen the 'play of Robin Hood' when staying with the Earl of Arran in 1585, so was not unequivocally opposed to the figure *per se*.[62]

Both these figures, however, were firmly under aristocratic control, and may not have gone all the way to erase James's previous, and much more threatening, encounter with Robin Hood. Despite the use of Robin Hood and associated figures having been forbidden by Act of Parliament in 1555, it was resurrected in Edinburgh, in May 1561. As John Knox (then minister of St Giles's) reported, 'the rascall multitude were stirred vp to make a Robin Hood', and this Robin Hood procession 'ceased not to molest, aswell the inhabitants of Edinburgh, as diuerse countrey men, taking from them money, and threatning some with farther injuries'.[63] Even more threatening than the procession itself was the reaction to the death sentence conferred upon one particular rebel, which provoked a more aggressive, explicitly anti-establishment riot. This riot was especially threatening not just because it was directed against the judicial authorities but because it involved six master craftsmen (as named in the prosecutions), two of whom had themselves held offices of civic responsibility.[64] Depending on how it was framed, then, an image of Robin Hood presented in relation to King James could sit anywhere on the scale from conventional praise for monarchical authority to rebellion so deep it involved tradesmen of good standing in local government – a striking parallel to the London merchants who sponsored, organised and participated in *Metropolis Coronata*.

The May-games featuring Robin Hood had not always been threatening, as the authorities had permitted and even encouraged their quasi-anarchic activities. Even once parishes began to ban them towards the mid-sixteenth century, the challenge they posed was one of confessional identity – they were, as with many festivals, condemned as 'popish' or, in some cases, pagan (or a combination of the two).[65] Nevertheless, that the Robin Hood figure had been associated with such

---

Modern, ed. Lois Potter and Joshua Calhoun (Newark, Del.: University of Delaware Press, 1998), 118.

[62] *Ibid.*, 117.

[63] John Knox, *History of the Reformation of Religion within the Realm of Scotland*, quoted in Wheare, 113.

[64] Wheare, ' "From the Castle Hill They Came with Violence" ', 116.

[65] David Wiles, *The Early Plays of Robin Hood* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1981), 28–9; Nelson, *The Robin Hood Tradition in the English Renaissance*, 74.

unrest while King James was on the Scottish throne meant that the monarch's relationship with the legend was particularly ambivalent. Exploiting this allows Munday to move his Robin Hood character beyond the loyal nobleman of the Huntington plays, creating in just a few speeches a figure who both embodies conventional virtues and challenges King James's monarchical ideologies, thus implicitly repositioning those virtues away from the monarch, at the kingdom's political centre, toward the City itself.

Robin and his band are associated primarily with two things: hunting and hospitality. The Robin Hood figure who had welcomed James to Sherwood Forest in 1603 had acknowledged his interest in hunting and honoured his monarchical claim to the land and its produce by 'offering his Maiestie to show him some game'.[66] In contrast, Munday's 1615 Robin Hood lays claim himself to forest game, recounting that Friar Tuck had '*bid* Scathlock*, Iohn, or honest* Brand [...] *Shoote right and haue him*' (sig. C2r). The outlaws of the *Death* and *Downfall* had lived off the land, but for Munday to highlight their ability to hunt stags, in the context of a work which was already politically provocative, surely put at least some of *Metropolis Coronata*'s readers in mind of the King's assertion of his own hunting rights, in two proclamations given earlier in 1615.

In April *A Proclamation for restrayning of the seruing of Fee-Deere* stated that owing to the shortfall in deer stocks following 'the great and extraordinary Frost and Snow', the King and Council 'haue thought fit to make stay of the seruing of all Fee Deere, and all Deere by Warrants'.[67] Minor government and local estate officials were thus deprived of a traditional perquisite which usually formed part of their wages.[68] September's *Proclamation for the due execution of Forrest Lawes* similarly warned of the shortage in deer stocks and ordered that 'pawnage be not consumed and taken from them', that nothing should be done 'which may scant them

---

[66] Wheare, ' "From the Castle Hill They Came with Violence" ', 117.

[67] *By the King. A Proclamation for Restrayning of the Seruing of Fee Deere.* (London: Robert Barker, 1615).

[68] Roger B. Manning, 'Unlawful Hunting in England, 1500–1640,' *Forest & Conservation History* 38, no. 1 (1994): 16–23.

of their feede' and that laws 'concerning the restraint of Swine [...] bee strictly obserued and put in execution'.[69]

Both these proclamations, however justified in terms of husbandry, conspicuously put the king's and nobility's right to plentiful deer in the next hunting season ahead of the rights of those below them either to the deer themselves or the land they inhabited ('pawnage' denoting customary rights to the use, or profit from sale, of that fruit from trees which was commonly used to feed pigs). This was given added resonance by the fact that the September proclamation was given from Theobalds, where the king often hunted. James considered it essential to his royal prerogative that he be able to curtail others' rights to livestock and land *while* exercising his own as king. The claim of Robin and his band to have shot a deer in Sherwood Forest thus surely carried special resonance to those who remembered the earlier proclamations, and is far more than a mere attribute of the 'traditional' greenwood figure.

Munday integrates this challenge to royal claims over land by using the stag mentioned above as a crux around which the band builds increasingly lavish offers of hospitality. Hood's speech first claims never '*emptie-handed to be seene / were't but feasting on a Greene*' (sig. C2r), relating the deer itself to the current occasion and underlining the gift's political significance. Friar Tuck broadens out these claims by requesting that, 'seeing iolly *Christmas* draws so neere', the band continue to entertain the new Lord Mayor. Peter Stallybrass links the forest themes so closely associated with the Robin Hood legend with questions of liberty, rights and social relations, noting that 'The forest was [...] the terrain on which the very definition of 'liberties' was fought out'.[70] If hunting and forest living raised issues over the erosion of customary rights and freedoms, so too the figures' claims to control over hospitality– particularly at Christmas – signalled Munday's deliberate use of the Robin Hood legend to challenge James's own monarchical ideologies.

---

[69] *By the King. A Proclamation for the due execution of Forrest Lawes* (London: Robert Barker, 1615).

[70] Peter Stallybrass, ' "Drunk with the Cup of Liberty": Robin Hood, the Carnivalesque, and the Rhetoric of Violence in Early Modern England,' in *The Violence of Representation: Literature and the History of Violence*, ed. Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse (London: Routledge, 1989), 58.

Many have recognised the significance of hospitality and feasting in early modern political culture. Felicity Heal's substantial study, for example, examines its role as a focus of political and social negotiation at many different levels, while Daryl Palmer explores hospitality as a vital part of 'the full, tremulous practice of government'.[71] These studies' focus on the duty of regional and middle-ranking officials to practise hospitality might seem to imply that the Earl of Huntington *should* offer a deer to the civic celebrations, and that Friar Tuck should 'subscribe libenter' (in the speech's words) to a Christmas celebration (sig. C2v). Hospitality was important to the Shows, too, as Leinwand notes: 'Year after year, the pageant poets stressed the theme of generosity. The Lord Mayor was cast in the role of the great housekeeping country landlord'.[72]

The hospitality offered by Robin Hood and his men is much more than merely a nod to pageant tradition, however, instead undermining its function in James's royal policy. It was important to the King not just that hospitality be *given*, but that the crown could control who gave it and how. His December 1615 *Proclamation, requiring the Residencie of Noble-men, Gentlemen [etc] [...] vpon their chiefe Mansions in the Countrey, for the better maintenance of Hospitalitie*, and the Star Chamber speech of 1616 on the same theme, claim to distance the nobility and gentry concerned from the monarch and royal court. However, this did not mean that James relinquished his claims of control over them. Although they drew on a long-held tradition of praising regional hospitality as a cornerstone of local and regional social relations, both also made sure to emphasise the role of properly-controlled hospitality – that is, magnificence which was under the control of the king – in maintaining James's monarchical authority. The proclamation, (given, incidentally, a month after *Metropolis Coronata* was performed) stated that officials' failure to practise hospitality:

> doeth manifestly tend to the hinderance of ordinary Justice,
> the discontinuance and weakening of our seruice [...] and to
> the breeding of an unreadinesse in the Countrey, either for

---

[71] Felicity Heal, *Hospitality in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990); Daryl W. Palmer, *Hospitable Performances: Dramatic Genre and Cultural Practices in Early Modern England* (West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press, 1992), 16.

[72] Theodore B. Leinwand, 'London Triumphing: The Jacobean Lord Mayor's Show,' *Clio* 11, no. 2 (1982): 142.

the suppressing of Ryots, tumults and disorders, or for the performing and executing of Our Royall Commandements, upon any suddaine euent.[73]

The king's authority beyond Westminster depended upon the ability of nobles and local officials to carry out his wishes unhindered and to mobilise the populace, if necessary, in his service or even defence.

He repeated this sentiment in his speech to Star Chamber on 20th June, 1616, stating that 'I esteem the service done me by a good justice of peace three hundred miles, yea, six hundred miles out of my sight as well as the service done me in my presence. For as God hath given me large limits, so must I be careful that my providence may reach to the farthest parts of them'.[74] It was important to the king that he controlled the actions of regional power-brokers, which included both nobles and justices of the peace. When the character of Hood, a self-confessed outlaw, claims to dispense regional hospitality, and beyond that to bring that hospitality to such a significant political institution as the City of London, this surely challenged the king's vision of an unbroken network of royal authority.

Of course *Metropolis Coronata*, having been staged in October 1615, could not have been referring to the above sources specifically, as both appeared after the show's performance and the text's publication. They nonetheless provide the fullest surviving statements of the king's own claims on control over hospitality (even as he passed the responsibility for it onto others). Moreover, that both proclamation and speech could evoke such strong links in such few words suggests that James was able to draw upon well-known paradigms, linking royal authority to regional hospitality without having to explain why they were interdependent. It was these same assumptions that Munday drew on when he celebrated Robin Hood and Medea in a show focused ostensibly on London and the cloth trade. By drawing out Robin's claims to hospitality, and Medea's claims to control of the Thames and shipping, Munday can direct his readers' and audience's gaze toward by-now customary images of Jacobean monarchical power, finely adjusting the way in which

---

[73] *His Maiesties Proclamation, Requiring the Residencie of Noblemen, Gentlemen, Lieutenants, and Justices of Peace, vpon their Chiefe Mansions in the Countrey* (London: Robert Barker, 1615).

[74] Speech to Star Chamber, 20th June 1616, in King James VI and I, *Political Writings*, 221.

he frames both figures so as to maximise their power in constructing a political position for the city.

Angela Stock seizes upon Munday's Argo image, claiming that 'Comparing the lord mayor to a mythological hero and his boat trip to Westminster to an adventurous quest at sea [comes close to the farce in which] Beaumont's Rafe [...] turns a shop in the Strand into a scene for chivalric romance'.[75] In assuming that Munday and Middleton (both of whom use the Argo image in at least one of their Shows) attempt in all seriousness to compare the Lord Mayor to the mythical Jason, Stock misreads the function of sources and legends such as this one within the genre of the Shows. They are not merely misguided attempts to elevate the new Lord Mayor by comparison, but rather allow authors to position each particular Show in relation to a wide range of contentious events and debates. Images as far removed from London as the Argo (though even this had a connection to the Drapers' coat of arms) were able to invoke a broad range of themes, which authors could then narrow down and shape to their own purposes, making the Show much more powerful than the sum of its parts.

Ironically, it is also Stock who makes the valuable observation that the authors of the Shows were in the main experienced writers of drama and other genres (particularly the prolific Munday) – though she restricts her assessment to suggesting that they might follow one another's 'dramatic experiments'.[76] This implies that writing for the Shows required the same skills as did writing for the theatre, and moreover that the two genres worked in the same way. However, the genre of the Lord Mayor's Show text had two elements that made it extremely powerful, distinguishing it from drama and allowing authors to use it in focused, politically significant ways. The first was that, while the text was separate from the October 29th spectacle it was nonetheless associated closely with it. However little of the speeches and allegory could be perceived by their audience, both drew power in the text from the fact that they had been presented on the streets of London. Secondly, however ridiculous Stock and others might find the Shows' allegory, their close connection to real and powerful political institutions meant that they could extend

---

[75] Angela Stock, ' "Something Done in Honour of the City": Ritual, Theatre and Satire in Jacobean Civic Pageantry,' in *Plotting Early Modern London: New Essays on Jacobean City Comedy*, ed. Dieter Mehl, Angela Stock, and Anne-Julia Zwierlein (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 130.

[76] *Ibid*., 126–27.

these allegories to represent the very foundation of city – and sometimes national – government, society and economy. This may have restricted their freedom somewhat, but it also gave them tremendous capacity for creating what might be called *versions of reality*. A playwright can create a complete fictional world, adjusting it as he or she wishes; a pageant-author had to relate even the most surreal-looking allegorical figures to the real institutions with which his work was interconnected.

Any reader of the Shows' texts who was aware of this surely therefore understood this connection, understanding such bizarre combinations as *Metropolis Coronata*'s Medea and Robin Hood as not only connected to one another but also as working together to establish a particular political position. Munday utilises this expected reader response in his Shows for the Drapers in 1614 and 1615. Using the Shows' grounding in real political institutions, and in London itself, he frames two entirely different sets of allegorical images as opposite sides of the same coin, connecting and distancing them at the same time. *Metropolis Coronata* recalls the national framework that had dominated *Himatia-Poleos*, but explicitly inverts it. Munday thus stages, on the same streets, two entirely different visions of the same city.

Here, then, we have a direct demonstration of precisely what makes the Shows an interesting genre which rewards serious analysis. In both these Shows, occasionality and intertextuality combine, producing sensitive responses to a rapidly changing political context. While both are readable as individual works, it is only when we read them together that we can see just how radically Munday inverted his vision of London. That he did this while all the while using seemingly 'conventional' images – even the Argonauts and Robin Hood had been used in politically safe contexts before, albeit that they make an odd combination – demonstrates this genre's paradoxical nature. The Shows' proximity to their political context and sponsors has often been taken as a constraint, forcing authors to praise the leaders they would rather challenge. However, both of the Shows analysed here prove that the civic agenda could be a spur to creativity rather than a limit. Responding to such short-term change, in such politically-demanding circumstances, allowed Munday to test the genre's capacity for marshalling various sources into incisive, timely political commentary.

Chapter 2. 'Your Charracter, Office and place': Responsibility and Just Reward in Anthony Munday's *Chrysanaleia*.

> It were a mightie injury [...] that you, being the main Ocean,
> feeding all the rivolets of this painfull employment, and
> directing the course of any current that way tending: should
> not receive the just retribution and dutie, which (by instinct
> of nature) all Rivers else send duly to their nursing Mother
> the sea. Therefore, Gentlemen, I doe but send you that, which
> in right and equity belongs unto you, the Patronage and
> protection of this Orphan childe, begotten in your service,
> bredde up hitherto by your favour and kinde cherishing, and
> not despayring now to dye, through your want of regard.[1]

Anthony Munday's dedication to the Fishmongers' Company in *Chrysanaleia*, their Lord Mayor's Show of 1616, manages in the space of just over a page to summarise and exemplify the complex mix of sources, concerns and questions animating this work. It confronts, in quick succession, the importance of just reward, parental responsibility and nourishment, patriarchal authority and the reciprocal nature of the patron-author relationship. It thus does more than 'appeal [...] to [the Fishmongers'] protection specifically on the grounds of his orphaned state' as Hill claims; it also sets the tone for these issues' complex role in the rest of the text.[2]

Hill rightly notes that Munday claims that the company 'had been entirely responsible for his birth and upbringing', but there is a rather odd disjuncture here between this giving of thanks to the Fishmongers and Munday's habitual foregrounding of his civic roots, to which Hill attributes the river imagery.[3] As the orphaned son of a freeman, Munday would have been cared for, and given his portion on coming of age, by the City, not the Fishmongers, and having been born to, and later become, a Draper, he had hardly been 'begotten in [the Fishmongers'] service'. The other possible object of the dedication is the work itself, but this too is

---

[1] Anthony Munday, *Chrysanaleia: The Golden Fishing, or, Honour of Fishmongers* (London: George Purslowe, 1616), sigs. A3r-v. Subsequent references are to signature numbers in this edition and will be integrated into the main text.

[2] Tracey Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture: Theatre, History and Power in Early Modern London, 1580-1633* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 24.

[3] *Ibid.*, 24.

complicated by the claim that the 'orphan childe' will 'dye, through your want of cherishing'; surely an inappropriate metaphor for a genre widely acknowledged to be ephemeral and limited in performance to a single historical moment. While deliberately confusing the issue of to whom he owes his thanks, Munday simultaneously highlights the importance of credit where credit is due by stating his intention to give the fishmongers credit for 'feeding all the rivolets' and 'directing the course' of Munday's 'employment'.

These blurred distinctions, along with Munday's emphasis on just reward, set the tone for the show as a whole. Munday's overarching concern in *Chrysanaleia* is to articulate in concrete terms the importance of mutual responsibility within politics, and the contribution to the common weal by all elements of the political hierarchy. Part of this mutual responsibility is just reward, which Munday claims encourages political virtue – warning, for the same reason, against unjust reward. In exploring these issues Munday draws on a wide range of sources, from King James's own *Basilikon Doron* to John Stow's *Survey of London*, constructing a complex intertextual web that links past successes and imaginary failures to the day's political issues. By using past leaders to exemplify the virtues outlined in the present monarch's political works, Munday reminds the political elite in 1616 of their present responsibilities, linking those to past successes or failures. Most riskily, he implicitly rebukes King James, contrasting his present actions with the political ideals he himself had once set out.

The Show confronts this theme using what seems to be a disparate collection of sources, linked only by their connection to the Fishmongers' Company. Munday begins with a tale of the Grocers' and Fishmongers' role as merchants in the First Crusade, which is so jarring that most critics have ignored it entirely; this is followed by brief descriptions of three pageant-devices – a fishing boat, a crowned Dolphin, and the King of Moors. Munday then describes three devices in much more detail: the image of a pelican family, accompanied by a lemon tree and the Five Senses, and two images that present the role of William Walworth, Fishmonger Lord Mayor in 1381, in defeating that year's popular rebellion. All these devices are linked superficially by their connection to the Fishmongers, and no doubt the Company would expect to see characters like Walworth in any Show under their sponsorship.

In performance the six devices were perhaps given more equal weighting, but the printed text devotes much more commentary to the last three than to the first

three. This suggests that Munday wishes to use the combination of the last three devices for a greater purpose than one based on performance. His commentary certainly frames them within a particular political angle which links them to the themes outlined above, and to the description of the crusade. Although the remembered power of the Show's performance had some bearing on the text, this chapter will focus on the printed text as being deliberately constructed to create a specific political statement. Emphasising the second three devices, Munday frames them in such a way as to use their connections and contrasts for this purpose. This method of intertextual positioning, along with combining disparate images to create a particular political message, echoes the combination of Medea and Robin Hood investigated in the previous chapter. *Chrysanaleia* develops the technique much further, however, combining elements from across the entire Show and using intricate detail to position himself at a particular angle to his sources.

A significant part of the Show's politicized intertextuality consists in exclusively textual elements such as the preface and crusade tale, which seem to have had no equivalent in performance. Munday also makes much use of his descriptions of pageant-devices, which add a particular angle to what might have seemed conventional in performance. He links the pelican device to patriarchal authority by blaming an absent father for the mother pelican's self-sacrifice, turning a standard image into one which confronts issues of patriarchal authority. This framing occurs in the description and could hardly have been expressed in performance. The same is true for the Walworth devices. Aside from Walworth's speeches, both seem to have been performed largely as tableaux: the first was a bower containing Walworth's 'tomb' (from which his character was 'resurrected'), while the second was a structure on which King Richard II (king at the time of the 1381 rising) sat surrounded by figures representing various virtues. Whatever their effect in performance, Munday's description in the text links them directly to the Show's themes of political responsibility, social reciprocity and just reward.

These themes were particularly important in October 1616, as the unpopular alderman Sir William Cockayne had been knighted for his personal gifts of money to the Crown, even as the economic project he had superintended (which Munday had lambasted in his last two Shows) continued to weigh down the English economy. Themes of responsibility and reward, individualism versus concern for the common good, would therefore have come easily to both Munday and his civic readers. By

angling his sources in a particular way, he turns the Show from a collection of Fishmonger-themed pageant devices – which may well be how it looked in performance – into a highly specific political statement, made for and on behalf of the City. That political statement was concerned with the implications of the King's evident willingness to reward those who did not deserve it, encouraging individual greed and private gain at the expense of the common good and disrupting the potential of just reward to encourage virtue.

This is not to claim that the Show was in any sense a 'message' to the king, not least because it was unlikely that James would have read the text closely himself (though doubtless he was aware of the content of the Show in performance). Rather, it directly addresses the City even while taking a position on its behalf, focusing on James's philosophy as part of its confrontation with broader social and political issues. By linking all three devices to his theme of political responsibility, Munday can to make use of the precise implications of both his choice and combination of images – and of their particular relationship to their sources, which he almost always foregrounds as a factor in determining how we can read the Show.

To give a concrete example, the pelican and Walworth devices move from being broadly linked to fish and fishmongers, in the Show as performed, to their textual equivalents being connected by issues of individual accountability within the political system. In the pelican device, this angle brings out an emphasis on paternal obligation and the effects lower down the hierarchy (familial, social and political) of its neglect. In direct parallel, the Walworth devices emphasise the rewards of success along with the high risks attendant on failure by either the king or the civic leader. Together, they combine to encourage a focus on some of the most well-known political philosophy which linked paternal responsibility with that of the king: the writings of James VI and I. While *Chrysanaleia* never addresses the king by name, then, Munday was able to use these particular textual strategies to alert his readers to the relevance of James's own philosophies, bringing them into the text's orbit even as he questioned the same king's actions in reality.

Crusading merchants and early modern apprentice drama

Combinations which may seem initially jarring are thus linked more cohesively by the text's overarching political concern, and the same is true of Munday's take on particular legends. Positions which at first seem implausible turn out, when taken as

part of the text's overall strategy, to play a vital role. This is certainly true of Munday's account of the Fishmongers' crusading past, which comes after the dedication but before the main text. Munday claims that 'when *Godfrey*, Duke of Boloigne ([was] chosen Generall of the Christian Army, for the freedom and deliverance of Jerusalem from *Saladine*' – conflating the First Crusade's successful siege of Jerusalem in 1099 with Saladin's defeat during the Third Crusade, in 1192 – he was assisted by merchants from the Goldsmiths' and Fishmongers' Companies (sig. A4r). Daryl Palmer assumes that this is Munday's way of presenting a 'vision of Christian abundance' in which companies' 'ambition has taken the form of God's business'.[4] The merchants' actions do more than merely augment their piety, however. They represent not generalised Christian piety but rather a particular form of chivalry, as will be explained.

Merchants' presence in Jerusalem might seem unconnected with Bouillon's heroic exploits, but the mention of Bouillon himself might have reminded some readers that this was not merely an exaggeration of merchants' piety but an intervention by Munday in an ongoing debate regarding civic virtue and its place in society. Godfrey of Bouillon features in a play first performed in 1592-94, Thomas Heywood's *Four Prentices of London*, in which the Earl of Boloigne's four sons, forced by poverty to take apprenticeships in London livery companies, reveal their inner nobility by joining, and heroically participating in, a crusade. Eventually their nobility wins out and the eldest son becomes the new Earl of Boloigne, while the other three become kings of Jerusalem, Cyprus, and Sicily. In the meantime, however, each apprentice carries the banner of his company – the Mercers, Goldsmiths, Haberdashers, and Grocers – and Heywood's play is seen by many as attempting to please his civic audience by associating their most-loved institutions with ancient heroism. By linking his text to this play, then, Munday is also linking to these themes, signalling to his audience that he will be taking a particular position in regard to them.

While topical in the early 1590s owing to the vogue for heroic-apprentice prose works (such as Richard Johnson's *Nine Worthies of London*) and the growing aspirations of the civic middle classes, *The Four Prentices* was also relevant in 1616.

---

[4] Daryl W. Palmer, 'Metropolitan Resurrection in Anthony Munday's Lord Mayor's Shows,' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 46, no. 2 (2006): 381.

It had been printed a year earlier, and this edition included a 'Notice to Prentices' by Heywood himself, praising those 'who have begunne againe the commendable practice of long forgotten Armes'.[5] This refers to the recent rejuvenation of London's trained bands, following the Privy Council's order in 1614, which included a general muster, extra taxation and recruitment into the civic militia.[6] Heywood praises this force, which theoretically required regular practice at the 'artillery garden' but for many was merely a commitment to go to war if required (and which those who could afford it paid others to take in their place) as embodying the values of his heroic prentices – also, of course, pointing up his own play's relevance.

However, two years before this, in 1613, Francis Beaumont's *Knight of the Burning Pestle* had mocked just such a combination of chivalry and commerce. Beaumont's fictional audience members, a London 'Citizen' (and Grocer) and his wife, insist that the players improvise a heroic drama very like Heywood's, featuring their apprentice Rafe as an adventuring knight.[7] The resulting metatheatrical farce highlights the disjuncture between commercial and knightly values, as Rafe struggles to fulfill the requirements of both and, in the process, fulfills neither. Beaumont's play touches on a vital issue with the *Four Prentices*: although the trappings of civic institutions follow the apprentices on their quest, they do not return to London, and their company membership is only ever referred to on a surface level. Although Lisa Cooper is right to note that the prentices' hyper-masculine duelling and rivalry threatens their enterprise as often as it fuels it, the definition of success for these brothers is the reattainment of noble status.[8] It is preferable, in this play, for Guy to marry the King of France's daughter than for him to return to London and rise in the ranks of the Goldsmiths' Company.

---

[5] Thomas Heywood, *The Four Prentices of London* (London: I.W., 1615), A2v.

[6] See K. J. Lindley, 'Riot Prevention and Control in Early Stuart London,' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society (Fifth Series)* 33 (1983): 122. Reginald R, Sharpe, *London and the Kingdom: A History Derived Mainly from the Archives at Guildhall, Etc* (London: Longmans, Green, 1894), vol. 2: 65–67.

[7] Francis Beaumont, *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, ed. by Shelton P. Zitner (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004).

[8] Lisa H. Cooper, 'Chivalry, Commerce, and Conquest: Heywood's *The Four Prentices of London*,' in *Material Culture and Cultural Materialisms in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. Curtis Perry (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2001), 169.

This is what Beaumont mocks in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (though Heywood's play may have had more nuance than Beaumont credits him with): an attempt to glorify the City via the chivalric value-system without admitting the real mismatch between mercantile and knightly virtues. At stake in both plays is the access of different social classes to particular levels of chivalric virtue. While Beaumont satirises Heywood, both plays operate under the assumption that merchants and nobility have access to inherently different forms of virtue. Heywood's crusading apprentices could never achieve the success to which their noble birth suits them by remaining in London, and much of the comedy in Beaumont's play is founded on the basic assumption that Rafe, as an apprentice, is fundamentally at odds with the knightly virtues he is attempting to portray. Munday's description of crusading Goldsmiths and Fishmongers does more than merely aggrandize the trades beyond what is plausible, therefore. Instead, it positions *Chrysanaleia* as part of a longer-running debate about the scope and powers of civic virtue in relation to other political values.

Also participating in this debate, and within Munday's frame of reference, is Thomas Dekker's *The Shoemaker's Holiday*. Dekker's play, first published in 1600, uses the device of a humble shoemaker, Simon Eyre, becoming miraculously rich (and thus Lord Mayor) as a way of exploring tensions between the craftsmen who formed the bulk of London's citizen body and the merchants – whose wealth came from speculation – who dominated the city's leadership. As David Scott Kastan notes, although the play presents a fantasy of social cohesion between apprentices, craftsmen and city leadership, 'if this is a fantasy it knows itself as such, and cannot help reveal the contradictions it apparently would repress'.[9] Paul Seaver goes further, arguing that the implausibility of Eyre's miraculous fortune highlights the impossibility of London's craftsmen ever gaining access to the higher civic echelons in reality.[10] *The Shoemaker's Holiday* challenges the civic hierarchy's claim to legitimacy, separating the governors from those they claimed to represent. Hill has, appropriately, highlighted the importance to all mayoral Shows, as an ideological

---

[9] David Scott Kastan, 'Workshop And/as Playhouse: Comedy and Commerce in *The Shoemaker's Holiday*,' *Studies in Philology* 84, no. 3 (1987): 327.

[10] Paul S. Seaver, 'The Artisanal World,' in *The Theatrical City : Culture, Theatre, and Politics in London, 1576-1649*, ed. David M. Bevington, David L. Smith, and Richard Strier (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 95.

representation of civic unity, of bridging the gap between merchants and artisans, seeing the continual emphasis on 'adventure' and exotic goods as a way in which pageant-writers could 'represent and hence celebrate the mercantile activities of the Lord Mayors'.[11] However, Munday also celebrates the merchants' activities by directly confronting a play which criticised them, and asserting the potential of merchants – specifically adventurers, not artisans – to benefit the civic and national commonwealth.

Dekker's play joins Heywood and Beaumont in debating the differences between aristocratic and civic virtue, and access to both across London's social classes. The aristocratic Rowland Lacy evades military action and instead joins Eyre's workshop as a shoemaker – in contrast to the journeyman, Rafe, who *does* go to war. Masquerading as a Dutch immigrant, Lacy seeks to marry his middle-class lover by lowering his own status and marrying her in disguise, rather than elevating hers; however, at the play's triumphant conclusion the King approves the match and knights Lacy in order to make Rose a lady. *The Shoemaker's Holiday* thus explores the implications of aristocratic and civic hierarchies, setting convention and stereotypes against the reality of individual achievement and undermining the assumptions on which both aristocratic and civic hierarchy were founded.

Some see *The Four Prentices* as uniting these two value systems. Kathleen McLuskie notes that it shows 'unity of purpose between aristocrats and citizens', while Barbara Baines states that the four prentices 'embody a fusion of aristocratic, chivalric aspiration with middle-class pragmatism'.[12] However, Laura Stevenson is right to note that most of the heroism takes place outside the city, and that the 'prentices' fight as noblemen, not tradesmen: 'the fighting is left to the earl's sons, while the real apprentices stay in London'.[13] Although Beaumont's *Burning Pestle* mocks the play's link between civic and chivalric activity, *The Four Prentices* only creates a surface connection, failing to praise civic value in and of itself. Even where the companies are glorified (e.g. the use of their arms) this glorification can only take

---

[11] Tracey Hill, *Pageantry and Power: A Cultural History of the Early Modern Lord Mayor's Show, 1585-1639* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), 288.

[12] Kathleen McLuskie, *Dekker and Heywood: Professional Dramatists* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994), 80; Barbara J. Baines, *Thomas Heywood* (Boston: Twayne, 1984), 40.

[13] Laura Caroline Stevenson, *Praise and Paradox: Merchants and Craftsmen in Elizabethan Popular Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 187.

place when removed from the civic and mercantile context. The apprentices only achieve glory when they decide to leave London – and they can only do so because of their inherent aristocratic virtue, which differentiates them from the rest of the City.

All three plays tap into contemporary debates in other genres regarding chivalry's relationship to political virtue, and access by different social classes to both. Texts addressing the function of titular honours had the difficult task of defending the hereditary *status quo* while also linking honour to merit. John Ferne's *The Blazon of Gentrie* (1586) locates the origin of nobility in the Latin verb *noscere* (to know), arguing that long ago 'some one, abounding in many outward graces and partes aboue the rest, and the fame of his worthines spread abroad, caused the multitude to yeeld an especiall honor vnto him'.[14] Robert Glover adds a degree of social utility to this definition, writing in *The Catalogue of Honour* (1610) that

> when as euil and wicked men preuailed, and good and honest
> men were oppressed: it was necessary the good to be
> distinguished from the bad, and for the preseruation of the
> publicke peace and tranquility, to be [...] set ouer the rest,
> that they might be vnto all men an example of godly and
> honest life, that they might decide and determine all things.[15]

Both Glover and Ferne go on to defend inherited titles, but on the grounds that noble status is founded upon its origins as a reward for true virtue. Its political function was to distinguish those who were best suited for leadership, ensuring that the commonwealth was ruled by those who were most likely to ensure its wellbeing. Although they admit that inherited titles do not always correlate with honour, both link original just reward with longer-term social hierarchy, implying that the children of those who were originally rewarded for virtue were also more likely to display virtue than those of the vulgar classes (who, having not displayed virtue when the titles were originally given out, were unlikely to do so now). This is a simplification of contemporary debate regarding merit and hierarchy, but illustrates the neat logical

---

[14] John Ferne, *The Blazon of Gentrie* (London:John Windet for Andrew Maunsell, 1586), sig. B2v.

[15] Robert Glover, trans. Thomas Milles, *The Catalogue of Honour or Treasury of True Nobility* (London: William Jaggard, 1610, sig. C2r.

turn by which honours, however recently conferred, could be linked to virtuous action and thus retain political legitimacy.

For many this legitimacy was undermined by King James's creation of the (hereditary) Order of Baronets in 1611. While the baronetcy was open only to gentlemen 'of good birth', the Order's purpose was primarily to raise Crown revenues and thus qualification was mostly financial, requiring a payment worth thirty soldiers' wages for three years. This action left the king open to accusations of undermining traditional values and selling social status on the basis of wealth. A petition presented to the 1614 Parliament attacked the baronetcies, arguing that 'Nothing is more commended than honor springing out of virtue and desert, but to purchase honor with money (as baronets have done) is a temporal simony and dishonorable to the state'.[16] Appointed to the committee for reviewing this petition, Sir John Holles warned that the sale of titles constituted 'selling honour as ware (which from all beginnings hath usually been the prize of vertue)'.[17] The function of honour in marking out the virtuous for leadership was thus diluted and would lead to political instability, as it would become impossible to tell whether a noblemen had earned his title by virtue or by wealth.

The vexed relationship between wealth and social status was still a matter of concern two years later, in 1616. Its connection to Cockayne's financially-motivated knighthood is clear, and equally clear is Munday's obligation to separate the Lord Mayor's Show, as a display of mercantile wealth which also claimed political legitimacy for the city's elite, from what was seen as the corrupting sale of honour. In this climate, the tradition for the Show's texts to relate spectacular magnificence directly with civic leadership (implicitly using companies' wealth to justify their dominance) came dangerously close to the sale of baronetcies, which many viewed as tantamount to political corruption. Linking *Chrysanaleia* to the debates on chivalry and social class, as played out in drama and other genres, was Munday's way of confronting this. By asserting that merchants could attain their own version

---

[16]'Motives to Induce Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses of the Commons House of Parliament to Petition His Majesty for the Revoking and Abolishing of the Degree of Baronets Lately Erected by His Highness's Letters Patent.' Harleian MS. 6800 [f. 261]. Printed in Maija Jansson, ed., *Proceedings in Parliament, 1614 (House of Commons)* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988), 328.

[17] Linda Levy Peck, *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England* (London; New York: Routledge, 1993), 212.

of chivalric virtue, and that the system of rewarding for valour worked as well in city politics as it did in other spheres, the Show defends the wealth and power of the civic elite.

Munday takes on the implicit division between civic virtue and chivalry by presenting what seems to be the first truly mercantile version of chivalry. In his account, the Goldsmiths and Fishmongers help the Crusade not despite their civic identities but *because* of them. Not only did they participate 'in divers dangerous adventures', but after the Crusade they used both their civic concern to revive Jerusalem as a city, helping to 'build the ruined Wall againe', and their ability as merchants '(by Fishing and Shipping) to supply the daily wants of the Souldiours' and 'for bringing Gold and Silver thither' (sig. A4v). Intriguingly, these are not humble artisans, as glorified by Dekker, but explicitly merchants: the term 'adventures' links the imagery to mercantile speculation and exploration, and Munday describes the praiseworthy adventurers as not producing but 'trading in fish, oyle, flaxe, silkes and other commodities' (sig. A4r). The mayoral Shows often praised the craft with which the sponsoring Company was associated, and in the process risked exacerbating tensions between the artisans whose subscriptions funded the Shows and the merchants whose speculation had made them rich enough to rise to civic leadership, and who (for the most part) had not practised a craft for some time, if ever. Munday thus rehabilitates the civic mindset which both Heywood and Beaumont had separated from chivalric bravery, but unlike Dekker links it to mercantile activity, not artisanal. Only by being both speculating merchants – with the sense of adventure and ability to move goods that this entailed – and civic-minded could these praiseworthy Fishmongers be of use to the Crusade.

This description of crusading merchants is therefore much less incongruous than it seems at first. Munday uses it to position the Show within a broader debate regarding the place of heroism within the city, and the particular claims of civic leaders to such glory, questioning the terms in which civic leadership had traditionally been both glorified and vilified. Bravery and adventure still denote virtue, but 'adventure' is most certainly given its mercantile and speculative connotations, making it particularly applicable to the merchants who made up most of the civic hierarchy. Munday might seem to be on dangerous ground here, defending the gain of wealth by speculation and individualism rather than the service of the common good, which was a much safer (and thus more usual) route for civic

pageantry. However, in Munday's crusade story mercantilism serves the common good, helping to rebuild and supply first Jerusalem, then London. Contrary to Dekker's implicit criticism in *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, the merchants are in fact more suited, not less, to serve their community's interests. They alone have the financial and commercial resources needed to undertake large projects and maintain stability in difficult times.

Munday thus fulfiled his obligation to both acknowledge the sponsoring company's importance and address the concerns of London as a whole, in particular the merchant community which the Shows had come to represent. This resonated more deeply in 1616 than it had for some time. In the Shows of 1614 and 1615, the Cockayne Project had been both sufficiently topical and sufficiently close to the Drapers' own concerns that Munday could address both City and Company on this topic. It perhaps also helped the previous year's situation in that Munday himself was a Draper (and indeed, unlike many of the actors and writers who were free of livery companies, seems in fact to have actually practised this trade); his interests were therefore aligned with the company's in focusing on the cloth trade.[18] *Chrysanaleia's* sponsors, the Fishmongers, had rather different corporate concerns, notably their historic links to the Goldsmiths' Company and rivalry with the Butchers.[19] Munday thus pulled off a tricky balancing act, taking an issue which might be seen as specific to those Companies involved in textiles and linking it to the welfare of the City as a whole, including that of his sponsoring Company.

Defending merchants would always have been a worthy cause for civic pageantry, but it was particularly important in 1616 for Munday to prove that (well-chosen) merchant governors could benefit the common good. As noted above, William Cockayne, one of the City's most controversial leading figures, had been knighted in the summer, despite the harm done by his policies. This surely exacerbated concerns about merchants' increasing dominance over city affairs, since Cockayne's dangerous speculation and risky reform had caused more harm than good. Munday's intention was not to defend Cockayne himself, of course, but rather to repudiate him as an individual while also showing that merchants in general were

---

[18] Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, 28–29.

[19] For an assessment of the historic rivalry between the Fishmongers' and Butchers' Companies, see Sandra Billington, 'Butchers and Fishmongers: Their Historical Contribution to London's Festivity,' *Folklore* 101, no. 1 (1990): 97–103.

still capable of political virtue. By demonstrating the potential good done by responsible civic governors (along with wise royal policy) Munday hoped to demonstrate that self-interest was an exception in civic government, not the rule. The virtuous potential that he identified in the crusading Fishmongers and Goldsmiths is made concrete in his descriptions of the pelican and Walworth.

Munday uses the connections and contrasts between the pelican and Walworth devices to move between the specific and the general, but most research on *Chrysanaleia* has hitherto focused on individual parts of the work rather than how they combine. Daryl Palmer, for instance, offers an interesting theological interpretation of the show's 'resurrection' of Sir William Walworth, while Tracey Hill analyses Munday's use of metaphors of nursing and maternity.[20] Hill extends this to describe the show as a whole as 'preoccupied by matters of birth and parentage', but the two devices involving Walworth and commemorating his actions in 1381 make no mention of either. Hill does not neglect Walworth in her discussion, but she does describe his mention as something that Munday 'could not resist' rather than a part of the show's overall message.[21] David Bergeron, paradoxically, avoids dealing with the Show's overall message by referring to it only as a whole; where Hill and Palmer move outward from particular aspects to the Show's and Munday's wider context, Bergeron praises the Show for its dramatic unity but confines his reasons to the fact that 'every element of the entertainment refer[s] to the Fishmongers in some way'.[22] Here Bergeron pinpoints what might be one of Munday's most interesting strategies, which is to take a legend related to the sponsoring company and form it into a pageant-device which relates to London as a whole.

