

## ‘To prune and dresse the Tree of Gouernment’: political and contemporary contexts of the Shows

Bergeron helpfully reminds us that ‘by definition civic pageants are *political* events. They involve the presence of the ruler . . . they utilise public monies of city or guilds, they take place in the public arena, and they celebrate national and civic virtues.’<sup>1</sup> The latter are not inconsiderable concerns, although the political dimensions of the Shows have been widely overlooked. In general terms, the Shows repeatedly personified traits of good government as well as threats to the City’s peace and stability such as Envy or Ambition. In so doing, they inevitably engaged with political questions in the broadest sense. In this respect, as in others, they contrast to the royal masque, where, as Norbrook has argued, ‘overt religious imagery and overt political comment are kept under strict control’.<sup>2</sup> The Shows also displayed the City’s sense of itself, often in implicit or, more rarely, explicit contrast to the values of the court. Mayoral pageantry was therefore a reflection of a civic culture grounded in the values of a local government which was, in Withington’s words, ‘elitist, elective, pragmatic, patriarchal, and more often than not committed to civil and godly reformation’.<sup>3</sup>

My account of the Shows will demonstrate the ways in which they engaged with the changing socio-economic scene of the City and with court and city politics, in the widest sense, in the pre-Civil War period. Indeed, the chasm between the courtly and civic domains widened as the seventeenth century wore on. By the middle of the century, Withington has argued, the monarchy and its closest supporters were ‘actively suspicious of citizens and the powers they wielded’.<sup>4</sup> This is not, however, to posit some fundamental opposition between these two centres of power through the whole period. The Crown needed the City’s money – increasingly so as the seventeenth century progressed – as much as the City needed the Crown’s distribution of monopolies and its continued, if contingent, acceptance of its much-prized autonomy.<sup>5</sup> As Brenner

points out, those at the top of the civic hierarchy, in particular, were ‘drawn, unavoidably, into perpetual contact, and collaboration, with the royal government’.<sup>6</sup> Equally, out-and-out criticism of state policy or of the shortcomings of individuals, royal and otherwise, did not feature in the Shows. Such sentiments in civic circles at large were sometimes inchoate in any case; where they were expressed, this tended to occur subtly and tentatively, in coded language and through the careful use of selected figures and emblems.<sup>7</sup> I therefore follow Curtis Perry’s judicious approach: one should see the Shows not as ‘points on a graph leading to increased opposition between the city and the court’, he writes, ‘but as successive reformulations of civic pride occasioned by James’s withdrawal from the center of London’s political consciousness’. The situation, he stresses, was ‘more complicated than simple rivalry’ between Crown and City.<sup>8</sup>

Alongside larger historical changes, this chapter will also explore those more immediately contemporary aspects of the Shows which Leah Marcus calls their ‘present occasions’.<sup>9</sup> Numerous opportunities for what Manley terms ‘fine-tuned topical analysis’ are offered by the Shows.<sup>10</sup> Alongside the regular mayoral inaugurations, civic entertainments of other kinds were sometimes put together as a direct response to, or intervention in, a local issue or event. For instance, the ceremony to mark the opening of the New River in 1613 was scheduled specifically to take place at the same time as the election of the Lord Mayor in September, and, as we’ll see further below, it was no coincidence that Raleigh was executed on 29 October 1618. Thus, although the overt politicisation of the Shows was to accelerate from the 1650s onwards, my account of the Shows will dispute that of A. M. Clark, who wrote of the Shows that ‘their “history” [was] lore from the past, rather than the events of a sixteenth or seventeenth century present’, and that their politics were ‘purely conventional’. I will demonstrate that the Shows were not uniformly ‘studiously couched in the language of generalities and compliment’, as Clark asserts.<sup>11</sup> Civic pageantry was undeniably drawn towards historical tradition and the *assertion* of unbroken continuities, but at the same time it was capable of responding to more immediate concerns and its attempt to establish a harmonious civic community (at least textually) was not always entirely successful. Manley expresses the precarious balance between long-standing tradition and politically aware response to contingency well. Civic pageantry, he writes, was ‘endowed with an aura of timelessness . . . but it was never simply the case that performance straightforwardly re-enacted tradition . . . An element of

improvisation proceeded against a background of customary events and practices.<sup>12</sup> Such ‘improvisation’, as we will see, could manifest itself as the Shows’ engagement with political events and tensions.

At the most fundamental level, an essential aspect of all these entertainments was *instructive* support: ‘the performance of good counsel’, in Hunt’s useful phrase.<sup>13</sup> Praise, the ostensible purpose of the mayoral Show, was a double-edged sword, for it is composed of both compliment and, potentially, criticism, inhabiting a precarious place between the two. The figures invoked by mayoral pageantry perform the function of gentle – and, as we’ll see, sometimes not so gentle – moral exhortation. Munday, true to form, summarises this rationale when he baldly states to the new Lord Mayor that the tale of Jason and the golden fleece has been used for a purpose. ‘By way of Morall application’, he has Fitz-Alwin declare, ‘Your Honour may make some relation / Vnto your selfe out of this storie’ (*Metropolis coronata*, sig. B1v). For Munday, ‘no Monsters dare confront [Jolles’s] way’ (*ibid.*), but other Shows did sound a note of warning about the challenges that lay ahead for the new incumbent. For Middleton, who, as we will see below, generally stresses the rigours of the mayoralty, Edward Barkham will confront risks in his ‘Yeares voyage’. ‘There is no Voyage set forth to renowne’, the figure of Jason states, ‘That do’s not sometimes meete with Skies that frowne, / With Gusts of Enuie, Billowes of despight, / Which makes the Purchase once achieu’d, more bright’ (*The sunne in Aries*, sigs A4v–B1r).<sup>14</sup> Using a similar metaphor, Dekker has Neptune caution John Swinnerton that ‘thou must saile / in rough Seas (now) of Rule: and every Gale/ will not perhaps befriend thee’ (*Troia-Noua triumphans*, sig. B1v). The point is reiterated later on, when Fame informs Swinnerton that he faces a ‘dangerous yeare’ in which ‘Each Eye will look through thee, and Each Ear / Way-lay thy Words and Workes’ (sig. C1v).