It was obvious to many that King James had knighted Sir William Cockayne on 8th June 1616 in reward for his generosity to Crown finances rather than his contribution to policy, since the latter had been disastrous. At the time, Cockayne's namesake project – to ban unfinished cloth exports and instead sell cloth dyed and dressed – was widely understood to have failed. At the end of the previous year cloth

---

[20] Palmer, 'Metropolitan Resurrection.'

[21] Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, 180–81.

[22] David M. Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry, 1558-1642*, revised edn. (Tempe, AZ: Arizona University Press, 2003), 156.

exports had been 50% lower than in previous years, which affected clothworkers throughout the country, while Cockayne's company had reneged on their initial promises to ship a minimum number of cloths each year (and pay duty to the Exchequer thereon).[23] Although we should be careful not to assume that all of the City government shared Munday's dislike of the project (after all, Cockayne himself was an alderman), the economic depression caused by the company's failure surely affected London's clothiers and traders until well after 1615. Cockayne was therefore in no position to claim that he had performed a public service; *Chrysanaleia*'s evident concern with the just attribution of credit and its application to the common weal might therefore have been a reaction to what seemed (to Munday, at least) a rather inappropriate reward.

Even more controversial than Cockayne's self-interest was the fact that his 'generosity' to the king in June 1616 – he was knighted at a dinner he held for the king and Prince Charles – was funded not by his personal wealth but by the company, although the credit for it went to him. John Chamberlain makes a point of mentioning this to Dudley Carleton in his letter of June 22nd:

> the kinge dined that day at alder-man coquins, where he was presented with a bason of gold, and as many peeces in yt as together made vp the summe of a 1000li. the Prince after the same manner wth 500 li.: so that *the whole charge of that feast stoode the new companie in more then 3200li. the thanks remaining wholy wth the Alderman who at parting was knighted* wth the citie-sword. [my italics].[24]

That the New Merchant Adventurers could afford to spend so much money when business was so bad hints at the disjuncture between the company's claims of difficulty and need, and its individual participants' actual wealth.

This disjuncture resurfaces in the accounts of the Privy Council from later that year, closer to the Show's performance. In August Gloucestershire clothworkers

---

[23] Roze Hentschell, *The Culture of Cloth in Early Modern England: Textual Construction of a National Identity* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 161.

[24] 'Chamberlain to [Carleton].' June 22 1616. MS Secretaries of State: State Papers Domestic, James I, 1603-1640. SP 14/87 f.134. The National Archives of the UK. *State Papers Online*. Web. 3 Mar. 2012. Document URL http://go.galegroup.com/mss/i.do?&id=GALE%7CMC4323684296&v=2.1&u=uniyork&it=r&p=SPOL&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript.

complained to the Privy Council of the decay of their trade and consequent financial difficulty.[25] The New Merchant Adventurers blamed the 'deceitful making of Gloucestershire cloth', but four days later the King ordered the Council to remonstrate with Cockayne for the company's failure. The meeting minutes record that this failure had occurred 'in spite of the King's private warnings not to undertake more than they could accomplish' and pledge that 'Such of the Company as fail in buying the quantities which they severally undertook are to be threatened with punishment'.[26] The Council's report of later that month mentions that the Cockayne projectors had reduced the clothing trade to decay, and in the following month's they report similar excuse making on the new company's part.[27]

The company's report of 11th September laments the Dutch ban on English cloth imports and promotion of their own clothing trade, requesting that they be given privileges in order to promote their trade.[28] That this report overstepped the mark in asking the king to compensate for the company's failure is confirmed by a letter sent by Edward Sherburn to Dudley Carleton ten days later. This letter reports that 'notwthstanding [the king] findes he hath bin much abused', in order to uphold the new company, he has promised £40,000 of his own funds. Sherburn sums up his

[25] 'The Council to the Justices of Peace, co. Gloucester.' Aug. 2 1616. MS Secretaries of State: State Papers Domestic, James I, 1603-1640. SP 14/88 f.71. The National Archives of the UK. *State Papers Online*. Web. 3 Mar. 2012. Document URL http://go.galegroup.com/mss/i.do?&id=GALE%7CMC4323684454&v=2.1&u=uniyork&it=r&p=SPO L&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript.

[26] 'The Council with the King to the Council at London.' Aug. 6 1616. MS Secretaries of State: State Papers Domestic, James I, 1603-1640. SP 14/88 f.77. The National Archives of the UK. *State Papers Online*. Web. 3 Mar. 2012. Document URL http://go.galegroup.com/mss/i.do?&id=GALE%7CMC4323684458&v=2.1&u=uniyork&it=r&p=SPO L&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript.

[27] 'The Council in London to the Council with the King.' Aug. 13, 1616. MS Secretaries of State: State Papers Domestic, James I, 1603-1640. SP 14/88 f.86. The National Archives of the UK. *State Papers Online*. Web. 3 Mar. 2012. Document URL http://go.galegroup.com/mss/i.do?&id=GALE%7CMC4323684467&v=2.1&u=uniyork&it=r&p=SPO L&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript

[28] 'Statement by the new Company of Merchant Adventurers, that the Hollanders thwart their trade, by prohibiting the use of cloth dyed and dressed in England, both by public edict and private ….' Sept. 11 1616. MS Secretaries of State: State Papers Domestic, James I, 1603-1640. SP 14/88 f.124. The National Archives of the UK. *State Papers Online*. Web. 3 Mar. 2012. Document URL: http://go.galegroup.com/mss/i.do?&id=GALE%7CMC4323684502&v=2.1&u=uniyork&it=r&p=SPO L&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript.

own feelings on the project in a sarcastic aside regarding the king's promise of money: 'sed ubi est' ('but where is it?').[29]

The actions of both the New Merchant Adventurers and Cockayne himself would hardly, in the City's view and especially Munday's, have seemed to qualify him for knighthood. Central to his relationships with both king and populace seems to be a distinct lack of concern for the public good – aside from the Project, his loans to James were in return for political capital. Munday had already criticised Cockayne's project of late 1614 in his Lord Mayor's Show of 1615, as has been explained earlier, and one of his most pressing concerns was the king's palpable neglect of the public interest (whatever the proclamations' claims). The refusal of the new company to purchase dressed cloth, along with their seeming inability to sell it on, went precisely against what had been claimed to be the main public interest of the project: that is, job creation in the dyeing and dressing industries. This was the ground on which the Clothworkers' Company had professed support for the scheme, claiming that the monopoly on unfinished cloth prevented the aforementioned industries from thriving and led to market stagnation.

The project was evidently harming the very sections of society that it had claimed to help, endangering London merchants and rural workers alike, just as Munday had warned in his 1614 Show. As bad as the plan's failure was, however, it was the conspicuous wealth of Cockayne and his fellow New Merchant Adventurers that seems especially to have rankled with Chamberlain, Munday, and quite probably many of Munday's fellow Drapers (who had, after all, sponsored the previous two years' anti-Cockayne Shows). For Cockayne to ostentatiously feast the king and display his (and, as it turned out, the Company's) wealth at the same time as visibly failing in his business showed that the risk he and the king had taken with the New Merchant Adventurers had been upon the popular good, not upon their own wealth. The project had failed, but those who had instigated the project and stood to make money from it had not suffered losses themselves but had managed to transfer them onto the populace.

---

[29] 'Edw. Sherburn to [Carleton].' Sept. 21 1616. MS Secretaries of State: State Papers Domestic, James I, 1603-1640. SP 14/88 f.142. The National Archives of the UK. *State Papers Online*. Web. 1 Mar. 2012. Document URL http://go.galegroup.com/mss/i.do?&id=GALE%7CMC4323684517&v=2.1&u=uniyork&it=r&p=SPOL&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript

Munday's use of the pelican and Walworth devices directly confronts this palpable privileging of individual gain over the common good. The text describing each device makes it into a cycle of political responsibility, highlighting the role of individuals within a broader structure. In this emphasis on mutual contribution, kings, lord mayors and other leaders can enhance or undermine the wellbeing of those with whose welfare they, as governors, have been entrusted. The link to Cockayne's knighthood is somewhat self-evident – the alderman was given an honour that Munday and many others believed he did not deserve – but the specific presentation of these three devices helps move *Chrysanaleia*'s perspective beyond individual unfairness to the wellbeing of the nation as a whole. It does this by reaching out to contemporary political theory, positioning itself in relation to broader debates on magistrates' political responsibilities, making a text which was superficially concerned with Cockayne's knighthood into a conduit to explore broader issues – which in turn allowed readers to reflect on the broader implications of the Crown's financial and economic policy.

Munday achieves this by presenting the Lord Mayor as both father and husband in his political role. Describing the pelican device, he refers to the 'Magistrate, who, at his meere entrance into his yeares Office, becommeth a nursing father of the Family', but two of William Walworth's speeches refer to the bachelor status of the new Lord Mayor, John Leman, making the inauguration 'Londons and Lemans wedding day' (sigs. B2r, C1v). One surely cannot be husband and father to the same entity, and indeed Hill sees the combination of 'nursing father' and bridegroom as 'rather peculiar'.[30] Palmer claims that the image results naturally from the resurrection imagery elsewhere in the Show, as 'resurrection engenders nuptials'.[31] However, the conventional image of Christ as bridegroom has no clear link to this explicitly political work.

More likely is a more political (and thus more relevant) connection. The significance of the father-husband amalgamation in the Show becomes much clearer when we examine the father-husband role in the light of one of the most significant contemporary connections between patriarchy and magistracy: King James's theorization of kingship. Of course, James was not the only theorist to compare the

---

[30] Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, 24; Hill, *Pageantry and Power*, 167.

[31] Palmer, 'Metropolitan Resurrection,' 382.

monarch to the *paterfamilias*, and Leman's bachelor status was at least as significant in prompting the nuptial imagery. Nevertheless, the fact that Munday's complex network of quasi-familial obligations is illuminated only by examining James's own in his two most famous texts surely suggests that Munday drew on it, indirectly or directly, and may even have been responding directly to its policy implications. The works examined, *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies,* are both the two most likely to have been familiar to Munday and come closest of all James's works to Munday's own description of the paternal magistrate's duties, and will therefore form the basis of this analysis.

King James's political theory: monarchy as fatherhood

Since it focuses on only two texts out of James's huge corpus of political thought, the present work will not participate in the debate around whether James's political thought should indeed be viewed as 'absolutist'.[32] It will thus be mentioned only insofar as it touches on the possibilities with which the works might be read. For example, Judith Richards's view of the *Trew Law* as an uncompromising statement of absolutism will be addressed, but Johann Sommerville's argument about the *relative* absolutism of James's thought compared to other European and English theorists will not.[33] The focus will remain on how Munday himself appropriated and re-framed King James's politicisation of fatherly authority in *Chrysanaleia* in order to question, on behalf of the city and the Drapers, the king's adherence to his own philosophy.

Scholarly debate on Jacobean absolutist theory has often assumed that in denying subjects' right to rebel against an inadequate ruler the king's works also made the image of the *pater patriae* into one in which the subjects (or 'children') had responsibility to obey their ruler, but the ruler was untrammelled by obligation. Judith Richards, for example, argues that while for Mary I and Elizabeth I 'political authority was shared, even within the marriage metaphor', when James spoke of himself as husband to his kingdom 'the corollary was that ultimate authority was his

---

[32] For a summary of the main positions in this debate as they stood in 1996 see Johann P. Sommerville, 'English and European Political Ideas in the Early Seventeenth Century: Revisionism and the Case of Absolutism,' *Journal of British Studies* 35, no. 2 (1996): 168–94.

[33] Judith M. Richards, 'The English Accession of James VI: 'National' Identity, Gender and the Personal Monarchy of England,' *English Historical Review* 117, no. 472 (2002): 528.

alone', contrasting this to more pluralist Elizabethan practice.[34] Wormald also refers to the content of the *Trew Law* as 'controversial', emphasising the distinction between the 'reciprock and mutuall duetie between a king and his subjects' named in the subtitle, and any conception of a contract between ruler and ruled which could be broken by either party.[35]

This is usually justified with reference to James's use of the speech in 1. Samuel 8-20, which lists the unjust actions that a king might commit without his subjects being justified in rebellion. Political theorists and historians have understood this in practical terms: although the king has a moral duty to rule well, it makes no material difference to his day-to-day life if he rules tyrannically, since his subjects still have no recourse to rebellion. They view the distinction as one which is made in the king's conscience alone and which is thus minor in the pragmatic reality of rule. Even Sommerville, who cautions against seeing James's works of 1598 as excessively absolutist in relation to contemporary theories, notes that some theorists viewed the described actions as tyrannical while others saw them as acceptable, but nevertheless groups them together as absolutist, viewing the distinction as insignificant.[36]

However, the distinction between moral and immoral rule was more significant for James, and how Munday and others read him, than the practical viewpoint allows. John Cramsie notes that the king's responsibility for his subjects' spiritual welfare was inscribed in the coronation oath as a contract between monarch and God, and that 'to emphasize simply the divine right pedigree of *Trew Law* is to miss this feature'.[37] In addition, the monarch's responsibility to rule well went beyond spiritual welfare to the more worldly fields of law and good governance. In *The Trew Law* James makes explicit, even as he theorizes the way in which the Samuel speech sets out the subjects' duty of obedience, the fact that this entailed an

---

[34] *Ibid.*, 352.

[35] Jenny Wormald, 'James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*: The Scottish Context and the English Translation,' in *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*, ed. Linda Levy Peck (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 52.

[36] Sommerville, 'English and European Political Ideas in the Early Seventeenth Century,' 177–81.

[37] John Cramsie, 'The Philosophy of Imperial Kingship and the Interpretation of James VI and I,' in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority and Government*, ed. Ralph Anthony Houlbrooke (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 48.

equal duty on the part of the monarch. The subjects' duty forms 'part of this mutuall and reciprock band' of which the first part was the king's duty to 'care for all his subiects[...] to thinke that his earthly felicitie and life standeth and liueth more in them, nor in himselfe'.[38] For James, the king is only absolute in terms of earthly power. While the tyrannical king cannot be held to account *by* his subjects, this does not mean an absolute lack of moral obligation.

He makes this distinction most clearly in explaining why the king is not bound by the law:

> albeit it be trew that I haue at length prooued, that the King is aboue the law[...]yet a good king will not onely delight to rule his subiects by the lawe, but euen will conforme himselfe in his owne actions thervnto, alwaies keeping that ground, that the health of the common-wealth be his chiefe lawe.
>
> (74)

It is precisely because the king can make and break laws that he is obliged to keep them. A good king will have ensured that the laws he makes are for the good of the commonwealth, and if he truly respects the common good his actions will align with his laws. The concept of a 'good king' is not meaningless in the *Trew Law*. Although the king's subjects could not judge or correct his kingship, he was subject to a far greater judge: 'that great God, who placed him as his lieutenant ouer [the subjects], vpon the perill of his soule to procure the weale of both soules and bodies' (65). The free monarch can rule tyrannically without reprisal during his lifetime, but lack of earthly punishment does not preclude judgement after death. For James to say that the king had no judge but God was not only to claim absolute earthly power, but also to acknowledge the responsibility that came with that power.

This message is reiterated in the *Basilikon Doron*, in which James argues that the king's lack of accountability to his subjects (being ordained not by them, but by God) only increases his accountability to God:

---

[38] King James VI and I, *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies* (1598) in King James VI and I, *Political Writings*, ed. Johann P. Sommerville (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 66. Subsequent references to *The Trew Law* to page numbers in this edition and will be integrated into the main text.
.

> [...]ye haue a double obligation [to God]; first, for that he
> made you a man; and next, for that he made you a little GOD
> to sit on his Throne, and rule ouer other men[...].as in dignitie
> hee hath erected you aboue others, so ought ye in
> thankfulnesse towards him, goe as farre beyond all others.[39]

The moral obligation to rule well is not a limitation on absolute power but a consequence of it. The second opening poem exemplifies the finely-made distinction between monarchs' ability and obligation, noting that just as 'their subiects ought them to obey', so too 'Kings should feare and serue their God againe' (1). This seems at first glance to deny the king's obligation to rule for his subjects' benefit. However, when we examine this in the light of both works' emphasis on the monarch's spiritual obligation we see that the king is far from unaccountable. Indeed, the famous statement in the *Trew Law* that 'Kings are called Gods[...]because they sit vpon GOD his Throne in the earth' does not place the monarch on a level with God but continues by saying that they 'haue the count of their administration to giue vnto him.' (64) In other words, the people cannot pass judgement on a king precisely because his responsibility is too great for earthly punishment: quasi-divine responsibility calls for divine punishment, of which we must not underestimate the significance.

Jonathan Goldberg's literary analysis (largely of *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Law*) certainly underestimates the monarch's moral responsibility as *pater patriae*. In Goldberg's view, the image of the king as husband to the realm and father to his subjects implies a one-sided system in which the subjects must obey the monarch, the children's obligation to the father mirroring the subjects' to their king.[40] However, this underestimates the importance of both the father's obligation to his children (and wife) and the king's to his subjects. While Goldberg even goes as far as quoting James's statement of fatherly obligation in the *Trew Law*, he dismisses it while discussing patriarchal imagery because it does not translate into

---

[39] James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* (1598), in Sommerville, ed. *Political Writings*, 12. Subsequent references to this are to page numbers in this edition and will be integrated into the main text.

[40] Jonathan Goldberg, *James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne, and Their Contemporaries* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983), 84–87; 257–58.

subjects' ability to rebel against their king.[41] This is understandable given that Goldberg is mainly concerned with hierarchy, and whatever one's view on the obligations of the Jacobean father-king he is clearly placed on a level above his subjects. However, a more nuanced view of this hierarchy, together with an emphasis on the reciprocity on which Munday focuses in *Chrysanaleia*, allows us to see that the image of the king as husband to his realm and father to his subjects was key to James's understanding of the monarch's role.

Debora Shuger provides an important addition to the debate around the political ramifications of fatherhood, reminding us that early modern conceptions of fatherhood were not monolithically absolutist but emphasised both the father's obligation to his family and the emotional connection that differentiated fatherhood from magistracy. This is an important corrective to the idea of a top-down patriarchy mirroring a top-down ideal of parenthood. Shuger notes that James's father-king analogy implies that 'the king is like a father [...] because he loves and cares for his subjects'.[42] Natural and political fatherhood are thus linked by the emphasis on the duty of the more powerful to protect and serve the interests of those over whom they have power. Although Lancelot Andrewes distinguished between God's fatherhood, founded on mutual love, and the patriarchal kingship which demanded obedience, James's conception of the relationship between a king and his subjects made no such distinction, emphasising the king's responsibility as much as the subjects'.[43]

Shuger's 'hierarchy where the stronger loves and cares for the weaker' is what gives James's *pater patriae* the moral and spiritual imperative to rule in the interests of his subjects.[44] This is visible in the way that both *The Trew Law* and *Basilikon Doron* theorize absolute power. Whenever James mentions the king's obligations in the *Trew Law*, they are connected to his position as *pater patriae*:

---

[41] Jonathan Goldberg, 'Fatherly Authority: The Politics of Stuart Family Images,' in *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan, and Nancy .J. Vickers (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), 3.

[42] Debora K. Shuger, *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance : Religion, Politics, and the Dominant Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 235. For Shuger's exploration of the concept of *storge* as opposed to *eros* and *caritas*, see 219-30, 235.

[43] *Ibid*., 229.

[44] *Ibid*., 235.

> the King becomes a naturall Father to all his Lieges at his
> Coronation: And as the Father of his fatherly duty is bound to
> care for the nourishing, education, and vertuous gouernment
> of his children; euen so is the king bound to care for all his
> subiects. As all the toile and paine that the father can take for
> his children, will be thought well bestowed[...]so ought the
> Prince to doe towards his people.
>
> (65)

The king's duty to care for his subjects is thus not in *opposition to* but explicitly *justified by* absolute patriarchal authority. James's theory of the king's 'reciprocall duetie' is based on his position as father to his people, which incorporated his position as husband also. Fatherly obligation is thus an essential part of the monarch's power. As the much-longer meditation on Samuel and Saul makes clear, it was within the king's earthly power to neglect this paternal duty: however, to do so constituted both moral and spiritual sin.

Of course, James's actions as king did not always display an awareness of this moral duty. Nevertheless, within the two texts examined here the moral duty of good governance is the very distinction between monarchy and tyranny, and thus the crux on which the king's judgement before God will turn. James notes in *Basilikon Doron* that 'a good King[...] obtaineth the Crowne of eternall felicitie in heauen', contrasting it with 'the endlesse paine [a Tyrant] sustaineth hereafter' (21). James explicitly lists the king's obligations in connection with the role of *pater patriae*:

> [the King is] a louing Father, and carefull watchman, caring
> for them more then for himselfe, knowing himselfe to be
> ordained for them, and they not for him; and therefore
> countable to that great God, who placed him as his lieutenant
> ouer them, vpon the perill of his soule to procure the wealth
> of both soules and bodies, as farre as in him lieth, of all them
> that are committed to his charge.
>
> (*Trew Law,* 65)

Goldberg's reading of this as a naturalization of absolute power places insufficient emphasis on what would have been a truism for both James and his readers: the judgement of God was much more real and terrifying than the prospect of legitimised popular rebellion, and certainly an incentive to good governance.

In both *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Law*, good governance is defined principally as the king's privileging of his subjects' needs over his own wants: the distinction between a good king and a tyrant rests not on the *degree* of power

wielded (for a king's power is by definition subject only to God and unchallengeable by his subjects) but the aims with which that power is exercised. A good king exercises his absolute power for the ultimate good of his subjects, while a tyrannical one seeks only his own profit. As with the king's moral duty to govern well, this self-abnegation is often explicitly linked to the king's role as husband to the realm and father to his people:

> As the kindly father ought to foresee all inconuenients and dangers that may arise towards his children, and though with the hazard of his owne person presse to preuent the same; so ought the King towards his people. [...]as the Fathers chiefe ioy ought to be in procuring his childrens welfare, reioycing at their weale, sorrowing and pitying at their euill, to hazard for their safetie,[...]in a word, to thinke that his earthly felicitie and life standeth and liueth more in them, nor in himselfe; so ought a good Prince thinke of his people.
>
> (*Trew Law*, 65-66)

The moral imperative for good governance demonstrated above demands that the monarch be prepared to sacrifice not only his own interests but even his own safety. King James's behaviour in knighting Cockayne for services which had been rendered to him alone revealed both men as disregarding the reciprocal chain of government, in which the good of the magistrate and the good of the common weal were one. This is not to say that Munday or Cockayne's enemies, or indeed Leman himself, were ideal governors. Nevertheless, the conferral of Cockayne's knighthood alongside the widespread suffering of ordinary clothworkers created an unfortunate contrast between royal policy and the public good.

'Nursing Fathers': the pelican *paterfamilias*

Munday's image of the pelican speaks directly to this visible disjuncture and, aside from the combination of husband and father imagery, forms one of the main pieces of evidence for the Show as a response to Cockayne's elevation. While the pelican was commonly used as an emblem of maternal self-sacrifice, Munday's crucial innovation is to diverge from the accepted set of narratives to blame the pelican's demise on insufficient *paternal* contribution, which can surely be read as a reference to James's failure to live up to his promised privileging of his subjects' benefits before his own. Munday states that the reason the mother pelican dies in the process of feeding her young is that 'the sustenance she receiveth from the male bird [...is]

insufficient for their nourishing'(sig. B2r). As Bergeron notes, two of Munday's three named sources make no mention of the pelican's self-sacrifice: however, there exist many other possible printed sources which might have influenced his portrayal and against which we can view his innovation.[45]

The pelican is used as the archetype for maternal self-sacrifice in a wide variety of early modern works. Nicholas Breton mentions 'the Pellican that pecks the blood out of hir brest,/ And by her death only doth feed her yong ones in the nest'; Joseph Hall's *Meditations* (1605) describes the pelican's self-sacrifice for her young; Robert Daborne's *Christian Turn'd Turke* (1612) includes the lines 'with his bloud regain'd/ Her wasted body, like the Pellican'.[46] The self-sacrifice of the pelican has a religious connotation in works such as Thomas Dekker's *Four Birds of Noah's Ark* (1609), which compares Christ is to a pelican in his self-sacrifice.[47] In a 1595 sermon, Thomas Playfere remarked that 'Christ is that tender Pellican, who by wounding his owne breast, doth restore his owne to life againe', while Arthur Dent's *Plaine Man's Pathway to Heaven* describes Christ as '[...] that Pellican, who by pecking a hole in his owne breast, doth restore his yong to life' ; Thomas Adams' *Englandes Sicknes* (1615), too, states that 'The *Pelican* rather then her young ones shall famish, feedes them with her owne bloud' and compares this to Christ.[48] These sources seem to emphasise the pelican's spiritual connotations, but this spirituality is

---

[45] David Bergeron, *Pageants and Entertainments of Anthony Munday: A Critical Edition* (London; New York: Garland Publishing, 1985), 120. Aristotle's *History of Animals* limits its discussion to the pelican's migratory and eating habits (Book 8, part 12 and Book 9, part 10): Aristotle, *History of Animals*, trans. D'Arcy Wenworth Thompson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/history_anim.html while Pliny's *Natural History* (Book 10, 66) only notes that pelicans have a second stomach in their chests: Pliny the Elder, *Natural History*, trans. John Bostock (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1855), ii, 527-28.

[46] Nicholas Breton, *Brittons Bowre of Delights* (London: Richard Jones, 1591), sig. B3v; Joseph Hall, *Meditations and Vowes, diuine and morall* (London: Humphrey Lownes for John Porter, 1605), sigs. H6v-H7r; Robert Daborne, *A Christian turn'd Turke* (London: William Barrenger, 1612), sig. H1r. Interestingly, there is also a tradition wherein the pelican is described as having killed her young – and either then mourning them in solitude or sacrificing her own blood to revive them. However, Munday's description of the pelican device, and his emphasis on its applicability to the new Lord Mayor, makes clear that there is no link to this particular strand of the tradition. See William Hunnis, *Seven Sobs of a Sorrowful Soul for Sin* (1583) and Guillaume Du Vair, *Holy Meditations* (1612), for examples.

[47] Thomas Dekker, *Foure Birds of Noah's Arke* (London: H. B. for Nathaniel Butter, 1609).

[48] Thomas Playfere, *A most excellent and heauenly sermon vpon the 23. chapter of the Gospell by Saint Luke.* (London: for Andrew Wise, 1595), sig. D1r; Arthur Dent, *The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven* (London: for Robert Dexter, 1601) sig. Dd4v; Thomas Adams, *Englands Sicknes: Comparatively Compared with Israel's* (1615), sig. K2v.

connected to patriarchal authority. Christ's self-sacrifice is related directly to God's role as father to his people, and underscores the obligation of the ruler – divine or political – to take responsibility for his subjects' failings.

Munday's application of the pelican device is as much political as it is spiritual, therefore, and there existed plenty of sources for this politicized interpretation of self-sacrifice. One of the most important, and recent, uses would have been the title page of the 1611 *Bible* (now known as the 'King James Bible'), which featured a prominent emblem of the pelican's self-sacrifice, linking it closely to King James himself. The political pelican had a longer history, however, appearing as both positive and negative example during Queen Elizabeth's reign.[49] A mid-sixteenth century emblem shows a pelican feeding her chicks with the Latin motto 'pro lege, rege, et grege' – 'for the law, the king and the people (lit. herd)' – and the English 'Love Keepeth the Lawe, Obayeth the Kinge, And is Good to the Common Wealth'.[50] Here the pelican represents the self-sacrifice made by the subject for his or her king, law and realm, and by including all three elements the emblem's designer reminds us that the benefit of self-sacrifice redounds not only to the monarch but to the institutions he or she governs, and to the commonwealth as a whole.

The pelican's relationship to the ruled is made even more explicit in the anonymous play *The raigne of king Edward the third* (1596); the then-Prince Edward explains to his father King Edward that the motto of the feeding-pelican emblem is *'sic et vos,* & so should you', relating this bird's self-sacrifice to governor and governed alike.[51] Elizabeth herself was also portrayed in positive association with a pelican, in Nicholas Hilliard's portrait of c.1573-6, in which she wears a

---

[49] See, for example, the pelican-themed target in Thomas Hughes, *Certaine Devises and shewes presented to her Majesty by the Gentlemen of Grayes-Inne* (London: Robert Robinson, 1587) sig. F1v; Robert Greene, *A Quip for an Upstart Courtier:* or, *A quaint dispute between velvet breeches and cloth-breeches* (London: John Wolfe, 1592) sig. B2v.

[50] See, for example, the pamphlet *Pro Lege, Rege, et Grege* (1585) by Eric Sparre, Chancellor of Sweden (see Gary D. Peterson, *Warrior Kings of Sweden : The Rise of an Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co., 2007), 85; the end of Thomas Raynalde's *The Bird of Mankynde* (London, 1565); the colophon to Matthew Parker's *Holy Bible* of 1568 (London: Richard Jugge); the title page of Andrew Maunsell's *The First Part of the Catalogue of English Printed Bookes* (London: John Windet for Andrew Maunsell, 1595); the title page of Thomas Pelletier's *A Lamentable Discourse* [on Henri IV's assassination] (London: Edward Blunt and William Barret, 1610).

[51] Anon., *The Raigne of King Edward the Third* (London: Cuthbert Burby, 1596), sig. G2v.

brooch depicting a feeding pelican, which symbolises her royal bounty and role as protector of her subjects.[52] Curtis Perry is right to point out that the pelican symbol was often a part of artists' use of maternal imagery to mask Elizabeth's meanness, but in this particular painting the pelican seems more positive, symbolising the queen's willingness to sacrifice herself for the good of her realm.[53]

Hilliard's image shares the most with Munday's own pelican, who 'launceth her brest, and so supplieth that want [of food] with her owne bloud[...] though they survive, the Damme dyeth' which, he affirms, is 'An excellent type of government in a Magistrate' (sig. B2r). However, Munday's device does more than merely encourage political self-sacrifice. Rather, it appropriates an image which James had made his own and applies to it the abnegation of self-interest symbolized by the pelican and advised in James's own work:

> If [the Lord Mayor's] love and delight be such to the
> Commonwealth, as that of the Pellican to her young ones, by
> broken sleeps, daily and nightly cares, that the very least
> harm should not happen to his charge: then doth he justly
> answere to our Embleme;
>
> (sig. B2r)

Whether or not the new Lord Mayor achieves good governance will be determined by whether he serves his own interests or those of the common weal, just as, in James's works, the good king rules for his people and the tyrant rules in his own interest. In emphasising this distinction and linking it an obligation that is at once familial and political, Munday's work reminds the king that his own theorization of the monarch as father had once placed great emphasis on the same thing.

Curtis Perry's work helps explain an image which Tracey Hill has found 'somewhat strained' and an 'impossible creature': that of the Lord Mayor as 'a nursing father of the Family' (sig. B2r).[54] Perry's research on specifically Jacobean images of royal bounty reveals that the 'nursing father' was not only eminently

---

[52] See Roy C. Strong, *Gloriana : The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I* (London: Pimlico, 1987), 80: cited in Curtis Perry, *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the Renegotiation of Elizabethan Literary Practice* (Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 124.

[53] Perry, *The Making of Jacobean Culture*, 124.

[54] Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, 24.

possible within the field of iconography but had become, by James's time, sufficiently conventional for him to adapt it to his own iconography. In Perry's words, 'once it is recognized that generosity and bounty are conventionally depicted as maternal, it becomes possible to describe the assimilation of maternality to monarchy as already implicit in patriarchal royalism as such: good kings must be nourish-fathers'.[55] Perry shows that, by the time James came to the throne, the association of nursing mother with patriarchal royal bounty was an established convention on which writers could easily draw. By explicitly associating paternalistic government with female lactation, Munday is not taking the metaphor too far but rather appropriating a tradition which was not only specifically royal, but by 1616 had also been appropriated by King James himself. Although the image of the pelican was, as shown above, associated on several occasions with Elizabeth I, her royal imagery did not link bounty and male fertility as did James's, and was never paternal nor patriarchal. It could not therefore combine the images of nursing mother and bountiful father in quite the same way. As Perry also notes, central to James's rhetoric of paternal bounty was his status as a *paterfamilias* as well as *pater patriae*; this was more than just a way of naturalizing absolute power, as Goldberg claims, but rather a way in which James could theorize his responsibilities.[56]

The role of the *paterfamilias* is therefore central to Munday's strategy of appropriating the Jacobean 'nursing father' image and using it to touch directly on James's own writings and policy. The principal way in which Munday diverges from all of his possible sources for the pelican is in his portrayal of the pelicans' family unit, and in particular the role of the father – who is seldom mentioned in descriptions, however detailed, of the legend. The main difference between other portrayals of the pelican rests on whether the mother pelican is praised or blamed for her self-sacrifice. In Munday's telling, however, the blame for the mother's death lies with the father:

> because [the mother's] love and care[...] makes her
> extraordinarily jealous of [the chicks], as never daring to be
> absent from them (the sustenance she receiveth from the
> male Bird, being insufficient for their nourishing:) with her

---

[55] Perry, *The Making of Jacobean Culture*, 123.

[56] *Ibid*., 130; Goldberg, 'Fatherly Authority,' 3–5.

> beake she launceth her brest, and so supplieth that want with
> her owne bloud.
>
> <div align="right">(sig. B2r)</div>

Munday makes sure to emphasise that the father's insufficient contribution is as much to blame for the mother pelican's death as her own unwillingness to leave the chicks – an elaboration seldom, if ever, made by other writers. The fact that his innovation is in the area of the father's contribution to the family is no coincidence, and turns the pelican device into a microcosmic depiction of what he sees as the effect of royal policy in 1616 on the realm's condition. If, as Munday affirms in the next paragraph, the mother pelican represents the magistrate and the chicks the commonwealth for whom he must sacrifice himself, then by extension any self-sacrifice required of the Lord Mayor must have been occasioned by an insufficient contribution on the part of the 'father' – who (if the mayor is his deputy) surely represents the king.

This innovation demonstrates just how specifically an intertextual angle could position *Chrysanaleia* in relation to the political situation on which Munday wished to comment. By combining a symbol which had been used to explore reciprocity and responsibility in government with a model used by the king to stake his own claim to absolute power (and absolute responsibility), Munday constructs a frame of reference through which the king's actions can be contrasted with his previous, more abstract claims. Invoking the hermaphroditic 'nursing father' image in the dual contexts of family and government, he thus links the pelican device inextricably to James's own claims to familial bounty. His exhortation to the Lord Mayor to become the 'nursing father' to his subjects echoes James's own claims to be the 'nourish-father' to his realm. However, his conspicuous departure from his sources in introducing an insufficiently-bounteous father into the microcosmic pelican family challenges the king's claim to be the all-providing *father* by dividing the role. In James's own model, he could serve as hermaphroditic mother and father because he was the only (worldly) source of bounty to his subjects, but Munday's model places this theoretical role of 'nourish-father' within the reciprocal reality of governance. In this sphere, bounty is dependent upon others and insufficient contribution by any individual may damage the entire political structure.

By linking the mayor's civic role to the monarchical duty set out by King James in his early political texts, Munday makes *Chrysanaleia* into a reminder of the

duties which James had originally assigned to his own role as King, and by extension (in Munday's view, if not the king's own) the Lord Mayor's role as magistrate. He uses the image of the pelican family to stage a cycle of responsibility in which the individual at the very top of the hierarchy, whose position renders him duty-bound to put his inferiors' needs first, has failed to perform his obligations; the death of the mother pelican demonstrates the consequences of this failure on the father's dependents, as well as the obligation of the mother-figure towards her children. Having invoked Jacobean and other concepts of absolutism, Munday is able to blur the distinction between father and mother while also associating fatherhood with kingship. The pelican device thus warns James (regardless of whether he ever read the text) of the possible consequences of the father-king's insufficient nourishing of his family while also implicitly rebuking him for what Munday presents as the self-sacrifice that the civic authorities (implied in the mother-pelican, or mayor as 'nursing father') must make to compensate for this failure.

William Walworth: individual heroism within the political community

While the pelican image stages a failure of the reciprocal cycle between king and magistrate, Munday also stages the successful working of this relationship using the legend of William Walworth, Fishmonger Lord Mayor in 1381, who played a part in the defeat of that year's popular rebellion. Munday uses the story of Walworth heroically rescuing the king from Wat Tyler, leader of the rebels, to stage a cycle of reciprocal responsibility that succeeds politically where the pelican fails. In Munday's description, the mayor's service of both king and people above himself, and its beneficial consequences, is not only presented as an example of virtuous civic governance but is also linked directly to the king's own obligation to reward the deserving. Dangerous rebellion among the populace can only be contained by the acceptance of individual duty by those responsible for governing both city and realm. The story of Walworth's heroism thus becomes a concrete example of the successful functioning of responsibility and reward in government, warning of the potential consequences when this cycle fails and showcasing the long term benefits of its success.

Although there are many potential sources for this story, the text of the show contains details which signal that Munday must have used one or both of two historians' work as sources: Raphael Holinshed's *Chronicles* (1577/87) or John

Stow's *Survey of London* (1598) and *Annales of England* (1600).[57] Given that
Munday was to revise and republish the latter work only two years after
Chrysanaleia (in 1618), it was highly likely he had read this, but his account also
implies that he had come across Holinshed's work. The detail that links
Chrysanaleia to these works is Munday's naming of the five men knighted with
Walworth in the field. Holinshed names them in recounting Henry Knighton's telling
of the incident in his chronicle (in which Walworth's first name is given as John):
'the king [...] knighted the said Iohn Walworth, & Rafe Standish, with foure
burgesses more of the citie, namelie Iohn Philpot, Nicholas Brembre, Iohn Laund,
and Nicholas Twifield'.[58] Stow names three in his *Survey of London* – 'Iohn Philpot,
Nicholas Brembar, and Robert Launde' – and mentions also in passing Adam
Francis and Nicholas Twiford, bringing the total up to five, all of whom he also
mentions in the *Annales*.[59] Munday's five names, added in the margin next to
Walworth's penultimate speech, are 'Sir Nicholas Brember, Sir Iohn Philpot, Sir
Nicholas Twiford, Sir John Standish, Sir Robert Launde' (sig. C3v). Munday follows
Stow in naming Philpot, Brembre, Twiford and Launde, but takes Standish from
Holinshed (interestingly, while in the *Brief Chronicle* he keeps the name 'Ralphe
Standish', in *Chrysanaleia* he uses 'John').[60] He thus probably used Stow as a
principal source, but was also familiar with Holinshed. Although Munday is willing
to alter details from these texts where he sees fit, it is clear from the above parallels
that he is not only dependent on them both but wishes to make that dependence
known to his readers; in very few (if any) other texts of the period are these names
mentioned, so any who were at all familiar with either Stow or Holinshed would
surely recognise the link between their work and Munday's.

---

[57] Raphael Holinshed, *The Third Volume of Chronicles, beginning at duke William the Norman* (London: Henry Denham, 1587); John Stow, *A survey of London* (London: John Windet for John Wolfe, 1598); John Stow, *The Annales of England* (London: Ralfe Newbery, 1600). N. B: The later edition of Holinshed has been used in order to take account of any additions Munday might have seen, but comparison between this and the earlier edition of 1577 has shown that all the sections quoted here are substantially the same in both editions. See Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, 10, for the probability that Munday and his collaborators had used Holinshed as a source on the 1517 Evil May Day riots for the play *Sir Thomas More*.

[58] Holinshed, *Chronicles*, sig. Rr5r.

[59] Stow, *Survey*, sig. M7r, F8v; Stow, *Annales*, sig. Gg8r.

[60] Munday, *A Briefe Chronicle of the Successe of Times* (London: W[illiam] Jaggard, 1611), sig. Qqr.

However, they might also recognise that Munday consciously diverges from these sources even as he relies upon them. Holinshed and Stow seem to be the only historians of Walworth's actions to deny that he killed Wat Tyler himself as well as the only ones to mention the five knights, while Munday, in direct contrast, claims that Walworth was Tyler's sole killer. Holinshed's account credits Walworth with the *arrest* of the rebel leader but others around the king with his actual death:

> the maior[...] foorewith rode to [Tyler] and arrested him[...].
> and streightwaies other that were about the king, as Iohn
> Standish an esquier, and diuers more of the kings seruants
> drew their swords, and thrust him through in diuerse parts of
> his bodie, so that he[...]died there in the place.
>
> (sig. Rr5r)

Stow's account is more protracted, but again does not give Walworth sole credit:

> The Mayor arrested [Tyler] on the head with a sound blow,
> whereupon *Wat Tylar* furiously stroke the Mayor with his
> dagger[...][then Walworth] grieuously wounded *Wat* in the
> neck, and withal gaue him a great blow on the head [...] *Iohn
> Cauendish* drew his sword, and wounded *Wat* [...]the horse
> bare [Tyler] about 80. foot from the place, and there he fell
> downe halfe dead[...][the king's attendants] thrust him in
> diuers places of his bodie[...][and then] the Mayor caused
> him to bee drawne into Smithfield, and there to be beheaded.
>
> (sig. M7r)

In both of these accounts Tyler's death is a collaborative effort; even in Stow's version, where the Mayor orders Tyler's execution, many other people have been involved in his defeat and his execution is official, contrary to what Munday implies by including Tyler's severed head impaled on Walworth's dagger (sig. B3r).

In *Chrysanaleia*, by contrast, Walworth is said to have 'slaine the proud insulting Rebell [Tyler]' (sig. B3r) by himself, and his character later claims that 'I strooke dead/ [the rebels'] chiefest Captaine' (sig. C3r). In thus diverging from his sources even as he overtly aligns himself with them, Munday is not merely playing fast and loose with historical detail. Rather, he is alerting his readers (and perhaps his audience) to the fact that he is selecting from and modifying historical accounts, and that these changes are important.[61] This mirrors a strategy in Heywood's *King*

---

[61] Munday's account of Walworth's killing of Tyler follows his view in the *Brief Chronicle* so may not be specific to the occasion of *Chrysanaleia*, but its retention is surely as deliberate – and thus significant – a decision by Munday as a change would have been.

Edward IV, which attributes the defeat of the Faulconbridge rebellion to London's citizens and thus overtly signals Heywood's 'fundamental departure from Holinshed' and alignment with Stow.[62] The insistence on Walworth's responsibility for Tyler's death has two possible effects. Firstly, it augments London's role in defending the king, in what was otherwise a rather ambiguous account of civic loyalty (at least in Holinshed). Secondly, it emphasises the importance of Walworth's assumption of duty and the potential consequences of his failure to do so.

Munday's description of the pageant-devices certainly highlights the latter, emphasising Walworth's pivotal role in the rebels' defeat. He presents Walworth as the only person standing between the king and certain death:

> [the rebellion risked] great disturbance of the King and State,
> and unavoydable ruine of this Cittie, but for the good Angell
> of defence then guarding it ,and the worthy Lord Maior made
> the second instrument.
>
> (sig. B3v)

This emphasises the importance of Walworth's fidelity – indeed, London's Genius later describes his actions as a 'deed of loyalty' – and implicitly reminds us of the consequences when a magistrate is interested only in himself. Here the very existence of London, as well as its current glory, is attributed directly to the actions of Walworth alone. This does more than merely exemplify good governance, however. It is also one of the many reminders in this work of the chain of loyalty and duty on which the wellbeing of both country and city (and, by extension, the populace of both) depend. Although Munday is using Walworth's action to stage the successful functioning of the reciprocal political relationship, by giving him sole credit (aside from the Angel) he creates an implicit warning. The city's welfare depends entirely on Walworth's virtuous actions, which in turn depend upon the successful functioning of this political reciprocity – should the latter fall, so too might the city itself.

This focus on the particular importance of the magistrate fulfilling his duty is where the Walworth story connects to, and contrasts with, the pelican legend. In the latter, the mother pelican cannot adequately care for the young without self-sacrifice because of failure at the top (the father's inadequate provision); in the Walworth

---

[62] Richard Rowland, 'Introduction,' in Thomas Heywood, *The First and Second Parts of King Edward IV,* ed. Richard Rowland (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), 25.

section of the show, the success of the magistrate is connected directly to the fact that the king has assumed his own duty. The salvation of London, England and the realm is thus connected to the king's good actions, as is his own safety. More pertinently for the Lord Mayor, the actions and welfare of the civic magistrate are connected to the responsible behaviour of those above him in the political and social scale. The 'triumphing Angell' personifies this, being responsible for Walworth's sense of duty and the king's power and thus linking the two in Tyler's defeat: she 'smote the enemy by Walworth's hand' and 'holds [King Richard's] Crowne on fast', and 'holds his striking Rodde, inferring thus much thereby: By mee Kings Reigne' (sig. B3v).

According to Munday, then, the quality that this angel represents is necessary for kings to rule as well as for magistrates to do their duty; it is the very stuff of government. Although Munday calls her an 'Angell of defence' she also represents the mutual sense of duty by which the common weal is upheld; successful defence is a consequence of this duty. On the pageant-car representing the royal virtues, and on the top of which the Angel sits, the uppermost characters are individual virtues such as 'Vertue, Honor, Temperance, Fortitude [... and] Conscience' while qualities that seem more pertinent to government, such as 'Justice, Authority, Lawe [...] Peace, Plentie', are placed below them (sigs. B3v-B4r). Here Munday's concern is with the individual virtues of the magistrate, which make up the building-blocks of political stability. Qualities such as peace and plenty may result from good governance, but good governance itself can only come from the magistrate's use of his individual qualities for the common good.

Heraldry and heritage: ensuring political responsibility in the long term

If these individual qualities are important because they engender the virtues of the ideal commonwealth, they are also the vehicle by which those virtues can be ensured in the long term. A magistrate does not pass down discipline directly to his successors, for example, but each successive leader must possess the individual virtue of temperance in order to engender its public equivalent among the wider populace. Munday's description of the pelican device exemplifies this process:

> If [the Lord Mayor's] love and delight be such to the
> Commonwealth, as that of the Pellican to her young
> ones[...]as of her, so of him, it may be sayd, his brest and

> bowels of true zeale and affection, are alwaies open[...]to the
> expiration of his yeare. And then, though the maine
> Authoritie of Governement (in him) may be sayd to dye: yet
> it surviveth in other Pellicans of the same brood, and so it
> reacheth to them in the same manner.
>
> (sig. B2v)

If this year's Lord Mayor sets the example of good governance, then successive mayors will follow it; this is how the individual magistrate can ensure the long-term wellbeing of the commonwealth. This image of future mayors as 'of the same brood' and of the inheritability of political virtues is echoed later, when the resurrected Walworth addresses '[...]you grave Fathers of this State,/ Which I my self did propagate[...] as Lord Maior' (sig. C1r). Later in the same speech, he expresses pleasure at seeing that those virtues which reigned supreme in his time are still strong in 1616. His 'propagation' has, the Show asserts, ensured the survival down the generations of the qualities he displayed in 1381.

While individual qualities in each magistrate help sustain long-term political health, equally vital is the *process* by which these qualities are passed down to posterity in order that they can be engendered repeatedly in each individual magistrate. Munday foregrounds this in the Walworth sections of the show by focusing on the process and significance of knighthood. While Munday's text does not acknowledge that anyone other than Walworth was involved in the actual killing of Wat Tyler, the pageant-chariot containing Walworth's tomb is attended by the five men who were 'Knighted with Sir William in the field' (sig. B3r). Walworth's speech gives them no distinction beyond their rank:

> [The king knighted] me, and the rest
> Of Aldermen, that were in fielde with me.
> [...]. these do represent the men
> Knighted in field, on Corpus Christi day.
>
> (sig. C3r-v)

The only possible reason Walworth gives for their being knighted is their presence with Walworth when he slew Tyler; we are left to assume from context that they had in fact assisted in the rebels' defeat in some way and thus merited the knighthood. Munday thus blurs the distinction between reward and visible merit not to question the justice of these knighthoods but to remind his audience/readers of the importance of just reward more generally. We cannot resurrect past figures to tell us what they

or others did to deserve their rewards; we must assume that those whose deeds are not recorded in historical sources but who have been honoured officially did something beneficial to the commonwealth and are thus to be praised. In this case, Munday implies, the knighted aldermen *do* deserve praise, and the reader might well have remembered that the king knighted five aldermen along with Walworth for their bravery in opposing the rebels and in defending the city. However, by forcing his reader to *assume* this within his pageant, he warns that the same may occur in the future for those who are not nearly so deserving: William Cockayne, for instance.

If used well, knighthood and other official honours represent an important mechanism whereby virtue can be rewarded in the present and engendered in the future; by the same token, they might have disastrous consequences for the conduct of future magistrates if used wrongly. Bestowing these honours appropriately is thus a vital part of the king's duty. He must not only judge individual merit and virtue, however, but according to the show's use of Jacobean concepts of the monarch's fatherly duty he must also ensure to judge the magistrate on his contribution to the *common* weal as well as the monarch's own wellbeing. Munday (through Walworth) praises King Richard for having done just that:

> King Richard, to requite true loyaltie,
> His gracious favour presently exprest
> In Royall manner, knighting me and the rest
> Of Aldermen, that were in fielde with me.
>
> (sig. C3r)

By rewarding 'true loyaltie' in 1381, the king has fulfilled his duty to help engender virtue in his magistrates and has, implicitly, contributed to the current glory of both London and the Fishmongers' Company. In the above passage Munday foregrounds the importance as well as the long-term implications of the king's ability to reward his men justly; by associating 'true loyaltie' with 'me and the rest/ Of Aldermen', he (as above) reminds us that we must, effectively, take Richard's word for it that the other Aldermen were knighted for good reasons – and if we did not have the resurrected Walworth, we would only have the fact of their knighthood on which to base our assumptions. This implies that had they been knighted for base reasons such as financing court profligacy, and had Munday been staging *Chrysanaleia* without the 'aid' of Walworth, we might be unintentionally honouring those who did not deserve it. Moreover, their dishonourable deeds might permeate the books of history

and the ranks of future magistrates, and thus be propagated in just the same way as Walworth's.

This concern with history and posterity is perhaps what motivates Munday to again deviate from his source, this time Stow. In recounting Walworth's actions in 1381 Stow systematically disproves the myth that a dagger was added to the city arms in memory of Walworth's bravery, arguing instead that its addition stemmed from a meeting in the Guildhall the year after the revolt.[63] Despite almost definitely having read this, Munday persists in claiming that 'Walworths dagger' was added to the city's arms (sig. C3v). As with the legend of Walworth's slaughter (or not) of Tyler, this owes itself to more than Munday's disrespect for historical veracity and love of a good story (although we should not discount these things); it also connects to the concern, identified above, with the long-term memorialisation of events and their survival into posterity. That the dagger added to the city's arms is specifically 'Walworths' connects it to the dagger on which, according to Munday's description, Tyler's severed head is carried:

> Londons Genius [...].sits mounted on Horsebacke by the
> Bower; with an Officer at Armes, bearing the Rebels head on
> Walworths Dagger.
> <div align="right">(sig. B3r)</div>

By linking the precise object with the arms of the city Munday highlights both the particularity of the action to Walworth (as with his attribution of Tyler's death to the mayor alone, noted above) and the long-term consequences of that particular action. The dagger with which Walworth demonstrated his loyalty has here taken on a life of its own, outliving Walworth in order to communicate the tale of his virtuous actions to future generations of citizens. Walworth's dagger is thus, like his knighthood, a mechanism whereby his short-term actions are made immortal; by infiltrating the city's heritage it has made his actions part of its future as well as its past.

Munday's purpose in mentioning the dagger's heraldic afterlife is thus much more complex than what Bergeron dismisses as his being 'confused'.[64] Rather, it helps to unite the show's staging of political reciprocity with its themes of honour and virtue, showing how well-placed reward for virtue can ensure the fulfilment of

---

[63] Stow, *A Survay*, sig. M7v.

[64] Bergeron, *Pageants and Entertainments*, 122.

obligation in the long term. This understanding of heraldry's long-term political function helps to illuminate the way in which Munday ends the crusading merchants story from earlier in the text. The Fishmongers and Goldsmiths whose mercantile skills had helped to supply the First Crusade also helped, Munday claims, 'to build the ruined Wall againe, from the Water-gate of comfort, to the Sheepe-gate of holinesse'. This action so strengthened the fellowship between the two groups that, in Munday's account,

> they continued, and declared it in Englands Jerusalem, our famous Metropolis *London*, building the Wall and two North Gates therein, *Moore-gate*, and *Criples-gate*, as yet their Armes and Memories on them do sufficiently testifie. The one performed by *Thomas Faulconer, Fishmonger*, and the other by *William Shaw, Goldsmith*.[65]
>
> (sig. A4v)

This ending to the story not only cements the merchants' contribution to the crusade in a specifically civic context, but provides readers with another clue as to the long-term function of the system of political reciprocity that Munday sets up throughout the text.

Just as with the city-sword, the built environment of the city functions simultaneously as evidence of past deeds and a spur to future deeds. Refiguring urban space as evidence of civic governors' political virtue, Munday proves right Lawrence Manley's argument that 'the very fabric of the city [...] entered the pageant-scripts as visible evidence of what London had produced by the worthy efforts of its citizens'.[66] As Richard Rowland notes of Heywood's *King Edward IV*, 'the play's engagement with the internal tensions of the capital in the 1590s' is founded on its being 'mapped onto particular London sites'.[67] For both writers, a work's political directness is founded upon links to the material environment in which it was staged and set.

---

[65] Thomas Falconer was in fact a Mercer, Lord Mayor in 1414, and 'William Shaw' is actually Edmund Shaw/Shaa, though he was a Goldsmith.

[66] Lawrence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 280.

[67] Rowland, 'Introduction,' 15.

The dual function of London's built environment as evidence of past virtue and an encouragement to future virtue mirrors the argument Sir William Segar makes about knighthoods themselves in *Honour, Military and Civil* (1602). Here he argues that knighthoods were originally awarded for merit:

> they that receiued [knighthoods] as a token of honour, kept
> them carefully in perpetuall memory of their valour, and the
> honour of the Prince that gaue them. By this meane also they
> became much admired and esteemed of other souldiers.
>   Afterwards, for more encouragement of vertuous
> minds, other Princes thought good that the memorable acts of
> soldiers should be in perpetuall memory written, and such
> priuiledges as were giuen them to be recorded, calling them
> in those writings, Valiant men, Companions in Arms,
> Victorious souldiers and Knights. Which maner of
> proceeding did encourage the men of warre.[68]

In adopting this tactic to apply to other things, then, Munday draws on a traditional defence of knighthood but relates it to other aspects of the city, showing that the 'encouragement of vertuous minds' can be spearheaded using other tactics. Despite Cockayne's inappropriate honour, therefore, it is still possible for the city itself to honour those who deserve it, and for that honour – if applied to the right people – to engender political virtue in the long term. Creating this kind of cycle makes Cockayne's knighthood into an exception, rather than a sign of decline. Expanding it to other means of preserving honour also asserts the city's own right to control this cycle of virtue and reward: only the king could award a knighthood, but should he fail to confer this honour for the right reasons or to the right people, the city had its own means of highlighting the worthy – including the Show itself.

Making the Show into a means of honouring the deserving, and thus a vehicle for long-term political stability, legitimates it not merely as performance but also as printed text, turning the devices into textual exemplars and encouraging the reader to read into them the political cycle that I have outlined in this chapter. To summarise the contrasts and connections between the symbols: where the pelican-father fails to nourish his family, the patriarchal monarch Richard II succeeds in politically nourishing his realm in the short and long term by rewarding those who act in the good of the common weal. This nourishment depends on Walworth's act of self-sacrifice. Had Walworth not done what Munday presents as a deed that saved

---

[68] William Segar, *Honour, Military and Civil* (London: Robert Barker, 1602), sig. E2v.

the king and commonwealth, King Richard could not have used his actions to engender stability in the long term. At the same time, however, Walworth's actions are committed in the king's sight, linking his bravery with the presence of his sovereign. By outlining such a complex cycle of mutual obligation, Munday reminds his readers (and, to a lesser extent, his audience) of the sheer stakes involved in contribution – or lack thereof – to the common cause. Where one element of the political hierarchy fails to act in the interest of the common weal, instead privileging or rewarding his or her own interests, the consequences are dire. The Show, now a political exemplar, thus warns Leman that only by putting the common interest above his own can he ever hope, in Munday's words, to: 'Crowne still [the Fishmongers'] ancient worthie name' (sig. C4r).

This was not merely empty encouragement to political virtue, but rather struck right at the heart of contemporary concerns about the way in which the country, its finances and its social hierarchy, was being managed – particularly with regard to the city-court relationship. Manley argues that the mayoral Shows 'established a circle of custom and neofeudal consensus around the interface between two potentially divergent systems of government and society. This was in keeping with the mutual interests of the two jurisdictions'.[69] So too, Leinwand refers to the 'ruler's ethic', an 'unwritten code that demanded service of the merchant elite in return for the preservation of London as a separate and self-respecting community.'[70] The Shows did not merely function as sociopolitical glue, however. They could reflect and even enhance tensions, as well as defusing them, and *Chrysanaleia* certainly does not smooth over the city-court relationship. Rather, Munday highlights disjunctures not only between what the king claims a king should do and what he actually does, but also between what is necessary for (and has in the past contributed to) the success of the common weal, and the current policy –which by the same standards looked set, in 1616, to have dire results. Tracey Hill is right to argue against Gail Paster's harmonious vision of civic pageantry, noting instead that the genre was 'a more complex, fractured entity' than is often assumed.[71] Fractures

---

[69] Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*, 219.

[70] Theodore B. Leinwand, 'London Triumphing: The Jacobean Lord Mayor's Show,' *Clio* 11, no. 2 (1982): 140.

[71] Gail Kern Paster, *The Idea of the City in the Age of Shakespeare* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1985); Hill, *Pageantry and Power*, 274.

and complexity did not just exist within the genre, however; its institutional and political significance, as well as the skill of its writers, made it uniquely well-placed to identify and highlight such fissures within the broader scope of Jacobean society.

Chapter 3. A 'labourer in the cause': 'free love' and the Work of the Virtuous Magistrate in Thomas Middleton's *Triumphs of Love and Antiquity*.

> that common favour (which is often cast upon the
> undeserver, through the distress and misery of judgement) ...[1]

The aspersions cast by Thomas Middleton on the popular works of his rival pageant-writer, Anthony Munday, were a particularly dangerous route to take in the Lord Mayors' Show of 1619. *The Triumphs of Love and Antiquity* was written to celebrate the mayoralty of Sir William Cockayne, who was by now infamous for his role in the disastrous Cockayne project. That at least some in the livery companies disliked the project and its initiator is demonstrated by the existence of the three Shows analysed earlier in this thesis: two of them lambasted his project and the third, *Chrysanaleia* (1616), criticised Cockayne himself and the award of his knighthood.

Cockayne was notoriously unpopular with at least some of the civic elite, not to mention London's populace. When the alderman's London house was destroyed by fire in 1623, John Chamberlain told Sir Dudley Carleton that he 'had seldom known a man less pitied, [...] and specially for that business of clothing (wherein all England hath and is like to suffer so much) which was his only plot and project, and procured him many a curse from poor people'.[2] The previous chapter analysed the immediate aftermath of the Project's failure, in which it was evident that Cockayne had gained personally at the expense of the national economy and countless livelihoods. While the direct scandal died down, Chamberlain's words show that not only were the Project's effects longer-lasting but that many still associated them with Cockayne, holding him responsible for a significant economic downturn.

If anyone could be accused of gaining favour while being undeserving, therefore, it was surely Cockayne, making such themes a rather hazardous way to

---

[1] Thomas Middleton, *The Triumphs of Love and Antiquity*, edited by David M. Bergeron, in *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, ed. Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007),1399, ll. 30-32. Subsequent references are to line numbers in this edition and will be integrated into the main text.

[2] Chamberlain to Carleton, November 15th, 1623, in John Chamberlain, *The Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. Norman Egbert McClure (Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society, 1939), vol. 2: 524.

begin a Show celebrating his mayoralty – a 'crucial step in his rehabilitation', as Lawrence Manley puts it.[3] However, this apparent riskiness, addressing such ideas head on, is precisely how Middleton uses this Show to refute the accusations Munday had made in his own Show in 1616. *Chrysanaleia* had linked popularity with merit, positing Cockayne's unpopularity as making his knighthood a dangerous exception in a tradition which usually functioned to reward virtue. In order to reframe Cockayne's award as a perversion of an otherwise virtuous system (rather than an example of a perverse system) Munday argued that where well-deserved, reward actually functioned to further political virtue by providing a spur to the same kind of virtue in the future. In *Love and Antiquity*, Middleton directly addresses this claim, refiguring the relationship between desert, reward and further virtue. Risky though it might seem to introduce the issue of reward and desert while celebrating Cockayne, reappropriating Munday's system enables him to refute his claims, separating Cockayne's unpopularity from his political virtue.

Therefore, the above-quoted statement on 'common favour' could be taken to refer to Munday's Shows, but also has relevance to the broader sweeps of political virtue and popularity which mayoral Shows addressed. Though Middleton would later have a significant writer-patron relationship with Cockayne, writing several of the *Honourable Entertainments* (1621) for him, *Love and Antiquity* is more than mere pro-Cockayne propaganda. Throughout, Middleton refigures the traditional encouragement to good governance as coming not only from worldly politics but also spiritual obligation. Munday's text had distinguished between just and unjust reward, condemning Cockayne's knighthood as unjust but praising well-chosen honours as an incentive to virtue in future generations. Middleton undermined this distinction by refiguring Munday's distinction as overly worldly and thus doomed to failure.

He did so by appropriating the concept, from Calvinist theology, of 'free love'. The phrase appears twice in this text alone, along with additional variants of both 'free' and 'love'; that this is clearly drawn from theology is shown by the fact that I have been able to find only four other non-theological uses of the exact phrase

---

[3] Lawrence Manley, 'Introduction' to Middleton, *The Triumphs of Love and Antiquity*, 1397.

in English print between 1580 and 1620.[4] In contrast, it appears hundreds of times in theological texts – and as will be shown below, the vast majority of these are of a Calvinist inclination. This is because this phrase was associated with a particularly Calvinist concept, underpinning the idea that God's election of the saved and damned cannot be affected by any worldly factor. In other words, however virtuously a human behaves, it can only be evidence of his election but cannot actually make it more or less likely. This might seem a rather incongruous phrase to use in a Lord Mayor's Show. Although the genre addressed morality and spiritual concepts (resurrection and crusading had both appeared in *Chrysanaleia*), the contested issues traditionally centred around more worldly political concepts like good governance and the maintenance of the common weal. However, Middleton pulls off an intriguing tactic by appropriating this phrase. He simultaneously applies it to human behaviour (mirroring the Calvinists themselves) and utilizes the hierarchy between human approbation and divine election with which it was also associated.

This gave rise to several strategies in *Love and Antiquity*. 'Free love' is applied here to human behaviour, to denote love (political, spiritual or personal) given without anticipation of reward. This gave Middleton an obvious strategy for opposing Munday's hierarchy, since he was able to figure the relationship of virtue and popularity as irrelevant to authentic political virtue – thus reasserting Cockayne's claim to the latter. Breaking the association between praise and virtue, however, placed Middleton in a tricky position regarding the Show as a genre. Despite Cockayne's previous unpopularity, the Show inescapably represented wide adulation, official if not honest praise, so if this did not prove Cockayne's virtue, Middleton needed to find another way to frame it.

This was another use for 'free love'; just as Cockayne had given his political service out of 'free love' for the community, the community's adulation in the form of the Show was similarly 'free'. Middleton frames both forms of praise as more authentic than those which Munday had linked to worldly action and reward, and

---

[4] George Chapman and Christopher Marlowe, *Hero and Leander: begun by Christopher Marlowe; and finished by George Chapman* (London: Felix Kingston for Paul Linley, 1598), sigs. M1r-v; George Chapman, *Sir Gyles Goose-Cappe* (London: John Windet for Edward Blunt, 1606), sig. F4v; John Marston, *The Wonder of Women, or the Tragedie of Sophonisba* (London: John Windet, 1606), sig. A2v; Gervase Markham, *The Famous Whore* (London: N[icholas]. O[kes]. for John Budge, 1609)*, sig. F4v.

finds a spiritual justification for this authenticity in the phrase's previous association with predestined salvation. Condemning 'those who mind their ends, but not their end', Middleton dismisses those who elevate political success, even the good of the commonwealth, above eternal salvation. This is the final nail in *Chrysanaleia*'s coffin, continually reminding Middleton's readers that no political virtue or popularity can compete with the ultimate form of 'free love'.

Of all three of Munday's anti-Cockayne Shows, *Chrysanaleia* was both the most recent and criticised him on the deepest level, as a threat not merely to the short-term economy but to the maintenance of political stability in the long term. By contrasting that Show's worldliness to his own Show's spirituality, Middleton refigures its accusations regarding Cockayne as similarly trifling. This demonstrable intertextual relationship between two Shows, three years apart, reminds us that the genre's capacity for political engagement went far beyond its own moment of performance. It was not just *Chrysanaleia* that Middleton criticised, however. The second half of *Love and Antiquity* attempted to denigrate not just *Chrysanaleia*'s content, but the hallmarks of Munday's pageant-writing style. Middleton uses self-conscious irrelevance and ponderous historical lists to mock Munday's use of superfluous details, his exhaustive historical research and his keenness to relate all aspects of his Show to the sponsoring Company.

This mocking was, however, in the service of the Show's political message, and did not, as some have assumed, denote a rivalry between the two writers. The two competed for commission at times, so a rivalry is not impossible, and Middleton's reference in *The Triumphs of Truth* to 'the impudent common writer' whose work produced 'freezing art, sitting in darkness, with the candle out, looking like the picture of Black Monday' is clearly to Munday's own work.[5] This seems more likely to have been a light-hearted dig, or at most commercial rivalry than the serious 'warning' that Sergei Lobanov-Rostovsky sees in the reference – not least because Middleton was unlikely to have felt so personally invested in the city's glorification that he felt the need to 'warn' them about the 'less theatrical' Munday.[6] David Bergeron is therefore more convincing when he warns us not to assume that

---

[5] Thomas Middleton, *The Triumphs of Truth*, ed. David M. Bergeron, in *The Works of Thomas Middleton,* 969, ll. 63, 67-68.

[6] Sergei Lobanov-Rostovsky, 'The Triumphes of Golde: Economic Authority in the London Lord Mayor's Show,' *ELH* 60, no. 4 (1993): 879.

cross-references between the two meant serious conflict, a tradition continued by Hill when she points out that they were collaborators on Shows as often as they were rivals.[7]

This implicit rebuke to Munday for being too worldly in only considering secular political ends raises the question, frequently discussed in criticism, of Middleton's Calvinism. Ironically, while Margot Heinemann's case for Middleton's 'puritan' religious sympathies is weakened by its reliance on the existence of a 'parliamentary puritan' group in the city – which simply did not exist in the clear form Heinemann imagines – her argument has spurred other scholars to consider Middleton's position from the more convincing basis of his works themselves.[8]

Michelle O'Callaghan makes the valuable point that *The Triumphs of Truth* (1613) displays a Calvinist work ethic, viewing labour (political or otherwise) as a constant spiritual battle rather than a discrete task with a visible reward.[9] However, her valid refutation of Heinemann's Calvinist-patron argument rests upon Middleton's having been employed by Cockayne, who was himself no prominent Calvinist.[10] This implies that we would only expect to find Calvinist sympathies in a work written for a figure who publicly espoused them. *Love and Antiquity* demonstrates, on the contrary, that at least in the Shows Middleton was able to draw on Calvinist philosophies for secular political purposes. He may well have been inspired to use this concept by his readings among the many Calvinist texts cited below. However, it is beyond the scope of this chapter to assess his personal position – not least because, as I made clear in the Introduction, the Shows' generic hybridity makes it difficult (and less interesting) to separate writers' personal views from their political mandate as pageant-writers.

Although Cockayne himself espoused no particular confessional affiliation (aside from firm conventionality in public), the concept of 'free love' was still useful

---

[7] David M. Bergeron, 'Thomas Middleton and Anthony Munday: Artistic Rivalry?,' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 36, no. 2 (1996): 461–79; Tracey Hill, *Pageantry and Power: A Cultural History of the Early Modern Lord Mayor's Show, 1585-1639* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), 5, 67.

[8] Margot Heinemann, *Puritanism and Theatre: Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama Under the Early Stuarts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 16.

[9] Michelle O'Callaghan, *Thomas Middleton: Renaissance Dramatist* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 96.

[10] *Ibid.*, 93.

in strengthening his political position. As the works analysed in this thesis prove, the Shows provided a particularly powerful framework for appropriating diverse concepts and intertexts. *Love and Antiquity* simultaneously shapes the concept of 'free love' to Middleton's own purposes and utilises a surprising number of its resonances for that political purpose. This allows Middleton to enter into a broader debate regarding the role of 'love' in politics, with which, as we will see, King James himself had engaged in his political works, especially the *Basilikon Doron*. Both engagements with this debate linked political 'love' with the work-reward relationship, which is where *Love and Antiquity* explicitly challenges *Chrysanaleia*, using the concept of 'free love' to disrupt the system which Munday had posited as helping to maintain present and future political stability. Over the course of the Show Middleton uses various explorations of 'free love', political effort and reward, in order to create a system directly inverting, and thus challenging, Munday's – and in the process also challenges what Munday had implied about Cockayne.

The exact phrase 'free love' appears twice in *Love and Antiquity*. Middleton first uses it to introduce the speech entertaining Cockayne on his journey by water as 'beholding to free love for language and expression'; its second instance is in his introduction of the city's Trained Bands, whose Lord-General Cockayne would also become on that day, as saluting him in a way 'answerable to the nobleness of their free love and service' (ll. 37-38, 101). Both times it refers to love *for* Cockayne, not by him, but as the other uses of 'love' and 'free' in the Show make clear, Middleton intends its meaning to be broader. Orpheus uses the word 'free' twice in his speech exhorting Cockayne to govern well (including a reference to 'man's free applause'), while Love's valedictory speech at the end of the Show uses 'free' three times, referring to 'free gift' and 'a love so bountiful, so free, so good' (ll. 131, 143; 413, 425-426). Aside from titles and references to character, the word 'love' appears 22 times in the Show, often in close proximity to 'free' and its variants – so we can say at least that their dominance in general would be apparent to a reader. Two appearances might seem rather few for a phrase to be as significant within a work as I have claimed. However, a look at the use of 'free love' in other non-theological texts of the period demonstrates just how rarely it appeared beyond Calvinist thought – and thus how readily even two appearances in a text would colour it with the associations I will outline below.

The phrase appears in only four other texts of the period (once each time) and in all of those, as well as *Love and Antiquity*, it has connotations of love which is unaffected by external factors. Continuing Christopher Marlowe's translation of *Hero and Leander* (1598), George Chapman uses the phrase in relation to the myth of the parrot's creation – in which the figure of *Adolescens*, robbed of the opportunity to gossip, falls down in distress and is struck by lightning, which 'for meere free love/ Turnd her into 'the pied-plum'd *Psittacus*/ That now the Parat is surnamed by vs'.[11] The two possible meanings of this 'free love' – unlimited power exercised by lightning, or excessive freedom on Adolescens' part – both separate authentic feeling from that delimited by external concerns. In Chapman's play *Sir Gyles Goose-cappe* (1606)*,* Lord Momford reassures his niece Eugenia that 'Only the lawes of faith, and thy free loue/ Shall ioyne my friend [Clarence] and thee': truly romantic 'free love' is by definition free from constraints. [12] This is its meaning also in the Argument of John Marston's *Wonder of Women* (1606) which promises that the play will demonstrate 'The folly to inforce free love', which indeed it does, contrasting true with enforced love.[13] In Gervase Markham's *The Famous Whore, or Noble Curtesan* (1609) the (narrating) courtesan Paulina contrasts 'free love' to love within the legal structures of marriage, castigating Pope Paul IV who in banning courtesans from the city 'seeketh to withdraw/ Men from free love.'[14] All these uses of 'free love', using the phrase do denote a love free from worldly concerns, give a more human application to its more spiritual usage within Calvinist discourse.

'Free love' and its theological uses

Though later most associated with Calvinism, 'free love' was used as early in Protestant thought as Martin Luther himself. While it developed in significant ways between Luther's first use and Middleton's application of the concept in 1619, Luther's usage nevertheless provides an important basis for our understanding of the

---

[11] Chapman, *Hero and Leander*, sigs. M1r-v.

[12] Chapman, *Sir Gyles Goose-Cappe*, sig. F4v.

[13] Marston, *The Wonder of Women*, sig. A2v.

[14] Markham, *The Famous Whore,* sig. F4v.

phrase's resonance throughout the period. Luther's original use for 'free love' was in explaining his theory of justification *sola fide* [by faith alone], denoting the difference between good works done for salvation and those arising from true Christian virtue. He explained in the *Treatise, Touching the libertie of a Christian* (here in James Bell's 1579 translation) that individuals must 'of a free love yeelde humbly obedience'. Ironically, faith which is motivated by desire for salvation cannot produce salvation.[15] He defines 'free love' as being 'to do good thinges and abstaine from wicked things, not through compulsion or necessitie of the Lawe, but by free love and with pleasure, even as if no law commaunded them'.[16] For Luther, virtuous acts must thus be done without concern for their consequences. This is an early but important distinction between motivation and action in spiritual life.

Calvin and his followers took up this distinction and applied it to divine action, using it to conceive of a power which could affect the world but was entirely removed from it. The 1561 English translation of Calvin's *Institute of Christian Religion* notes that the Israelites 'excell onely by the free love of God', meaning that 'he was pleased in you to choose you, not because you passed other nations in number, but because he loved you'.[17] The same work states that '[the faithful] do impute to free love all the gyftes wherewith they were garnished of God [...] because they knewe that they themselves had obteined them by no deservynges'.[18] A sign of divine grace for Calvin is the spiritual maturity to know that this grace comes not from one's worldly merits but from unfathomable divine grace: 'when the scripture speaketh of Gods love: it meaneth that free favor which he beareth towards us, so as he respecteth not our persons nor services, nor aught else that wee can bring'.[19] This view of 'free love' is key to Calvin's ideas of salvation and, by extension, of human

---

[15] Martin Luther, *A treatise, touching the libertie of a Christian. Written in Latin by Doctor Martine Luther. And translated into English by Iames Bell* (London: Ralph Newbery & H. Bynneman, 1579), sig. C5r.

[16] Martin Luther, *Speciall and Chosen Sermons of Dr. Martin Luther. Englished by W.G.* (London: Thomas Vautroullier, 1578), sig. T8r; sigs. R2v-R3r.

[17] Jean Calvin, *The Institution of Christian Religion, wrytten in Latine by maister Iohn Calvin, and translated into English* (London: Reinolde Wolfe and Richarde Harrison, 1561), sig. Hh8v.

[18] *Ibid.*, sig. Hh8v.

[19] Jean Calvin, *The sermons of M. Iohn Caluin vpon the fifth booke of Moses called Deuteronomie[...] Translated out of French by Arthur Golding*, (London: Henry Middleton for George Bishop, 1583), sig. O5v.

free will. Calvin urges his readers/listeners to 'not make long circuits to find some reason in ourselves: but let us holde us contented with the free love of our God, for hee is not bound to any man'.[20] This subordinates human action to divine power in an extremely direct sense, limiting the potential of 'free will' strictly to earthly action, as human actions operate on a different plane from that which determines salvation.

Like Calvin himself, English Calvinist writers throughout this period also used the phrase 'free love' to denote the separation of God's election from human merit. Richard Crakanthorpe preached what 'what moved or induced God to graunt [Solomon's] people so wise a King; no merrits nor deserts, eyther of King or people, but onely his owne favour and free love to Israell', and that this came from 'no desert of theirs, either King or people, but his owne favour and free love unto them'.[21] Thomas Cooper described 'the free love of God' (towards Noah) as 'confirming an infinite reward, farre beyond all proportion, of an imperfect and finite obedience'.[22] 'Free love' can *by definition* not be in proportion to its object's virtues, but is controlled only by the will of its subject, argued Andrew Willet, writing that '[divine grace] proceedeth from the free love, grace, and favour of God [...] away with all merits either of congruitie as preparations unto grace, or of condignitie unto salvation'.[23]

Nicholas Byfield agreed that God's love 'is a free love, hee stands not upon desert'.[24] This theorisation of 'free love' was not limited to highbrow theology but became part of popular writers' instructions on practical piety. William Perkins, whose works were published in six languages and could 'rival the claims to "popularity" ' of any writer during the period', described 'the most free love of God'

---

[20] Calvin, *Sermons vpon[...]Deuteronomie*, sig. O5v.

[21] Richard Crakanthorpe, *A sermon at the solemnizing of the happie inauguration of our most gracious and religious soueraigne King Iames[...]Preached at Paules Crosse the 24th of March last 1608 [N.B: 1609]* (London: W. Jaggard for Tho. Adams, 1609) , sigs. B1v, G3v.

[22] Thomas Cooper, *The Blessing of Iapheth, proving the gathering of the Gentiles, and finall conversion of the Iewes. Expressed in divers profitable sermons* (London: T. C. for Richard Redmer, 1615), sig. B1v.

[23] Andrew Willet, *Hexapla: that is, A six-fold commentarie vpon the most diuine Epistle of the holy apostle S. Paul to the Romanes* (Cambridge: Cantrell Legge, 1611), sig. Xx1r.

[24] Nicholas Byfield, *The Promises: or, a Treatise showing How a Godly Christian may support his heart with comfort* (London: G. P. for Ralph Rounthwaite, 1619), sig. C5r.

as something that 'nothing in us moved him to send, but his owne goodnes'.[25] Lewis Bayly's extremely popular *Practise of Pietie*, which had reached its fifth edition by 1619, taught that 'thou [God] hast of thy free love according to thine *eternall* purpose, elected me, before the foundation of the world was laid'.[26] The Calvinist use of 'free love' to separate divine mercy from human merit was, we see here, both long-standing and widespread, and the connection could not have been unknown to Middleton or his sponsors.

Tracing *who* writes about 'free love' can be as valuable as analysing *what* they write about it. If a phrase is associated with a particular group of people or a position on the spectrum of English Protestant thought, it helps us to draw out the potential connotations of the phrase for the audience and readers who heard it used in *The Triumphs of Love and Antiquity*. Whatever the subtle differences in doctrine between them, we can locate all six writers – Crakanthorpe, Cooper, Willet, Byfield, Perkins and Bayly – on the more Calvinist end of the establishment spectrum. Bayly was famously Calvinist-leaning and even disputed with the King on the subject of the Sabbath, but remained conformist enough to become bishop of Bangor; William Perkins remained within the established church while again taking issue with finer points of doctrine.[27] Nicholas Byfield is now seen as a nonconformist at heart but conformed for the sake of ecclesiastical unity, and like him William Burton, who had defined 'free love' in *Certaine Questions*, defended the destruction of stained glass while preaching in Bristol but generally remained within conformist doctrine. Richard Crakanthorpe, Andrew Willet and Thomas Cooper were also all Calvinist-leaning but within the establishment.

Others who used 'free love' included Robert Humpston, Francis Bunny, John Hayward, Samuel Hieron and Thomas Taylor, all of whom were what we might call 'establishment Calvinists'. That is, they leaned towards the strict-Calvinist end of the high-low Anglican spectrum, but (for the most part) attempted to conform to the

---

[25] Leif Dixon, *Practical Predestinarians in England, C. 1590-1640* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), 8.; William Perkins, *A Commentarie, or exposition, upon the five first chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians* (Cambridge: John Legat, 1604),sig. Nn1r.

[26] Lewis Bayly, *The Practise* [sic] *of Pietie* (London: John Hodgets, 1613), sig. P8r.

[27] J. Gwynfor Jones, Vivienne Larminie, 'Bayly, Lewis (*c*.1575–1631)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/1766, accessed 12 July 2012].