Richard Deane, Lord Mayor in 1628, is issued with a series of quite stringent instructions: to remember the poor, to watch out for ‘Dangers farre off’, and to ‘Kisse Peace [and] let Order euer steere the Helme’ (*Brittannia’s honor*, sig. B3r). At the end of the Show Deane is advised to trust no one as he takes his year’s voyage through the mayoralty (here the ship of state appears again), ‘for Officers Sell / Their Captaines Trust’. Dekker’s approach here, as he admits, is admonitory: ‘You May: you *Must*’, he writes, for ‘I counsell not, but *Reade / A Lesson* of my loue’ (sig. C1v; my emphases).<sup>15</sup> Heywood could be even more demanding: there is something almost threatening in his use of the mirror as a metaphor

in *Londini speculum*, whereby, he writes, ‘I have purposed so true and exact a Mirrour, that in it may be discovered as well that which beautifies the governour, as deforms the government’ (sig. B2v). The message to Richard Fenn thus seems to be that there is no hiding place from the intense scrutiny he is about to experience. Nautical imagery features too in Heywood’s first Show, where he uses Scylla and Charybdis as tokens of the hazards the Lord Mayor must try to escape. Ulysses informs Whitmore that he must ‘Keep the even Channell, and be neither swayde, / To the right hand nor left’. The range of challenges that he must evade include ‘Malicious envie . . . Smooth visaged flattery, and blacke mouthd detraction, / Sedition, whisprings, murmuring, [and] private hate’ (*Londons ius honorarium*, sig. B1v). One would hardly be surprised if Whitmore had wished his election had never taken place upon hearing such a series of ghastly threats in store.

Being included in Fame’s record – or not – was often used as a motivating force for the new incumbent: ‘for the Encouragement of after ages’, as Middleton put it in *The sunne in Aries* (sig. B1v). Indeed, the recitation of what Middleton calls ‘the Glory of illustrious Acts’ (*ibid.*, sig. B2r) that we see in so many Shows may have worked as much as a marker of how far short the new Lord Mayor may come to his predecessors than as an inspiration to emulate their achievements. In *The sunne in Aries* Edward Barkham, only very recently a member of the lowly Leathersellers’ Company, is presented with exemplars whose worthy deeds range from being ‘Colledge Founders [and] Temple-Beautifiers’ to ‘Erecters . . . of Granaries for the Poore’. Indeed, by stating that ‘no Society, or Time can match’ the achievement of that most famed and primary of Lord Mayors, Fitz-Alwin, who served ‘for twenty-four Yeares compleate’ (*ibid.*), Middleton more or less rules out Barkham making an equivalent impression. In *Troia-Noua triumphans* it is possible that the difficulties Dekker anticipates Swinnerton confronting may have something to do with the ‘spite that murmur[ed] at the Choice’ of the new Lord Mayor that Dekker rather impolitically mentions (sig. B3v). Conditional rather than unconditional approval of the new Lord Mayor is therefore a consistent feature of the Shows’ rhetoric. Indeed, ‘Expectation’ features as a discrete character in *Sidero-Thriambos* expressly to ‘intimate’ to the Lord Mayor that ‘there will be more then ordinary matter expecte[d] from him’ (sig. B4v). More bathetically, Munday’s extended simile of the Lord Mayor as the nursing pelican in *Chrysanaleia* leads him to warn John Leman, as

the City's parent, to expect 'broken sleeps [and] daily and nightly cares'; indeed, he almost implies that, if he is to 'iustly answe're to our Emblem', then, like the legendary pelican, Leman will expire at the end of his term of office (sig. B2r). There is then a recap at the end of this Show, where Leman is warned in even more drastic terms of what lies ahead for him:

Continuall cares, and many broken sleepes,  
 Heart-killing feares, which waite on Eminence  
 Hard at the heeles, and (torturingly) still keeps  
 Within the soule imperious residence,  
 As whippes t' afflict both hope and patience . . .  
 These you hardly will auoide this yeere.

(sig. C3r)

All is not doom and gloom, however, for Munday offers the reassurance that with the assistance of 'Discretion, Policie, and Providence, / Courage [and] Correction', even the 'busiest troubles' will be 'sweetly qualified' (*ibid.*).

All these references to threats and troubles demonstrate that the London represented in mayoral pageantry was a more complex, fractured entity than Paster assumes when she writes of 'the clear atmosphere of the communities of praise' and of an absence in the Shows of any 'ambivalence about urban life'.<sup>16</sup> In themselves, as a starting point, the mayoral Shows' nostalgia and reification of the past were ideological strategies, attempts to fend off what was perceived by the City's great livery companies as an undesirable decline in their power and influence. As Hentschell has written in relation to the cloth trade, there was 'in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, a recurrent strain of loss and nostalgia in the writings about [this] industry'.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, the sometimes aggressive economic actions and motivations that underscored the City's wealth could here be represented in a more benevolent light. In mayoral pageantry, Palmer has argued, 'malevolent ambition [is translated into] a felicitous vision of mercantile endeavor and aspiration'.<sup>18</sup> The invocation of past and present civic glories stands as a contrast to the eventful, crisis-ridden reigns of the Stuart kings before the civil wars.

### 'London's secure, with peace and plenty blest': responses to crisis in the Shows

Whether or not a full-scale Lord Mayor's Show took place was in itself dependent on immediate contingencies. In times of plague, as

we have already seen, only minimal entertainments were put on and the route was usually changed to abbreviate the procession. There was thus no Lord Mayor's Show in 1625 owing to James's death and a severe outbreak of plague in London. In the following year's Show Middleton belatedly praises Allan Cotton, the Lord Mayor of 1625, and comments that at his 'Inauguration . . . Tryumph was not then in season, (Deaths Pageants being onely aduanc'st vppon the shoulders of men)' (*The triumphs of health and prosperity*, sig. B2r).<sup>19</sup> Thereafter, during the Caroline period, civic entertainments suffered generally, not exclusively because of unfortunate circumstances such as plague but also owing to a lack of interest on the part of the monarch. There is a precedent here in the early years of James's reign, when the Shows seem to have elapsed for a while and were in 1609 'revived againe by order from the King', as Munday puts it in the 1633 edition of Stow's *Survey* (sig. Eee3v). Heywood's near-contemporary mayoral Show of 1635, *Londini sinus salutis*, perhaps to underscore the difference between James and Charles in this respect, also comments that on the inauguration of Thomas Campbell in 1609 'all the like Showes and Triumphs belonging unto the solemnitie of this day, which for some yeeres, had been omitted and neglected, were by a speciall commandement from his Majestie, King Iames, again retained' (sig. A4v).<sup>20</sup> In this instance, as both Munday and Heywood emphasise, even though his concern for pageantry was shortlived, the King did take action to renew mayoral entertainments. His son's approach was rather different. An insight into the attitude of the Caroline court to civic pageantry can be gleaned from Jasper Mayne's *The citye match*, a sub-Jonsonian play commissioned by the King and first performed at court. The 'Epilogue at Whitehall' praises the critical acumen of its aristocratic audience, stating that the author

. . . hopes none doth valem [the play] so low  
As to compare it with my Lord Maiors show.  
Tis so unlike, that some, he feares, did sit,  
Who missing Pageants did or'ese the wit.