Established Church's strictures in order to preserve unity within the Church.[28] Taylor was reprimanded by Archbishop Laud in 1627 for campaigning to raise funds for Calvinist preachers in the Palatinate, but opposed separatism; Samuel Hieron, too, was arrested five times for nonconformity but publicly and frequently reaffirmed his loyalty to the established Church.[29] Humpston was relocated to Ireland as it was thought his Calvinist leanings would better suit the atmosphere of the established Church there; Bunny was one of the preachers tasked with bringing Calvinism to the north of England (as prebend at Durham Cathedral).[30] The above represents an overwhelming predominance of Calvinist texts in using 'free love', compared to the paltry few examples of its use in non-theological texts shown below. Even if Middleton had not been familiar with the complexities of the phrase 'free love' which I have outlined above, therefore, the works in which he had come across it are extremely likely to have been within this 'Establishment Calvinist' group. For at

---

[28] Edward Dering, *A Sparing Restraint, of many lavishe untruths* (London: Henry Denham for Humfrey Toy, 1568), sig. Dd4r; Robert Humpston, *A Sermon Preached at Reysham in the Countie of Norffolk* (London: John Wolfe for Edward Aggas, 1589), sig. A7v; Francis Bunny, *A Comparison between the auncient fayth of the Romans, and the new Romish Religion* (London: Robert Robinson for Raph Jackson, 1595), sig. D3r; John Norden, *A Progresse of Pietie* (London: I. Windet for I. Oxenbridge, 1596), sig. B5v; John Hayward, *The Sancutuarie of a troubled soul* (London: I. W., 1601), sig. E10r; Hayward, *The Strong Helper* (London: John Beale for William Welby, 1614), sig. Cc7r, Nn8r; Samuel Hieron, *The Abridgement of the gospell: or, The order and course of mans salvation* (London: M. Bradwood for Samuel Macham, 1609), sig. C2v; Thomas Taylor, *The Beawties of Beth-el: Containing: sundry reasons why euery Christian ought to account one day in the courtes of God, better then a thousand besides. Preached in Cambridge* (London: G. Eld for Thomas Man, 1609); Nicholas Byfield, *An Exposition upon the Epistle to the Colossians* (London: T. S for Nathaniel Butter, 1615), sig. A3r; Thomas Granger, *The Light of the World. A Sermon Preached...neere Boston in Lincolnshire* (London: T. S. for Thomas Pauier, 1616), sig. D1v; John Hart, *The Burning Bush not Consumed* (London: T.C. and B. A. for Roger Iackson, 1616), sig. F4r; Nicholas Byfield, *Sermons upon the First Chapter of the First Epistle Generall of Peter* (London: Edward Griffin for Nathaniel Butter, 1617), sig. L8r. This is not an exhaustive list, but a large number of works are included in order to give some idea of just how many Calvinist-leaning writers use the phrase.

[29] J. Sears McGee, 'Taylor, Thomas (1576–1632)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/27083, accessed 12 July 2012]; Vivienne Larminie, 'Hieron, Samuel (*bap.* 1572, *d.* 1617)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/13221, accessed 12 July 2012].

[30] Mihail Dafydd Evans, 'Humston [Humpston], Robert (*d.* 1606)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/14168, accessed 12 July 2012]; William Joseph Sheils, 'Bunny, Francis (1543–1617)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/3944, accessed 12 July 2012].

least some well-informed readers of the Show, then, any use of the phrase was sure to carry overtones of establishment Calvinist thought.

The Show's exploration of human virtue and 'love' in politics was not incompatible with such theological overtones. Calvin's theorization of human love for God was affected by how he had conceptualised God's love for humans. He wrote that 'if our serving of [God] bee by constraint […] though wee honor him never so much, and doe all that is possible to glorify his name: yet if the same proceede not of love [….] he utterly disaloweth it, and such service is not acceptable to him'.[31] Merely displaying or professing love for God is not sufficient, since only when such professions or displays come from love that is *within* can they ever constitute 'true' love. The 71st Sermon on Deuteronomy links the authenticity of human 'free love' to the 'free love' that comes from divine grace; Calvin warns that 'As many as woorship God vppon no further grounde, but for that they are sure they cannot scape his ha[n]d, & because they know him to be their maker […] being not touched with any free love, will shunne God'.[32] The application of 'free love' to human action in works by English Calvinist writers demonstrated a similar connection between human 'free love' and the divine 'free love' conceptualised by Calvin himself. William Perkins, for example, drew parallels between God's 'free love' and ours, arguing that 'as Christ loved us freely, not mooved by any amiable thing in us, nor for any profit that should redownd unto himselfe thereby; so we should freely love one another'.[33] In a sermon Richard Greenham described the elect as having been blessed with 'a godly nature, so that they freely love God the father'.[34] It is God's own 'free love' in choosing to bless the elect that has, in turn, enabled them to show 'free love'.

'Free love' and political fatherhood

---

[31] Calvin, *Sermons on Deuteronomy* (46th sermon), sig. Z6r.

[32] Calvin, *Sermons on Deuteronomy* (71st sermon), sig. Oo2r.

[33] Perkins, *A Commentarie….[on] the Epistle to the Galatians*, sig. Eeee2v.

[34] Richard Greenham, *Two Learned and Godly Sermons* (London: Gabriel Simson & William White, for William Jones, 1595), sig. E7v.

Calvinist theorisations of 'free love' in human behaviour have particular political resonance in two metaphors of fatherhood, used by Thomas Cooper and Nicholas Byfield to explore how 'free love' affects obedience and power relations. Cooper wrote that 'God freely loves [Man] not as an hireling for his wages, but as a sonne in obedience'.[35] Opposing a 'sonne in obedience' to a 'hireling for his wages' figures the 'free love' of a father for his son as the inverse of any love based on obligation or reward. While this does not erase the son's duty to obey the father, the father loves his son because of an indefinable compulsion whose authenticity is founded on its dissociation from any reward the father might receive from the son's obedience. Byfield also argued that 'A fatherly love is a *free love,* there needs no argument to a father, but that, this is my childe, so it is with God'.[36]

Here a father needs no compulsion to love his child but the fact that he or she *is* his child. In both texts, a child is obliged to obey his/her father, and a father loves his child, but that love is not dependent upon the child's obedience. Though neither Byfield nor Cooper apply this to political power, the link between fatherhood and magistracy was well-founded by the early seventeenth century. As Constance Jordan has noted, no other analogy 'received greater scope or play than that between the governments of the household and the state'.[37] One of the best-known uses – the subject of Jordan's article, to which I will return below – was in the political works of King James VI and I, of which Middleton cannot have been unaware. Moreover, the analogy had played a significant part in Munday's *Chrysanaleia*, to which I have already established *Love and Antiquity* was a response.

Fatherhood and politics was thus surely a well-known connection for Middleton, and the way in which he theorises political duty on both sides – the ruler and ruled – mirrors the view of fatherhood taken by Cooper and Byfield. In *The Triumphs of Love and Antiquity* the two explicit uses of 'free love' imply that the popular acclaim Cockayne is receiving via his mayoral inauguration comes not from

---

[35] Thomas Cooper, *The Christians Daily Sacrifice* (London: N[icholas]. O[kes]. for Walter Burre, 1615), sig. C8r. Incidentally, Okes printed all of Middleton's Lord Mayors' Shows, including *Love and Antiquity*, while Burre had published his *A Mad World, My Masters* (1608); both form another link between Middleton and the texts of popular Calvinism.

[36] Nicholas Byfield, *Sermons vpon the first chapter of the first epistle generall of Peter: Wherein method, sense, doctrine and vse is with great varietie of matter profitably handled.* (London: Edward Griffin for Nathaniel Butter, 1617), sig. C5v.

[37] Constance Jordan, 'The Household and the State: Transformations in the Representation of an Analogy from Aristotle to James I,' *Modern Language Quarterly* 54, no. 3 (1993): 307.

the material gains expected from his magistracy but rather an intrinsic sense of political duty. In the 'entertainment upon the water', the 'expectation' is 'big with the joy of the day, but beholding to free love for language and expression' (ll. 36-38). Although the occasion has magnified the population's admiration here, its expression through the Show and indeed its existence stems not from Cockayne's achievements but from his position – just as 'there needs no argument to a father, but that, this is my childe'. So too, the city's trained bands salute Cockayne in a form 'answerable to the nobleness of their free love and service' (ll. 100-101): their service is the more authentic for being given freely.

This may seem somewhat at odds with one of the hallmarks of a Middleton Show, which was to emphasise the gravity of the new mayor's task and explicitly refuse to honour him more than he deserved. Middleton first staged this using the continual battle with Error in *The Triumphs of Truth* (1613) – in which Error is not defeated by one act of virtue but must be kept at bay by continuous spiritual labour – and continued in *The Triumphs of Honour and Industry* (1617) in which Justice refuses the new Lord Mayor entry to 'Fame's bright castle', stating that 'there must be merit, or our work's not right' (ll. 193, 214; p. 1260). Indeed, in *Love and Antiquity* itself Orpheus contrasts true example to 'flattering glasses', Antiquity exhorts Cockayne to 'match that honour' of the Show's historical exempla and Love's final speech emphasises the importance of 'care' in the Lord Mayor's role. However, in this Show as least, Middleton figures political merit as able only to be judged by a higher power than either magistrate or citizens. Rather than doing good in the expectation of reward, Cockayne must do good for its own sake; likewise, those who honour and obey him must do so because it is their duty. He is entitled to expect their obedience, and they are entitled to require his political virtue – indeed, their expectation is later figured as a spur to virtue – but in neither case should the anticipation of reward be the impetus behind action.

Middleton uses 'free love' to establish the authenticity of the populace's love for Cockayne, but a much larger part of *Love and Antiquity* is taken up with Cockayne's duty to the populace – which should likewise be motivated by 'free love' and a sense of authentic duty, not by the anticipation of fame or reward. Orpheus states that:

> he that deals in such a weight of truth

> As th'execution of a magistrate's place
> [...] Both from his own worth and man's free applause
> Yet may be called a labourer in the cause [...]
>
> (ll. 140-144)

It is responsibility – the 'weight of truth' that Cockayne's position carries – that should motivate him to work hard as Lord Mayor, not the anticipation of fame. The speech separates 'his own worth' and 'man's free applause' even as it invokes them both. That they work simultaneously, rather than being part of the same system, speaks volumes about how Middleton conceives of political virtue in this show. Cockayne's 'own worth' can support his status as 'a labourer in the cause', as can 'man's free applause' – but just as the worth should not be linked to anticipation of applause (or material reward for it), so too the people's 'free applause' should be just that: free from any external motivation, such as anticipation of any material benefits that Cockayne's 'worth' can give them.

Orpheus in the wilderness of government

In the same speech, Orpheus warns of the 'rude and thorny ways [...] the vices in a city sprung' against which Cockayne must beware, including 'oppression, coz'nage, bribes, false hires' (ll. 149-151). These are not external dangers to the Lord Mayor's welfare so much as ways in which he may be endanger himself, notably by governing according to external reward rather than his internal sense of virtue. Although the commonwealth is made up of 'the rude multitude the beasts o'the'wood', these beasts can be tamed by 'fair example, musical grace, harmonious government of the man in place' (ll. 159-160). Good governance begets political stability, but not through the promise of reward – rather, for both governor and governed, political stability is its own reward.

Classical mythology, and early modern interpretations thereof, gave to the character of Orpheus associations which were simultaneously conventional and dangerous. Orpheus was portrayed as '[c]reator, lover, philosopher, musician, magician, historian, civilizer, prophet and priest', and as Bruno DiGangi notes, such 'radically divergent' interpretations meant that using the character in a work could

have very different effects.[38] At the more dangerous end of the Apollonian-Dionysiac spectrum, Orpheus was associated with homoerotic desire. Arthur Golding's translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* – a text with which Middleton was doubtless familiar, and a principal source on the myth for him and his readers – describes Orpheus as having 'utterly eschew[ed]/ The woman-kynd' and 'taught the *Thracian* folke a stewes of Males too make'.[39] While the Show's significance in civic politics means that Middleton is unlikely to have intended much in the way of homoerotic associations, that this was an easy association to make meant that any mention of the character, however conventional carried intriguing undertones to those who were well-read. In 1617 John Fletcher had used Orpheus to signify emasculating passion: the masque of *The Mad Lover* features an underworld filled with men who, having died for love, were turned into animals and plants which signified those who had been tamed by Orpheus' music.[40] Those reading *Love and Antiquity*'s description of a 'wilderness' could thus have brought more than political associations to the text.

Orpheus' reputation as a tamer of the wilderness was thus always tempered by an awareness of the wilderness's constant power. Even when Ovid describes the civilising force of his music, no sooner has he mentioned that 'the Thracian poet with this song delightes the minds/ Of Sauage beastes, and drawes both stones and trees [to him]' than the 'wiues of Ciconie [have] espide him' and, having identified him as 'hee that doth disdaine/ Vs women', soon 'franticke Outrage reygnd'.[41] Nevertheless, Middleton's main model for this Show's Orpheus was probably his more conventional early modern guise, as 'lover-artist and as civiliser'.[42] George

---

[38] A. Leigh DeNeef, 'The Poetics of Orpheus: The Text and a Study of *Orpheus His Journey to Hell* (1595),' *Studies in Philology* 89, no. 1(1992), 20; Mario DiGangi, *The Homoerotics of Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 45.

[39] Ovid, *The Fifteene Bookes of P. Ouidius Naso, Entituled, Metamorphosis*, trans. Arthur Golding (London: Thomas Purfoot, 1612) sig. R2v. I have used the 1612 edition since it is closest in date to *Love and Antiquity*, but it is useful to note that Golding's translation had been in print since 1567.

[40] DiGangi, *The Homoerotics of Early Modern Drama*, 154. *The Mad Lover* was not published until 1647, in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio, but is recorded as having been performed at court on 5th January 1617 (new style).

[41] Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, trans. Golding, sigs S4v-S5r.

[42] Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, 'The Triumph and Death of Orpheus in the English Renaissance,' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 9, no. 1 (1969): 65.

Puttenham stated that 'by [Orpheus'] discreete and wholsome lessons vttered in harmonie and with melodious instruments, he brought the rude and sauage people to a more ciuill and orderly life', while for William Webbe Orpheus 'by the sweete gyft of his heavenly Poetry withdrew men from raungyng uncertainly, and wandring brutishly about, and made them gather together and keepe company'.[43]

This civilising influence was often linked to Orpheus' legendary poetic and musical skill, but even the literary-minded Webbe and Puttenham also view the process of taming the wilderness as one of governing people and societies. Middleton continues this by having Orpheus character in the Show warn Cockayne of the wilderness awaiting him in government, but also makes the character appropriate to the Show's theological theme, contradicting Louis's statement that 'classical myths were attacked by the Puritans'.[44] Cockayne's Orphic task of taming the wilderness is presented as requiring not a single civilising incident but rather continual labour in government. O'Callaghan identifies a similar espousal of laboured magistracy in *The Triumphs of Truth*, in which 'the godly citizen is imagined as one of God's soldiers fighting in the battle against the forces of Error'.[45] Replacing this morality-play aesthetic with Orpheus' warnings, Middleton emphasises not the rewards of taming the wilderness but the difficulty, stressing that Cockayne's power to do so is an obligation which he must labour continually to fulfil.

Middleton thus combines the image of Orpheus, a lone civilising force in the wilderness, with the Calvinist concept of labouring in one's vocation. As Paul Seaver notes, for the Calvinist or Puritan (used loosely here) mindset, 'The point of a calling was not to gain riches, but to be profitable and useful to oneself, one's family, church, and commonwealth. Wealth [...] came not as a reward but as an obligation'.[46] Arthur Dent stated that only when 'all men with care and conscience performe the dueties of their places' could 'the honor of God' and 'the very

---

[43] George Puttenham, *The Arte of English Poesie* (London: Richard Field, 1589), sig. C2v; William Webbe, *A Discourse of English Poetrie* (London: John Charlewood for Robert Walley, 1586), sig. B3v.

[44] Gros Louis, 'The Triumph and Death of Orpheus,' 63.

[45] O'Callaghan, *Thomas Middleton: Renaissance Dramatist*, 96.

[46] Paul S. Seaver, 'The Puritan Work Ethic Revisited,' *Journal of British Studies* 19, no. 2 (1980): 43.

preservation of all things' be certain; similarly William Perkins argued that 'to them which imploy their gifts more is giuen, and from them which imploy them not, is taken that which they haue: and labour in a calling is as pretious as golde or siluer'.[47] Virtue consisted in neither wealth nor poverty *per se* but rather in consistent labour.

Middleton applies this value to the civilising character of Orpheus by portraying the wilderness as something to be continually tamed, rather than one which – as with the woodland creatures of Ovid's myth – required taming only once. As Orpheus himself says, 'Every wise magistrate' may 'be called a powerful Orpheus' (ll. 163-164) – that is, each individual magistrate must govern well in order to save society from the inevitable wilderness. Example's speech follows on from this by warning of the ' cares of government/ Which every painful magistrate must meet' (ll. 211-212). Not only is Cockayne's labour continual, but his power to civilise the commonwealth will result in cares and pain, rather than rewards. This may seem to be a more worldly concern than the obviously devilish Error in *Truth* but Middleton's application of spiritual labour to political obligation is more than mere borrowing of rhetoric. Rather than rendering a theological concept secular, he imbues the political with a spiritual force, reminding Cockayne of the divine ordination behind his and all callings. It is this, not the possibility of external reward, that must motivate true political virtue.

Aside from divine disapproval, Middleton is also careful to outline the risks that reward-motivated virtue brings to the commonwealth. The speech on the water cautions against a principal risk of linking political effort with worldly gain: 'they that think their care is at great cost' will 'make their year but a poor day in all' (ll. 56, 58). Here Middleton refigures the political pragmatism that Munday had praised – well-placed reward as an incentive to virtue – as a sure route to corruption. Those who govern well in anticipation of reward will be encouraged to shape their efforts according to what brings the greatest return – not what is best for the commonwealth. This is a direct inversion of Munday's view of the reward-virtue relationship in *Chrysanaleia*. The 1616 Show had dramatised the way in which rewarding virtue could engender further virtue, outlining the various means by which just reward could ensure political stability in the long and short term. For example,

---

[47] Arthur Dent, *The Plaine Mans Path-way to Heaven* (London: for Edward Bishop, 1607), sigs. N1r-v; William Perkins, *A Treatise of Callings* (London: John Legat, 1603), sig. A6r.

Munday argues that the knighthood conferred on William Walworth for his actions in saving the King from the rebel Wat Tyler in 1381 showed future generations that political virtue would be rewarded – thus providing an incentive for future virtue.

Contesting King James's politics of reward

One of the most significant sources for *Chrysanaleia* was the political work of King James VI and I. Munday deliberately recalled the link between just reward and good governance which James himself had theorized in his works, in order to contrast the king's own ideal with his current policy of rewarding the *un*deserving (that is, Cockayne). Munday had recalled James's work directly by emphasising the parallels between the husband and father of the household and the governor of the commonwealth, which was a hallmark of the king's own political self-presentation. Reading *Chrysanaleia*'s connection of the neglectful father-pelican to the potentially neglectful magistrate, it would have been difficult not to think of works like *Basilikon Doron*, which described the monarch as 'loving nourish-father' to his subjects. Although Middleton does not link to this text explicitly, his inversion of Munday's reward-virtue cycle leads him into negotiations with James's political philosophy. While Munday had effectively reiterated James's own view of the monarch's duty to encourage virtue by rewarding those who deserved it – in order to contrast James's theory with his action – Middleton's view of this relationship is the opposite, as we have seen.

In the *Basilikon Doron* (1598) James asks the implied reader, his son, 'how can they love you, that hated them whom-of ye are come? [... It is] a thing monstrous, to see a man love the childe, and hate the Parents'.[48] Later he reasons that 'if the haters of your parents cannot loue you, as I shewed before, it followeth of necessitie that their lovers must loue you' (35). For James, the love of one person for another is intimately connected to whether the former also loved the latter's parents. The quality of love between two people depends as much on external factors, and the behaviour of both participants beyond their relationship to one another, as it does on each one's 'internal' love. As a father, James advises his son to 'loue [your children]

---

[48] King James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* (1598) in Johann P. Sommerville, ed. *King James VI and I: Political Writings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 23. Further references are to this edition and integrated into the text.

as ye ought [according to social obligation] but let them know as much of it, as the gentlenesse of their nature will deserve' (42).

This view of how love functions among individuals, within families and social networks, was carried over into how the *Basilikon* theorized its political function. Having spent much of his youth dealing with the factious Scottish nobility, James places great emphasis in the *Basilikon* and other works on retaining loyalty among the nobles. The best way to do this, he argues, is to 'vse your selfe louinglie to the obedient, and rigorously to the stubborne'. Rewarding obedience and punishing stubbornness will reduce the latter vice and encourage the former virtue, and just so, to encourage honesty in advisors one must 'Loue them best, that are plainnest with you' (38). James is not merely arguing political love *is* affected by external factors but that it *must be*. Well-used political love, distributed by merit, has such power to engender stability that the monarch and magistrate must use it wisely. Rather than encouraging corruption, as in Middleton's view, James's merit-based love will expel it – so long as corruption is punished and virtue rewarded.

The distinction between these two views is not merely one of love based on or separated from merit, however, but is more complex, in two senses. The first is that the two base their assessment of love's effectiveness on different assumptions. While James assumes that merit-based love will engender further merit because it will reward the deserving, Middleton views the process from the other end, worried that the prospect of reward will encourage the greedy to display superficial virtue in order to gain the reward without putting in the effort. In other words, for Middleton the prospect of reward is not enough to prompt authentic, laboured virtue – only an internal love 'free' of external concerns can engender such a thing. Munday had reaffirmed James's reward-virtue in order to show its potential benefit as well as its present corruption. For Middleton, however, that corruption is an inevitable part of allowing worldly reward to enter the equation at all, encouraging men to 'mind their ends, but not their end' (l. 126).

The second complex distinction between Middleton's and James's view of political virtue is that while both admit the existence of the virtuous political mind, beholden only to God, Middleton applies this to all magistrates (and indeed people) while for James there is a vital distinction between the divinely-appointed monarch and the populace – who require a more worldly form of persuasion. The two modes of thought are not mere opposites, therefore, but rather contest the difference in

nature between monarch and subjects. For James, the governmental benefits of encouraging virtuous magistracy with material reward made it compatible with divine kingship. As John Cramsie notes, the king's principal attraction to Xenophon's *Cyropedia* (the principal source for the *Basilikon*) was that it 'examined the crucial components of stable political relationships that concerned James: the ruler's sense of law and justice [...] cultivating loyalty and obedience'.[49] Accordingly, the *Basilikon Doron* advises: 'let the measure of your loue to euery one, be according to the measure of his vertue; letting your fauour to be no longer tyed to any, then the continuance of his vertuous disposition shall deserue' (60). The king is continually obligated to care for his subjects, but this involves rationing his favour in order to maximise their virtue and the kingdom's wellbeing.

This view is predicated on a fundamental distinction between the subjects' nature and the king's (at least in the case of a good king). James assumes that the promise of favour and thus reward will work as an incentive to virtue in the subject, but insists that the monarch himself should act out of an inward love of his subject and sense of duty toward God, rather than the prospect of any worldly reward. This may, as Cramsie notes, have stoked a 'tension inherent between ideology and practice', but it was fundamental to how James viewed the role of a monarch.[50] The *Basilikon Doron* begins by warning that 'devise and labour as [the king] list', knowledge of worldly politics is insufficient, as 'the blessing of God hath onely power to give the successe thereunto' (12). James distinguishes the king's relationship to God from that of his subjects: 'as in dignitie hee hath erected you aboue others, so [...] a veniall sinne (as the Papists call it) in another, is a great crime into you' (12). In his view, 'a King is not *mere laicus*, as both the Papists and Anabaptists would have him' (52). As Debora Shuger notes, 'James was, in his own eyes, king of souls [...] accountable to God for his subjects' salvation'.[51] What James thought kings should do is less important, for this discussion, than *why* they did it, but nevertheless the sacrality of the king's duties surely carried with it a sacrality of

---

[49] John Cramsie, 'The Philosophy of Imperial Kingship and the Interpretation of James VI and I,' in *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority and Government*, edited by Ralph Anthony Houlbrooke (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 50.

[50] *Ibid*., 59.

[51] Debora K. Shuger, *Political Theologies in Shakespeare's England: The Sacred and the State in Measure for Measure* (London: Palgrave, 2001), 110.

purpose. While the king could – indeed should – motivate his subjects to virtue by offering favour and rewards, his own motivation could come only from God.

This distinction is precisely what Middleton denies in *The Triumphs of Love and Antiquity*, in which the divine motivation (if not the responsibility for souls) is applied to all, not just the monarch. All of the human applications of Calvinist 'free love' which I identify above relate human love to divine love, implying that all humans – subject, of course, to divine election – have access to a higher motivation for love than worldly, external factors. Just as William Perkins had used the example of Christ loving humanity 'freely' to show how humans should love one another in the same way, so Middleton applies this to politics, arguing that true political virtue is motivated only by God – who alone can provide the reward. The Show continually reminds Cockayne of the godliness of true political virtue. When the river speech promises that 'thy good works wed thee to eternity', this is not a sudden conversion to the Roman Catholic doctrine of salvation by works but rather clarifies the true purpose of political virtue, even beyond 'men's loves' (ll. 52, 50).

This was not part of the contest between 'Puritan' and high-Anglican political theologies that Shuger has identified.[52] James himself had shown at least sympathy to Calvinist predestinarian beliefs in his ecclesiastical policy, particularly in responding to the Synod of Dort in 1618-19.[53] However, as Louis Knafla has shown, though 'James spoke and wrote as a man of God, and as a theologian', he 'espoused good magistrates'; it was essential to his conception of divinely-sanctioned governance that he 'acknowledged the local municipal laws and saved to himself those laws he saw as God's gift to his person'.[54] For this 'most theologically sophisticated of English monarchs', as Peter Lake has characterised James, it was vital that the link between political power and responsibility was exclusive to divinely-appointed kings.[55]

---

[52] *Ibid.*, 39–61.

[53] Peter Lake, 'Calvinism and the English Church 1570-1635,' *Past & Present*, no. 114 (1987): 51–53.

[54] Louis A. Knafla, 'Britain's Solomon: King James and the Law,' in *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I*, ed. Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier (Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2002), 237, 241.

[55] Lake, 'Calvinism and the English Church 1570-1635,' 54.

As James wrote warningly in the same year as *Love and Antiquity*'s performance, 'once trusting to that private spirit of Reformation, according to our Puritans doctrine, it is easy to fall and slide by degrees into Chaos'.[56] Middleton uses the Show to demonstrate exactly that 'private spirit', recasting all political responsibility as rendering one accountable to God. Orpheus' warning to Cockayne that 'Thy power is great, so let thy virtues be' (l. 128) mirrors James's caution to his son at the start of the *Basilikon Doron* that 'your [spiritual] fault shall be aggrauated, according to the height of your dignitie' (12). This was not an inversion of James's political thought but a redistribution of spiritual responsibility. Where James viewed responsibility as lying with the monarch, Middleton refigures it as belonging to all individuals. An individual's fulfilment of political responsibility was thus important in more than secular terms, forming part of a wider individual obligation to God.

Example and Fame: from reward to obligation

It is with just such a solemn view of responsibility that Middleton shifts the function of historical *exempla* away from Munday's usage, emphasising their significance in terms of authentically inward virtue. In *Chrysanaleia*, while historical examples functioned as models for behaviour, their additional function as a spur to virtue depended on them demonstrating its potential rewards – in terms of fame and material wealth. Here, however, the existence of an historical example stands as both model *and* incentive – as in the internal sense of virtue mentioned by Orpheus, the pursuit of political good is its own reward. That historical examples provide a model of good is enough to render them an incentive for future virtue. Orpheus notes that 'example is the crystal glass/ By which wise magistracy sets his face' – and the wise magistrate follows example not because it has promised him reward but because 'there he sees honour and seemliness' (ll. 113-114, 116). Although Example's speech promises that 'here the reward stands for thee', the reward is a seat in 'Fame's fair sanctuary', rather than any kind of earthly prize. As is proper within this Show's value-system, Cockayne's only reward for virtue will be something that he will himself never experience.

---

[56] James VI and I, *A Meditation on the Lord's Prayer, written by the Kings Maiestie, for the benefit of all his subiects* (London: Bonham Norton and John Bill, 1619), sig. C2r.

Fame is presented in much more negative terms – hardship and obligation – than it had been in *Chrysanaleia*. Those currently in the Sanctuary are 'Crowned with their troubles', and Middleton makes clear that only great sacrifice during life can ensure fame after death. Example refers back to the 'rough wilderness' that Orpheus had presented, reminding Cockayne (and the text's readers) that the political virtue needed to secure a place in 'Fame's fair Sanctuary' will be against a backdrop of opposition and corruption. Antiquity's speech strikes a similar note. If fame requires great sacrifice on the part of the would-be famous, so too historical *exempla* can impose great obligations on the next generation. She states that 'I record, that after-times may see/ [...] how they ought to be' and warns Cockayne that he must 'Be careful [...] to bring forth deeds/ To match that honour that from hence proceeds' (ll. 253-254; 278-279). Historical *exempla* are not a reward for those who display the virtue, but an obligation placed upon those who follow them.

Although the Show offers Cockayne a place in 'fame's fair sanctuary', the emphasis of Example's speech is on the exemplary function of the sanctuary's current residents, rather than the rewards that await Cockayne therein. The true reward to which Cockayne should aspire is spiritual – that is, salvation – while fame as the worldly evidence of his virtue will provide an exemplar to subsequent governors. This emphasis makes *Chrysanaleia*'s aspiration to worldly fame as reward, with Walworth's boast that 'the king knighted me in the field' seem rather petty by comparison. It is ironic, then, that Daryl Palmer uses *Chrysanaleia* to explore the way in which Shows could appropriate theological concepts in mediating between political and spiritual virtue. For Palmer, Munday appropriates account-book ideals of spirituality from Lancelot Andrewes' and others' sermons in order to turn the resurrection of civic heroes such as William Walworth into a 'metropolitan theodicy' which helps transform 'malevolent ambition into a felicitous version of mercantile endeavour and aspiration'.[57] However, the goal of *Chrysanaleia* is fundamentally more political than spiritual, as I have shown: the end towards which Munday hopes to steer the metropolitan community is good governance, not individual or collective salvation.

---

[57] Daryl W. Palmer, 'Metropolitan Resurrection in Anthony Munday's Lord Mayor's Shows,' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 46, no. 2 (2006): 380, 382.

Mocking Munday

By raising the possibility of reward on a higher plane than worldly politics – and whose relationship to effort is much less clear – Middleton consciously distances himself from Munday's way of thinking and paints it as a triumph of worldly greed over true virtue. Middleton's refutation of Munday's work is not limited to *Chrysanaleia*, though it is his main focus. He also uses what seems like a traditional pageant motif – historical *exempla* – in such a way that they not only recalled Munday's previous works but denigrated them as worldly and irrelevant. Using historical figures and sources was, as Tracey Hill has argued, something of a trademark for Munday – and was less so for Middleton.[58] While all but Munday's most recent Shows had used historical figures as examples for the City's or sponsoring Company's decency, Middleton much preferred to use examples from classical tradition or allegorical characters like Truth. When Middleton devoted two entire pageant-devices to figures from the Skinners' past in *The Triumphs of Love and Antiquity*, therefore, he immediately linked them to the devices and techniques used by Munday in previous years.

This was no mere connection, however, but one meant to belittle Munday – and surely in the service of the same political purpose in which he refuted the value-system of *Chrysanaleia*. Explaining his inclusion of historical detail, Middleton states that his readers demand concrete details in order to visualise moral ideals:

> that all the honours before mentioned in that Parliament, or
> Mount of Royalty, may arrive at a clear and perfect
> manifestation, to prevent the over curious and inquisitive
> spirit [..]
>
> (ll. 294-97)

The most likely reference of 'over curious and inquisitive spirit' is to a technique like Munday's, which prioritised concrete details and discrete facts over analysis and summary as evidence of investigative labour and adequate research on the part of the author. This kind of reader, Middleton implies, would be unable to imagine the exemplary virtues which Antiquity and other characters urged Cockayne to follow

---

[58] Hill, *Pageantry and Power*, 303, 320; Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture*, 148-59.

without a large, if irrelevant, injection of historical details into the pageant-text. This surely refers to Munday's all-too-evident pride in the nuts and bolts of his historical research. At the start of *Himatia-Poleos* (1614), Munday not only apologises at length for having mistaken Henry Fitz-Alwin for a Goldsmith but provides an extended narrative of the process of his mistake and its rectification. While he evidently took pride in such legwork, such passages ran the risk of pushing his reputation from historian to pedant – and this is what Middleton seizes upon in *Love and Antiquity*.

Antiquity's speech is followed by a section of almost a hundred lines detailing the 'names and times of those kings, queens, prince[s], dukes, and nobles' who were free of the Skinners' Company. Middleton then presents us with a list of royals, in chronological order (and then ordered by rank), whose involvement with the Skinners is often left unexplained or unsubstantiated, but of whom several come with a chunk of inconsequential detail. The list begins with Edward III and his foundation of the Skinners as an official livery company – so far, so relevant – but then trails off into his queen's foundation of Queen's College, Oxford, and her three requests at her death (whose ordinariness belies Middleton's comment that they 'are rare in these days') of payment of debts, burial with her husband, and gifts to the Church, the last hardly exceptional among early medieval or indeed Jacobean civic leaders (ll. 301-313). The Black Prince is then mentioned, and we are given some statistics concerning his victory over the French at Poitiers; Richard II's section is much more civically-orientated, mentioning his role in unifying the Skinners and the Lord Mayor's attendance at his feast in Westminster Hall. Queen Anne, however, is given the self-consciously irrelevant detail that, according to legend, she invented the technique of side-saddle riding (ll. 335-38). Henry IV is given the somewhat relevant fact of the Guildhall's construction but also the legend of the Thames having 'flowed thrice in one day', and we then rush through Queen Joan/Jane, Henry V (pausing briefly to mention Agincourt), his wife and Henry VI. While the event itself associated with Edward IV is unusually relevant, being a feast and hunting trip on which the king invited the Lord Mayor and aldermen, it is followed by some inconsequential details about precisely how much game and wine was sent to the wives of the mayor and aldermen.

Another quick run-through follows in which Middleton merely lists nobles and their relations in descending order of rank, implying only by their inclusion that

they were in some way connected to the Skinners. The effect of this list is to highlight the contrast between assembling evidence and making use of it. Anachronistic though that dualism may be, it is the contrast which Middleton himself makes by combining vast lists of names and irrelevant details with a self-conscious failure to relate most of them to the occasion at hand or synthesise any of the facts that he has seen fit to include. The intended effect of this technique is revealed in the way in which Middleton rounds it off:

> The royal sum: Seven kings, five queens, one prince, seven
> dukes, one earl; twenty-one Plantagenets. Seven kings, five
> queens, one prince, eight dukes, two earls, one lord; twenty-
> four Skinners.
>
> (ll. 395-98)

This 'sum' in fact sums up what the intelligent reader must have already surmised: the Skinners have had many royal and noble members. Its deeper purpose, however, is in replacing, and thus highlighting the omission of, any comment on the facts it claims to summarise. By rounding off his list with a 'royal sum' Middleton foregrounds the fact that his list only really provides evidence for historical pedantry and for the Skinners' membership, implying that Munday's own fascination with historical detail had often fulfilled little real function within his Shows.

This is a *reductio ad absurdum* of Munday's technique, allowing Middleton to mock the ponderous narrative and dusty tangents into which the former was apt to descend. Particularly biting is the fact that the Skinners' Company connection is presented as just such an irrelevant detail, when one of Munday's greatest skills had been to tailor his historical precedents to that year's sponsoring company as well as the Show's theme (as shown above in relation to *Chrysanaleia*). He mentions in *The Triumphs of Re-united Britannia* (1605) that seven kings of England had thus far been made free of the sponsoring Merchant Taylors' Company; six years later, in *Chruso-Thriambos* (written for the Goldsmiths) he links the figure of Leofstane, Goldsmith and London's first provost, to the company's prominence in civic history, and connects the charitable deeds of Nicholas Faringdon, another Goldsmith Lord Mayor, to his membership of the company itself.[59] In *Himatia-Poleos* (1614), too, he

---

[59] Anthony Munday, *The Triumphes of Re-vnited Britania* (London: William Jaggard, 1605), sig. C1r; Munday, *Chruso-thriambos: the Triumphes of Golde* (London: William Jaggard, 1611), sigs. A3v, B2r, B3v.

had retold the myths surrounding the Draper Lord Mayors Henry Fitz-Alwin and Sir John Norman in order to assert the company's long-standing civic altruism. So too in *Chrysanaleia* (1616) he had woven together symbols associated with the sponsoring Fishmongers and figures from their history in order to explore themes of reciprocity and duty within the city as a whole.

At the end of the Show, Middleton foregrounds self-consciously irrelevant detail in order to illuminate the distinction between content and moral message. Following the final speech, to which I shall return below, he includes a list, in no particular order, of:

> The names of those beasts bearing fur, and now in use with
> the bountiful Society of Skinners, the most of which
> presented in the Wilderness, where Orpheus predominates.
> (ll. 446-48)

A list of the beasts presented in Orpheus' Wilderness device would have perhaps indicated that the Show functioned as some sort of 'programme' or assistance to interpretation, or indeed would have provided detail to assist those who, reading after the event or too far away from it, could not see the device itself. However, while the Wilderness features heavily in the blurb, Middleton makes clear that the list of beasts does in fact *not* refer to those in the Wilderness alone, but rather those used by the Skinners' Company as a whole. Here Middleton may in fact be referring to another aspect of Munday's pageantry, and indeed a tactic from which Middleton could not exempt his own past Shows: the inclusion of (sometimes irrelevant) details about the sponsoring companies. The inappropriate placement of this list, between the final speech and the coda of pageant-commentary, draws ironic attention to an unfortunate tendency in more 'traditional' pageantry's mix of performance text and contextual information: it derails the reader's attention and leads to no more helpful conclusion than that the Skinners' honour is connected to their effective use of furred animals (hardly new information to those who were familiar with the Company's work). As with the list of historical figures, Middleton adopts a posture of ironic detachment, pointing up the way in which the obligations which had become traditional to London's civic pageantry were often at odds with its ability to communicate messages of moral import.

Amusing as it might be to paint Munday as a dry pedant, Middleton's refutation of his historical methods has a serious purpose. A clue to this lies in a couplet in Antiquity's speech (just before the historical narrative begins):

> Be careful then, great lord, to bring forth deeds
> To match that honour that from hence proceeds.
>
> (ll. 278-79)

This highlights the difference between worldly reward as an incentive and the more nebulous 'free love' of virtue which should drive the ideal magistrate. The self-consciously irrelevant historical details which accompany the royal and noble endow them with qualities which Cockayne could not imitate – and, more importantly, remind readers that no amount of effort in political office could promise the status of a Plantagenet. Walworth's knighthood in *Chrysanaleia* can be framed as an incentive to virtue precisely because this level of prestige was achievable by a Lord Mayor. Although the average Lord Mayor was unlikely to foil a regional rebellion against the king, he could certainly aspire to similar levels of political self-sacrifice, and in return expect a reasonable reward. Middleton overturns this process, presenting worldly prestige that no amount of political labour could obtain – and which therefore could not function as an incentive to that labour.

His purpose here is not to remove the incentive to labour but rather to reposition it, as not worldly but inward and spiritual; only labour without reward can constitute 'free' political love and virtue, and labour without reward is precisely the political ideal showcased in *Love and Antiquity*. The final speech of Love provides a fitting conclusion to this, stating that 'Love is circular, like the bright sun, / And takes delight to end where it begun' (ll. 416-417). The process of political virtue in governor and governed should not involve external reward as an incentive on either side: rather, love should beget love. Although the city and company 'Expect some fair requital from the man/ They've all so largely honoured' (ll. 428-429), what is 'desired' is 'That which in conscience ought to be required' (ll. 430-431). Cockayne should thank them 'in thy justice, in thy care, / Zeal to right wrongs' (ll. 432-433), and those works, prompted by political love, will 'become thy soul' just as 'those rich ornaments [become] thy brother-kings' (ll. 434-435). Only love can repay love, and whatever the royal or noble attributes of the listed historical *exempla*, Cockayne

must follow them not in their worldly accoutrements but in a similar display of political virtue.

Middleton adopts yet another of *Chrysanaleia*'s strategies in comparing Cockayne to 'the city's bridegroom' and demanding that 'according to [his] morning vows' he be 'A careful husband to a loving spouse' (ll. 440, 442-443). Here again he appropriates the marriage metaphor which Munday had used to underwrite his system of political virtue and just reward. Munday had used the nuptial metaphor to equate the Lord Mayor's great responsibility to his obligation, warning of the potential dangers should a figure with such responsibilities choose to neglect them. Middleton's use is similar in that he frames the position of 'city's bridegroom' as one conferring great responsibility, but as we have just seen it exists within an entirely different value-system. By returning to Munday's marriage metaphor in the Show's final speech, Middleton reminds us that although he places equal responsibility on the incoming Lord Mayor, that responsibility comes from an entirely different place and has a different relationship to the popular acclaim and worldly reward that mayoralty often conferred.