(sig. S2r)

Interestingly, the 'Epilogue at Black-friers' which follows in the printed text reins in the hostility towards civic entertainments manifested in the Whitehall epilogue. In its Whitehall incarnation, however, the play epitomises the Lord Mayor's Show as the kind of contemptible entertainment which stands in opposition to courtly pleasures.<sup>21</sup>

Charles's own indifference towards civic pageantry began to manifest itself very early on. At the very start of his reign, in 1626, the new monarch called a halt to the already quite advanced preparations for the traditional civic celebration of a sovereign's accession, which had already been postponed from 1625 owing to the plague (Middleton had been employed to design some of the pageantry). 'Almost worse than the last-minute cancellation', Randall writes, Charles I 'ordered the pageants torn down immediately, despite the fact that his subjects had gone to great expense to build them'.<sup>22</sup> The Venetian ambassador reported that 'five most superb arches . . . will prove useless and they have already begun to dismantle them amid the murmurs of the people and the disgust of those who spent the money'.<sup>23</sup> Indeed, a contemporary witness, George Wither, relates in *Britain's remembrancer* that walking through the desolate post-plague city

. . . my eye did meet,  
 Those halfe built Pageants which, athwart the street,  
 Did those triumphant Arches counterfeit,  
 Which heretofore in ancient Rome were set . . .  
 The loyall Citizens (although they lost  
 The glory of their well-intended cost)  
 Erected those great Structures to renowne  
 The new receiving of the Sov'raine Crowne.

(sig. K2v)

Bergeron comments that it is 'more accurate' to call Charles's royal entries "non-Entries", because it seems to have been this king's particular penchant to build up anticipation for a state entry and then for some reason to fail to follow through on the plans'.<sup>24</sup> As far as civic visibility is concerned, Charles's royal entry into London from Scotland in 1641 was therefore too little, too late.

The first Show of Charles's reign might be seen to comment on the King's cessation of the royal entry. After the 1625 hiatus the Shows returned in 1626 with Middleton's last one, *The triumphs of health and prosperity*, a work which is quite a bit shorter than many of its predecessors, perhaps a reflection of uncertain times. Middleton strikes a dark note in the first speech, doubtless alluding to the dual misfortunes of 1625, plague and the death of a monarch, writing that 'a cloude of grieffe hath showrde upon the face / Of this sad City, and vsurpt the place / Of Ioy and Cheerfulnesse' (sig. A4r). Middleton uses the image of a rainbow to suggest a silver lining to these recent clouds in the person of the new Lord Mayor and the

chance to celebrate his inauguration. Although Charles himself was not present at the Show, Middleton took the opportunity to outline the relative roles of City and Crown. Indeed, one could see *The triumphs of health and prosperity* as a criticism of the King's recently abandoned royal entry. Middleton's text begins with what looks like the usual historical survey of civic record, but he singles out the importance of inaugural ceremonial with notable hyperbole:

if you should search all Chronicles, Histories, Records, in what Language or Letter soeuer; if the Inquisitiue Man should waste the deere Treasure of his Time and Ey-sight, He shall conclude his life onely with this certainty, that there is no Subiect vpon earth receiued into the place of his Gouvernement with the like State and Magnificence, as is his Maiesties great Substitute into his Honorable charge the Citty of London. (sig. A3r)

The King, the subtext of Middleton's prologue seems to imply, and as all readers of this work would have known, refused to be 'receiued into the place of his Gouvernement' in the time-honoured fashion. The Show's celebration of Charles's 'great Substitute' (a phrase reiterated in the first speech) with all the appropriate 'State and Magnificence' therefore could be seen to act as a kind of reproach to the King's neglect, and to appropriate the glamour that should have belonged to the royal entry further to magnify itself.

The effect is subtly conveyed, for Middleton is ostensibly simply reusing prefatory material he had written for *The triumphs of truth* and then recast slightly for *The triumphs of integrity* in 1623. He had made some small but significant changes from the original wording from 1613, however, which may have had a particular valency in the context of 1626. Here, for instance, the phrase 'great Substitute' is preferred to 'the Lord Maior of the Citty of London' as used in the 1613 work, a tactic which points up the status of the Lord Mayor *vis-à-vis* that of the King whose absence from that same City had recently been so glaringly apparent. It also suggests that the mayoral Show is itself a kind of substitute for the royal entry. Indeed, as if to emphasise the point, Middleton comments that London bears 'the Inscription of the Chamber Royall'. This title is one traditionally used for London during the royal entry rather than the Lord Mayor's Show, so its citation in this context is rather odd (London bore the name as an 'inscription' for James's 1604 entry, for instance). By stressing that the current occasion is 'no lesse illustrated with brotherly Affection then former Tryumphall times haue bene partakers of' (*ibid.*), in its 1626 moment the text could also



be drawing attention to a period within those ‘former times’ when ‘affection’ towards the City was lacking. It is in the preface that the majority of these encoded comments occur, interestingly: perhaps with a more select civic readership any criticism of the monarch could be safely made more tangible than in the public speeches.<sup>25</sup> In the latter, Middleton contents himself with the more vague statement that in recent times ‘Delight, / Triumph and Pompe had almost lost their right’ (sig. A4v). The blame for this state of affairs is left unspecified. Indeed, although dutiful acknowledgement is made in the Show’s speeches of the loyalty due to the monarch from both mayor and people, ultimately the burden of the text is that the king may be the head of the body politic but the City is the heart. Middleton calls it ‘the Fountayne of the bodies heate: / The first thing [that] receiues life [and] the last that dyes’ (sig. B2v).

Middleton’s emphasis on the importance of the City to the health of the country as a whole is a common, if carefully negotiated, theme in mayoral inaugurations. Recorder Finch claimed in his Exchequer speech in 1623 that the City is ‘the center in which all the lines of the kingdome meete’.<sup>26</sup> Dekker uses another kind of metaphor in *Brittannia’s honor* to encompass the idea: for him, London is ‘the Master-Wheele of the whole Kingdome: [and] as that moues, so the maine Engine works’. As if the notion is not clear enough, he supplements yet another representation of it, whereby ‘London is Admirall ouer the Nauy royall of Cities: And as she sayles, the whole Fleete of them keepe their course’ (sig. A3v). In *Himatia-Poleos* Munday takes London’s primacy further still, and has Fitz-Alwin, the first mayor, explain that his role came into existence to make up for shortcomings in the system of sole sovereign power that preceded it. In earlier times, Fitz-Alwin says, ‘men thought fit / In the Kings iudgement Courts to sit’. Contention over this arrangement (about which Munday is unhelpfully if perhaps understandably vague) resulted in chaos: ‘wrongs vnredrest, offences flowing, / Garboyles & grudges each where growing’. To ensure consistent and peaceful government, therefore, monarchical authority had to be supplemented: ‘so would he [the King] plant a deputie, / To figure his authority, / In the true forme of Monarchie’ (sig. C1v). The message is clear: the security of the state requires both sovereign *and* Lord Mayor. In *Metropolis coronata* (as I have discussed at greater length elsewhere), the Lord Mayor’s stature almost displaces that of the monarch. Jolles is likened to ‘an immortall Deitie’ who is ‘this day solemnly married to Londons supream Dignitie’; the Show itself is akin to ‘a Royall Maske’ (sig. B4v).

The Shows can therefore be seen to represent the monarchy and its relationship with the City in a way that was receptive to changing times. Peele, with his court connections, and writing at a time before the printed mayoral Show had become an established genre with its own specifically metropolitan values, made much of ‘our faire Eliza’, the ‘peerless Queene’, in *Descensus astraeae*, the very title of which aligns the Show with one of Elizabeth’s favoured personae (sigs A2v–A3r). When compared to the work of his successors, Peele’s integration of the Queen into his mayoral Show illustrates Perry’s argument that ‘King James’s departure from Elizabeth’s civic persona released London from the affective bond of . . . mutual obligations . . . [resulting in] alterations in the civic self-fashioning of the first decade of his reign’.<sup>27</sup> Thus for the later pageant writers the figure of ‘Fame’, although repeatedly associated with Queen Elizabeth throughout her reign, was not an exclusively monarchical image but one which could readily be borrowed to praise the City and its mayors. Some years later, Munday may have made a rather compromised attempt to genuflect to the new sovereign in *The triumphes of re-united Britania* but this was not the mayoral Shows’ usual mode.<sup>28</sup> In their treatment of the Crown, the Shows can be seen to express a potentially critical response to James’s much-cited lack of interest in public display in civic forums. As we have seen, Middleton was particularly likely to accentuate the Lord Mayor’s status as the royal ‘substitute’. For Middleton, the glory tends to reflect back on the monarch from the Lord Mayor, not vice versa. Thus, he cannot resist commenting in *The triumphs of loue and antiquity* that for a member of the monarchy to pay their debts to ‘Merchants’ – in this case, ‘Philip [*sic*]’, Edward III’s queen – is an act ‘rare in these dayes’ (sig. C2r; my emphasis). Middleton foregrounds royalty only in his final Show, *The triumphs of health and prosperity*, and even there, as I have argued above, he does so to critique rather than praise. As Manley comments, Taylor presents a ‘wonderfully ambiguous’ take on the king’s power *vis-à-vis* that of his ‘substitute’:

For no Kings Deputy, or Magistrate  
 Is with such pompous state inaugurate,  
 As Londons Mayor is, which most plainly shows  
 The Kings illustrious greatnesse whence it flowes.<sup>29</sup>

(*The triumphs of fame and honour*, sig. A3v)

The circularity of Taylor’s argument in these lines is reminiscent of that put forward in the Recorder of London’s speech at the

Exchequer in 1624. On this occasion Finch stated that ‘tis for the honor of the kinge that he be honoured whome the kinge honored’: although he hastily explained that he was not saying that the king was not supreme, whose the real ‘honor’ was remains highly ambiguous.<sup>30</sup> Heywood too could sometimes be quite bold in his defence of the City’s primacy versus that of other cities, notably Westminster. In *Porta pietatis* he writes that although London and Westminster are ‘Twin-sister-Cities’, ‘London may be presum’d to be the elder, and more excellent in Birth, Meanes, and Issue; in the first for her Antiquity, in the second for her Ability, in the third, for her numerous Progeny’ (sig. A3r–v).<sup>31</sup>

Such a defence of London’s supremacy took place within the context of a debate about its boundaries and its freedoms which accelerated through the seventeenth century. As is often noted, concerns about civic governmental and livery company jurisdiction in the face of the expansion of the city into the suburbs increased into the seventeenth century to become, in Harding’s words, ‘one of the important and enduring characteristics of early modern London’.<sup>32</sup> Whether or not these concerns were entirely justified or were shaped partly for rhetorical purposes, as Griffiths has recently proposed, it is still the case that there was undeniably a *perception* that the City was under threat from various quarters.<sup>33</sup> Following the model established in the early years of King James’s reign, when in 1607 he issued new charters to some livery companies as part of his move to bring them more under his purview, the London suburbs were incorporated by the Crown in 1636, an act that implicitly endangered the City’s monopoly over legitimate trade within its boundaries.<sup>34</sup> With this ‘New Incorporation’, Hardin writes, ‘the line separating sanctioned from unsanctioned commercial activity disappeared, rendering the original corporation no longer unique’.<sup>35</sup> The effective result was that the City now had a rival. In response to challenges of this kind, and to the growth of unregulated trade in the suburbs, the City made efforts in the 1630s to reinforce its boundaries by, for instance, rebuilding the Gate at Temple Bar and, later, in 1640, setting up an iron chain between the City limits and Middlesex.<sup>36</sup> Concurrently, City oligarchs were ordering more scrutiny of the City wall and its gates and ditches. Despite all this – or perhaps due to all this – as Harding states, ‘the sense of the boundary was weakening’.<sup>37</sup>

The Shows’ response to these infringements and challenges varied. For one thing, the suburbs were invariably edited out of the ‘London’ represented in the pageantry: as Griffiths argues, ‘there

was no wish to celebrate larger metropolitan identities incorporating the ribbon-developments that sapped specific senses of civic identity'.<sup>38</sup> Relatedly, one sees a defiant stress on the full, extended limits of mayoral authority, especially in the Shows of the 1620s and 1630s. Here the river Thames is often used as a metonym for the extent of the civic realm. Thamesis's statement in *Londini emporia* that Ralph Freeman is the 'great Lord in cheife' 'up [river] to Stanes and downe as farre as Lee' (sigs A4v–B1r) echoes Dekker's more explicit treatment of the same theme a few years earlier.<sup>39</sup> The latter writes that 'the extention of a Lord Maiors power, is euey year to bee seene both by Land and Water: Downe as low as Lee in Essex: [and] vp as high as Stanes in Middlesex' (*Brittannia's honor*, sig. A3v). Heywood's *Londini speculum*, which took place the year after Charles I's 'New Incorporation', also addresses the changing political and economic landscape of London and, in particular, the Crown's recent innovation, which he mentions towards the very end of the Show. Unavoidably perhaps, Heywood engages with the New Incorporation directly, using a maternal image to explain its genesis and to present the newcomer as the progeny of the original City. His imagery, however, is not without implied tension. London, he writes, 'in her age grew pregnant [and was] brought a bed / Of a New Towne'. Although this infant allegedly adds 'to her more grace', it is still described as a 'burthen' (sig. C4r). Hardin asserts that the arrival of the 'New Towne' is 'recast as a natural process', thus dispelling any sense of danger or threat to the City, but I would argue that the force of the word 'burthen' is not so easily discounted; in addition, the phrase 'to her more grace' is held in abeyance by parentheses.<sup>40</sup>

Towards the end of this period, as the political temperature in London rose still higher, the mayoral Shows were constrained in their entirety. In 1640 the Royalist Sir William Acton, a Merchant Taylor, was initially elected as Lord Mayor. He was, however, subsequently discharged from the offices of Lord Mayor and Alderman by the Commons (he was later imprisoned by Parliament in 1642), and was succeeded as Lord Mayor by Edmund Wright, a Grocer. The Merchant Taylors made no entries in their minute books or accounts of anything associated with Acton's putative mayoralty.<sup>41</sup> Acton is also omitted by John Tatham from the list of previous Merchant Taylor mayors that he provided in his 1660 Show.<sup>42</sup> The Grocers did treat Wright's nomination more conventionally, although it was certainly not accompanied by anything like the usual fanfare (the total expenditure was some £200 less than the