Middleton took a gamble in attempting to rehabilitate Cockayne by inverting the very value-system which Munday had used to criticize him. Whatever the Show's success in terms of its contemporary readers, *Love and Antiquity* certainly portrayed a convincing value-system, demonstrating that the Shows could appropriate concepts from unexpected sources, not only putting them to a political use but also using their original associations to inflect, in turn, on the Show into which they had been transplanted. This is certainly the case with 'free love'. Middleton's use of the borrowed concept to create a value-system through which the Show could frame a political message depended on retaining the phrase's origins as a byword for authentic feeling – by God and by humanity, made in his image.

Love and Antiquity thus illustrates the multifaceted intertextuality made possible by the hybrid genre of the Shows. Not only did it invert completely the value-system of another show – relating to it on a deeper level than mere reference – but it also used the components of that value system to define itself with, or against, a variety of political and religious modes of thought. Whether or not all of Middleton's readers (including Cockayne himself) understood the complex histories of texts and ideas behind the Show, they certainly played a part in how it was put together. That a difficult task of rehabilitating Cockayne lay behind this intricate

foundation shows just how important the Shows' material contexts were. They functioned not as limitations to creativity but as spurs to it, and as this Show proves, encouraged authors to test the genre's aesthetic capacities to its utmost limit.

Chapter 4. 'Impossible Performance'? Negotiating text-event relationships in Middleton's *The Triumphs of Honour and Industry* and Munday's *Sidero-Thriambos*.

Describing the Lord Mayor's Show of 29th October 1618, Anthony Munday concedes that 'favourable conceit must needs supply the defect of impossible performance'.[1] This admission of the gulf between what is performed and what can be described casts a cloud over this and the many other printed texts of the mayoral Shows, and certainly contrasts with the others' triumphal mood. Both *Sidero-Thriambos* (1618) and the text of the previous year's Show, Thomas Middleton's *The Triumphs of Honour and Industry* (1617), have been identified as having a slightly unusual tone. Tracey Hill notes that Munday's text 'has a rather tired feel to it', while Kate Levin identifies 'a narrator who often seems distracted' in Middleton's.[2] The 'odd' aspects of both Shows arise from their shared concern with one theme: the relationship between printed text and performance. Both texts interrogate, in different ways, the way in which the series of pageants and speeches performed on London's streets to celebrate the new Lord Mayor's inauguration, made its way onto the printed page of the texts which survive.

In *Honour and Industry* Middleton exploits the link between text and performance, utilising his readers' memory of the Show as it had been performed to recreate in text a perfect performance, satisfying their need to see stability staged in a way that actual performance – particularly the very public one of the mayoral procession – never could. Evoking imperfections by complaining about inaudible speeches and disordered devices, Middleton then smoothes them over, providing transcriptions and resolving contradictions. He thus introduces the possibility of imperfect performance only to replace it with a perfect one. Where Middleton uses the print-performance link to smooth over such issues, Munday uses it to emphasise them. In *Sidero-thriambos* he creates a reading experience that, while also linked to

---

[1] Anthony Munday, *Sidero-Thriambos: Steele and Iron Triumphing* (London: Nicholas Okes, 1618), sig. A4v. Subsequent references are to signature numbers in this edition and will be integrated into the main text.

[2] Tracey Hill, *Pageantry and Power: A Cultural History of the Early Modern Lord Mayor's Show, 1585-1639* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), 208 n. 225; Thomas Middleton, *The Triumphs of Honour and Industry*, in *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, by Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino, ed. Kate Levin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 1252.

performance, was overtly textual, highlighting the text's inability to truly reconstruct performance and demonstrating the distinct representative powers of both media. As a genre, the Lord Mayor's Show was particularly well suited to this. Its material circumstances – a one-off occasion which was months in the planning – meant that, unlike many other performance-related print genres, texts of the Shows could only speak to past performance, never a possible future one. The Shows in performance therefore had a particular relationship to the occasion surrounding their performance, and an author preparing the printed text could choose to highlight this occasion or occlude it, as the situation required. Susan Anderson opines that the Lord Mayor's Show 'expand upon and contract the source event in particular ways', but (necessarily in a short article) goes into little detail on the variety of ways in which the printed Shows could relate to the event of their performance.[3]

The 1617 and 1618 Shows were both performed in politically-demanding circumstances, which placed a lot of pressure on the spectacle to mould the occasion to its own purpose. Seven months before the 1617 Show was performed, the traditional Shrove Tuesday revels had turned into riots. The details of this incident, and how Middleton's text responds to it, will be discussed below, but it also directly affected the atmosphere in which the Show was performed in October. Although Ian Archer is right to argue that early modern London was relatively stable, incidents like the playhouse riots stoked a fear among the city's governors that such violence would erupt again; such fear was surely amplified by the large, often unruly, public gathering of the Shows in performance.[4] This placed pressure on the moment of performance to demonstrate that unruliness need not descend into open disorder, and instead to demonstrate stability – which in turn affected how Middleton could use the occasion of the Show in his commemorative text. If there was pressure on the 1617 Show in performance, even more was placed upon the following year's. 29th October 1618 was also the date on which Sir Walter Raleigh was to be executed, and the execution had presumably been timed so that the mayoral Show would detract from its attendance.

---

[3] Susan Anderson, 'Representations of India on Jacobean Popular Stages', *Theatre Survey*, 54, no. 1 (2013): 20.

[4] Ian W. Archer, *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Both Shows, then, had a task to achieve in performance which went beyond merely demonstrating magnificence. This meant that both Middleton and Munday needed to address the issue of performance in mediating between the pageantry and its occasion, particularly given that their likely readers had not only seen the performance, but been invested in its success. What little evidence we have suggests that the texts were, at least initially, given out to members and/or chosen guests of the sponsoring Company.[5] We certainly know that they were delivered to the Company after printing, which the Company paid for, so it seems most likely that they were given as gifts after the Show.[6] This meant that writers of the Shows could be virtually certain that their readers had seen them in performance, and reasonably sure that at least some of those readers had been responsible for the smooth running of that performance.

This presented both a challenge and an opportunity. On the one hand, it obliged the pageant-writer to memorialise the text favourably, reassuring his readers that the pageantry had fulfilled its function in displaying the Company's magnificence; on the other, the knowledge that his readers had a particular memory of the performance, and had had a particular investment in it too, was something he could use as part of an overall literary strategy. Middleton's technique aims to use his readers' memory of the event to placate the anxiety caused by their investment in success, invoking the real event in order to rewrite it as perfect. Here the text gives readers the opportunity to view a 'perfect', smooth-running Show, which would have been impossible in real life. In *Honour and Industry*, Middleton's description introduces 'imperfections' of performance, such as inaudible speeches, only to correct them straightaway by providing a perfect alternative. This invokes the memory of performance, but only to give the perfect, textual version more power – which in turn reinforces the reader's, or at least Middleton's imagined reader's, sense of the occasion's success. Text and performance here work in tandem, and although they take on different roles they blur into one as the reader combines his or her memory with the text designed to supplement it.

[5]Here I refer to the texts' initial distribution, but surviving printed copies have been located in a variety of curious, non-civic places. For more on this, see Tracey Hill, 'Owners and Collectors of the Printed Books of the Early Modern Lord Mayors' Shows,' *Library and Information History* 30, no. 3 (2014): 151-71.

[6] Hill, *Pageantry and Power*, 250.

Munday's is rather less conciliatory. Where Middleton uses the text and performance together, creating an ideal performance through text, Munday pits them against one another, highlighting the gulf between the two media. This forces the reader to confront what the performance cannot do for the text and what the text cannot do for performance. Where Middleton's text goes beyond the reality of performance, it does so in order to extend that reality, reinscribing that performance in the reader's memory with the additions integrated into it. Munday's text also departs from performance, but does so in an explicitly textual way, creating effects that were not only impossible in that particular performance but would be impossible in any performance. Middleton's additions aim to be imagined as performed; Munday's aim only to be read, and are self-consciously unperformable.

Orality and Print in Early Modern Culture

While these differences are closely linked to the particular conditions of the Lord Mayor's Show, they drew on pre-existing debates around the relationship between text and aural/visual performance. Both Middleton and Munday had a plethora of literary strategies on which to draw, and their readers had a wealth of possible frameworks through which to encounter those strategies as they functioned in the printed texts of the Shows. Critics and historians alike have noticed the tension between oral and literary representations of performance in the period, and it was certainly ripe for exploitation within many different print genres.

D. F. McKenzie highlights the links between print and orality in texts such as Sir John Harington's 1591 translation of Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*, showing that the printed text could have a much more complex relationship to orality than mere opposition.[7] Writers did not just notice this connection but could utilise it, developing different strategies to either open up or close down the space between hearing words and seeing them on a page. Walter Ong claims that while 'the word in its natural, oral habitat is part of a real, existential present', 'words are alone in the

---

[7] D. F. McKenzie, 'Speech-Manuscript-Print,' *The Library Chronicle of the University of Texas at Austin* 20 (1990): 108.

text'.[8] The strategies which certain texts use to exploit their materiality in print is in fact dependent on their close relationship to a particular occasion or possibility of oral performance. The meanings of those words, written though they may be, is conditioned by their history in oral performance and relates as closely to 'real, living persons' as did the performance itself.

Printed sermons mediate between past events and present readership in much the same way as pageant-texts, and often use the occasion of their delivery – evoking either the reader's memory, or his or her imagination – to augment the power of the text. While these do not always record occasions of great import (though some certainly do), they all share the sense of recording something spoken in the past, which can never be repeated in the same context. A printed sermon might be read aloud, but the experience of hearing it preached in church is impossible for the lay reader to simulate. Printed sermons often acknowledge this, and as McKenzie notes, 'almost every sermon printed in the first half of the [seventeenth] century has something to say by way of apology for the loss of the preacher's presence'.[9] This genre was much more popular than plays or pageantry; even the most anti-theatrical reader of a pageant-text, therefore, might have experienced a sermon-author's mediation between performance and print.

However, that sermons acknowledge this distance does not mean that they separate the oral experience from the written one. As Arnold Hunt notes, they play upon the power of the remembered or imagined experience to augment their effect on the reader, and 'slowly but steadily, the distinction between reading and preaching was breaking down'.[10] Although some sermons are exclusively textual, modelling themselves on written treatises, Hunt identifies a clear trend in which sermons attempt to reproduce 'something of the sensation of hearing a sermon preached'.[11] That they were marketed as such, with phrases such as 'a very feeling and moving sermon', shows that both writers and readers were aware of the benefits

---

[8] Walter J. Ong, 'From Allegory to Diagram in the Renaissance Mind: A Study in the Significance of the Allegorical Tableau,' *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 17, no. 4 (1959): 423–40.

[9] McKenzie, 'Speech-Manuscript-Print,' 91.

[10] Arnold Hunt, *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences, 1590-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 128.

[11] *Ibid.*, 163.

a text could gain from linking itself to oral experience.[12] Just as sermon writers could experiment with strategies, so too could writers like Munday and Middleton who were likely familiar with printed sermons – and readers, too, would surely be as receptive when encountering those strategies in a printed Show as they would when reading a sermon in print.

Performance and text in printed theatrical drama

If the producers of printed sermons could reasonably expect readers to engage with this mode of using oral-literate tension to create particular literary effects, so could playwrights. As Robert Weimann notes, 'dramatic writing and theatrical performing in the English Renaissance found themselves in a socially and culturally precarious state of both cooperation and confrontation'.[13] Both Middleton and Munday wrote stage plays before mayoral Shows, and it is thus highly plausible that they brought the print-performance interaction from drama to civic pageantry. Weimann distinguishes between scenarios 'presented' by real actors on the space of the stage (*platea*) and those that were 'represented' textually in imagined/imaginable spaces (*loci*). This binary precludes the possibility of a reader imagining performance *in* the playing space of the *platea*. While we cannot delineate for certain what an early modern reader might have imagined while reading a play text, it is surely just as possible that he or she would have imagined the play *in performance* – that is, presented by actors, in the theatre – than in an imaginary setting such as Agincourt or Sherwood Forest. The play in performance and the play in print did not merely interact as separate entities, but impinged upon one another: Weimann has recognised that the playtext informed performance, but just as true is that the context of performance impacted on how a play presented (or indeed represented) itself in print.

Although the work of Lukas Erne and Tiffany Stern is often viewed as opposite sides of the print-performance debate, both have usefully uncovered some of the ways in which the performance context of a play affected that play's text in

---

[12] Anthony Cade, *St Paul's Agonie: a sermon preached at Leicester* (London: Bernard Alsop, 1618), see headings.

[13] Robert Weimann, *Author's Pen and Actor's Voice : Playing and Writing in Shakespeare's Theatre*, ed. Helen Higbee and William West (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 6.

print. Erne views the longer, Folio versions of Shakespeare plays such as *Romeo and Juliet* and *Henry V* as designed specifically for readers, not for performance, while seeing their shorter quartos as closer to performance.[14] Stern makes the case for seeing plays' various textual parts (not just playtexts) as indelibly connected to performance.[15] Despite Erne's emphasis on the reader's role, those points which he imagines as more 'literary' are arguably connected, if not to a future performance context, then to an imagined or past one. For example, he notes that the Folio text of *Henry V* contains the line 'Here comes the Herald of the French' which is missed out in the Quarto. This, Erne argues, is because it would have been made obvious in performance. However, such additions are not sealed off from performance, as Erne himself admits, stating that they 'allow a reader to imagine a point of stage business'.[16] When the reader of *Henry V* reads the line 'Here comes the Herald of the French', therefore, he or she might conceivably imagine an actor entering in that guise, not an actual French herald. Such descriptions thus have more than an exclusively textual function in play texts – and, we can assume, other texts which are linked to a previous performance, including Shows.

Both Erne and Weimann emphasise the role of 'performability', and view a playtext's link to performance as resting on the possibility of performing the printed text: that is, the performance they imagine being linked to the text, and perhaps see the reader imagining, is a future one. However, Tiffany Stern is right to note the importance of *past* performance to the paratexts of printed plays, arguing that:

> plays with courtly prologues and epilogues are [...] asking the readers to imagine an event at which they were not actually able to be present. So prologues and epilogues are always 'event' related in a way the rest of the text may not actually be.[17]

---

[14] Lukas Erne, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 222–25.

[15] Tiffany Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 60-68.

[16] Erne, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*, 222.

[17] Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*, 118.

Here the printed text relates to a past performance that had actually happened, rather than a potential future performance. Although many plays were performed after they had been printed, making it plausible that a reader could imagine future performance, the performance on which many writers and publishers focused was one that had occurred in the past. Bruce Smith notes that title-pages of playtexts frequently referred to past performance, and could therefore function as a 'mnemonic device', helping readers to recall their own experience (if they had it) of the play in performance.[18] The importance of title pages to printers and prospective readers has been highlighted by Alan Farmer and Zachary Lesser, who have demonstrated that '[t]itle-pages were the major mode of book advertising in early modern London' because 'a potential purchaser would have been confronted with the title page before any other element of the book'.[19] For invoking memory on title-pages to be worth the effort, stationers would need to be reasonably certain of a reader's awareness of a play's past performance, even if they had not seen it. As Farmer and Lesser show, 'an effective title page was crucial for those publishers who wished to turn a profit', so if printers and publishers bothered to invoke past performance, we can reasonably assume that they did indeed consider it worth the effort – and, therefore, that such a technique would have attracted at least some potential purchasers.[20]

Recalling past performance was more than a sales technique on the title page, however. It seems to have been key to how playtexts addressed potential readers, and did not always appear on the title page itself but was the remit of writers rather than stationers. The preface to *The Family of Love* (1608) notes that in its performance 'the general voice of the people had seald it for good, and the newnesse of it made it much more desired, then at this time'.[21] John Fletcher was less lucky with *The Faithful Shepherdess* (1610): 'the people seeing when it was plaid, having ever had a

---

[18] Bruce Smith, 'Speaking What We Feel About *King Lear*,' in *Shakespeare, Memory and Performance*, ed. Peter Holland (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 33.

[19] Zachary Lesser and Alan B. Farmer, 'Vile Arts: The Marketing of English Printed Drama, 1512–1660,' *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 39 (2000): 78.

[20] *Ibid.*, 79.

[21] *The Family of Love* (London: for John Holmes, 1608), sig. A1v. Though many authors attribute this toThomas Middleton, it is not included in the Oxford *Complete Works*, so I follow Taylor and Lavagnino and treat the work as being of indeterminate authorship.

singuler guift in defining, concluded [it] to be a play of country hired Shepheards'.[22] John Webster defends *The White Devil* (1612), claiming that 'it was acted, in so dull a time of Winter, presented in so open and blacke a theatre, that it wanted (that which is the only grace and setting out of a tragedy) a full and understanding auditory'.[23] The frequency and nuanced variation in references to past performance suggests that at least some of them were more than marketing strategies. Rather than merely selling the play, authors seem to be actively interested in exploring the distinction between the play as acted and the printed text.

Thomas Dekker claims in *The Whore of Babylon* (1604) that the stage can ruin a good play: 'let the Poet set the note of his Nombers, euen to Apolloes owne Lyre, the Player will haue his owne Crochets, and sing false notes, in dispite of all the rules of Musick'.[24] Also in 1604, but in direct contrast, John Marston laments that 'Scenes invented, meerely to be spoken, should be inforcively published to be read', asking that 'the unhandsome shape which this trifle in reading presents, may bee pardoned, for the pleasure it once afforded you, when it was presented with the soule of lively action'.[25] Not only were playwrights aware of the relationship between performance and print, but they could use one for the advantage of the other – either to excuse it, or to assert its unique value. These viewpoints are linked only by one thing: they rely on the fact of past performance, even if only to reject it. That such a variety of views could emerge from the interaction of performance and text shows not only that it was important to early modern playwrights, but that they could manipulate that connection for different literary ends. Both readers and writers of Shows, then, would surely have had some experience of being made to think about the connection between printed text and past performance.

The text in print is even more dependent on a past performance in texts of civic and royal pageantry, such as those which commemorated royal entries into

---

[22] John Fletcher, *The Faithful Shepherdess*, ed. Cyrus Hoy, in Fredson Bowers, ed. *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 497.

[23] John Webster, *The White Devil*, ed. John Russell Brown (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996), 30.

[24] Thomas Dekker, *The Whore of Babylon* in Fredson Bowers, ed. *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker* (Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 1955), ii, 497.

[25] John Marston, *The Malcontent* , ed. George K. Hunter (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999), 15.

London: such performances, as with mayoral Shows, could never be repeated. Understanding how writers used the fact of past performance in other civic pageantry can help us to understand the concerns which Middleton and Munday explore in commemorating mayoral Shows. The use of imagined performance to replace its reality is something which Evelyn Tribble identifies in Thomas Dekker's account of his role in King James's delayed triumphal entry into London, *The Magnificent Entertainment* (1604).[26] Tribble highlights Dekker's use of details such as crowd noise to create 'an illusion of readerly presence and participation,' giving the reader the perspective of an unusually privileged audience member, but still one who experienced all the day's sensory aspects.[27] She contrasts this with Ben Jonson's description of the occasion, which privileges the readerly act over the auditory and visual acts of perceiving the performance in practice: Jonson 'situates his work on the serene surface of the page, ignoring the hubbub and commotion of the day', footnoting his sources heavily for the educated reader.[28] Where Dekker imagines that his reader wishes to recreate the day, Jonson's imagined reader wishes to escape the day altogether and textualise the spectacle entirely. The link between imagined and experienced performance was clearly important to both authors, and although they use it in very different ways it is clear from the clarity with which they do so that both viewed it as an effective strategy.

Remembered performance occasions were thus surely familiar to both Middleton and Munday, perhaps from invoking them in their own texts, and certainly from their invocation in others', such as the plays quoted above. Perhaps more importantly, it meant that readers of the Shows were much more likely to have experienced such strategies before, in a variety of genres. The way in which Dekker and Jonson contest the print-performance relationship frames the debate as one in which the writer either recreates the day for the reader, or presents the text as a non-theatrical, literary treatise, which bears minimal relation to performance. Middleton and Munday depart from this, however, contesting not the *importance* of lived

---

[26] Thomas Dekker, *The Magnificent Entertainment Given to King James [etc]* in Fredson Bowers, ed. *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, 4 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953-61), vol. 2: 303.

[27] Evelyn B. Tribble, *Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England* (Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1993), 134.

[28] *Ibid.*, 134.

performance, but rather *how* memories of that performance can be used within a text related to it. For Middleton, invoking the material imperfections of performance is a way to improve upon readers' memories, supplementing them with the perfect information that only reading can deliver. For Munday, those same imperfections offer an opportunity to explore the divergences between text and performance.

Where Middleton's 'perfect performance' is sustained by text but still defined by what would constitute 'perfection' in reality – perfect audibility, orderly and admiring crowds, visual coherence – Munday's emphasises the features of performance which a text cannot recreate, along with the text's capacity to outshine performance in various aspects. For both authors, at least when writing mayoral Shows, the question was no longer *which* out of text and performance was more important, or even better quality, but rather *how* the two could be combined to create particular effects in print. The increasing interest in different methods of combination perhaps came from the features of the printed mayoral Show as a genre, as noted above: one-off occasion, remembered performance, and of course well-informed and interested readers.

Performance and political pressure in 1617: reshaping readers' memories

All three were at work in 1617, whose occasion made remembering a perfect performance particularly important to the potential readers of *Honour and Industry*. On Shrove Tuesday 1617 (4th March), the traditional apprentice antics became what they often threatened to, but never had: a full-scale riot. Thousands of apprentices forced their way into the newly-built Cockpit theatre on Drury Lane, wounding many actors and causing such damage that the indoor playhouse had to be closed again for several months while repairs were carried out. Mark Bayer attributes this to the closure of the Red Bull Theatre in Clerkenwell, and the local community's objection to this institution – which had put money into the local economy and provided a social gathering-place– moving to the upscale West End of the city.[29] Eleanor Collins rightly cautions against too direct a link, noting that there were far

---

[29] Mark Bayer, 'The Red Bull Playhouse,' in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre*, ed. Richard Dutton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 225–39. See also Eva Griffith, *A Jacobean Company and its Playhouse: The Queen's Servants at the Red Bull Theatre (c. 1605-1619)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 246.

more apprentice rioters than could be explained by Clerkenwell's local politics (several thousand according to some accounts).[30] This incident certainly shows, however, that the theatre could be both a target for apprentice violence and a centre around which it could coalesce: indeed, the apprentices (or at least some of them) were said to have met and organised at the Fortune Theatre, in Finsbury.

The tensions arising from the riots no doubt put pressure on the performed spectacle to demonstrate civic stability, but the spectacle itself may have intensified its audience's doubts rather than reassuring them. The popularity of the inaugural procession meant that just as civic authority was asserted in allegorical terms, it was often threatened in reality. The amount that the companies spent on crowd control made up a large proportion of their total expenditure on the day, and shows just how volatile the crowd really was. For example, in 1613 the Grocers paid for '29 dozen' (348) staves for whifflers, 'Trunchions for the marshall', hired 130 javelins, and twenty swordsmen, as well as paying eleven more people a total of five pounds 'for the ushering Marshalling and making waye for the whole Company on the daye' of the Show.[31] In 1617, the year of the Show in question, the Grocers bought slightly fewer staves, twenty-four dozen (288), but still paid the same people to clear the way for the crowds.[32] Not all of the weapons mentioned would have been used on people, but many were, and the fact that they could be meant that a Show which bristled with this many armaments carried a more violent undertone than the peaceful message of the printed texts. Even with such large expenditure, the crowds often intruded on the successful running of the show, and their allegorical content could be appreciated in performance only through the mediating framework of barely contained upheaval. Since this rich allegory was often intended to claim the existence of social cohesion (and the sponsoring company's contribution thereto), crowd violence was a visible contradiction to this.

The events of March 1617, along with the material circumstances of the Show's transmission in both text and performance, make it particularly significant that *Honour and Industry* engages collectively-constituted memory in order to

---

[30] Eleanor C. Collins, 'Repertory and Riot: The Relocation of Plays from the Red Bull to the Cockpit Stage,' *Early Theatre* 13, no. 2 (2010): 132–49.

[31] Grocers' Company, 'Charges of Triumphs' account book, Guildhall MS 11590, fo 4r.

[32] *Ibid.*, fo. 13v.

reshape that memory through text. Middleton knew that his readers had wanted to see the Show demonstrate civic stability, and also knew that this might not have been achieved by performance alone. Indeed, as outlined above, the more contingent elements of the Show's staging were an even more powerful source of tension than normal. His solution to this was to use the printed show as an opportunity to reshape collective memories of the day so that it became a source of reassurance rather than anxiety. His strategy in textualising ritual draws on, but is much more nuanced than, Thomas Dekker's performance-oriented technique in reporting King James's 1604 entry to London. Although, like Dekker, Middleton refers to the material realities of performance to invoke memories of the spectacle as staged, he also uses Jonson's potential 'serenity of the page' not to eliminate performance, but rather to reassert control of it through text.

As Ian Munro notes, Middleton's authorial persona in *The Triumphs of Honour and Industry* is unusually candid about the potential problems which came with a spectacle as huge as the Lord Mayor's Show. He admits that timings sometimes fail, speeches are not always audible and that spectators may not be able to see or interpret the complex visual emblems of the pageant-devices. However, what Munro disparagingly calls 'traces of [...] anxiety' are in fact much more sophisticated.[33] Middleton inserts these 'risky' details in order to recall the reality of the day's events, bringing his readers' remembered experience to the fore in order that he can then reshape it. Contemporary accounts of the Lord Mayor's Day inform us that the experience of watching the Shows was characterised by chaos and noise as much as visual splendour: Aleksei Ziuzin's account of *The Triumphs of Truth*, for example, mentions the 'trumpeters', 'drums', 'great salute' and 'shooting of muskets'.[34] Middleton is thus able to stimulate his readers' memory by recalling this chaos, temporarily disrupting the 'serenity of the page' in order to assert the longer-term serenity of both page and remembered performance. He responds to the problems outlined above – his sponsors' insecurity regarding social order on London's streets, particularly at times of festival – by memorialising what had been

---

[33] Ian Munro, *The Figure of the Crowd in Early Modern London: The City and Its Double* (New York; London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 62.

[34] 'An Account by Aleksei Ziuzin', ed. M. Jansson and N. Rogozhin, trans. P. Bushkovitch, in Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino, eds. *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 978.

the risky reality of *Honour and Industry*'s performance as an event which demonstrated that that risk could be successfully overcome by the civic community who made up the text's main audience.

Memory was already a well-established site at which writers could explore the text-performance relationship. Tiffany Stern highlights this relationship in the case of theatrical Arguments, printed summaries of a play which were distributed among its audience. Analysing such documents as 'thrilling moments at which [performance and print] intersect', Stern explains that 'an Argument, read after the theatrical event [...] can make what the occasion should have been: it can shape, or falsely create, memory'.[35] This memorial function allowed the Argument itself to span the divide between text and event, but also surely affected the play texts with which they were sometimes included. Having had a memory (re)created or otherwise touched by an Argument, readers surely read the play with this in mind, thus making the event of performance (even if in some cases this event was imaginary or reimagined) as important to the play as its more 'literary' elements were. Moreover, this approach empowers the playwright to use memory in order to shape the text in a particular way. He does not have to describe the performance in reality: so long as he includes enough true detail to stimulate his readers' memory and make the image convincing, he can use the process of memorialisation in text to shape his readers' perception both of how the performance was received and what it achieved.

Exemplifying the difference between slippage and deliberate tactic is the narratorial aside introducing Industry's speech after the first device: 'if you give attention to Industry that now sets forward to speak, it will be yours more exactly'.[36] According to Munro's interpretation, as outlined above, this is a moment in which Middleton's authorial agency fails and he is forced to admit that the performance is imperfect. This gives Middleton far too little credit as an author, however, and it would have been easy for him to omit such an aside had it really undermined his intentions for the text. If we examine this line as a way in which Middleton links text and performance in the minds of his readers, it adds to the text's power rather than

---

[35] Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*, 80, 78.

[36] Thomas Middleton, *The Triumphs of Honour and Industry* (1617), edited by David Bergeron, in Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino, eds. *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1256. Subsequent references are to line numbers in this edition and will be integrated into the text.

detracting from it. By admitting that there was a potential problem with the speeches' audibility Middleton is more effective in invoking a memory of the Show, which was (as noted above) remembered by many for its noisiness. Moreover, the text's resolution of that problem is substantially more powerful if it also admits that there was a problem on the day. By positioning his readers as past auditors who are satisfied *despite* difficulty hearing the speech, rather than as readers alone, who as such could never have experienced this problem, Middleton turns a mere written speech into evidence that the 1617 Show overcame potential threats to its audience's enjoyment.

Of course, the effectiveness of this depended on the readers' willingness to imagine themselves as auditors, which in turn relied upon their not only having experience of the Lord Mayor's Show but having the right kind of experience: that is, one in which they could reasonably expect to hear the speeches (albeit with some impediment) and understand the overall concept. Few of the diverse target readers of Dekker's *Magnificent Entertainment* would have been especially perturbed by their inability to hear the speeches when lining the streets to watch the spectacle (if they had done so at all). However, if the Ironmongers' Company's reaction to Munday's inaudible actors in the 1609 Show, *Camp-Bell: or the Ironmongers Faire Field* is anything to go by, the elevated civic readers of *Honour and Industry* had a vested interest in whether they themselves and those processing with them could hear the speeches.[37] On hearing Munday's request for extra payment (to cover his additional costs, he claimed) after the 1609 Show was over, the Company refused on the grounds that 'the children weare not instructed in their speeches'.[38] We cannot know how Middleton's spectacle compared to the failure of 1609, but it was surely comforting for those who had been responsible for it to relive the occasion with the problem firmly resolved.

He uses a similar technique with regard to the vexed issue of timing during the Show's day-long performance. The narrator seems to become confused about the appropriate order, describing the Pageant of Nations for several lines before checking himself and apologizing: 'But before I entered so far, I should have shared the zeal and love of the Frenchman and Spaniard' (1257). In fact, if he had

---

[37] Anthony Munday, *Camp-Bell: Or the Ironmongers Faire Field* (London: printed by Edward Allde, 1609).

[38] Guildhall MS 16967/2, qtd. in Hill, *Pageantry and Power*, 143.

transcribed and translated these two speeches before explaining the conceit of the Pageant of Nations, the text would have been somewhat confusing: even the target readers who had theoretically seen the Show once might have needed to remember that the French and Spanish characters were part of a broader celebration of London's cosmopolitan society and international trade links. However, it suggests that perhaps in the performance itself, these two characters were seen, and later processed, ahead of the rest of the device. This would no doubt have been an effective way to attract the crowd's enthusiasm, but might also have been confusing without Middleton's having introduced these two foreign-looking figures.

By drawing attention to his introduction's misplacement, Middleton both raises and erases this potential interpretive issue. He admits that interpretive problems were possible in the Show's performance, perhaps helping his readers to recall their own experience of being forced to interpret visual spectacle and listen to speeches at once. However, he does so having already resolved any potentially unsettling confusion. The apology comes before the speeches but after the description, so that Middleton's readers encounter it on their way to the speeches, having already been made aware of their context. By placing it in the very centre of the structure by which he ensures his readers are well informed, Middleton uses this textual feature to recreate an ideal performance experience – one in which the speeches were not only audible but heard after their significance had been explained – perhaps correcting what had been a less ideal experience in reality.

One reason for the disordering of aural and visual interpretation in the performed Show was the crowded nature of the occasion. Characters often went ahead of pageant-devices to allow the procession clear access, and thus those at the front were frequently greeted by a character of whose significance they were not yet sure. Middleton invokes this experience in his text, only to replace it with one which self-consciously does not need to submit to the dangerous aspect of crowd control. The readers of *Honour and Industry* are positioned not merely as having a privileged viewpoint, but as unhindered by the difficulties of civic spectacle in a way which would have been impossible for anyone watching the Show itself. They can peruse the device at their leisure, taking the time they need to understand its significance before they move on to the speeches. Middleton thus overlays his readers' memories of the actual performance, with all its disjunction between speech and image, with an artificially-constructed ideal in which the two were subject only to the needs of the

privileged procession audience, in which position most of the Show's readers would have remembered themselves. This frames the readers' newly-detailed understanding of the interaction between speech and spectacle in the 'Pageant of Nations' as evidence that, contrary to their fears, no disorder had threatened this particular Show's success.

Threats to serene performance: responding to disorderly xenophobia

The 'Pageant of Nations' was potentially threatening for another reason, which went beyond the disjuncture between ideal and real interpretation: it represented the integration of foreigners into London life. Encounters with strangers were commonplace in the increasingly-cosmopolitan capital, but even the most elevated of outsiders did not find it easy to integrate. The Venetian Ambassador's chaplain Orazio Busino, describing his experience of watching *Honour and Industry*, noted that 'Foreigners in London are little liked, not to say hated'.[39] Texts such as Dekker's *Shoemaker's Holiday* point out the well-established suspicion of foreigners in this period: although the play itself is far from hostile to the Dutch, the reaction of many characters is, showing that suspicion of foreigners was one of the characteristics with which a playwright could create a plausible 'ordinary' Londoner. Beyond merely representing generic foreigners, however, Middleton prioritized two of the most hated nationalities, making the French and Spanish characters the speaking parts in this device.

Given what we have seen about the disquieting gulf between the ideal setting of a mayoral Show – calm, accepting, orderly – and the confusion that reigned in reality, this might seem a risky tactic. Busino's account demonstrates the riot-inducing potential of the Spaniards in particular (though we should remember that he shared with the account's intended readers the longstanding Venetian hatred for Spain). He distinguishes Spaniards for their dress, which made them 'easily recognised and mortally hated', noted that they are 'considered harpies in this country [England]' and relates an incident on the day of the Show itself in which a woman, 'enraged against a man thought to belong to the Catholic [Spanish]

---

[39] 'Orazio Busino's Account', ed. Kate Levin, in Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino, eds. *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1267. Subsequent references are to this edition and integrated into the text.

Ambassador's household', 'aroused the crowd to persecute him, leading the way by striking him with a bunch of greens while calling him "Spanish rogue" ' ('Busino's Account', 1267). Anti-foreign feeling thus combined with the presence of more foreigners than usual (especially in distinctive livery) to make the crowd volatile even without Middleton egging them on with his device.

Although it was theoretically intended to *celebrate* the city's cosmopolitan nature, the pageant in performance had a rather different effect. As Busino puts it:

> a Spaniard was perfectly impersonated, the gestures of his
> nation expertly mimicked [...] He was continually blowing
> kisses to the onlookers: but to the Spanish Ambassador, who
> was a short distance from us, he did it to such a superlative
> degree that the entire crowd roared with laughter.
>
> ('Busino's Account', 1267)

This performance sailed rather close to the wind regarding pageant decorum. Although acting and performance were more common in the Shows than some have admitted, it was rare for an actor to play *to* the massed populace rather than to the procession of dignitaries (who whatever their personal preference, could not in their public personas be seen to mock foreign ambassadors). The ambassador in question, the relative newcomer Diego de Sarmiento (later known as Count Gondomar) was a particularly dangerous figure to mock, as it seems from Busino's account that his household had already become unpopular among Londoners at large.

Less than a year after this performance, in July 1618, Sarmiento's servants caused a full-scale riot. The Venetian Ambassador, Piero Contarini, reported to the Doge and Senate that following an injury done by one of Sarmiento's household to a child in the street, 'so great a mob collected and followed the Spaniard that [...] he had much ado to reach the embassy'; the man himself escaped injury, but the crowd turned into a riot outside the Spanish Embassy, throwing stones through the windows and attempting to force the door.[40] Although the rioters were eventually punished to satisfy Sarmiento and maintain diplomatic relations, in the meantime the city authorities were forced to lock up the offending household members in order to disperse the crowd. That such a riot could break out so quickly, over a small incident

---

[40] 'Piero Contarini, Venetian Ambassador Extraordinary in England, to the Doge and Senate.' in Allen B. Hinds (ed), 'Venice: August 1618, 2-15,' *Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice*, Volume 15: 1617-1619, British History Online, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=88681 (accessed 22/8/2013)

(the child was, as Contarini said, 'more frightened than hurt') demonstrates the tension surrounding the Spanish, and their ambassador in particular, within London. For Middleton to not only give the Spanish prominence in representing foreigners' place in London but to play upon (and thus reinforce) the crowds' dislike of them and their ambassador, was surely a dangerous tactic.

Crucially, however, this performance only appears in Busino's account, and not in Middleton's own text of *Honour and Industry*. Understanding the different contexts of performance and print, Middleton played upon the massed crowd's prejudices in performance in order to create an atmosphere, helpful to the Shows' legitimising function, of popular enjoyment. However, writing for a readership which doubtless felt anxiety upon watching such a fine line being drawn in such a volatile crowd, he draws the device back under the authorial control made possible by print. Introducing the Frenchman's and Spaniard's speeches, Middleton emphasises that they are 'understood of [a small] number' (1257), minimising the imagined audience's interaction with these figures (relative, for example, to the 'Indians' in the first device, who on the procession's approach begin to dance 'to give content to themselves and the spectators'). He also translates both speeches in print to control the figures' dangerous foreignness – where the actor playing the Spaniard, and possibly the Frenchman, in whom Busino had less interest, emphasised the same in performance. We cannot know whether they were spoken in English as well as French and Spanish on the day of performance, but Middleton frames them in a way that implies they were spoken untranslated. The French and Spanish versions are entitled respectively 'The short speech delivered by the Frenchman in French' and 'The Spaniard's speech in Spanish' while both English translations are merely labelled 'the same in English' (1257). Thus on the day their speeches made them stand out even further from the crowd; indeed, Busino himself notes that foreigners 'must make themselves understood by signs whenever they can avoid speaking', ('Busino's Account', 1267) noting the linguistic element in Londoners' xenophobia. In translation, however, the characters can be brought under control, and Middleton can replace the anxious feeling engendered by exploring foreignness amongst a volatile and intolerant crowd with one reassured both by the speeches' content and the characters' corresponding greater closeness to standard pageant rhetoric.

Erne addresses the issue of translation in print but not performance, noting that in *The Spanish Tragedy* a multilingual playlet was probably performed on stage but replaced in the printed text by an English play. Although in performance 'the enacted linguistic confusion is more important than a literal understanding of the characters' lines', the same sense of 'Babel-like confusion seems difficult if not impossible to convey' in print.[41] Without the actor's well-pitched impersonation or the crowd it was designed to please, the speeches would probably have lost much of their dangerous patina in any case: however, by including the English – and in such bland language – Middleton can overlay his readers' anxious memories with a feeling of hearing the speeches as they were spoken on the day but also of not only understanding them but feeling reassured by their content. In refiguring the Show's spectacle in order to reassure his civic readers, Middleton was in effect presenting the civic community to itself, in a light that was not only flattering but tailored to assuage of anxieties regarding London's social stability in London.

Technology and labour: risky performance, textual reassurance

Starting to close the Show's text after Honour's final speech, Middleton highlights the amount of non-textual labour that went into the October 29th performance. While only Rowland Bucket, Henry Wild and Jacob Challoner are thanked by name, this conscientious attention to the laboured nature of the Show's preparations would have reminded the text's readers of the sheer number of craftsmen upon whose skill and industry the Show's success depended. This was surely another source of anxiety, and company records concerning preparations for the Shows indicate a desire to ensure success in all technical aspects. The Grocers' 'Charges of Triumphs' Account book records an expenditure of 2s 6d 'for goyng by water at severall tymes to see the worke made ready' before the 1617 Show.[42] The Ironmongers' Company, preparing for the 1618 Show, insisted that 'if ther be any default of p[er]formance in any of the Committees in the buisnesses to them respectively appounted the p[ar]tye delinquent of fayling of his due p[er]formance [should] forfaict and pay forty shilling[es] in

---

[41] Erne, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*, 54.

[42] Grocers' Company, 'Charges of Triumphs' Account Book, Guildhall MS 11590, fo. 14v.

such default'.[43] Technical hitches were a real possibility, and every failure in spectacle undermined the link between display and power on which the Shows rested. Having raised and then smoothed over the possibility of common problems throughout the text, Middleton waits until 'the triumph is dissolved' (1262) to do the same with the most vital issues of technology and design.