Grocers paid out in 1622).<sup>43</sup> They also, perhaps understandably, made no reference to Wright being a replacement for Acton when they set up their usual arrangements in early October. Members of the livery were thereafter assessed for their contributions, barges were rowed up and down river, the procession evidently took place with torches, whiffers, trumpeters, banners and so on, and the event was concluded with a dinner – what was missing was the pageantry. The Company decided in May to forgo its usual anniversary dinner owing to ‘the inconveniences and unfitnes of the times for publike feasting’, so it may be that the same rationale came into play in respect of Lord Mayor’s Day, although it still held the feast on that occasion, albeit a ‘moderate’ one.<sup>44</sup> As far as the pageantry is concerned, the Grocers baldly stated that ‘their [*sic*] is noe publike show eyther with Pageats [*sic*] or uppon the water’ (the livery paid a reduced subscription as a result of the lesser expenditure) but refrained from saying why.<sup>45</sup>

Nevertheless, although they seem to have been relatively understated when compared to previous years, in the same way as the theatre managed to continue in a much reduced form after 1642, civic festivities did not come to a total halt in the 1640s. Indeed, turning the usual convention of entertaining the monarch on its head, there was a ‘great and generous welcome’ given to members of Parliament at Grocers’ Hall in January 1641.<sup>46</sup> As far as civic posts were concerned, the Grocers in the usual fashion conferred a benevolence upon a Sheriff elect for the beautifying of his house and the ordering of plate for a feast in October 1642, when one might have expected them to have other things on their minds – or maybe that was the point of continuing in the traditional manner. In October 1645 the livery members of the Painter-Stainers ‘still met at the Hall in their gowns, the Assistants wearing their distinctive badges, and past Masters their foynes’.<sup>47</sup> Equally, Lord Mayor’s Day still took place throughout the Commonwealth period, though there is little evidence from Company records that it was accompanied by much in the way of entertainment. In 1654 the Grocers ordered that their barge be repaired and trimmed ‘as also trumpetes and others to bee agreed with by Mr Wardens as formerly’, indicating that the procession still went down river to Westminster as it had done since time immemorial.<sup>48</sup>

In the context of a very charged political atmosphere Heywood’s 1639 Show, the last Show with any pageantry before the first civil war broke out, is entitled (quite deliberately ironically, it seems, or in Rowland’s terms, ‘wistfully’) *Londini status pacatus; or, Londons*

*peaceable estate*. The Show was written to celebrate the inauguration of the royalist mayor Henry Garway, a Draper, and Heywood takes care to negotiate the pressing issues of the moment.<sup>49</sup> Rowland rightly calls Heywood's treatment of civil war 'visceral and intense'.<sup>50</sup> From the outset this text demonstrates an awareness of its dangerous times: for one thing, Heywood specifically and perhaps optimistically praises the new Lord Mayor's qualities as a peace-maker. As with Munday's 1618 Show, although on a much larger scale, Heywood's text deals explicitly with the calamity of 'sedition, tumult, uproares and faction'. The fifth pageant is the central one, sharing its name with the text itself. Here are displayed 'a Company of Artillery men compleatly armed, to express Warre'. In the preamble to the description of the show Heywood states specifically that 'Domesticke War is the over-throw and ruine of all Estates and Monarchies . . . most execrable, begetting contempt of God, corruption of manners, and disobedience to Magistrates'. He goes on to argue that civil war is worse than foreign warfare, the latter of which is, in comparison a 'more gentle and generous contention' (sig. C2r-v). In any other moment we might expect to see foreign warfare treated with anxiety – indeed, we see this in some Shows from the previous decade – but for Heywood it is very much the lesser of two evils. With some prescience he warns that

any War may be begun with great facility, but is ended with much difficulty; neither is it in his power to end it, who begins it . . . & therefore much safer and better is certaine peace, than hoped for Victory: the first is in our Will, the latter in the Will of the Gods. (sig. C2v)

'Our neighbour Nations' (one of which was Scotland), he states later in the text, are already in the 'throwes' of war, and he issues a plea that both gratitude and 'Pious cares' should strive to preserve peace at home.

Indeed, Peace, the antithesis of war, comes in for considerably more sustained attention than in any other Show of this period: it becomes a central focus of the latter stages of Heywood's text. The embodiment of the City itself, the Genius of London, is given the keynote speech in which these concerns are articulated. From the vantage point of a moment where peace must have seemed more and more endangered, Heywood produces what sounds with hindsight like a plaintive call for what he describes as 'the Tranquillity, and calme quiet of kingdomes, free from Section, tumult, uproares and faction'. Peace, he continues, as if aware that it is a precarious

quality in 1639, asks ‘no lesse wisdom to preserve it, then valour to obtain it’ (sig. C2r). It is naivety, he argues, to consider War but a ‘pleasant showe’ like the mayoral inauguration, for it is rather a dreadful prospect to be avoided at all costs. Indeed, Heywood illustrates its horrors very vividly: ‘when slaughter strowes the crimson plaine with Courses’ and ‘Massacre, (all quarter quite denying) / Revells amidst the flying, crying, dying’, the reality of civil war will strike home, but by then it might be too late. The lines invoking a situation in which ‘The Harmlesse, armelesse; murder one another: / When in the husbands and sad Parents fight’ (sig. C3r) show strikingly accurate foresight of how the widespread conflict to come was to manifest itself.

The impassioned treatment of warfare here goes far beyond the usual, brief invocation of such figures as Error and so on, who were traditionally conjured up in order to be defeated by the new Lord Mayor. For Heywood in 1639, writing during the Scottish war, warfare – and specifically *domestic* warfare – merits more prolonged attention, and he thus alludes to prior manifestations of the conflict that was to result so soon in civil war across the whole of Britain. He does so quite overtly, too. In the same work he has the figure of Janus give the Lord Mayor a ‘golden key’ with which to release certain political prisoners, ‘those Gaild / For Capitall crimes’ (sig. B3r). Rowland argues that this recalls ‘the MPs who were imprisoned after the king prorogued Parliament in 1629 [one of whom] Sir John Eliot, had already died in the Tower’.<sup>51</sup>

Heywood’s intervention apart, one cannot posit wholesale antagonism from the Companies towards Charles and his policies, however: for one thing, the political and religious affiliations of the City oligarchs varied from hardline Calvinist to loyal royalist. In addition, as Elizabeth Glover comments, during the troubled 1640s the Companies generally sought to stay on the safe side: ‘the official line will always have been cautious and conciliatory to whichever side was in power’.<sup>52</sup> Nevertheless, Clark understates the significance of Heywood’s portrayal of civic strife, arguing that his location of such upheaval in Germany rather than England – which takes place via a marginal note ‘As lately in Germany’ – displaces the contemporary urgency of the message of Heywood’s Show.<sup>53</sup> Rowland’s reading, in contrast, regards the citation of Germany as a reminder of ‘the Caroline regime’s failure to relieve the torments of protestants abroad’.<sup>54</sup> Indeed, only a few years previously John Taylor’s Show stated quite explicitly that ‘fire and sword doth Germany molest’ (sig. A7v). Heywood’s is, after all, only a marginal

note, and, even if it can be seen to act as a slight disclaimer, the numerous witnesses of this Show, unlike its readers, would not have known about it. In any case, and by any standards, the page after page of overt concern about potential upheaval is too apparent to be so dismissed. ‘Long may [peace] last’ is Heywood’s final word, although he has conferred little confidence that his hopes would be borne out (sig. C4r).

A military note is also struck in earlier mayoral Shows. The figure of War speaks to Francis Jones in the 1620 Show, eventually yielding to Peace, the subject of the title of the printed work. The advice ‘Warre’ gives to the new Lord Mayor suggests that peace is not guaranteed. Jones is told that he should ‘resolue of future hazards; and prepare / Me such prouisions that if times should cease, / To be vnto this land as now they are, / Warre might restore againe the Palme to Peace’ (sig. C1v) ‘Warre’ ends the day by defending Jones’s gates with ‘fire and sword’ (sig. C2r). ‘Future hazards’ are made to sound inevitable. Although I am not arguing for a direct connection (the text is not that specific), the background to the 1620 Show and its preoccupation with peace was a conflict between the Protestant Palatinate and Spain which made all-out war amongst the European powers, including England, look more likely than it had done for years.<sup>55</sup> There was, after all, a real interest and religico-political investment in England in the fortunes of Frederick of Bohemia, the Elector Palatine, who had since 1613 been the King’s son-in-law, and who was to become, along with his wife Elizabeth, James’s daughter, the bearer of (ultimately thwarted) Protestant hopes against Spanish hegemony on the continent.

The strains were perhaps already in the air, for in characteristic style Middleton strikes a topical note in *The triumphs of loue and antiquity*, staged the year before Jones’s inauguration. At this juncture William Cockayne, that year’s Lord Mayor, was, as Middleton notes, ‘Lord Generall of the Military Forces’. ‘Expectation’ implies a dual celebration of both aspects of Cockayne’s importance, for

two Tryumphs must on this day dwell,  
For Magistrate, one, and one for Coronell [Colonel],  
Returne Lord Generall, that’s the Name of State  
The Souldier giues thee; Peace, the Magistrate.

(sigs A3r and B1v)

The text highlights Cockayne’s military role throughout, stressing that alongside the conventional procession of aldermen and sheriffs one should not overlook



the Noble paines and loues of the Heroyick Captaines of the Citty, & Gentlemen of the Artillery Garden, making with two glorious Rankes a manly and Maiestick passage for their Lord Generall, his Lordship, through Guild-hall yard; and afterward their Loues to his Lordship resounding in a second Noble Volley. (sig. C1v)

Manley too cites this text's 'topicality', arguing that 'the unusually heavy use [in this Show] . . . of the City Trained Bands, whose Lord-General Cockayne became with his inauguration, may reflect the City's eagerness . . . to contribute to war with Spain'.<sup>56</sup> In the *Honorable entertainments* of 1621, also written for Cockayne, Middleton once more refers to the Lord Mayor as the 'L.[ord] Generall of the Military forces' (sig. B1r), a title which, Parr comments, 'inflates [Cockayne's] authority over the city militia'.<sup>57</sup>

By the mid-1630s, as we have already seen, warlike imagery was both more widespread and had taken on a more urgent note. As well as the negotiation of civil versus foreign war in *Londini status pacatus*, there is 'an Imperiall Fort . . . defenc'd with men and officers' in *Londini speculum* (sig. C2r). Perhaps with a recent outbreak of unrest in Scotland in mind, Heywood is notably defensive about why he has used such an image for his fourth show. 'Nor is it compulsive', he writes, 'that here I should argue what a Fort is, a Skonce, or a Citadell, nor what a Counterskarfe, or halfe Moone, &c. is; nor what opposures or defences are: my purpose is onely to expresse my selfe thus farre'. The 'onely purpose' of this 'project', he stresses, is to signify London's status as 'his Majesties royall chamber' (sig. C2r). Nevertheless, a certain nervousness persists. He stipulates that what he writes about 'Warre' has in it no 'impropriety' nor anything 'that is dissonant from authority', and he then cuts short an explanation of the history of the goddess of war, Bellona, with the interjection that 'this Discourse may to some appeare impertinent to the project in hand, and therefore I thus proceed to her speech' (sig. C2v). A similar image is given more sustained treatment in *Londini sinus salutis* (1635), where 'Bellipotent' Mars is placed in 'a Castle munified with sundry Peeces of Ordnance; and Accomodated with all such Persons as are needfull for the defence of such a Citadell' (sig. A8v). Heywood is still somewhat vague about Mars's function here, though. Moreover, the statement that Mars has witnessed 'so many Sonnes of Mars . . . In compleat Arms, Plum'd Casks [casques], and Ensigns spred' does not specify *where* such military figures have been seen. Heywood does add that although London itself is currently 'peacefull', it 'could to a Campe, it selfe change in an houre', indicating that a

military threat may not be all that remote (sig. A9r–v). It is possible, therefore, that Dekker’s praise for England in *Brittannia’s honor* as a beacon of peace in the context of a Europe that he describes as ‘Frighted with Vproares, Battailes, Massacres, / Famines, and all that Hellish brood of warres’ is at that juncture more hopeful than realistic. In the late 1620s it was becoming more difficult to sustain the image of a ‘blessed Land . . . that seest fires kindling round, and yet canst stand / Vnburnt for all their flames . . . When all thy Neighbours shrike, none wound thy brest’ (sig. C2r). Warfare is undeniably a present – and geographically close – reality for Dekker here.<sup>58</sup> The following year he cites more directly the foreign powers with which England was intermittently in conflict in this period: ‘Horrid Sea-fights, Nauies ouerthrowne, / . . . The Dunkerks Hell, / The Dutchmans Thunder, and the Spaniards Lightning’ (*Londons tempe*, sig. A4v). His references to ‘Pyrates’ and ‘Dunkerck’ would probably have been understood by the informed onlooker as alluding to the problems English merchant ships had had on that score for some years and which reached a height in 1628, the year of this Show.<sup>59</sup>