Almost all the extant accounts of the Shows focus mainly on their visual and pyrotechnical elements, prioritising display and explosions over the details in the speeches and the meaning of each device. Aside from what other critics have already extrapolated regarding how people watched mayoral Shows, this also shows us that the stakes surrounding the Shows' technical elements were especially high. By introducing the 'defacer' – either the potential vandal that Kate Levin suggests in her annotation, or the (more likely) official tasked with removing the pageant-wagons and Show paraphernalia from the public spaces of the procession route – Middleton clears a safe space to introduce such a high-stakes topic. His relieved tone at the end of the text surely mirrors his readers' relief at the Show's end in performance. 'After this day's trouble' completes the account's chronological framework but also reminds readers of the labour involved in the Shows' every aspect. Middleton is drawing attention to his own hard work, but also noting that the successes he has just documented were the result of many hours' and individuals' toil.

His account thus makes the Show itself an extension of Industry's pronouncement in the first device that 'to rise without me is to steal to glory' (1256). The Company's hard work in organising the Show is what guaranteed that their celebration would not only be successful but deserve to be so. Middleton here creates a cunning logical short-circuit, turning his readers' awareness of their own hard work into evidence that the Show was indeed successful. By celebrating Industry as a moral virtue which guarantees *desert* of success, but also firmly linking desert to reward, he allows readers to infer that, since hard work is the only thing that can really guarantee success, not just in terms of labour itself but in terms of moral absolutes, their hard work has in itself made the Show successful, and they do not depend upon others' validation. In this way he addresses his readers' potential insecurity over city governance in the Show's content, as well as in its description. A bad Lord Mayor shamed his company as much as a good one made it proud, and

---

[43] Ironmongers Company, Court Minutes, 9th October 1618, Guildhall Library MS 16967/3, fo. 131v.

after the chaos in March it was important to both the Grocers and the City government as a whole that Bolles was not only effective, but visibly so.

Labour is made especially visible in the Show's first pageant-device, the 'island of growing spices' with dancing Indians, and the Chariot which follows it carrying India and Industry (among other figures). In *The Triumphs of Truth*, the most active of the Oriental figures had been the King of the Moors. Middleton had included spice-laden islands to celebrate the Grocers' connection to the East India Company and import trade (and in both Shows spices had been thrown to the crowds for the same reason), but they had floated on the Thames, to be admired from afar rather than to take an active part in the proceedings. In contrast, these Indians have specific tasks, 'some planting nutmeg trees, some other spice trees [...] some gathering the fruits, some making up bags of pepper; every one severally employed' (1256). This is not just something for the actors to do until they meet the mayoral procession and begin dancing, but is important enough to the device's very symbolism that Middleton feels the need to narrate it in detail. Even when they do 'ceasing in their labours, dance about the trees', he emphasises that they are all 'active youths'.

The attraction of India here is not merely its exoticism, but the laboured nature of that exoticism. Industry's speech, as noted above, complements this by making the desert (and by extension possibility) of success contingent on visible hard work. If 'to rise without me is to steal to glory', then the achievements of those who cannot be seen to work hard rest, by implication, on a shaky foundation. The repurposing of 'love' and Cupid works together with this to move Industry from the internal, spiritual labour celebrated in *The Triumphs of Truth* to a form of toil which depends upon external validation. Industry led to spiritual reward in *Truth*, but here the golden ball with a Cupid figure which she holds, signifying 'that Industry gets both wealth and love' connects outward toil with others' approval and with externally verifiable successes.

The small dramatic conflict between Reward and Justice at the 'Castle of Fame or Honour' confirms the external verification of just reward. Reward attempts to seat the Lord Mayor in the Castle of Fame, but Justice protests that Bolles' place in the castle depends upon 'Great works of grace' and 'A whole year's reverend care'. The moral dimension here, which cements the relationship between desert and reward, rests on the necessity of discernible virtuous toil to good government. If

Bolles works hard in his position as Lord Mayor, it will enable him to take 'virtuous care/ Of the oppressèd', which contribution to government will in turn 'draw him forth/ To take this merit in this seat of worth' (1260). There is again a fine distinction to be made between this and Middleton's next Show, the 1619 *Triumphs of Love and Antiquity* (examined in the previous chapter), in which virtuous government's capacity to inspire similar action in future generations is part of its present value. Here, Bolles's virtue may well inspire virtue, but the real test of virtue in government is its effect in the present – surely the primary concern of a civic government shaken by social unrest six months earlier.

How, though, does this fit into the reassuring function earlier identified as the Show's primary objective? It seems if anything less reassuring, raising the possibility of Bolles's failure just as he begins his year in office. The answer lies, once again, in the way in which Middleton negotiates his readers' unique position between text and performance. Bolles' success will require external verification, as we have seen, but of course he will never *in real life* be conducted into a 'castle of Fame', however successful his mayoralty. The closest he will in fact ever come to visible validation by the governed is the spectacle of the Show itself. Although Middleton, as we saw above, does emphasise the fact that Bolles must earn his Fame in the future, and has a year of visibly laboured government ahead of him, he also uses the text to frame his readers' memory of the Show into *prima facie* evidence that Bolles has been and will be successful. This allows Middleton to address the issue properly, by admitting the possibility of failure, but without ever allowing this admission of theoretical possibility to turn into practical, realistic possibility.

By the time we reach the drama at Fame's castle, Bolles has been presented as always and already deserving of accolades: although he cannot enter Fame's castle just yet, we are left in no doubt that he will merit it by the end of his year as Lord Mayor. Middleton starts this from the very beginning, addressing the Show's dedication to 'the worthy deserver of all [these] costs and triumphs' (1254). The first invention, which as mentioned above outlines the necessity of visible labour, makes visible the labour that Bolles has already undertaken by celebrating his close connection to the East India Company. By making India the 'seat of merchandise' (1256), Middleton locates Industry in the commerce associated with that region – by which definition Bolles has already laboured visibly – and thus has not risen without Industry, nor, in the terms of her speech, stolen to glory.

The Triumphs of Honour and Industry may lack the religious allegory of Middleton's previous Show, but it engages with the equally complex issue of performativity on several different levels, exploring the relationship between text, memory and performance in the Show itself while also scrutinising the importance of performativity in the execution of good governance. The Show thus deserves more credit than Lobanov-Rostovsky gives it. He states that, having followed Thomas Dekker in reforming pageants' structure (implicitly for the better) in *Truth*, Middleton 'abandoned' this in his later shows, since the companies had, in Lobanov-Rostovsky's words, 'wielded [their] power to efface the presence of theatrical artifice in their spectacles'.[44] There was undoubtedly drama in *Truth*'s performance, but Middleton used it to allegorise the Calvinist conception of humans' relationship with sin: hardly a fiction to be considered dangerous by the civic authorities. We cannot know how far they approved of *Honour and Industry*, but what is certain is that Middleton did not disengage from theatricality but in fact deepened his engagement, making it more complex and applying it to several different areas. While less overtly intertextual than Munday's *Metropolis Coronata* (1615) and *Chrysanaleia* (1616), this Show looks to its own genre, exploring and utilising its particular qualities. Printed Shows were not, and never could be, printed drama, and the Shows in performance behaved very differently to drama on stage. However, Middleton's innovation in *The Triumphs of Honour and Industry* showed that the Lord Mayor's Show possessed a power, theatrical and textual, which was all its own.

Sidero-thriambos: challenging Middleton's harmony

Middleton's text proves that the printed Show has a capacity that is distinct from printed drama and even from other printed pageantry: not only does Munday's *Sidero-Thriambos* (1618) confirm this, but it also gives the printed Show a strength which is distinct from the performed Show, exploring the ways in which print and performance diverge. Although he inverts the relationship Middleton establishes in *Honour and Industry*, Munday shows the same concern with how the text relates – or does not – to the performance it supposedly commemorates. Such a connection may have stemmed from the fact that, like the 1617 Show, Munday's 1618 Show was

---

[44] Sergei Lobanov-Rostovsky, 'The Triumphes of Golde: Economic Authority in the Jacobean Lord Mayor's Show,' *ELH* 60, no. 4 (1993): 880, 892.

performed under significant social pressure. Scheduled to coincide with it –
deliberately, we can assume – was the execution of Sir Walter Raleigh. The
performed Show therefore had political relevance on a national, as well as a local
level. Where others had merely to demonstrate Company magnificence and civic
order, this particular spectacle was also intended to exert social control over a
situation of national importance, overcoming citizens' interest in the execution of a
highly significant figure.

The charges against Raleigh were technically of treason, but were on what
his supporters might have considered flimsy grounds, particularly given the anti-
Spanish feeling in the populace at large. He had disobeyed King James's instructions
during a voyage to the Azores, attacking a Spanish fleet and damaging the Anglo-
Spanish relations which the king was so anxious to protect. Being seen to punish
Raleigh was the most effective method for James to distance himself from the attack,
and as Raleigh had already been imprisoned under a charge of treason since 1603
(his release for the voyage was on probation, not pardon), anything less than
execution would amount to a continuance of his former treatment – and thus
implicitly condone his behaviour. James and Raleigh had never seen eye to eye, but
whatever the king's personal motivations, Raleigh's fate was sealed by diplomatic
necessity. Nevertheless, to many bystanders, particularly those whose opposition to
Spain led them to admire Raleigh's unauthorised attacks, it seemed as though
Raleigh was being executed unfairly. His popularity – or at least the unpopularity of
his death – is evident in the several accounts of his execution which not only record
his dying words but praise his piety in that moment. For example, John Pory, a
servant of Sir Dudley Carleton, wrote to Carleton the day after the execution that
'every man that saw Sir Walter Ralegh dye sayd it was impossible for any man to
shewe more Decorum, courage, or piety; and that his death will doe more hurte to
the faction that sought it, than ever his life could have done'.[45]

Such popular approbation meant that the execution, as Bowers notes, risked
'overt protest on the part of those excited English subjects who were outraged at the
sordid spectacle of a gallant public figure being sacrificed to the whim of Spain'.[46]

---

[45] William S. Powell, 'John Pory on the Death of Sir Walter Raleigh,' *The William and Mary Quarterly* 9, no. 4 (1952): 537.

[46] R. H. Bowers, 'Raleigh's Last Speech: The 'Elms' Document,' *The Review of English Studies* 2, no. 7 (1951): 215.

Redundant though this rhetoric is as a historical account, it expresses effectively the likely viewpoint of Raleigh's supporters. Such a stark dichotomy between patriotic hero and Catholic-loving monarch was precisely what the authorities feared would foment popular unrest. Scheduling the execution to coincide with the popular festivities of the mayoral inauguration represented an attempt to minimize Raleigh's potential audience, hoping that people would be drawn away from Westminster (where the execution took place) to the procession at the other end of the City. This placed a good deal of pressure on the Show to be not merely even more popular than usual, but to be comparatively orderly, representing as it now did the maintenance of order among the populace.

There is, sadly, little evidence as to the Show's success in distracting from Raleigh's execution. We do know that the execution was well attended, however, and we can assume that, as was usual for mayoral Shows, disruption and violent crowds competed with the official splendour of the procession itself. Like Middleton, then, Munday had to deal in his text with the dichotomy between what the Show would ideally overcome, in terms of social disorder, and the fact that if anything it was seen as likely to foment more disorder. Where Middleton's text directly addressed the pressure of the Show's situation, however, *Sidero-Thriambos* has a less direct relationship to Raleigh's execution. Munday seems to have been less concerned with responding directly to the situation. Instead he uses this Show to meditate on the genre's capacity – or lack thereof – to rewrite performance memories, and Middleton's work the year before is at least as likely an influence as the direct tensions surrounding Raleigh's execution.

Nevertheless, the City's natural trepidation about potential disorder may have influenced Munday's dedication to *Sidero-Thriambos*, which expresses the hope that the Ironmongers 'trust [...] reposed in me' is fulfilled 'in the despight of envy, and calumnious imputations' (A3r). Tracey Hill interprets this as an acknowledgement of swipes made by Middleton and Jonson at Munday's work – the latter in the character Antonio Balladino, in Jonson's *The Case is Altered* (1597-1609) and the former in *The Triumphs of Truth* (1613), which refers to 'Black Monday' as the epitome of low-quality pageant-writing.[47] We cannot be sure how Munday reacted to these

---

[47] Hill, *Pageantry and Power*, 87. Two dates are given here for *The Case is Altered* because, while 1597 is the approximate year it was first performed, 1609 is the date of the first print edition.

comments, and, as previously stated, David Bergeron cautions against assuming an automatic rivalry between him and Middleton.[48] One thing that is certain, however, is that like Middleton's deliberate 'slippages', this negative note in Munday's dedication is included consciously, as a deliberate authorial tactic. Leaving this note of 'anxiety' uncorrected, Munday ensures that his readers move on to the Show's main text aware that its circumstances of production belied the claims, standard for pageant rhetoric, of civic and company harmony.

This sets a keynote for the Show itself. Unlike *Chrysanaleia*, the Show lacks a unifying theme, and its tone is slightly different to Munday's earlier, more triumphal texts, as noted above. However, this makes rather more sense when we read the Show in conjunction with – and as a possible reaction to – the strategies I have just identified in Middleton's *Honour and Industry*. Middleton uses the 'slippages' and negative notes in his text as a positive force, stimulating his readers' memories of the Show's imperfect performance in order to rewrite that performance with the imperfections corrected. The combination of controlled imperfection and perfectly-calibrated reassurance made *Honour and Industry* a text which did not merely 'complete' performance, in David Bergeron's words, but surpassed it, utilising the fact of the Show's staging (and readers' memory thereof) to augment its own power of creating, in their minds, a 'perfect' view of it.[49] This strategy of Middleton's touches on many issues regarding the relationship between printed text and performance, including the text's capacity to revive or memorialise a performance: this is particularly germane to the genre of the printed mayoral Show, as the material circumstances of performance were so specific and unrepeatable –and yet part of a regular tradition.

Munday picks up on those debates in *Sidero-Thriambos*, but adopts a stance rather different to Middleton's. Middleton resolved issues and potential problems, creating a relationship of mutual power between text and performance by eliding their differences: the logical conclusion was an ideal of spectacular performance, which combined the ritual power of London's civic space and the mayoral

---

[48] David M. Bergeron, 'Thomas Middleton and Anthony Munday: Artistic Rivalry?,' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 36, no. 2 (1996): 461–79. See also Tracey Hill, *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture: Theatre, History and Power in Early Modern London, 1580-1633* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004), 79.

[49] David M. Bergeron, 'Stuart Civic Pageants and Textual Performance,' *Renaissance Quarterly* 51, no. 1 (1998): 163–83.

inauguration day with the authorly control of the text. Middleton's crowds, controlled in print, only contribute to the Show's political claims, and never – unlike the real crowds – threaten to undermine its claims to order. Munday adopts a rather different tactic, showcasing not print's close relationship to performance but rather its distance from performance, producing a self-consciously *textual* printed Show which, while drawing on performance, could never have been entirely realised on the streets. Where Middleton raises conflicts only to resolve them, Munday leaves contradictions deliberately unresolved, resisting the smooth symbiosis that underpins *Honour and Industry*. Both authors are keenly aware of their texts' power in interpreting performance, but where Middleton uses this power to create a perfect performance, Munday denies the possibility of this perfection, deliberately moving his text beyond and away from the civic spectacle even as he supposedly memorialises it. Just as in *Honour and Industry*, this is a deliberate authorial strategy, caused not by Munday's busyness or lack of understanding but by his ability to manipulate the complex relationship between text and performance on which the printed Shows were founded.

Munday's description of the Show's first device neatly summarises his perspective on this relationship. The reason he gives for such a lavish description is not the corresponding lavishness of the spectacle (something pageant-writers were generally keen to emphasise) but rather the opposite: that 'favourable conceit must needs supply the defect of impossible performance' (sig. A4v). We are thus instantly made aware, as readers, that the descriptions we are about to read, however magnificent, are not just imperfect representations but fundamentally different. The more favourable the conceit, the more – we are to assume – impossible the performance. Where Middleton uses his descriptions to assert the perfection of *Honour and Industry*'s performance, Munday leaves us in no doubt that his text will not do such a thing. We cannot be sure whether 'so slender a compasse' refers to the short text or the short time he was given to execute such a spectacle, but whatever the reference, we can be certain that the text will correct neither. Ironically, in telling us that the reader's imagination will have to compensate for the inadequate performance, Munday prevents this from ever happening. As we read the rest of the show, we will be inescapably aware that, whatever the text claims about the performance, its reality may well have come up short. The printed Show can no longer enhance our imagination of its spectacular realisation on London's streets,

and in barely half a sentence Munday has thus constrained our sense of what the printed Shows are capable of, as a genre. They can claim a loose relationship with performance, but they can neither provide an accurate report of its magnificence, nor enhance it – as Middleton had attempted to do a year previously.

The impossibility of imagination: textual description versus performance

The description of Lemnos, the 'imaginary isle' against whose 'impossible performance' Munday sets 'favourable conceit', is not just impossible to perform but also impossible to imagine performed. In Munday's description, the 'Isle it selfe' is 'swallowed up in the apparance of a goodly Myne, aptly seated in the midst thereof' (sig. B1r). Aside from the oddness of having introduced Lemnos as 'ingeniously and artificially fitted' (sig. A4v) and then seemingly covered it back up instantly, Munday seems to resist any consistent interpretation at all – even an odd one. We are left in doubt as to whether the mine actually engulfs the island, as 'swallowed up' implies, but then this makes uncertain how the mine can be 'aptly seated in the midst' of the island, as being in the midst of something would surely necessitate being smaller than it. Even more confusingly, the device is later referred to as an 'Isle or Myne', implying that the two have merged and become indistinguishable. This is of course not necessary for understanding the other visual details that Munday gives (such as the singing Cyclops). However, a reader trying to imaginatively reconstruct the occasion from this description would be forced to leave gaps or uncertainties in their imagination correlative to the contradictions that Munday has deliberately inserted, and thus to acknowledge the distance between text and performance.

This could, of course, merely be bad description on Munday's part. However, by this point he had written at least six mayoral Shows; self-contradiction seems too easy a mistake to make, particularly in such a short text. Moreover, having (as was usual) been paid not merely for the text but for organising the spectacle, Munday was surely clear on how it had looked in performance: occluding this in text, then, is likely to have been a deliberate tactic rather than a creative failure. Describing the difference between playtexts as written for performance and those which addressed a reader, Lukas Erne notes that 'the readerly text, designed for a reception in which the

intellect is much involved, puts up greater resistance to the reader's mind than the short, theatrical text'.[50]

As we have seen, this binary between 'readerly' and 'performative' text is not always helpful, and both Munday and Middleton have a more complex, nuanced approach to the print-performance relationship than merely elevating one or the other. However, Erne's comment usefully reminds us that reading texts such as the Shows, which rest on the relationship between performance and description, necessarily entails imagining a performance, or resisting the act thereof. Beyond this, as already noted with reference to *Honour and Industry*, many of the Show's readers – particularly its original recipients – would have a memory of the Show which they would surely have linked with the description they read in print. In describing the spectacle, then, Munday has a choice. He can facilitate that link between print and remembered performance, as Middleton does; or he can interrupt that link by making his description impossible to visualise – or indeed to match with whatever his readers might remember seeing.

John Cox notes the virtue, for editors of early modern dramatic texts, of leaving stage directions undetermined, to 'allow the reader to imagine the staging for themselves'.[51] This, as he and Margaret Jane Kidnie note, mirrors the freedom given to the texts' early modern readers: Kidnie notes that while editors can offer information about early modern staging, excessive specificity of stage directions precludes the reader's ability – and right – to 'choose to fix [particular details] in his or her imagination – or indeed [...] to leave unfixed, open'.[52] Leaving space for the reader to imagine the performance or action effectively makes a statement about the relationship between a play's text and its realization in performance, implying that although the text may draw power from having once been performed, it cannot control how it is subsequently realized, either in actual performance or in the reader's mind. Mayoral Shows, however, sit less easily with such a gap. Claiming as they do to describe a performance, and at that a one-off spectacle rather than a play,

---

[50] Erne, *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*, 232.

[51] John D. Cox, 'Open Stage, Open Page? Editing Stage Directions in Early Modern Dramatic Texts,' in *Textual Performances: The Modern Reproduction of Shakespeare's Drama*, ed. Lukas Erne and Margaret Jane Kidnie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 179.

[52] Margaret Jane Kidnie, 'The Staging of Shakespeare's Drama in Print Editions,' in *Textual Performances: The Modern Reproduction of Shakespeare's Drama*, ed. Lukas Erne and Margaret Jane Kidnie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 159.

they have, for better or for worse, a much closer – and more weighted – relationship to their readers' memories and/or imaginations of the realities of performance.

Authors of the Shows are thus forced to take up a much more specific position with regard to their readers' visualisation of performance, asserting more control than the 'open' play texts of the same period. Choice here does not open up possibility: unlike many plays, these shows only had a single performance, in highly-controlled circumstances. Plurality of interpretation does not, as with plays, mirror the potential for improvisation in everyday theatrical life, but rather mitigates against the stated purpose of the genre itself. We have seen how Middleton utilises that control, carefully shaping his readers' imagination of performance in order to link it to their remembrance of reality. Munday was just as invested, and takes just as strong a position: instead of Middleton's smoothing tactics, however, he deliberately problematises the relationship, emphasising the disjunctures between print and performance and reminding his readers at every turn what the text cannot do.

One such moment is his description of the character 'Expectation': according to Munday, this character 'intimateth to [the new Mayor] that there will be more then ordinary matter expected from him: in regard, that hee is now mounted like a Beacon on an Hill, to flame forth brightly, and not to burne dimly' (sig. B4v). 'Intimateth' refers either to reported speech or to a dumb-show, but either way it is distinctive for what it lacks in terms of performance. A reader, using the Show to visualize performance, would by this point in the text be conditioned to read directly-reported speeches as that which was spoken. Munday's terse report either preserves nothing of the Show's usual grand style (compare this to, for example, the Master Gunner's speech on B3r) or reports on a dumbshow which would have been completely incomprehensible. Only by knowing textually that the alternative to flaming 'brightly' is to 'burne dimly' could a reader understand that 'more than ordinary matter' was expected of the new Lord Mayor, Sir Sebastian Harvey. Of course, none of this content is at odds with the Show's tradition (one would hardly expect Expectation to request 'ordinary matter') but the significance lies in Munday's deliberately obscure way of presenting that content. We can imagine several alternative views, but can settle on none of them as the 'reality' of what happened during performance. In being thus prevented from arriving at a specific conclusion regarding the performance, readers are forced once again to confront the unstable

relationship between this printed text and the performance on which it supposedly rests.

Uncertainty and risk: troubling the text-event relationship

If this instability is unsettling for a modern reader, it would have been even more so for the reader to whom Munday's tactics, like Middleton's, were initially directed. Despite the uncertain evidence, the Company's ownership of the texts means that at least some of them were probably given as gifts to elevated members, some of whom would no doubt have been invested in the Show's success. This was particularly true for the Ironmongers, who were so pleased with the execution of this Show in performance (Munday's 'good performance of his business undertaken', albeit also as compensation for the 'spoyling of his Pageant apparaile') that they awarded him an extra £3.[53] There are a variety of reasons why companies paid for the printing of these texts, but one of the most important was surely that they functioned as souvenirs, memorialising the success of a day which had been expensive and time-consuming to organise. Middleton's text addresses such a reader directly, reasserting the Show's success and utilising their expertise to reassuring effect. By now a veteran pageant-writer, Munday was also aware of his readers' likely expertise in the Shows' staging, and consequent investment in the printed text's relationship to performance. However, he exploits it in a very different way in *Sidero-Thriambos*, complicating his readers' understanding of the relationship.

One concrete example of this is Munday's description of the 'Gunner and his Mate', who operate the 'Millitary Engine' (cannon):

> diverse Chambers [are present], to bee shot off as occasion
> serveth, and as the Master Gunner and his Mate (there
> present) please to give direction, or performe the service in
> their owne persons.
>
> (sig. B2v)

Written in the future tense, this reads almost like a blueprint for the Show. Munday leaves room for different eventualities and preferences, and seems to write as though

---

[53] Ironmongers Court Minutes, 2nd November 1618. Guildhall Library MS 16967/3, fo. 138r.

he does not know when occasion *will* serve – or even how many were employed at the cannon. It may well have been extracted from, or mirrored, Munday's original plans, but this was surely not just for convenience. As we have seen, the rest of the Show resists visual interpretation, offering simultaneous but mutually exclusive possibilities and forcing the reader to confront the difference between reading and seeing. Hill suggests that Munday used the plans he had given the Company as a source for the printed Show, and although she notes that other sources were used, we should be cautious about assuming that the present tense indicates mere copying from a blueprint.[54] If one could not use this show to imagine a specific set of devices, one could certainly not use it to plan and construct one. We can therefore assume that Munday's hint here of a blueprint is a deliberate strategy rather than laziness. This serves the same purpose as his resistance to visual interpretation, reminding his readers – many of whom would have been privy to his actual plans, in some form or another – that the nature of the Show in text is always potential, never concrete. Only in actual, material performance could the events around the cannon be fixed: until and indeed after then (for those who lacked perfect, accurate memories), they are, like all texts, subject to interpretative openness and uncertainty.

Middleton attempts to use the text of *Honour and Industry* to 'fix' the uncertainties of its performance; Munday does the exact opposite, including deliberate textual uncertainty to remind the readers of *Sidero-Thriambos* that, despite the text's apparent stability, it has no real authority to corroborate what happened on 29th October 1618. As Hill points out, Munday's dedication of the text to the Ironmongers' Company implies that it was presented at some stage after the performance, promising that 'briefly set downe in this Booke' are 'what the whole scope of the deuises aymed at, and were ordered according to your direction'(sig. A3r).[55] Munday would therefore have had ample scope, had he wished, to 'set downe' definitely what had happened at the cannon, rather than leaving the possibilities open. However, in doing the latter he complicates what Bergeron claims *Honour and Industry* does – 'asks the reader to pretend actual attendance' – once again opening up a dialogue with Middleton's text.[56] Where Middleton certainly

---

[54] Hill, *Pageantry and Power*, 242–43.

[55] Munday, sig. A3r; cited in *Ibid*., 242.

[56] Bergeron, 'Stuart Civic Pageants and Textual Performance,' 174.

does rely on his readers' memory of attending the Show's performance, Munday – knowing full well that many of them had attended – denies that his text has anything to do with this attendance. Many, if not most, of the text's readers would have been fully aware of whether the Gunner and Mate had operated the cannon themselves, and even in the Show's noisy atmosphere a cannon would have been loud enough that everybody knew at what point it had been fired. However, Munday deliberately shies away from admitting this knowledge, overtly refusing to make an interpretive decision either way and highlighting the text's failure as an authoritative account.

This does not mean, however, that Munday denigrates the power or the value of the printed Show. Rather, he uses a deliberate moment of uncertainty to highlight for his readers something he explores throughout *Sidero-thriambos*: the capacity of the printed text to introduce possibilities and open up themes that might have remained closed, or been closed down, in the reality of performance. His description of the devices in this Show is notable for its insistence on giving extra textual detail, far more than could ever have been perceived by a spectator, even in the privileged position of the mayoral procession. For example, on the device which includes the Ironmongers' Mine and the Isle of Lemnos (whose uncertain visual description is noted above), 'Jupiter [is] mounted upon his Royall Eagle' (sig. B2r). As expected, Jupiter holds 'his three-forked Thunderbolt in his hand'; but, rather less predictably, we are also told that the thunderbolt was 'made in the Isle of Lemnos by Mulciber' (sig. B2r). While believable within the Show's internal fiction, this fact strikes an odd note because it is presented in the same tone as visual description: as a fact pertaining to the performance.

In fact, it would be impossible to communicate to those watching (except through speeches, which if they were given are not set down here) that this prop has a particular history related to the rest of the pageant-device, and indeed to another of the characters. So too, Jupiter's armour was 'intended for the service of Mars, but [is] now bestowne on him' by Mulciber. One could perhaps portray the *bestowing* itself through the actors' performances, but Mulciber's previous intention for the armour would surely be more difficult to express. These directions are reminiscent of what Richard Rowland terms 'overdetermining' stage directions, 'in which the dramatist attempts to convey to the actor not merely the physical gesture of a

character, but his or her thought process'.[57] Interestingly, while Rowland identifies this type of stage direction as particularly distinctive to Thomas Heywood, Munday himself comes a close second, using such directions in his Huntington plays and in *The Book of Sir Thomas More*.[58] If Munday used such directions in a dramatic script to determine actors' actions, he surely had a different purpose in this Show. As I note above, this text goes far beyond what we would expect of a mere blueprint, so even those features which imply an attempt to control performance must have another purpose for Munday to have retained them in the printed account. Just so, his 'overdetermined' directions/descriptions surely have a purpose in terms of the printed texts, with their intended readership not of performers but of Company (and perhaps civic) dignitaries.

More than a printed programme: distinct yet interdependent

Providing extra detail about performance might seem to imply that the text is intended as an addition to the Show's performance, to be read alongside it. However, the extensive visual detail and attention to relative position challenge this, making the account something which stands apart from the Show in performance. Alan Dessen's work, though pioneering in many respects, assumes that stage directions can only function as scripts for present or future performance. In distinguishing between 'fictional' and 'theatrical' directions, he describes 'theatrical' directions as denoting the use of large stage properties and 'fictional' directions as directing how an actor should use his or her skills, and handheld properties, to work upon the imagination of the audience.[59] This is contradicted by Antony Hammond's earlier study, which notes that John Webster's stage directions in the printed text of *The White Devil* are 'a conscious attempt to bring the staging of his play to life to a *reader*' [Hammond's italics], and that therefore 'Webster was actively interested in the way his play would make an impression upon readers who had not seen it in

---

[57] Richard Rowland, ' 'Speaking Some Words, but of No Importance': Stage Directions, Thomas Heywood, and *Edward IV*,' *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 18 (2005): 111; 113.

[58] *Ibid*., 114.

[59] Alan Dessen, 'Stage Directions and the Theatre Historian', in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre*, ed. Richard Dutton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 522-23.

performance.'[60] As noted above, Webster was keen to distinguish the printed text from its incarnation in performance, attributing its failure on the stage to the lack of '(that which is the only grace and setting out of a tragedy) a full and understanding auditory'.[61] This does not mean, however, that the text was completely unrelated to performance: the title page advertises that it was 'Acted by the Queen's Majesties Servants', and the inclusion of detail as stage directions encourages the reader to imagine the action as a stage performance. While Webster was indeed writing for readers and not audience members, he seems to encourage those readers either to imagine, or to remember, the experience of being an audience member.[62]

The interdependence of performance and print in this playtext is mirrored in *Sidero-Thriambos*. Where Webster asks readers to imagine a more favourable performance, however, Munday creates a much more complicated relationship between the role of reader and audience. He reminds his readers that although this text is linked to a real performance, the things it can express are entirely different: unlike performances, it can speak directly to the intellect rather than through spectacles and speeches. By comparing Munday's description here to his work in *Chrysanaleia* (1616) we can see that *Sidero-Thriambos* employs a specifically non-theatrical strategy. Describing the 'Fishmongers' Esperanza', the fishing boat which represented the first device in the 1616 Show, Munday states that it 'may passe (by generall sufferance) for the same fishing Busse, wherein Saint Peter sate mending his Nets', and even provides an alternative view: 'if not so; take her for one of those fishing Busses, which [...] enricheth our kingdome'.[63] Munday's description here acknowledges the Esperanza's existence in performance, and the text's status as

---

[60] Antony Hammond, 'Encounters of the Third Kind in Stage-Directions in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama,' *Studies in Philology* 89, no. 1 (1992): 73.

[61] Webster, *The White Devil*, 30.

[62] Webster's own Lord Mayor's Show, *Monuments of Honour* (1624) seems to provide similarly reader-focused descriptions of the day's events, but like the Shows discussed here may well have been intended for readers who *had* seen the Show performed. This issue certainly bears further examination, but the scope of this piece is insufficient to separate Webster's own authorial innovation from the developments made to the genre in Shows before 1624. For existing discussion of *Monuments of Honour* and its mediation between spectacle and print, see Paula Johnson's 'Jacobean Ephemera and the Immortal Word,' *Renaissance Drama: New Series* 8 (1977): 151–71.

[63] Anthony Munday, *Chrysanaleia: or the Golden Fishing* (London: George Purslowe, 1616), sig. B1v.

representation; in stark contrast, in *Sidero-Thriambos* Munday merely states the non-performable details about Jupiter's props and their provenance as facts.

He does not, of course, expect his readers to seriously believe these mythological details as facts; nor, however, does the same suspension of disbelief apply here as it does in, say, the court masque, which relied much more heavily upon the creation of mystery. Indeed, as noted above, the likely readers would be more, not less, familiar with the earthly circumstances of the text's production. While the Shows did occasionally refer to the Mayor's quasi-royal qualities, the performance circumstances of the two genres were entirely different, and mythical mysteries thus functioned differently in them. The mine/Lemnos device gains as much grandeur from its connection to the Ironmongers as from the presence of Jupiter, and pageant-texts tend to flaunt the material labour and investment that had gone into the performance, in contrast to the masque's ineffable mysteries.[64] Munday knew, then, that his readers did not need to be given an elevated history for objects of whose provenance they were perfectly aware and perhaps even proud. It is thus likely that his technique here has to do with the purpose, outlined above, of complicating the relationship between visual description in print and the remembered reality of performance.

This is borne out by his description of the cannon as 'seeming to be forged in the same Myne' (sig. B2v). Here Munday emphasises the visual aspect of something that, ironically, would be impossible to represent visually (at least in performance). Aside from the very different processes of mining iron ore and forging metal into cannons, surely it would be impossible to distinguish metal whose ore came from a specific mine by sight. Munday's readers may not all have been actual ironmongers, but if they could understand his mythological and historical references they surely also had enough common sense to know this. They would therefore have been aware that this was a specifically textual detail; even those with a perfect memory of the pageant in performance could only have been given this information textually. Unlike some of the other textual detail, however, the verb 'seeming' specifically implies a context of performance and visual reception.

---

[64] An interesting connection here might be James's frequent representation as Jove or Jupiter in the court masque, and Jupiter's representation six years before *Sidero-Thriambos* in Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*. His cosmological place had also recently been challenged by Galileo's discoveries: Munday's representation may therefore have touched a raw nerve. For more on this, see John Pitcher's 'Introduction' to *Cymbeline* (London: Penguin, 2005), lxviii-lxxvii.

Munday's text thus contradicts what Stern claims for printed Arguments attached to plays – that they can 'make what the occasion should have been' – as well Bergeron's claims about prefaces to printed plays, which 'exist as *textual events*, having nothing to do with performance'.[65] This is both explicitly textual and fundamentally linked to performance, even as it denies it. By invoking the act of perception, Munday reminds his readers of their previous role as audience, and of the limitations of the printed text in recreating that role: he asks them to perceive something that they could never have perceived in performance, and which they can only know through being told explicitly (rather than shown). Like Middleton, then, Munday explores a much more complex, nuanced relationship between print and performance than merely rejecting one or the other, or even – as David Bergeron would have it – one 'complet[ing]' the other.[66]

Text and performance complicate, rather than complete, one another in Munday's description of the 'Mount of Fame' and its inhabitants. At first Munday seems to acknowledge the representative nature of his description, with Fame 'seeming' to sound her trumpet, the banner of which is decorated with eyes 'implying' the need for silence and vigilance (sig. B4r). However, before long he introduces a deliberate resistance to imaginable detail. As well as the contradictions in his description of Expectation (as outlined above), he leaves the reader momentarily unclear as to how – or if at all – the figures of Justice and Fortitude are 'treading down' Ambition, Treason and Hostility. It soon emerges that these threatening figures are unable to enact the threat they pose, as they 'sit gyved, and manacled together in Iron shackles' (sig. C1r). Also hard to imagine is the unperformable detail that the shackles are 'purposely made and sent from the *Ironmongers Myne*, to binde such base villaines to their better behaviour' (sig. C1r). As with Jupiter's armour earlier in the work, it would be impossible to express visually the mine from which a particular good originated, and Munday knows that his readers know this. This is not merely overenthusiastic description but a specific textual strategy, designed to evoke both the purpose of printed Shows – to communicate the sights and sounds of performance – and the impossibility of their doing this accurately.

---

[65] Stern, *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*; David M. Bergeron, *Textual Patronage in English Drama, 1570-1640* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 5.

[66] Bergeron, 'Stuart Civic Pageants and Textual Performance', 165.

As Munday reminds his readers, the pageant-text may be linked to the event of performance, and even derive some of its power from it, but it can communicate a layer of meaning over and above what even the most privileged spectator could have gleaned from merely watching the performance. No account of performance, however faithful, can give a true account of what 'happened': merely transposing performance to print entails change, and a performance-in-text must by its very nature be different from the performance as it was seen. Of course, accounts could be (and often were) closer to reality than Munday's is here; the point he emphasises by being overtly *un*faithful – and including details that make fidelity not just distant but unthinkable – is that however close an account was to reality, reading performance is a different experience from seeing it, and describing a performance is fundamentally different to enacting it. Gabriel Heaton identifies two types of relationship between performance and text in relation to early modern occasional spectacle (in this case royal entertainments of various kinds): printed texts as a 'faithful report' of what happened and texts which were entirely unrelated.[67] Some writers may indeed have adopted one of these two viewpoints, but Munday's attitude to 'faith' in reporting performance shows a much more complex understanding of the necessary omissions and additions which occur when 'performance' is transferred from lived experience to print.

The caution inherent in this view should not imply that Munday's view of pageant texts is negative, however, or that he saw reading them as inferior to the experience of watching the procession. He explores the additional capacities of print in communicating performance by adding motivations to characters that no actor could possibly have communicated to an audience. He explains the inclusion of more characters in the Mount of Fame device with the reason: 'Fame cannot endure, that any part of her Mount should be unfitly furnished' (sig. C1r). If it was difficult to act the intentions of Expectation earlier, it would have been impossible to present this kind of motivation in performance; once again, Munday gestures towards the description of performance only to make the content itself exclusively textual, making his readers much more than merely a privileged version of the audience. Describing Modesty as veiled, he adds an unexpected supplement to the description. We might attribute Modesty's veil to a desire not to be seen, but Munday claims that

---

[67] Gabriel Heaton, *Writing and Reading Royal Entertainments: From George Gascoigne to Ben Jonson* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 227.

it showcases her penetrating gaze, overtly giving his readers a layer of meaning that adds to the device's overall quality, but could only be perceived by the careful reading of the pageant-text.

This goes even further when Munday narrates what supposedly happens when the Mount is in danger: that is, that 'they [Fear and Modesty] informe Vigilancy and Providence [who] awake Care the Sentinell, to ring the Bell in the Watch-Tower, which calleth up Courage and Councel, that every one may have imploiment' (sig. C1v). It is just possible that all these characters were present, and even that a scene along the above lines was enacted at some point during the show: we might surmise, given what we know about the action in shows such as *The Triumphs of Truth*, that it happened when the procession reached the device. However, we do not know this, and Munday gives no indication either way: moreover, even if we assumed that it had happened at some point, essential to our interpretation of the performance would be a) *when* and in what circumstances it happened – in response to whose presence – and b) how it was initiated – that is, what kind of 'inconvenience' would be needed to overtly arise in order to show that this was a reaction to danger.

Interestingly, having given information that would have been unavailable to the audience, Munday contrasts this textuality with the relationship of emblem to audience at the time of performance. He notes in his description that 'for better understanding the true morality' of the devices, the characters 'have all Emblemes and Properties in their hands [...] that the weakest capacity may take knowledge of them' (sig. C1v). There would be no emblem complex enough to imply the series of events and motivations outlined above, so we can, I think, be certain that these are two different methods of perceiving (what is implicitly) the same device. By letting us know that he had provided for those 'of meaner understanding' in visual terms, Munday again draws his readers' attention to the different ways of creating meaning in performance and text. In the latter, he can create all sorts of complex and nuanced meanings merely by making statements. In performance, by contrast, to create a much simpler meaning requires a more difficult – and obvious – method of signifying. This is partly, of course, because the Show was attended by those of the 'weakest capacity' as well as the educated, but is also simple a consequence of medium: transmitting meaning in performance requires different strategies than those used to do the same on the page.