These later instances mark a substantial change from the well-nigh bucolic city invoked by Peele back in 1585, where the most common adjective used for London is ‘lovely’, where the Thames is a ‘sweet and daintye Nymph’ within whose waters ‘leaping fishes play’, and where ‘the Husbandman, / layes downe his sakes of Corne at Londons feet’ (*The deuice*, sigs A2r–A3r). Peele’s text does include a soldier, but his role is vaguely defined and quite passive when compared to those invoked by Middleton and Heywood in the Jacobean and Caroline periods. Later texts differ quite markedly too from those produced by Munday in quieter times. In *Camp-bell* Munday has St George rebut concerns about ‘inuading Enuie, or homebred trecherie’ with a simple ‘So much for this’ (sig. B3v). In the 1611 Show, *Chruso-thriambos*, Leofstane tells the new Lord Mayor that he will be ruling in ‘sweeter singing times’ than ‘those dayes of disturbance and rough combustion’ that he himself knew (sig. B2r). In *Chrysanaleia* Munday’s account of the long-distant Peasants’ Revolt is positively dismissive of it: ‘leauing the matter, a case of desperate Rebellion [and] the manner, a most base and barbarous kinde of proceeding’, Munday focuses instead on ‘that triumphant victorie’ within which Walworth played such a notable role. Victory over the enemies of ‘King and State’ is the keynote here, even though the depiction of Richard II has the ‘triumphing Angell’ ‘hold[ing] his Crowne on fast, that neither forraine

Hostilitie, nor home-bred Trecherie should euer more shake it' (sig. B3v). In any case, 'Treason and Mutinie' are conspicuously outnumbered by the combined forces of 'Truth, Vertue, Honor, Temperance, Fortitude, Zeale, Equity [and] Conscience', backed up by 'Iustice, Authority, Lawe, Vigilancy, Peace, Plentie and Discipline' (sigs B3v–B4r).

### **'Of Trafficke and Commerce': representing merchants and merchandise in the Shows**

As cultural forms very close to the changing realities for civic bodies such as the livery companies, the Shows did engage with the economic pressures on those who commissioned and paid for them. For the companies, a major concern as the seventeenth century wore on was their increasing failure to control economic activity by 'foreigners', and their decreasing powers even over those who had gained the freedom.<sup>60</sup> In their transition from guild to livery company these bodies had become more focused on merchandising than on the production of commodities, and the members of the oligarchy from which the Lord Mayors emanated were increasingly turning to trade to maximise their income, by controlling where the commodities were bought and sold as well as the manner in which they were produced. For instance, about one-sixth of the livery of the Drapers in this period were also members of trading companies such as the Merchant Adventurers.<sup>61</sup> These trends resulted in what Hirschfeld calls a 'bifurcation during the Elizabethan and Stuart years between craft and mercantile interests'.<sup>62</sup> The Merchant Adventurers themselves in turn became more and more displaced by newer bodies like the East India and Levant Companies. As we will see further below, in their efforts accurately to represent and hence celebrate the mercantile activities of the Lord Mayors, the pageant poets perforce engaged with the shifts and tensions inherent in this important transition.

As early as 1605 Munday emphasised the trading dimensions of the companies. In *The triumphs of re-united Britania* Epimeleia states that at the point at which the Merchant Taylors gained their present name, in the reign of Henry VII, 'they traded, as no men did more, / With forren Realmes, by clothes and Merchandize, / Returning hither other Countries store' (sig. C3r). As this demonstrates, despite the underlying tensions, mercantile values are ostensibly represented in a positive light by the Shows wherever feasible, creating what Manley calls 'new rationales for the city

and its bourgeois pursuits'.<sup>63</sup> Heywood provides an epitome of the approach in *Londini emporia*, which, as its title suggests, foregrounds 'Merchants and Merchandise'. The benefits of these two, he writes, are numerous. As well as making commodities 'conducibile and frequent', by merchants' 'glorious' 'Aduenture and Industry vnknowne Countries haue beene discovered, Friendship with forreigne Princes contracted, [and] barbarous Nations to humane gentleness and courtesie reduced' (sig. A3r). Middleton's take on the latter aspect of 'merchandise' in *The triumphs of truth* is typical. Here the Moorish king relates how he was converted from heathen belief by 'commerce' with 'English Merchants, Factors [and] Trauailers' (sig. C1r): even a religious discussion is coded in the language of trade as 'commerce'. Later in his civic career Middleton strikes the same note. In *The triumphs of honor and vertue* the 'blacke Queene' states that she was drawn to knowledge of 'Christian holinesse' through her encounter with 'English Merchants'; the colonies of Virginia and Bermuda are called 'those Christianly Reformed Islands' (the accuracy of Middleton's account of foreign trade is somewhat imperilled, though, by the citation of Virginia as an island) (sigs B2r and C2r). In this respect Middleton and his peers were in touch with changing realities. Oligarchs from the Great Twelve livery companies were deeply imbricated with the Merchant Adventurers, the Virginia Company, East India Company and the like, as well as with colonial endeavours in Ireland.<sup>64</sup> The City plutocrats made considerable financial investment into these new venturing bodies as the seventeenth century progressed, and unsurprisingly this increasingly significant aspect of the City made its way into pageantry.

In some cases, this was a result of pageant writers' tendency to provide an overview of the new Lord Mayor's career and notable roles. This trend within the Shows began quite early in the period and accelerated from then on. Via his usage of the ship 'The Royall Exchange' in *The triumphes of re-united Britania* Munday references the new Lord Mayor's involvement in foreign trade (Holliday was a founder of and was to become the Treasurer of the East India Company). We can see an amplification of this aspect of the City's activities from Munday's rather brief treatment of Holliday's trading links to their prominence later into the seventeenth century. In 1629 Dekker accurately cites the powerful merchant James Campbell's freedom of the East India Company as well as the fact that he was the 'Maior of the Staple, Gouvernor of the French Company, and free of the East-land Company' (*Londons tempe*, sig. B1v).<sup>65</sup> In the

same way, in 1637 Heywood discusses Richard Fenn's membership of the Merchant Adventurers, 'as also of the Levant, or Turkey, and of the East India Company'; indeed, the Haberdashers are rather eclipsed in the text by Fenn's trading links (*Londini speculum*, sig. B3r). Heywood also lists all the trading companies to which Morris Abbot belonged in 1638, emphasising his significance to overseas trade: 'the present Lord Major . . . [is] free of the Turkey, Italian, French, Spanish, Muscovy, and was late Governour of the East Indy Company' (*Porta pietatis*, sig. A4r).<sup>66</sup> In *Londini status pacatus* he flags up his awareness that Garway's 'breeding hath beene chiefly in Mercature' as well as of his 'personal Travell in [his] youth' (sig. A2r). Such knowledge of the new Lord Mayor's past and present was expected of pageant poets. Middleton refers similarly to the manner in which his namesake had escaped 'great and many incident dangers, especially in forraigne Countries in the time of [his] Youth and trauels' (*The triumphs of truth*, sig. A2r-v), and Peter Proby's recovery from 'so long a Sicknesse' is mentioned in *The triumphs of honor and vertue* (sig. B3r).