Blackletter and the British Bard: orality and typography

Sidero-Thriambos ends with the British Bard, one of the Show's most confusing characters. Written in a Scottish dialect or emulation of Middle Scots, the Bard's speeches are printed in 'black-letter' type (sigs. C2v-C3v). This has led Tracey Hill to assume, not unreasonably, that they are intended to be self-consciously 'archaic', following Zachary Lesser's characterisation of the typeface as one which was 'suffused with nostalgia'.[68] The use of type is certainly a credible textual strategy, and one that makes sense given Munday's evident concern with how the Show might function as a printed text in the hands of a reader. However, he uses this particular change of typeface not merely to signal a sudden archaism, but to continue what the rest of Show does: to interrogate the relationship between the text in print and the embodied reality of performance. Earlier in the Show, as we have seen, Munday explores the way in which seeing performance is not the same as reading a description, highlighting the disjunction between perception and description. In the two speeches of the British Bard, he moves on from the visual to the oral/aural aspect of performance, emphasising the text's capacity – or lack thereof – to transmit particular features of a performed speech.

The emphasis on orality in the printed text allows the Bard's speeches to challenge the relationship between what an audience can hear and what a reader can imagine themselves hearing. The content of the speeches itself is ordinary: the first one, in particular, intersperses the usual assurance that Harvey's brethren took great pains over the show and that he has great prospects as mayor, with a faintly unimpressive linking of Harvey to the two new Sheriffs (Herne and Hemersley) by the letter H. However, the typographical innovation makes content less important than form, drawing the reader's attention not to the Company's concerns but to the performance - and the text as an imperfect mediation thereof. Lesser notes the use of blackletter type as a textual strategy to denote nostalgia and a sense of national community in plays such as *The Shoemaker's Holiday* (in John Wolfe's 1609

---

[68] Hill, *Pageantry and Power*, 139; Zachary Lesser, 'Typographic Nostalgia: Playreading, Popularity and the Meanings of Black Letter,' in *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers, and Readers in Early Modern England*, ed. Marta Straznicky (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006), 99.

edition). This nostalgia, as Lesser demonstrates, can be traced back to the typeface's association with ballads, which we can therefore assume was, if not its only association, one of the most common, and certainly the most likely in this case.[69] Blackletter was also associated with populist forms of catechism, being more 'readable' for the less educated than roman type: however, for Munday's purpose the most relevant of its associations seems to be the link with broadside ballads.[70]

Association with ballads did not merely denote nostalgia, however. As Susan Stewart notes, the ballad form carries with it an implication of embodied orality, past and future; whatever the origins of a particular ballad, printing it did not mean fixing it forever but instituting a dialogue between the word-as-spoken/heard and the word-as-read.[71] Dianne Dugaw notes that, for early modern ballad-readers, print and oral delivery were not necessarily consecutive or even separate, but rather mingled together: 'written and printed versions of a song need not precede oral ones'.[72] Christopher Marsh provides a valuable corrective to the assumption that ballads moved only in one direction, from 'traditional oral and aural culture' towards a more 'literary', textual one, noting that many ballads 'had their origins in more expensive forms of literature' such as courtly verse.[73] This is not to deny the importance of orality/aurality to the ballad form, but rather to reasses its place in relation to the text: ballads' orality rested in their present use, not just in the genre's history. A ballad was capable, as Marsh has shown, of making a literary text into an oral one, and its orality was not confined to its past but rather existed in tandem with its textuality.

A reader of the Show, then, may have imagined the blackletter speeches in a more directly aural sense, associating them with the spoken ballad form (while, ironically, perceiving this orality through a print-specific medium). Aside from the Gunners' speeches, these are the only direct reported speech in the entire text,

---

[69] Lesser, 'Typographic Nostalgia', 98–100.

[70] See Ian M. Green, *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) for more on blackletter and popular religious texts.

[71] Susan Stewart, 'Scandals of the Ballad,' *Representations*, no. 32 (1990): 134–56.

[72] Dianne M. Dugaw, 'Anglo-American Folksong Reconsidered: The Interface of Oral and Written Forms,' *Western Folklore* 43, no. 2 (April 1, 1984): 87.

[73] Christopher W. Marsh, *Music and Society in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 231.

making this work much less speech-heavy than, say, *Chrysanaleia* (220 lines of speech as opposed to *Sidero-Thriambos*'s 108 lines). By presenting direct speech in such a self-consciously oral typeface, Munday reminds us that the mayoral Show, as a printed Show, is much *less* oral: defined, in fact, by its inability to be performed again. The ephemeral nature of the Shows, limited in their significance to the highly ceremonial occasion of performance – which, as we have seen in reference to *Honour and Industry,* was extremely important to the text's intended readers – pits against the assumptions commonly surrounding the ballad. As Stewart puts it, 'the location of voice within character in the ballad [...] situates the ballad in antithesis to the spatiality and stasis of the document and the document's devices of framing'.[74] The ballad's words and its material form may be mutually opposed, but they could still work together, at least in the early modern period. As Lesser points out, a ballad is not merely a text of something that has already been spoken but a text which can be spoken again, particularly given the popularity of displaying ballads on walls for collective performance, rather than private reading.[75] In contrast, the printed text of a Lord Mayor's Show is not merely a record of words that were once spoken but of words that will never be spoken in the same way again. Invoking the embodied nature of performance, Munday pits his text against itself, asking his readers to use, in their consumption of the text, an aspect of performance which the text itself cannot give them.

The self-conscious promise and denial of orality allows Munday, as with the rest of the show, to deny the reader a smooth linkage between performance and text. This denial goes further than mere orality, however, and is compounded by a seeming contradiction between the sound of the speech and its textual presentation – again pitting the text against an imagined and irrecoverable performance. The use of a ballad typeface foregrounds the immediacy of the voice in the text, encouraging us to imagine it as an embodied sound; Munday also controls how we imagine that embodied sound, however, by writing the text in what is either quasi-Middle Scots or a textual version of a Scottish accent and dialect. Both amount to a device by which the text encourages its readers to imagine a specifically Scottish voice.

---

[74] Stewart, 'Scandals of the Ballad,' 150.

[75] Lesser, 'Typographic Nostalgia,' 113.

As Paula Blank notes, Scots-speaking characters were rare in English literature between 1603 and 1625, meaning that Munday's Bard would have stood out by his nationality, as well as typographically.[76] Combining a Scottish Bard with an English typeface, and using that English typeface to facilitate our imagination of the character's Scottishness, Munday forces his readers to confront the assumptions governing their (indeed, our) reading of the printed Shows. He highlights the embodied elements of listening and seeing, and the textual aspects of reading and imagining, but instead of using them in combination, as Middleton does in *Honour and Industry*, he deliberately sets them against one another, reminding us of all the places in which they do not work together or connect as easily as we might wish to think. Whether or not *Sidero-thriambos* was, as Leah Marcus has argued, 'Munday's response to [Ben Jonson's] *The Golden Age Restored* and *The Vision of Delight*', it also made a substantial point about the genre of the Shows themselves, entirely separate from considerations of the court masque and other occasional forms.[77]

As a genre, the printed Lord Mayor's Show possessed a unique combination of features. Like ballads, printed sermons and play texts, Shows in print could utilise the power that the occasions they memorialised had possessed in reality. Distinguishing them even from other civic pageantry, however, were two main factors: the regularity of the event in performance, and the specialised, politically-invested nature of the text's main readers. This enabled Middleton and Munday to utilise, on the one hand, ongoing debates regarding the text-event relationship in other genres, but on the other to exploit their genre's unique features and challenging the terms of those debates. What they did with these debates can therefore tell us how they conceived of the Shows as a genre in print – what they thought were its capacities and influences, and how they thought it could be read.

That both writers shape their literary strategy around their reader's memory of performance shows that they were addressing the specialised reader to whom the text might have been given as a gift or souvenir, but also reminds us that to these readers the text was much more than merely a reminder of what the show had contained. Scholars of the Shows have often viewed the texts as merely records of

---

[76] Paula Blank, *Broken English : Dialects and Politics of Language in Renaissance Writings* (London: Routledge, 1996), 161.

[77] Leah S. Marcus, 'City Metal and Country Mettle: The Occasion of Ben Jonson's *Golden Age Restored*,' in *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater*, ed. David M Bergeron (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1985), 44.

performance (of varying degrees of completeness), but the variety of strategies by which authors memorialise performance shows that recording performance was not merely a matter of detail. Rather, choosing to recall or deny the event of performance was a way for a pageant-writer to negotiate between solid text and ephemeral occasion, and there were many possible paths to trace between those two factors.

The fact that Middleton and Munday trace two very different paths shows that exploring the relationship between print and performance was key to their conception of the Shows' potential as a genre, as well as a useful strategy for them to call upon when the occasion of performance was tense, as it was in both 1617 and 1618. Both *The Triumphs of Honour and Industry* and *Sidero-Thriambos* make use of the occasion's particular meaning to their readers, as well as the particular meaning of their text in relation to the event of performance. That these authors, experienced in other genres, were so willing to use this genre's particular attributes demonstrates an important point: that they were thinking of the printed mayoral Show as a discrete genre, related to other civic pageantry but fundamentally distinct from it.

Conclusion

Applying textual analysis to the neglected texts of the Lord Mayors' Shows has identified complex forms of occasionality, intertextuality and text-performance relations in this genre. This shows that analysing these texts' literary creativity does not merely reduce them to their linguistic properties and elide their relationship with their context. Rather, it allows us to see this relationship much more clearly, highlighting details which previous studies have left unnoticed. As Mary Orr states, cultural phenomena such as genres 'evolve and develop over time because local context will influence how any paradigm, to remain relevant, responds to changes at the legal, social or other level'.[1] Locating the texts in precise positions within their rich cultural contexts, and elucidating their links to it in concrete terms, I have shown that, in the process of responding to the demands of an individual occasion, writers of the Shows created innovations which stretched the capabilities of the genre, paving the way for further innovations in later Shows.

This is founded upon my methodology, which analyses the texts as whole entities in order to establish how each one creates its own innovative strategies, but also retains a sense of each Show's relationship to others in the genre. As I stated in the introduction, existing criticism of the Shows does not tend to examine texts in detail *qua* texts. Rather, some critics analyse them *en masse*, identifying common features and general trends within the genre; most others limit their assessment to one or two Shows, failing to relate them to the genre as a whole and allowing one link between a Show and its context to determine the whole of their assessment. Useful though both those approaches have been in outlining the genre's general shape and elucidating individual Shows' relationships to particular events, this study aims to move beyond both. I have shown that a more literary analysis – attending to the reader's experience, the writer's construction of the text from multiple influences, and of course the multifaceted influence of a Show's occasion on the text itself – can draw out hitherto unappreciated aspects of these hybrid works.

For example, analysing the short-term occasionality and multi-layered intertextuality of Anthony Munday's *Himatia-Poleos* (1614) and *Metropolis Coronata* (1615) has allowed me to demonstrate how much more there was to Munday's, and the Drapers', opposition to the Cockayne Project than formulaic praise of the English cloth trade. There were, the chapter

---

[1] Mary Orr, *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts* (Cambridge: Polity, 2003), 87.

shows, two different but equally powerful ways of praising 'old Drapery', each one making a distinct political point. The difference between these two Shows proves the plurality of available political positions, but also – and perhaps more importantly – the enormous variety of texts, discourses, influences and debates available for Munday to draw on as he worked within this genre.

He uses this strength to the full in *Chrysanaleia* (1616). The intertextual influences in this Show range from apprentice drama such as Thomas Heywood's *Four Prentices* to religious texts, historians such as Stow and Holinshed, to the writings of King James VI and I himself. Developing the techniques of previous shows, especially the incisive *Metropolis Coronata*, Munday creates holistic systems demonstrating the cycle of labour and reward by which, he argues, well-distributed honours (especially knighthood) uphold political stability. As with the texts in the previous chapter, this complicates existing ideas of occasionality. Munday's text is at once a response to the King's knighting of Cockayne earlier in the year and the Show's immediate role as a glorification of the civic elite.

The latter function is what makes Munday's refutation of Cockayne's honour so intriguing, as by necessity he must simultaneously refute this man's desert of the title while also upholding others' desert of the same – especially Sir John Leman, the new Lord Mayor in whose honour *Chrysanaleia* was staged. The difficulty of achieving both these things in a short text is what leads Munday to bring together such a rich variety of sources in such an elegant way, proving that the Shows' specific demands on writers could spur their creativity, and did not – as Peter Lake and others have assumed – limit it.[2]

The demanding specificity of the Shows reaches its apex in Thomas Middleton's *Triumphs of Love and Antiquity* (1619) – and so, it might be argued, does the Shows' creative use of intertextuality (at least within the period covered by this thesis). In this work, Middleton borrows a Calvinist theological concept, that of 'free love', to address the problem of writing a Show in honour of the unpopular William Cockayne – a figure whom three of Munday's Shows had in some way attempted to criticise. Middleton uses the term and its theological associations to overturn the assumptions that had governed Munday's effective criticism of Cockayne, particularly in *Chrysanaleia*. As well as this lexically-specific intertextuality, using a particular phrase to import its associations into a work, Middleton also shows an intriguing level of intertextuality within the genre of the Shows by setting his Show

---

[2] Peter Lake, 'From Troynovant to Heliogabulus's Rome and Back: "Order" and Its Others in the London of John Stow,' in *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stow to Strype, 1598-1720*, ed. J. F Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 221.

directly against Munday's. He undermines, at times almost mocking, many of Munday's 'signature' pageant-writing techniques – such as the use of history – in order to distance his show from Munday's anti-Cockayne politics.

Such intertextuality between Shows, and the political exchange among writers that it indicates, has important implications for how we assess the Shows' reception as a genre. That authors thought it worth their while to relate to Shows in previous years in aspects other than the performed devices and speeches shows that they had regular readers as well as a regular audience, who could plausibly understand a given Show's references to another year's content. We cannot know for sure how the texts were read, of course, but this thesis certainly shows authors envisioning informed and engaged readers, which is especially important for the final chapter of the thesis.

In that chapter (Chapter Four), I argue that both Thomas Middleton's *Triumphs of Honour and Industry* (1617) and Munday's *Sidero-Thriambos* (1618) contest the Show's capacity to transmit the experience of performance into a readable text. Both works address the relationship of performance to reading experience, but they do so in different ways. *Honour and Industry* creates what might be called a 'perfect' Show, continually invoking imperfections in performance in order to 'overcome' them in the text, thus addressing his readers' insecurity over the quality of the day's performance. Munday does the opposite in *Sidero-Thriambos*, highlighting the disjuncture between lived performance and printed text and reminding readers of their equally powerful but different functions. Where Middleton synthesises this difference in order to comfort his readers, Munday shows instead that the text could never capture the experience of watching performance – but instead had alternative expository capacities.

Issues of occasionality come into play here, too. Both Shows were staged and published after events which arguably precipitated a sense of social crisis and put pressure on the day of the Show's performance: *Honour and Industry* was performed a few months after the famous Shrove Tuesday riots involving the Cockpit; *Sidero-Thriambos* was staged at the same time as Sir Walter Raleigh's execution, and was evidently intended by the authorities to distract from this potentially divisive event. Both texts were therefore shadowed by important political expectations, and both writers therefore respond to this by exploring the genre's capacity to transcend the occasion of performance. That Munday's solution was much less conciliatory to his patrons' wishes (which were presumably to maintain a memory of unproblematic performance) is an intriguing challenge to the standard view of Munday as the 'establishment' writer, which also tends to paint Middleton as more interesting, and certainly

less conformist. In the Shows analysed here, both writers take political views that, while outwardly conforming to the values of civic government, were by no means conventional. All six of them question at least some aspect of the status quo or of its governing assumptions.

That the analysis in this thesis challenges commonly-held views of Munday as more 'establishment' than Middleton proves how important it is to take the Shows seriously as literature. Previous criticism has merely assumed that the Shows mirror the authors' other works, painting Munday as less controversial because his work is assumed to be so (albeit usually by default), while Middleton's Shows are seen to mirror the class-based political commentary evident in his drama. While both authors' Shows are certainly *related* to their other work, to see them as defined by it is to dismiss the shows themselves as sub-literary. My work, by contrast, has demonstrated just how germane the Shows might be to our understanding of both Middleton and Munday as writers. Further work might use the findings here, or similar methodologies, to analyse the distinctive strategies of the two authors. The deep but necessarily short-term analysis in the preceding chapters has, I hope, laid the foundations for work in which assessment of Shows by both authors can not just follow but in fact affect scholarly understanding of these authors as a whole – and, indeed, might be applied to other authors of the Shows.

Defending textual creativity in the Shows

The Shows have often been dismissed as less creative than other genres, or less aesthetically pleasing; even David Bergeron, who urges that 'we can no longer choose to ignore civic pageants', regretfully states that 'no one could make a completely compelling case for the poetic accomplishment of the verse of civic pageants'.[3] However, the textual analysis in this thesis has uncovered many complexities in their construction. Though these are not always strictly poetic, they nonetheless prove that writing for the Lord Mayors' Shows demanded as much creativity and skill as work in other genres. As I show in Chapter One, for example, Munday does not simply defend the old Merchant Adventurers by praising them. Instead, he develops intertextual strategies unique to this genre, combining seemingly idiosyncratic imagery to establish a particular political position and challenge not just the *status quo* but its implications for James's kingship. The next chapter uncovers his strategy in *Chrysanaleia* of linking the Show to contemporary debates on class, magistracy and the responsibilities of

---

[3] David M. Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry, 1558-1642*, Revised edn. (Tempe, AZ: Arizona University Press, 2003), 4,6.

power. This is as literary as it is political, requiring Munday to frame his images in such a way that the reader feels compelled to link these often-divergent images to one another and to their broader political implications. Chapter Three shows that Middleton was no less skilled in framing influence and using innovative methods of intertextuality. Finally, the shows analysed in Chapter Four contain nuanced meditations on the interface between text and performance. This thesis has therefore shown not just that the Shows benefit from textual analysis but that they deserve it, displaying as much complexity of literary construction as more canonical works.

Invaluable though their scholarship is for our understanding of this genre, both Tracey Hill and David Bergeron analyse the Shows *en masse*, viewing all the works at once to create an overview.[4] While this is a useful foundation from which to work, it arguably downgrades the Shows' status as textual constructions, eliding the differences between each work and overlooking the way in which each Show functions as an individual entity. The strategies that I have identified in this thesis show that literary analysis of Shows as discrete works can open up aspects of these texts which less specific analysis has neglected. For example, Chapter One elucidates the differences between two texts which have hitherto been seen as similar simply because they respond to the same event and both contain content related to the cloth trade. Chapter Two outlines the benefits of reading the pelican and William Walworth devices together, as examples of failed and successful political reciprocity. In Chapter Three, too, I examine how Middleton's use of the Calvinist concept 'free love' works along with his mockery of Munday's signature pageant techniques to distance *Love and Antiquity* from Munday's criticism of Cockayne. Finally, Chapter Four identifies themes of text and performance running through two Shows, outlining how Munday and Middleton each used a Show text to explore this vexed issue.

Intertextuality in the Shows

Important to Chapter Four is the relationship between the two Shows. The view of *Sidero-Thriambos* as exploding the harmony between performance and text is given valuable context by the knowledge that *Honour and Industry* had outlined just such a harmony the year before. So too, my assessment in Chapter Three of how fully Middleton undermines Munday's work rests on the real links between *Love and Antiquity* and Munday's other Shows – particularly

---

[4] Tracey Hill, *Pageantry and Power: A Cultural History of the Early Modern Lord Mayor's Show, 1585-1639* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010); Bergeron, *English Civic Pageantry*.

Chrysanaleia, whose themes Middleton tangibly takes up. Chapter One, too, reveals how possible readings of *Himatia-Poleos* and *Metropolis Coronata* change when they are analysed together. The 'idiosyncratic' imagery of Medea and Robin Hood would always have been politically-incisive, but become especially so when set against the previous Show's parade of national glory, which included the Cotswold Shepherd and Sir Francis Drake. The thesis has thus helped to establish the importance of intertextual relationships within the genre, showing that Shows did not merely react to events in the year of their own performance but could respond to other Shows. This perhaps stemmed from the regularity of their printing, suggesting that they were seen as a series or even a genre in their own right.

As well as responding to other Shows, all of the Shows analysed here demonstrate an intriguing variety of intertextual strategies, proving that the genre was not only literary but connected to other cultural forms. As Chapter One proves, Munday's response to the Cockayne Project utilised a variety of sources, from Robert Fabyan's *Chronicle* to Golding's *Metamorphoses* and his own Huntington plays, in order to establish two very different political positions on behalf of the Drapers' Company. This was especially significant in his portrayal of Medea, in which he took up a position which challenged all the previous sources' assumptions regarding her character – signifying the Show's political sharpness in the process. He made his use of sources, and relationship to them, even more explicit in *Chrysanaleia*; Chapter Two identifies several places in this text where Munday stakes out an explicit position for himself with regard to the sources he uses for particular devices and characters. These devices are also ways in which he can reach out to broader debates in the Show, particularly on social class and political merit.

Intertextuality takes what we might call a 'lexical' turn in *Love and Antiquity*, as Chapter Three traces Middleton's use of the phrase 'free love'. He takes this phrase from Calvinist theology, deliberately turning its rich religious associations into a political, yet still morally weighted, injunction. This method draws on but is separate from Munday's use of imagery and sources from other texts, relying as it does upon the phrase 'free love' itself to encourage the reader to make the association. Middleton also uses intertextual methods similar to Munday's, utilising the character of Orpheus' previous associations as a figure of civilising music. However, he does not just develop his intertextuality in the same direction as Munday but in fact creates a whole new strategy. Literary analysis has thus demonstrated that Shows – at least those analysed in this thesis – constitute a rich, untapped resource for scholarly investigation of how early modern writers employed such techniques as intertextuality.

Innovative occasionality

Occasionality is another concept which is too often seen as monotonous; as with intertextuality, the analysis in this thesis has uncovered several different ways in which Shows engage with their 'occasion'. Short-term and long-term responses might seem an obvious difference, but much historicist criticism, of both civic pageantry and court masques, assumes that where a given work responds to its context the most (or indeed only) likely referent is the immediate context. This is not unjustified, since most works do respond to recent issues, most likely because those where what their audience would have remembered. However, contained within a response to recent issues might be a response to, or at least awareness of, longer-term debates. For example, as Chapter Three demonstrates, Middleton's *Love and Antiquity* responds simultaneously to the immediate occasion of Cockayne's mayoralty, and the longer-term issues of his unpopularity and Munday's previous anti-Cockayne Shows.

Chapters Two and Three identify the longer-term issues with which Munday engages in the process of responding to the 'occasions' presented by the Cockayne Project and the conferral of Cockayne's knighthood. Chapter Four, too, shows that while a theme – the interface of text and performance – may have been inspired by 'occasions' such as Raleigh's execution in October 1618, authors went far beyond this in their engagement with the issue. This thesis has thus destabilised a concept which is often seen as rendering a genre less literary, and is even sometimes used to submerge a work beneath the weight of its historical context. My own analysis, while never doubting the importance of historical context, has sought throughout to foreground not only the context itself but also the writers' reactions to it, which were intricate and varied. It was not merely the texts' 'occasion' that determined their meaning, but the way in which its writer interpreted that occasion's demands, responding to it with as much literary expertise as we would find in a play or poem.

Implications for further research

This changed view of occasionality and its relationship with literary creativity might also be usefully applied to other genres commonly seen as 'occasional', such as court masques and royal entries. Commentary on entries in particular is often subsumed entirely by their political associations, focusing on how the institutions involved – the monarchy and various

sponsoring civic institutions – represented themselves. This is not, of course, the case for all criticism: Gabriel Heaton, for example, explicitly focuses his study on the texts of royal entertainments as works to be written and read, while Evelyn Tribble's chapter on the various texts of James's 1604 coronation entry foregrounds the intervention of authors between the political event and the textual report of it.[5] Criticism of Shows themselves has also helped this, with Tracey Hill in particular including a good deal of textual analysis in *Pageantry and Power*. Nevertheless, the particular methodology of my study, and the new aspects of the Shows that it has identified**,** demonstrates that there is room for much more acknowledgement of the importance of authorial innovation in 'occasional' texts.

For example, much of masque criticism has focused on debating a single issue: that of whether the developing masque genre used 'magnificence' to express the quasi-divine claims of Jacobean absolutist kingship, or whether this 'magnificence' was merely a mask for the competing claims in worldly politics made by each masque's courtly sponsors. This is, of course, an important debate, but in doing so tends to elide the *influence* of the occasion on writers such as Jonson, and the texts themselves – which were not determined by the occasion but were considered responses to it, often by experienced writers. Here court masque scholarship could well benefit from an approach pioneered by scholars of the mayoral Shows, particularly Hill but also Ceri Sullivan and Kara Northway, among others.[6] These scholars utilise archival evidence to outline the relationship between authors and their civic patrons in precise terms, using these to provide more rigorous assessment of texts' relationship to their occasion. Such archival rigour, combined with my literary methodology and focus on how texts function as complete entities, might prove a useful way forward for the ideas presented above.

Broadening the ideas generically and chronologically would be useful in allowing me to find out whether my findings can be applied only to Lord Mayors' Shows, to other 'occasional' works – and indeed whether they can even be seen as a generic feature of the Shows. Further work on the earlier Shows would help to establish starting-points for the textual strategies I identify, tracing their development just as I trace it within the necessarily limited chronological space addressed by this thesis. Even beyond 'occasional' works, it

---

[5] Gabriel Heaton, *Writing and Reading Royal Entertainments: From George Gascoigne to Ben Jonson* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Evelyn Tribble, *Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England* (Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1993).

[6] Ceri Sullivan, 'Thomas Middleton's View of Public Utility,' *The Review of English Studies* 58, no. 234 (2007): 162–74; Kara Northway, '"I Desyre to Be Paid": Interpreting the Language of Remuneration in Early Modern Dramatic Archives,' *Comparative Drama* 41, no. 4 (2007): 405–22.

would be useful to trace ideas such as intertextuality and if not occasionality *per se* – since plays, for the most part, are less explicitly occasional than civic pageantry – certainly a level of complexity in playwrights' responses to contemporary events. For example, Chapter Two shows that *Chrysanaleia* utilises several plays of the period and earlier, and may even have been prompted to do so by the recent reprinting of one of them (Heywood's *Four Prentices of London*). It would be intriguing to explore this further, asking, for example, whether drama written, performed or published around this time engaged with the same issues.

Although the chronological and generic specificity of this thesis could be seen as a limitation, it leaves space for the exploration of contextual material such as influences to its fullest capacity. This allows me to show precisely how much untapped potential lies within these texts, and is thus not only valuable but necessary for my argument about the value of deep analysis and contextual exposition. One way to develop this potential would be to take a longer-term view and trace the strategies that I have identified in the 1614-1619 period across the Show's development as a genre, from the earliest printed Show in 1585 (George Peele's *The Device of the Pageant*) to the last printed Shows in the Restoration period.[7] This would help broaden the chronological scope of the thesis and limit the ratio of context to text itself, since in a study of such long scope analysis of contextual influence would necessarily be much smaller. Although deep and narrow analysis was required to excavate the literary strategies identified in this thesis, therefore, such strategies could also be identified in work with a longer historical scope.

Despite its short length, the thesis does discuss the Shows' development as a genre across the period studied. So too, I demonstrate in many of the chapters how the Shows' specific form affected authors' responses, shaping their creative innovation. This genre-specific analysis makes the thesis an ideal foundation for further work on the genre's long-term historical development: studies could explore how different authors explore the genre's different attributes. Genre studies is a particularly fertile field in current early modern scholarship, so it would be intriguing to see how the Shows' development as a distinct form measured up to other, concurrently developing kinds of text. That Zachary Lesser and Alan Farmer divide printed works by genre shows how important it was seen to be in the burgeoning printed book trade, and this too is an area in which much research remains to be done on the Shows. Having analysed their textual and literary attributes, surely a plausible next step is to analyse their attributes not just as texts but as printed works, asking how

---

[7] George Peele, *The Deuice of the Pageant* (London: Edward Allde, 1585).

authors positioned the texts in the marketplace, how they related to printers and publishers – and, conversely, how the print marketplace positioned the texts. Though I conclude that the first stage of the texts' distribution was probably as gifts to Company members on the day of the Show, it is highly plausible that copies found their way to the lively marketplace for secondhand books.

One of those attributes was the hybrid position that Shows' texts held between text and performance. Chapter Four demonstrates the myriad ways in which authors of the Shows could explore and engage with this position, but this engagement need not have been limited to the works analysed in that chapter. I have limited my analysis of text-performance relations, in large part, to Chapter Four precisely because the two Shows on which that chapter focuses are not just concerned with the relationship but fully engaged with it, exploring it as a particularly germane issue. However, other Shows may well have engaged with this issue too, many of them on a less wholesale level than *Honour and Industry* and *Sidero-Thriambos*. It would be valuable to investigate how Show authors tackled the vexing issue of how to represent such a significant occasion on the printed page, placing the two explorations that I have identified in the context of the rest of the genre. As I note in the chapter itself, the issue of print's capacity to remember performance is something with which printed plays also engaged during the period (along with current scholarship thereof): it would thus enrich our understanding of both plays and Shows to establish the parameters of this debate across dramatic and 'occasional' genres.

Bibliography

Manuscript Primary Sources

'Motives to Induce Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses of the Commons House of Parliament to Petition His Majesty for the Revoking and Abolishing of the Degree of Baronets Lately Erected by His Highness's Letters Patent.' British Library, Harleian MS. 6800.

'Minute, in Burghley's hand, of an Order in Council touching the matters in controversy between the clothiers of Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, and Somerset, and the Merchants Adventurers'. 24th December, 1586. SP 12.195 f. 123. Document URL: http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/mss/i.do?id=GALE|MC4304283644&v=2.1&u=uniyork&it=r&p=SPOL&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript. Secretaries of State: State Papers Domestic, Elizabeth I, 1558-1603. The National Archives of the UK. *State Papers Online*. Web. Accessed 3 Mar. 2012.

'Chamberlain to [Carleton].' 22nd June 1616. MS Secretaries of State: State Papers Domestic, James I, 1603-1640. SP 14/87 f.134. The National Archives of the UK. *State Papers Online*. Web. 3 Mar. 2012. Document URL: http://go.galegroup.com/mss/i.do?&id=GALE%7CMC4323684296&v=2.1&u=uniyork&it=r&p=SPOL&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript.

The Council to the Justices of Peace, co. Gloucester.' 2nd August 1616. MS Secretaries of State: State Papers Domestic, James I, 1603-1640. SP 14/88 f.71. The National Archives of the UK. *State Papers Online*. Web. 3 Mar. 2012. Document URL: http://go.galegroup.com/mss/i.do?&id=GALE%7CMC4323684454&v=2.1&u=uniyork&it=r&p=SPOL&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript.

'The Council with the King to the Council at London.' 6th Aug 1616. MS Secretaries of State: State Papers Domestic, James I, 1603-1640. SP 14/88 f.77. The National Archives of the UK. *State Papers Online*. Web. 3 Mar. 2012. Document URL:

http://go.galegroup.com/mss/i.do?&id=GALE%7CMC4323684458&v=2.1&u=uniyor
k&it=r&p=SPOL&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript.

'The Council in London to the Council with the King.' 13th August 1616. MS Secretaries of
State: State Papers Domestic, James I, 1603-1640. SP 14/88 f.86. The National
Archives of the UK. *State Papers Online*. Web. 3 Mar. 2012. Document URL:
http://go.galegroup.com/mss/i.do?&id=GALE%7CMC4323684467&v=2.1&u=uniyor
k&it=r&p=SPOL&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript

'Statement by the new Company of Merchant Adventurers, that the Hollanders thwart their
trade, by prohibiting the use of cloth dyed and dressed in England, both by public
edict and private ….' 11th September 1616. MS Secretaries of State: State Papers
Domestic, James I, 1603-1640. SP 14/88 f.124. The National Archives of the UK.
State Papers Online. Web. 3 Mar. 2012. Document URL:
http://go.galegroup.com/mss/i.do?&id=GALE%7CMC4323684502&v=2.1&u=uniyor
k&it=r&p=SPOL&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript

'Edw. Sherburn to [Carleton].' 21st September 1616. MS Secretaries of State: State Papers
Domestic, James I, 1603-1640. SP 14/88 f.142. The National Archives of the UK.
State Papers Online. Web. 1 Mar. 2012. Document URL:
http://go.galegroup.com/mss/i.do?&id=GALE%7CMC4323684517&v=2.1&u=uniyor
k&it=r&p=SPOL&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript

'Nath. Brent to [Carleton]'. 29th November 1616. MS Secretaries of State: State Papers
Domestic, James I, 1603-1640. SP 14/89 f. 105. The National Archives of the UK.
State Papers Online. Web. 12 Oct. 2013. Document
URL: http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/mss/i.do?id=GALE|MC43236846
76&v=2.1&u=uniyork&it=r&p=SPOL&sw=w&viewtype=Manuscript

MS Secretaries of State: State Papers Domestic, James I, 1603-1640. The National Archives
of the UK. *State Papers Online*. Web. Accessed 3 Mar. 2012.

Worshipful Company of Grocers. 'Charges of Triumphs' Account Book. Guildhall Library, MS 11590.

———. Court Minutes 1591-1616. Guildhall Library, MS 11588/2.

Worshipful Company of Ironmongers. Court Minutes. Guildhall Library, MS 16967/2.

———. Court Minutes 1612-39. Guildhall Library MS 16967/3.

Printed Primary Sources

By the King. A Proclamation Conteyning his Majesties Royall Pleasure, concerning the proiect of Dyeing and Dressing of Broad Cloathes within the Kingdome, before they be exported. London: Robert Barker, 1614.

By the King. A Proclamation against the Exportation of Clothes, undyed and undressed contrary to Law. London: Robert Barker, 1614.

By the King. A Proclamation for Restrayning of the Seruing of Fee Deere. London: Robert Barker, 1615.

By the King. A Proclamation for the due execution of Forrest Lawes. London: Robert Barker, 1615.

His Maiesties Proclamation, Requiring the Residencie of Noblemen, Gentlemen, Lieutenants, and Justices of Peace, vpon their Chiefe Mansions in the Countrey. London: Robert Barker, 1615.

Anon. *A Pleasant Conceyted Comedie of George a Greene, the pinner of Wakefield.* London: Simon Stafford for Cuthbert Burby, 1599.

Anon. *The Family of Love.* London: for John Holmes, 1608.

Anon. *The Raigne of King Edward the Third.* London: for Cuthbert Burby, 1596.

Adams, Thomas. *Englands Sicknes: Comparatively Compared with Israel's.* London, 1615.

Aristotle. *History of Animals.* Translated by D'Arcy Wenworth Thompson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910. Web. Accessed 10th October 2014. URL: http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/history_anim.html

Bayly, Lewis. *The Practise of Pietie*. London: for John Hodgets, 1613.

Beaumont, Francis. *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. Edited by Sheldon P. Zitner. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.

Bergeron, David, ed. *Pageants and Entertainments of Anthony Munday: A Critical Edition.* London; New York: Garland Publishing, 1985.

Breton, Nicholas. *Brittons Bowre of Delights.* London: Richard Jones, 1591.

Bunny, Francis. *A Comparison between the auncient fayth of the Romans, and the new Romish Religion*. London: Robert Robinson for Raph Jackson, 1595.

Burton, William. *Certaine Questions and Answeres, concerning the knowledge of God [...] taught publikely by way of catechising*. London: John Windet for Toby Cooke, 1591.

Busino, Orazio. 'Orazio Busino's Account.' Edited by Kate Levin. In *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, edited by Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Byfield, Nicholas. *An Exposition upon the Epistle to the Colossians*. London: T. S for Nathaniel Butter, 1615.

———. *Sermons upon the First Chapter of the First Epistle Generall of Peter: Wherein method, sense, doctrine and vse is with great varietie of matter profitably handled*. London: Edward Griffin for Nathaniel Butter, 1617.

———. *The Promises: or, a Treatise showing how a Godly Christian may support his heart with comfort*. London: G. P. for Ralph Rounthwaite, 1619.

Cade, Anthony. *St Paul's Agonie: a sermon preached at Leicester.* London: Bernard Alsop, 1618.

Calvin, Jean. *The Institution of Christian Religion, wrytten in Latine by maister Iohn Calvin, and translated into English*. London: Reinolde Wolfe and Richarde Harrison, 1561.

———. *The sermons of M. Iohn Caluin vpon the fifth booke of Moses called Deuteronomie [...] Translated out of French by Arthur Golding*. London: Henry Middleton for George Bishop, 1583.

Chamberlain, John. *The Letters of John Chamberlain*. Edited by Norman Egbert McClure. 2 vols. Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society, 1939.

Chapman, George, and Christopher Marlowe. *Hero and Leander: begun by Christopher Marlowe; and finished by George Chapman.* London: Felix Kingston for Paul Linley, 1598.

———. *Sir Gyles Goose-Cappe.* London: John Windet for Edward Blunt, 1606.

Cooper, Thomas. *The Blessing of Iapheth, proving the gathering of the Gentiles, and finall conversion of the Iewes. Expressed in divers profitable sermons*. London: T. C. for Richard Redmer, 1615.

———. *The Christians Daily Sacrifice*. London: N[icholas]. O[kes]. for Walter Burre, 1615.

Crakanthorpe, Richard. *A sermon at the solemnizing of the happie inauguration of our most gracious and religious soueraigne King Iames...Preached at Paules Crosse the 24th of March last 1608*. London: W. Jaggard for Tho[mas]. Adams, 1609.

Daborne, Robert. *A Christian turn'd Turke.* London: for William Barrenger, 1612.

Dekker, Thomas. *The Whore of Babylon.* In *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, edited by Fredson Bowers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953-61.

———. *The Magnificent Entertainment Given to King James.* In *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, edited by Fredson Bowers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953-61.

———. *Foure Birds of Noah's Arke.* London: H. B. for Nathaniel Butter, 1609.

———. *The Shoemaker's Holiday*. Edited by Jonathan Gil Harris. London: Methuen, 2008.

Dent, Arthur. *The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven.* London: for Robert Dexter, 1601.

Dering, Edward. *XXVII Lectures, or readings, upon part of the Epistle made to the Hebrewes*. London: Lucas Harrison, 1576.

———. *A Sparing Restraint, of many lavishe untruths*. London: Henry Denham for Humfrey Toy, 1568.

Fabyan, Robert. *The Concordance of Hystoryes*. London, 1559.

Ferne, John. *The Blazon of Gentrie.* London: John Windet for Andrew Maunsell, 1586.

Fletcher, John. *The Faithful Shepherdess*. Edited by Cyrus Hoy. In *The Dramatic Works in the Beaumont and Fletcher Canon,* edited by Fredson Bowers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Foster, Elizabeth Read. *Proceedings in Parliament, 1610*. 2 vols. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1966.

Glover, Robert. *The Catalogue of Honour or Treasury of True Nobility*. Translated by Thomas Milles. London: William Jaggard, 1610.

Granger, Thomas. *The Light of the World. A Sermon Preached[...]neere Boston in Lincolnshire*. London: T. S. for Thomas Pauier, 1616.

Greene, Robert. *A Quip for an Vpstart Courtier: or, A quaint dispute between velvet breeches and cloth-breeches*. London: John Wolfe, 1592.

———. *Mamilia: a Mirrour or Looking Glasse for the Ladies of England*. London: William Ponsonby, 1583.

Greenham, Richard. *Two Learned and Godly Sermons*. London: Gabriel Simson & William White, for William Jones, 1595.

Hall, Joseph. *Meditations and Vowes, diuine and morall*. London: Humphrey Lownes for John Porter, 1605.

Hart, John. *The Burning Bush not Consumed wherein either vnder all deepe sense of wrath; or hardnesse of heart, one may iudge, whether he be the childe of God, or not, &c.* London: T.C. and B. A. for Roger Iackson, 1616.

Hayward, John. *The Sancutuarie of a troubled soul*. London: I. W., 1601.

———. *The Strong Helper*. London: John Beale for William Welby, 1614.

Heywood, Thomas. *The Brazen Age*. London: Nicholas Okes for Samuel Rand, 1613.

———. *The First and Second Parts of King Edward IV*. Edited by Richard Rowland. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.

———. *The Four Prentices of London*. London: I[ohn].W[indet]., 1615.

Hieron, Samuel. *The Abridgement of the gospell: or, The order and course of mans salvation*. London: M. Bradwood for Samuel Macham, 1609.

Hinds, Allen B., ed. 'Venice: August 1618, 2-15,' *Calendar of State Papers Relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice, Volume 15: 1617-1619*, British History Online, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=88681. Web. Accessed 22/8/2013.

Holinshed, Raphael. *The Third Volume of Chronicles, Beginning at Duke William the Norman.* London: Henry Denham, 1587.

Hughes, Thomas. *Certaine Devises and Shewes presented to her Majesty by the Gentlemen of Grayes-Inne.* London: Robert Robinson, 1587.

Humpston, Robert. *A Sermon Preached at Reysham in the Countie of Norffolk.* London: John Wolfe for Edward Aggas, 1589.

Hunnis, William. *Seven Sobs of a Sorrowful Soul for Sin.* London, 1583.

James VI and I, King. *A Meditation on the Lord's Prayer, written by the Kings Maiestie, for the benefit of all his subiects.* London: Bonham Norton and John Bill, 1619.

———. *Basilikon Doron.* In Johann P. Sommerville, ed. *King James VI and I: Political Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

———. *Daemonologie, in forme of a dialogue diuided into three bookes.* Edinburgh: Robert Waldegrave, 1597.

———. *Political Writings*. Edited by Johann P. Sommerville. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

———.Speech to Parliament, 1607. In Johann P. Sommerville, ed. *King James VI and I: Political Writings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

———. Speech to Star Chamber, 20th June 1616. In Johann P. Sommerville, ed. *King James VI and I: Political Writings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

———. *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies.* In Johann P. Sommerville, ed. *King James VI and I: Political Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Jansson, Maija, ed. *Proceedings in Parliament, 1614 (House of Commons).* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988.

Knox, John. *An Answer to a great number of blasphemous cavillations.* Geneva: John Crespin, 1560.

Luther, Martin. *A treatise, touching the libertie of a Christian. Written in Latin by Doctor Martine Luther. And translated into English by Iames Bell*. London: Ralph Newbery & H. Bynneman, 1579.

———. *Speciall and Chosen Sermons of Dr. Martin Luther. Englished by W.G.* London: Thomas Vautroullier, 1578.

John Lyly, *Euphues: The Anatomy of Wit; and Euphues his England*. Edited by Leah Scragg. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003.

M., T. *The true narration of the entertainment of his Royall Maiestie, from the time of his departure from Edenbrough; till his receiuing at London.* London: Thomas Creede for Thomas Millington, 1603.

Malone Society. *Collections, Volume III.* Edited by Jean Robertson and D. J. Gordon. Oxford: The Malone Society, 1954.

Markham, Gervase. *The famous whore.* London: N[icholas]. O[kes]. for John Budge, 1609

Marston, John. *The Malcontent.* Edited by George K. Hunter. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.

———. *The Wonder of Women, or the Tragedie of Sophonisba.* London: John Windet, 1606.

Maunsell, Andrew. *The First Part of the Catalogue of English Printed Bookes*. London: John Windet for Andrew Maunsell, 1595.

Maxey, Anthony. *The Golden Chaine of mans Salvation [...] opened and set downe in two seuerall sermons preached before the King.* London: G. Eld for Clement Knight, 1606.

May, John. *A Declaration of the Estate of Clothing Now Used Within this Realme of England.* London: Adam Islip, 1613.

Middleton, Thomas. *The Triumphs of Honour and Industry*. Edited by David M. Bergeron, annotated/introduced by Kate Levin. In Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino, eds. *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

———. *The Triumphs of Love and Antiquity*. Edited by David M. Bergeron, introduced by Lawrence Manley. In G. Taylor & J. Lavagnino, eds. *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

———. *The Triumphs of Truth*. Edited by David M. Bergeron. In In Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino, eds. *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

More, John. *Three Godly and Fruitful Sermons*. Cambridge: John Legat, 1594.

Munday, Anthony. *A Briefe Chronicle of the Successe of Times.* London: W[illiam] Jaggard, 1611.

———. *Camp-Bell: Or the Ironmongers Faire Field*. London: Edward Allde, 1609.

———. *Chruso-thriambos: The Triumphes of Golde*. London: William Jaggard, 1611.

———.*Chrysanaleia: or the Golden Fishing*. London: George Purslowe, 1616.

———. *Himatia-Poleos*. London: Edward Allde, 1614.

———. *Metropolis Coronata*. London: George Purslowe, 1615.

———. *Pageants and Entertainments of Anthony Munday: a Critical Edition*. Edited by David Bergeron. New York: Garland Publishing, 1985.

———. *Sidero-Thriambos: Steele and Iron Triumphing*. London: Nicholas Okes, 1618.

———. *The Death of Robert, Earl of Huntington.* London: for William Leake, 1601.

———. *The Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntington.* London: for William Leake, 1601.

———. *The Triumphes of re-vnited Britania.* London: William Jaggard, 1605.

Ovid, *Heroides and Amores.* Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1914.

———. *Metamorphoses, Books I-VIII.* Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, 1971.

Norden, John. *A Progresse of Pietie*. London: I[ohn]. Windet for I. Oxenbridge, 1596.

Notestein, Wallace. *The House of Commons, 1604-1610.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1971.

Parker, Matthew, ed. *Holy Bible.* London: Richard Jugge, 1568.

Peele, George. *The Deuice of the Pageant*. London: Edward Allde, 1585.

Pelletier, Thomas. *A Lamentable Discourse*. London: for Edward Blunt and William Barret, 1610.

Perkins, William. *A Commentarie, or exposition, upon the five first chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians*. Cambridge: John Legat, 1604.

———. *A Treatise of Callings.* London: John Legat, 1603.

Playfere, Thomas. *A most excellent and heauenly sermon vpon the 23. chapter of the Gospell by Saint Luke.* London: for Andrew Wise, 1595.

Pliny the Elder. *Natural History*. Translated by John Bostock. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1855.

Raleigh, Sir Walter. *The History of the World.* London: for Walter Burre, 1614.

Raynalde, Thomas. *The Bird of Mankynde.* London, 1565.

Robertson, Bartholomew. *The Crowne of Life: Containing the combate betwixt the flesh and the spirit, with meditations and prayers in time of afflictions, directing to liue christianly, and die blessedly.* London: E. G. for John Marriott, 1618.

Segar, William. *Honour, Military and Civil.* London: Robert Barker, 1602.

Shakespeare, William. *Antony and Cleopatra*. Edited by Michael Neill. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

———. *Cymbeline*. Edited by John Pitcher. London: Penguin: 2005.

Stow, John. *A Survay of London.* London: John Windet for John Wolfe, 1598.

———. *The Annales of England.* London: for Ralfe Newbery, 1600.

———. *The Survey of London*. Edited by Anthony Munday. London: George Purslow, 1618.

Taylor, Thomas. *The Beawties of Beth-el: Containing: sundry reasons why euery Christian ought to account one day in the courtes of God, better then a thousand besides. Preached in Cambridge*. London: G. Eld for Thomas Man, 1609.

———. *A Commentarie upon the Epistle of S. Paul, written to Titus*. Cambridge: Cantrell Legge for L. Greene, 1612.

Tuke, Thomas. *The high-way to Heaven: or, the doctrine of election, effectuall vocation, iustification, santification and eternall life*. London: Nicholas Okes, 1609.

Du Vair, Guillaume. *Holy Meditations*. London, 1612.

Webster, John. *The White Devil*, edited by John Russell Brown. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.

Willet, Andrew. *Hexapla: that is, A six-fold commentarie vpon the most diuine Epistle of the holy apostle S. Paul to the Romanes*. Cambridge: Cantrell Legge, 1611.

Ziuzin, Aleksei. 'An Account by Aleksei Ziuzin'. Edited by M. Jansson and N. Rogozhin, Translated by P. Bushkovitch. In *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, edited by Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Printed Secondary Sources

"portreeve, n.". OED Online. September 2014. Oxford University Press. Web. http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/148244?redirectedFrom=portgrave (accessed October 06, 2014).

Agnew, Jean-Christophe. *Worlds Apart: The Market and the Theater in Anglo-American Thought, 1550-1750*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Anderson, Susan. 'Representations of India on Jacobean Popular Stages.' *Theatre Survey* 54, no. 1 (2013): 7-25.

Archer, Ian W. 'The Charity of Early Modern Londoners.' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society (Sixth Series)* 12 (2002): 223-44.

———. 'Discourses of History in Elizabethan and Early Stuart London.' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68, nos.1-2 (2005): 205-26.

———. *The History of the Haberdashers' Company*. Chichester, Sussex: Phillimore, 1991.

———. 'London and Westminster.' In *A Companion to Renaissance Drama*. Edited by Arthur F. Kinney, 68-82. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002.

———. 'The Nostalgia of John Stow.' In *The Theatrical City : Culture, Theatre, and Politics in London, 1576-1649*. Edited by David M. Bevington, David L. Smith, and Richard Strier, 17–34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

———. *The Pursuit of Stability: Social Relations in Elizabethan London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

———. 'Religious identities.' In *Thomas Middleton in Context*. Edited by Suzanne Gossett, 135-43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Armstrong, Nancy and Leonard Tennenhouse, eds. *The Violence of Representation: Literature and the History of Violence*. London: Routledge, 1989.

Ashton, Robert. *The City and the Court, 1603-1643*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

———. *The Crown and the Money Market, 1603-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960.

———. 'Popular Entertainment and Social Control In Later Elizabethan and Early Stuart London.' *The London Journal* 9, no. 1 (1983): 3-19.

Baines, Barbara J. *Thomas Heywood*. Boston: Twayne, 1984.

Bald, R. C. 'Middleton's Civic Employments.' *Modern Philology* 31, no.1 (1933): 65-78.

Barbour, Richmond. *Before Orientalism: London's Theatre of the East, 1576-1626*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Barton, Anne. 'London Comedy and the Ethos of the City.' *The London Journal* 4, no. 2 (1978): 158-80.

Bath, Michael. *Speaking Pictures: English Emblem Books and Renaissance Culture.* London; New York: Longman, 1994.

Bawcutt, N. W. 'Was Thomas Middleton a Puritan Dramatist?' *The Modern Language Review* 94, no. 4 (1999): 925-39.

Bayer, Mark. 'Moving UpMarket: Queen Anne's Men at the Cockpit in Drury Lane, 1617.' *Early Theatre* 4 (2001): 138–48.

———. 'The Red Bull Playhouse.' In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre*. Edited by Richard Dutton, 225–39. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Beier, A. L, and Roger Finlay, eds. *London 1500-1700: The Making of the Metropolis*. London ; New York: Longman, 1986.

Benson, Joel D. *Changes and Expansion in the English Cloth Trade in the Seventeenth Century : Alderman Cockayne's Project*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2002.

Bergeron, David M. 'Anthony Munday: Pageant Poet to the City of London.' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 30, no. 4 (1967): 345-68.

———. 'The Bible in English Civic Pageants.' *Comparative Drama* 20 (1986): 160-70.

———. 'Creating Entertainments for Prince Henry's Creation (1610).' *Comparative Drama* 42, no. 4 (2008): 433-49.

———. 'The Emblematic Nature of English Civic Pageantry.' *Renaissance Drama, New Ser.* 1 (1968): 167-98.

———. *English Civic Pageantry, 1558-1642*, revised edn. Tempe, AZ: Arizona University Press, 2003.

———. *Pageants and Entertainments of Anthony Munday: A Critical Edition.* London; New York: Garland Publishing, 1985.

———. 'Pageants, Politics, and Patrons.' *Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 6 (1993): 139-52.

———. 'Representation in Renaissance English Civic Pageants.' *Theatre Journal* 40, no. 3 (1988): 319-31.

———. 'Stuart Civic Pageants and Textual Performance.' *Renaissance Quarterly* 51, no. 1 (1998): 163-83.

———. 'Symbolic Landscape in English Civic Pageantry.' *Renaissance Quarterly* 22, no. 1 (1969): 32-37.

———. *Textual Patronage in English Drama, 1570-1640*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

———. 'Thomas Middleton and Anthony Munday: Artistic Rivalry?' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 36, no. 2 (1996): 461-79.

Bergeron, David M., ed. *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1985.

Berlin, Michael. 'Civic Ceremony in Early Modern London.' *Urban History* 13, no. 1 (1986): 15-27.

Bevington, David M. 'Theatre as Holiday.' In *The Theatrical City : Culture, Theatre, and Politics in London, 1576-1649*. Edited by David M Bevington, David L. Smith, and Richard Strier, 101-16. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Bevington, David M, and Peter Holbrook, eds. *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Billington, Sandra. 'Butchers and Fishmongers: Their Historical Contribution to London's Festivity.' *Folklore,* 101, no.1 (1990): 97-103.

Blank, Paula. *Broken English: Dialects and Politics of Language in Renaissance Writings.* London: Routledge, 1996.

Blatchly, J. M. 'More, John (*c.*1542–1592)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/19184, accessed 12 July 2012].

Bloom, Clive, ed. *Jacobean Poetry and Prose: Rhetoric, Representation and the Popular Imagination*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1988.

Bonahue, Edward T. 'Citizen History: Stow's Survey of London.' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 38, no. 1 (1998): 61-85.

Boulton, Jeremy. *Neighbourhood And Society: A London Suburb in the Seventeenth Century.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Bowers, R. H. 'Raleigh's Last Speech: The "Elms" Document.' *The Review of English Studies* 2, no. 7 (1951): 209–16.

Bowra, C. M. *Poetry and Politics 1900-1960.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.

Breitenberg, Mark. *Anxious Masculinity in Early Modern England.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Brenner, Robert. *Merchants and Revolution: Commercial Change, Political Conflict, and London's Overseas Traders, 1550-1653*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

———. 'The Social Basis of English Commercial Expansion, 1550-1650'. *The Journal of Economic History* 32, no. 1 (1972): 361-84.

Bromham, A. A. 'The Contemporary Significance of *The Old Law.' Studies in English Literature*, *1500-1900* 24, no. 2 (1994): 1-9.

———. 'Thomas Middleton's *The Triumphs of Truth*: City Politics in 1613.' *The Seventeenth Century* 10, no. 1 (1995): 1–25.

Brooks, Douglas. *From Playhouse to Printing House: Drama and Authorship in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Brooks, Harold Fletcher, Antony Coleman, and Antony Hammond, eds. *Poetry and Drama, 1570-1700: Essays in Honour of Harold F. Brooks*. London; New York: Methuen, 1981.

Burgess, Glenn. 'The Divine Right of Kings Reconsidered.' *English Historical Review* 107, no. 425 (1992): 837-61.

Bush, Douglas. *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth Century, 1600-1660*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.

Butler, Martin. 'Courtly Negotiations.' In *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*. Edited by David Bevington and Peter Holbrook, 20-41. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

———. *The Stuart Court Masque and Political Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Chakravorty, Swapan. *Society and Politics in the Plays of Thomas Middleton.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Chamberlain, John. *The Letters of John Chamberlain*. Edited by Norman Egbert McClure. 2 vols. Philadelphia, PA: American Philosophical Society, 1939.

Collins, Eleanor C. 'Repertory and Riot: The Relocation of Plays from the Red Bull to the Cockpit Stage.' *Early Theatre* 13 (2010): 132–49.

Cooper, Helen. 'Location and meaning in masque, morality and royal entertainment.' In *The Court Masque*. Edited by David Lindley, 135-48. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.

Cooper, Lisa H. 'Chivalry, Commerce, and Conquest: Heywood's The Four Prentices of London.' In *Material Culture and Cultural Materialisms in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*. Edited by Curtis Perry, 159-75. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2001.

Cox, John D. 'Open Stage, Open Page? Editing Stage Directions in Early Modern Dramatic Texts.' In *Textual Performances: The Modern Reproduction of Shakespeare's Drama*. Edited by Lukas Erne and Margaret Jane Kidnie, 178–93. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Craig, Hugh. 'Jonson, the antimasque, and the "rules of flattery." ' In *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*. Edited by David Bevington and Peter Holbook , 176-96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Cramsie, John. 'Commercial Projects and the Fiscal Policy of James VI and I.' *The Historical Journal* 43, no. 2 (2000): 345–64.

———. 'The Philosophy of Imperial Kingship and the Interpretation of James VI and I.' In *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority and Government*. Edited by Ralph Anthony Houlbrooke, 43–60. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

Davies, Matthew P., and Ann Saunders. *The History of the Merchant Taylors' Company*. Leeds: Maney, 2004.

DeNeef, A. Leigh. 'The Poetics of Orpheus: The Text and a Study of *Orpheus His Journey to Hell* (1595).' *Studies in Philology* 89, no. 1(1992): 20-70.

Dessen, Alan. 'Stage Directions and the Theatre Historian.' In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre*. Edited by Richard Dutton, 513-27. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

DiGangi, Mario. *The Homoerotics of Early Modern Drama.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Doelman, James. 'A King of Thine Own Heart: The English Reception of King James VI and I's *Basilikon Doron*.' *Seventeenth Century* 9 (1994): 1-9.

Dugaw, Dianne M. 'Anglo-American Folksong Reconsidered: The Interface of Oral and Written Forms.' *Western Folklore* 43, no. 2 (1984): 83–103.

Dutton, Richard, ed. *Jacobean Civic Pageants*. Staffordshire: Keele University Press, 1995.

———, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Early Modern Theatre*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Erne, Lukas. *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Erne, Lukas and Margaret Jane Kidnie, eds. *Textual Performances: The Modern Reproduction of Shakespeare's Drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Evans, Mihail Dafydd. 'Humston [Humpston], Robert (*d.* 1606)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004

[http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/14168, accessed 12 July 2012]

Ferguson, Margaret W., Maureen Quilligan and Nancy J. Vickers, eds. *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

Finlayson, J. Caitlin. 'Mercantilism and the Path to Spiritual Salvation in Thomas Heywood's *Londini Emporia, or Londons Mercatura* (1633).' *English Studies* 91, no. 8 (2010): 838–60.

Fischlin, Daniel and Mark Fortier, eds. *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2002.

Foster, Elizabeth Read. *Proceedings in Parliament, 1610*. 2 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.

Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Clarendon Press, 1985.

Friis, Astrid. *Alderman Cockayne's Project and the Cloth Trade : The Commercial Policy of England in Its Main Aspects, 1603-1625*. Copenhagen: Levin and Munsgaard, 1927.

Gadd, Ian, and Patrick Wallis, eds. *Guilds, Society and Economy in London, 1450-1800*. London: Centre for Metropolitan History, 2002.

Gadd, Ian, and Alexandra Gillespie, eds. *John Stow and the Making of the English Past*. London: British Library, 2004.

George, Charles H., and Katherine George. *The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, 1570-1640*. Princeton: Princeton U.P, 1961.

Goldberg, Jonathan. 'Fatherly Authority: The Politics of Stuart Family Images.' In *Rewriting the Renaissance: The Discourses of Sexual Difference in Early Modern Europe*.

Edited by Margaret W. Ferguson, Maureen Quilligan and Nancy J. Vickers, 3-32. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1986.

———.*James I and the Politics of Literature: Jonson, Shakespeare, Donne and their Contemporaries.* Baltimore, MD; London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.

Gordon, Andrew. *Writing Early Modern London: Memory, Text and Community*. Early Modern Literature in History. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Gossett, Suzanne, ed. *Thomas Middleton in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Green, Ian M. *Print and Protestantism in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Griffith, Eva. *A Jacobean Company and its Playhouse: The Queen's Servants at the Red Bull Theatre (c. 1605-1619).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Gros Louis, Kenneth R. R. 'The Triumph and Death of Orpheus in the English Renaissance,' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 9, no. 1 (1969): 63-80.

Gwynfor Jones, J., Vivienne Larminie. 'Bayly, Lewis (*c*.1575–1631).' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008. [http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/1766, accessed 12 July 2012].

Hadfield, Andrew. *Literature, Politics and National Identity: Reformation to Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Haigh, Christopher. *The Plain Man's Pathways to Heaven: Kinds of Christianity in Post-Reformation England, 1570-1640*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Hall, Edith, Fiona Macintosh, and Oliver Taplin, eds. *Medea in Performance, 1500-2000*. Oxford: Legenda, 2000.

Halpern, Richard. *The Poetics of Primitive Accumulation: English Renaissance Culture and the Genealogy of Capital*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991.

Hamilton, Donna B. *Anthony Munday and the Catholics, 1560-1633*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.

Hammond, Antony. 'Encounters of the Third Kind in Stage-Directions in Elizabethan and Jacobean Drama.' *Studies in Philology* 89, no. 1 (1992): 71–99.

Hardin, William. 'Conceiving Cities: Thomas Heywood's *Londini Speculum* (1637) and the Making of Civic Identity.' *Comitatus: A Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 28, no. 1 (1997): 17-35.

Harding, Vanessa. 'City, Capital, Metropolis.' In *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stow to Strype, 1598-1720*. Edited by J. F Merritt, 117-43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Heal, Felicity. *Hospitality in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Heaton, Gabriel. *Writing and Reading Royal Entertainments: From George Gascoigne to Ben Jonson*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Heinemann, Margot. *Puritanism and Theatre: Thomas Middleton and Opposition Drama Under the Early Stuarts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Hentschell, Roze. *The Culture of Cloth in Early Modern England: Textual Constructions of A National Identity*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.

Hill, Christopher. *Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England*. London: Secker and Warburg, 1964.

Hill, Tracey. *Anthony Munday and Civic Culture: Theatre, History and Power in Early Modern London 1580-1633*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.

———. *Pageantry and Power: A Cultural History of the Early Modern Lord Mayor's Show, 1585-1639*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010.

———. 'Owners and Collectors of the Printed Books of the Early Modern Lord Mayors' Shows.' *Library and Information History* 30, no. 3 (2014): 151-71.

Holland, Peter, ed. *Shakespeare, Memory and Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Houlbrooke, Ralph Anthony, ed. *James VI and I: Ideas, Authority and Government*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.

Hunt, Arnold. *The Art of Hearing: English Preachers and Their Audiences,* 1590-1640. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

James VI and I, King. *King James VI and I. Political Writings*. Edited by Johann P. Sommerville. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Jansson, Maija, ed. *Proceedings in Parliament, 1614 (House of Commons)*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1988.

Jenner, Mark S. R. and Paul Griffiths, eds. *Londinopolis: Essays in the Cultural and Social History of Early Modern London*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.

Jinkins, Michael. 'Perkins, William (1558–1602)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2007 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/21973, accessed 12 July 2012]

Johnson, Arthur H. *The history of the Worshipful Company of the Drapers of London.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1922.

Johnson, Paula. 'Jacobean Ephemera and the Immortal Word.' *Renaissance Drama: New series* 8 (1977): 151-71.

Jordan, Constance. 'The Household and the State: Transformations in the Representation of an Analogy from Aristotle to James I.' *Modern Language Quarterly* 54, no. 3 (1993): 307-26.

Jordan, Wilbur K. *The Charities of London, 1480-1660: The Aspirations and the Achievements of the Urban Society*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1960.

Kamholtz, Jonathan Z. 'Ben Jonson's *Epigrammes* and Poetic Occasions.' *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 23, no. 1 (1983): 77-94.

Kastan, David Scott. 'Workshop And/as Playhouse: Comedy and Commerce in *The Shoemaker's Holiday*.' *Studies in Philology* 84, no. 3 (1987): 324–37.

Kesson, Andy, and Emma Smith. 'Introduction: Towards a Definition of Print Popularity.' In *The Elizabethan Top Ten: Defining Print Popularity in Early Modern England*. Edited by Andy Kesson and Emma Smith, 1–15. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013.

Kesson, Andy, and Emma Smith, eds. *The Elizabethan Top Ten: Defining Print Popularity in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013.

Kiefer, Frederick. *Shakespeare's Visual Theatre: Staging the Personified Characters*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Kidnie, Margaret Jane. 'The Staging of Shakespeare's Drama in Print Editions.' In *Textual Performances: The Modern Reproduction of Shakespeare's Drama*. Edited by Margaret Jane Kidnie and Lukas Erne, 158–77. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Kinney, Arthur F. *A Companion to Renaissance Drama*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002.

Kitch, Aaron. 'The city's money.' In *Thomas Middleton in Context*. Edited by Suzanne. Gossett, 68-74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

———. *Political Economy and the States of Literature in Early Modern England*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.

Klein, Benjamin. ' "Between the Bums and the Bellies of the Multitude": Civic Pageantry and the Problem of the Audience in Late Stuart London.' *The London Journal* 17, no. 1 (1992): 18–26.

Knafla, Louis A. 'Britain's Solomon: King James and the Law.' In *Royal Subjects: Essays on the Writings of James VI and I*. Edited by Daniel Fischlin and Mark Fortier, 235-64. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2002.

Knight, Stephen. *Robin Hood : a Mythic Biography*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Knowles, James. 'The Spectacle of the Realm: Civic Consciousness, Rhetoric and Ritual in Early Modern London.' In *Theatre and Government under the Early Stuarts*. Edited by J. R Mulryne and Margaret Shewring, 157-89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Kok, Su Mei. ' "How Many Arts from Such a Labour Flow": Thomas Middleton and London's New River.' *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 43, no. 1 (2013): 173–90.

Korda, Natasha. 'Trade, work, and workers,' in *Thomas Middleton in Context*. Edited by Suzanne Gossett, 75-82. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Lake, Peter. *Anglicans and Puritans?: Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker*. London; Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1988.

———. 'Calvinism and the English Church 1570-1635.' *Past & Present*, no. 114 (1987): 32-76.

———. 'From Troynovant to Heliogabulus's Rome and Back: "Order" and Its Others in the London of John Stow.' In *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stow to Strype, 1598-1720*. Edited by Julia F. Merritt, 217–49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

———. 'The King (The Queen) and the Jesuit: James Stuart's *True Law of Free Monarchies* in Context/s.' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Sixth Series, 14 (2004): 243-60.

———. 'Puritanism, (Monarchical) Republicanism, and Monarchy; or John Whitgift, Antipuritanism, and the 'Invention' of Popularity.' *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 40, no. 3 (2010): 463-96.

Lang, R. G. 'Social Origins and Social Aspirations of Jacobean London Merchants.' *The Economic History Review* 27, no. 1 (1974): 28-47.

Larminie, Vivienne. 'Hieron, Samuel (*bap.* 1572, *d.* 1617)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004
[http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/13221, accessed 12 July 2012].

Leinwand, T. B. 'London Triumphing: The Jacobean Lord Mayor's Show.' *Clio* 11, no. 2 (1982): 137-53.

Lesser, Zachary. 'Typographic Nostalgia: Play-Reading, Popularity, and the Meanings of Black Letter.' In *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers, and Readers in Early Modern England*. Edited by Marta Straznicky, 99-126. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006.

Lesser, Zachary and Alan B. Farmer.'Vile Arts: The Marketing of English Printed Drama, 1512–1660.' *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 39 (2000): 77-165.

Lewalski, Barbara Kiefer, ed. *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Lindley, David, ed. *The Court Masque*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984.

Lindley, K. J. 'Riot Prevention and Control in Early Stuart London.' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society (Fifth Series)* 33 (1983): 109–26.

Lobanov-Rostovsky, Sergei. 'The Triumphes of Golde: Economic Authority in the Jacobean Lord Mayor's Show.' *ELH* 60, no. 4 (1993): 879-98.

Manley, Lawrence. *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

———. 'Of Sites and Rites.' In *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre, and Politics in London, 1576-1649*. Edited by David L Smith, Richard Strier, and David M Bevington, 35–54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Manning, Roger B. 'Unlawful Hunting in England, 1500–1640.' *Forest and Conservation History* 38, no. 1 (1994): 16–23.

Marcus, Leah S. 'City Metal and Country Mettle: The Occasion of Ben Jonson's *Golden Age Restored*.' In *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater*. Edited by David M. Bergeron, 26-47. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1985.

———. ' "Present Occasions" and the Shaping of Ben Jonson's Masques,' *English Literary History* 45, no. 2 (1978): 201-25.

Mardock, James D. *Our Scene Is London: Ben Jonson's City and the Space of the Author*. London: Routledge, 2008.

Marrapodi, Michele, ed. *Shakespeare, Italy and Intertextuality*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.

Marsh, Christopher W. *Music and Society in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Matheson, Lister M. 'The Peasants' Revolt through Five Centuries of Rumor and Reporting: Richard Fox, John Stow, and their Successors.' *Studies in Philology* 95, no. 2 (1998): 121-51.

McKenzie, D.F. 'Speech-Manuscript-Print.' *The Library Chronicle of the University of Texas at Austin* 20 (1990): 87-109.

McLuskie, Kathleen. *Dekker and Heywood: Professional Dramatists*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1994.

Mehl, Dieter, Angela Stock, and Anne-Julia Zwierlein, eds. *Plotting Early Modern London: New Essays on Jacobean City Comedy*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

Merritt, J. F. 'Tuke, Thomas (1580/81–1657)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/27809, accessed 12 July 2012

Merritt, Julia F., ed. *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stow to Strype, 1598-1720*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Miner, Earl. 'Some Issues of Literary 'Species, or Distinct Kind.' ' In *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History, and Interpretation*. Edited by Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, 15–43. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Muldrew, Craig. *The Economy of Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1998.

Mullan, David G. 'Masked Popery and Pyrrhonian Uncertainty: The Early Scottish Covenanters on Arminianism.' *The Journal of Religious History* 21, no. 2 (1997): 159-77.

Mullaney, Steven. *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1995.

Mulryne, J. R. 'Cleopatra's Barge and Antony's Body: Italian Sources and English Theatre.' In *Shakespeare, Italy and Intertextuality*. Edited by Michele Marrapodi, 197-215. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.

Mulryne, J. R, and Margaret Shewring, eds. *Theatre and Government Under the Early Stuarts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Munro, Ian. *The Figure of the Crowd in Early Modern London: The City and Its Double*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

———. 'The populations of London.' In *Thomas Middleton in Context*. Edited by Suzanne Gossett, 45-51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Nelson, Malcolm A. *The Robin Hood Tradition in the English Renaissance*. Salzburg: Inst. f. Engl. Sprache u. Literatur, Univ. Salzburg, 1973.

Newman, Karen. 'Celebrating the city.' In *Thomas Middleton in Context*. Edited by Suzanne Gossett, 90-97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Northway, Kara. ' 'I Desyre to be Paid': Interpreting the Language of Remuneration in Early Modern Dramatic Archives.' *Comparative Drama*, 41, no. 4 (2007-8): 405-22.

———. ' 'To Kindle an Industrious Desire': The Poetry of Work in Lord Mayors' Shows.' *Comparative Drama,* 41, no. 2 (2007): 167-92.

Notestein, Wallace. *The House of Commons, 1604-1610*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1971.

Oakley-Brown, Liz. 'Framing Robin Hood: Temporality and Textuality in Anthony Munday's Huntington Plays.' In *Robin Hood: Medieval and Post-medieval*. Edited by Helen Phillips, 113–28. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005.

O'Callaghan, Michelle. *Thomas Middleton: Renaissance Dramatist.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

Ong, Walter J. 'From Allegory to Diagram in the Renaissance Mind: A Study in the Significance of the Allegorical Tableau.' *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 17, no. 4 (1959): 423-40.

Orr, Mary. *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003.

Palmer, Daryl W. *Hospitable Performances : Dramatic Genre and Cultural Practices in Early Modern England*. West Lafayette, IA: Purdue University Press, 1992.

———. 'Metropolitan Resurrection in Anthony Munday's Lord Mayor's Shows', *SEL 1500-1900* 46, no. 2 (2006) 371-87.

Parry, Graham. *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1981.

Paster, Gail Kern. *The Idea of the City in the Age of Shakespeare*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1985.

———. 'The idea of London in masque and pageant.' In *Pageantry in the Shakespearean Theater*. Edited by David M. Bergeron, 46-64. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1985.

Pearl, Valerie. 'Change and Stability in Seventeenth-Century London.' *The London Journal* 5, no. 1 (1979): 3–34.

Peck, Linda Levy. *Court Patronage and Corruption in Early Stuart England*. London ; New York: Routledge, 1993.
———, ed. *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Perry, Curtis. *The Making of Jacobean Culture: James I and the Renegotiation of Elizabethan Literary Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

———, ed. *Material Culture and Cultural Materialisms in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2001.

Peterson, Gary D. *Warrior Kings of Sweden: The Rise of an Empire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Jeffeson, NC: Macfarland & Co., 2007.

Phillips, Helen, ed. *Robin Hood: Medieval and Post-medieval*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005.

Pitcher, John. 'Introduction.' In William Shakespeare, *Cymbeline*. Edited by John Pitcher. London: Penguin, 2005.

Potter, Lois, ed. *Playing Robin Hood: The Legend as Performance in Five Centuries*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1998.

Potter, Lois and Joshua Calhoun, eds. *Images of Robin Hood: Medieval to Modern*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1998.

Powell, William S. 'John Pory on the Death of Sir Walter Raleigh.' *The William and Mary Quarterly* 9, no. 4 (1952): 532–38.

Power, M.J. 'London and the Control of the 'crisis' of the 1590s.' *History* 70, no. 230 (1985): 371–85.

Purkiss, Diane. 'Medea in the English Renaissance.' In *Medea in Performance 1500-2000*. Edited by Edith Hall, Fiona MacIntosh and Oliver Taplin, 32-48. Oxford: Legenda, 2000.

Rappaport, Steve. 'Social Structure and Mobility In Sixteenth-Century London: Part I.' *The London Journal* 9, no. 2 (1983): 107-35.

Richards, Judith M. 'The English Accession of James VI: 'National' Identity, Gender and the Personal Monarchy of England.' *English Historical Review* 117, no. 472 (2002): 513-35.

Robinson, Philip. 'Multiple Meanings of Troy in the Early Modern London's Mayoral Show.' *The Seventeenth Century* 26, no. 2 (2011): 221-39.

Rowland, Richard. 'Introduction'. *The First and Second Parts of King Edward IV.* Edited by Richard Rowland, 1-77. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005.

' 'Speaking Some Words, but of No Importance'?: Stage Directions, Thomas Heywood, and *Edward IV.' Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England* 18 (2005): 104–22.

———. *Thomas Heywood's Theatre, 1599-1639: Locations, Translations, and Conflict.* Farnham: Ashgate, 2010.

Schochet, Gordon J. 'Patriarchalism, Politics and Mass Attitudes in Stuart England.' *The Historical Journal* 12, no. 3 (1969): 413-41.

Shohet, Lauren. *Reading Masques : The English Masque and Public Culture in the Seventeenth Century*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Sears McGee, J. 'Taylor, Thomas (1576–1632)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/27083, accessed 12 July 2012]

Seaver, Paul S. 'The Artisanal World.' In *The Theatrical City : Culture, Theatre, and Politics in London, 1576-1649*. Edited by David M. Bevington, David L Smith, and Richard Strier, 87–100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

———. 'The Puritan Work Ethic Revisited.' *Journal of British Studies* 19, no. 2 (1980): 35-53.

———. *Wallington's World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1985.

Sharpe, Reginald R. *London and the Kingdom: A History Derived Mainly from the Archives at Guildhall*. 3 vols. London: Longmans Green, 1894.

Sheils, William Joseph. 'Bunny, Francis (1543–1617)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004 [http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezproxy.york.ac.uk/view/article/3944, accessed 12 July 2012]

Shuger, Debora. *Habits of Thought in the English Renaissance: Religion, Politics and the Dominant Culture.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990.

Simons, John. 'Open and Closed Books: a semiotic approach to the history of Elizabethan and Jacobean popular romance.' In *Jacobean Poetry and Prose: Rhetoric, Representation and the Popular Imagination*. Edited by Clive Bloom, 8-24. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1988.

Singman, Jeffrey L. 'Munday's Unruly Earl.' In *Playing Robin Hood: The Legend as Performance in Five Centuries*. Edited by Lois Potter, 62-76. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1998.

———. *Robin Hood: The Shaping of the Legend.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1998.

Smith, Bruce R. *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England: Attending to the O-factor*. Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

———. 'Speaking What We Feel About *King Lear*.' In *Shakespeare, Memory and Performance*. Edited by Peter Holland, 23–42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Smith, David L., Richard Strier, and David M. Bevington, eds. *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre, and Politics in London, 1576-1649*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Sommerville, Johann P. 'English and European Political Ideas in the Early Seventeenth Century: Revisionism and the Rise of Absolutism.' *Journal of British Studies* 35, no. 2 (1996): 168-94.

Stallybrass, Peter. ' 'Drunk with the Cup of Liberty': Robin Hood, the Carnivalesque, and the Rhetoric of Violence in Early Modern England.' In *The Violence of Representation: Literature and the History of Violence*. Edited by Nancy Armstrong and Leonard Tennenhouse, 45–76. London: Routledge, 1989.

Stern, Tiffany. *Documents of Performance in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Stevenson, Laura Caroline. *Praise and Paradox : Merchants and Craftsmen in Elizabethan Popular Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Stewart, Susan. *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984.

———. 'Scandals of the Ballad.' *Representations* 32 (1990): 134–56.

Stock, Angela. ' "Something Done in Honour of the City": Ritual, Theatre and Satire in Jacobean Civic Pageantry.' In *Plotting Early Modern London: New Essays on Jacobean City Comedy*. Edited by Dieter Mehl, Angela Stock, and Anne-Julia Zwierlein, 125–44. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

Straznicky Marta, ed. *The Book of the Play: Playwrights, Stationers, and Readers in Early Modern England*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006.

Strong, Roy C. *Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1987.

Sullivan, Ceri. 'London's Early Modern Creative Industrialists.' *Studies in Philology* 103, no. 3 (2006): 313–28.

———. *The Rhetoric of Credit: Merchants in Early Modern Writing*. London: Associated University Presses, 2002.

———. 'Thomas Middleton's View of Public Utility.' *The Review of English Studies* 58, no. 234 (2007): 162–74.

Supple, Barry. *Commercial Crisis and Change in England, 1600-1642: a Study in the Instability of a Mercantile Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Taylor, Gary, and John Lavagnino. *Thomas Middleton: the Collected Works*. Oxford University Press, 2007.

Trevisan, Sara. 'The Lord Mayor's Show in Early Modern London.' *Literature Compass* 11, no. 8 (2014): 538-548.

Tribble, Evelyn B. *Margins and Marginality: The Printed Page in Early Modern England*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1993.

Tyacke, Nicholas. *Aspects of English Protestantism, c.1530-1700*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2001.

———. 'Debate: The Rise of Arminianism Reconsidered.' *Past and Present* 115 (1987): 201-16.

Unwin, George. *The Gilds and Companies of London*. 4th ed. London: Cass, 1963.

Ward, Joseph P. *Metropolitan Communities: Trade Guilds, Identity, and Change in Early Modern London*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997.

Watt, Tessa. *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Weimann, Robert. *Author's Pen and Actor's Voice: Playing and Writing in Shakespeare's Theatre*. Edited by Helen Higbee and William West. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Wells, S. 'Jacobean City Comedy and the Ideology of the City.' *ELH* 48, no. 1 (1981): 37-60.

Wheare, Michael. ' 'From the Castle Hill They Came with Violence': The Edinburgh Robin Hood Riots of 1561.' In *Images of Robin Hood: Medieval to Modern*. Edited by Lois Potter and Joshua Calhoun, 111–20. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1998.

Witmore, Michael. 'Arrow, Acrobat, and Phoenix: On Sense and Motion in English Civic Pageantry.' In *The Automaton in English Renaissance Literature*. Edited by Wendy Beth Hyman, 109–28. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013.

Wickham, Glynne William Gladstone. *Early English Stages, 1300 to 1660*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959.

Wiles, David. *The Early Plays of Robin Hood*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1981.

Williams, S. H. 'Two Seventeeth-Century Allegories of Truth the daughter of Time.' *Guildhall Miscellany* (1963): 207-20.

Wilson, Charles. 'Cloth Production and International Competition in the Seventeenth Century'. *The Economic History Review*, New Ser., 13, no. 2 (1960): 209-21.

Withington, Philip. 'Public Discourse, Corporate Citizenship and State Formation in Early Modern England.' *American Historical Review* 112, no. 4 (2007): 1016-38.

Womersley, David. *Divinity and State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Wormald, Jenny. 'James VI and I, *Basilikon Doron* and *The Trew Law of Free Monarchies*: The Scottish Context and the English Translation.' In *The Mental World of the*

Jacobean Court. Edited by Linda Levy Peck, 36–54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Wright, Louis B. 'William Perkins: Elizabethan Apostle of 'Practical Divinity.'' *Huntington Library Quarterly* 3, no. 2 (1940): 171-96.

Wright, Nancy. ' "Rival Traditions": Civic and Courtly Ceremonies in Eary Modern London.' In *The Politics of the Stuart Court Masque*. Edited by David M. Bevington and Peter Holbrook, 197–217. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Zaret, David. *The Heavenly Contract: ideology and organization in pre-revolutionary Puritanism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Zwerling Sugano, Marian. *The Poetics of the Occasion: Mallarmé and the Poetry of Circumstance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992.