By the 1630s, the time of Heywood's dominance of the writing of the Shows, bodies like the East India Company had considerable importance for the City, and as a result their significance emerges clearly in Heywood's works. In the dedications of his 1632 Show Heywood highlights the new Lord Mayor's Lincolnshire breeding (like his own), and the membership of the Merchant Adventurers held by both of the City Sheriffs, but does not mention the Haberdashers until well into the text. Heywood's emphasis forms an instructive contrast with, say, Munday's Shows of some twenty years earlier, where the livery companies and their domestic enterprises are his primary concern. Heywood's Shows can therefore be seen – willingly or unwillingly – to represent the decline of the livery companies and the new hegemony of the merchants. Indeed, there is a defensive, as well as hyberbolic, note to the way in which Heywood describes the Merchant Adventurers' Company in *Londini speculum*. Before discussing the actual shows (in an echo of Munday's strategy with regard to 'old drapery' back in 1614 and 1615, discussed below), he hastens to tell his readers that the Company

were first trusted with the sole venting of the manufacture of Cloth out of this kingdome, & have for above this 4 hundred years traded in a privileged, & wel governed course, in Germany, the Low Countries, &c. and have beene the chiefe meanes to raise the manufacture of all wollen commodities to that height in which it

now existeth . . . whereby the poore in all Countries are plentifully maintained. (sigs B2v–B3r)

Merchants generally are heroic figures for Heywood, making ‘discovery of all Nations’ by bravely ‘plow[ing] the bosome of each unknowne deepe’ whilst ‘others here at home securely sleepe’, as he puts it in *Porta pietatis* (sig. B3r). Even figures from classical legend are reworked to fit this notion. Jason’s Argo becomes anachronistically ‘the first choise peece [i.e. ship]’ to trade across the sea and it is stressed that this voyage had no other pretext than to stand as the first mercantile endeavour (sig. B4r). In *Londons ius honorarium* he states that as kings arrive at their status ‘eyther by succession or Election’, so the Lord Mayor is elevated to that role ‘by Commerce and Trafficke, both by Sea and Land, by the Inriching of the Kingdome, and Honour of our Nation’ (sig. C1r). There is nothing here about good deeds – in this instance trade is paramount. Whitmore’s involvement in the East India and Virginia Companies is surely the referent of the dangers encountered by ‘Commerce’ in this text, where his ships travel ‘through a Wildernesse of Seas, / Dangers of wrack, Surprise, [and] Desease’ (*ibid.*, sig. C3r). In *Porta pietatis*, too, Heywood expresses the aspiration that ‘that Fleete / Which makes th’East Indies with our England meete, / Prosper’ (sig. B1r–v). *Londini status pacatus* is even more expansive, listing the numerous places where overseas trade was taking place, from Ireland to Newfoundland. Henry Garway, the Lord Mayor on that occasion, was a mainstay of the East India Company in the 1630s (as had been his father in the Levant Company); as Rowland has pointed out, Heywood’s information about Garway’s various roles is both correct and ‘absolutely current’.<sup>67</sup> In *The triumphs of honor and vertue* too Middleton mentions the banners displayed on the ‘Globe of Honor’ as ‘the Armes of this Honorable City, the Lord Maiors, the Grocers, and the Noble East-India Companies’ (sig. C2r). Heywood notes that Hugh Perry and Henry Andrews, the Sheriffs in 1632, were both members of the Merchant Adventurers; their ‘Trafficke and Commerce’, as he puts it, ‘testifie to the world your Noble Profession’ (*Londoni artium*, sig. A3r).

The following year, Heywood’s pseudo-historical preamble in *Londini emporia* is primarily concerned with celebrating the antiquity of ‘Merchants and Merchandise’; as with *Londini speculum* his account of the Clothworkers’ Company is secondary (sig. A3r). Although by judicious use of a shepherd the Clothworkers form the topic of the first Show on land, the second is dedicated to ‘the

Trade of Merchant-Adventurers'. This second show features the rather more lofty figure of Mercury in the somewhat unusual if timely guise of 'the God of Barter, buying, selling, and commerce in all Merchandise whatsoever' (he is also, fortuitously, associated with 'Showes, Ouations, [and] Triumphs') (sig. B2v–B3r). Mercury boasts about the Merchant Adventurers' commerce across the world, from exotic locations such as 'Musco', Persia, Turkey, China and Greece to the more familiar 'Genoua, Luca Florence, Naples . . . Norway, Danske, France, Spaine, [and] the Netherlands' (sig. B3v).<sup>68</sup> Picking up on the note of merchant heroism struck elsewhere, Heywood also stresses the potential dangers inherent in the Merchant Adventurers' overseas forays and includes a reference to the military force that such foreign adventures sometimes necessitated. Freeman's ship, he writes, 'though a wooden Fabricke', is

. . . so well knit,  
 That should inuasiue force once menace it  
 With loud-voic't Thunder, mixt with Sulpherous flame,  
 'T would sinke, or send them backe with feare and shame.

(sig. B3v)

As with Holliday's ship above, Heywood here alludes to the importance of ship-owning for these leading merchants, a link he makes even more apparent in *Londini emporia*, where the second show on land 'is a Ship most proper to the Trade of Merchant-Adventurers' (sig. B2v). Taylor's citation of a range of rivers from the Danube to the Indus in *The triumphs of fame and honour* makes their importance to trade very apparent. Thames states that 'for [the City's] commodities I'le ever flow' bearing 'silks and velvets, oyle, and wine, / Gold, silver, Jewels, fish, salt, sundry spices, / Fine and course linnen, [and] drugges of diuers prices' (sig. A5v).<sup>69</sup>

As cultural forms grounded in the shifting reality of the sources of the City's wealth – chiefly the East India Company and the Merchant Adventurers – the Shows undeniably do negotiate the 'otherness' of non-Europeans encountered on trading voyages. As Ania Loomba asserts, the mayoral Shows create 'a fantasy that enacts the possibilities of contemporary colonial trading practices, and thereby [they mobilise] the national pride and commercial optimism necessary for such ventures'.<sup>70</sup> Loomba contextualises the ways in which the Shows increasingly focused on traffic with foreign and sometimes colonised nations. In particular, she argues that through the widespread use of racial 'others' in these works (especially, although not exclusively, those produced for the

Grocers' Company), 'emperors, queens, or other representatives of riches, plenitude and exotic grandeur' are staged for the watching masses. Her judicious discussion emphasises, however, that in the Shows we do not habitually find 'savage or wild peoples' as in some other early modern cultural forms. Through their overseas adventures, as she comments, City merchants came into contact with 'sophisticated courts' with 'long standing commercial and trading histories', and these accordingly found their way into mayoral pageantry, even if they were so invoked only to be depicted as largely passive.<sup>71</sup> To bear her out, Middleton's 'Indians' in *The triumphs of honor and vertue* are 'Commerce, Aduenture and Traffique, three [of them] habited like Merchants' (sig. B1v). The group is headed by the 'Queene of Merchandize' (there is no king in this instance), who makes the speech to the Lord Mayor. The majority of 'Indians' or 'Moors' represented in these works are indeed kings and queens.

In a contrasting approach, although Rebecca Bach too gives the Shows valuably extensive discussion, and her account is well-informed about the socio-economic background of these works, her reading is too ready simply to castigate their treatment of black characters. She asserts categorically that 'pageants and masques depend on and instantiate coordinated oppressions', and she imposes an assumption that all non-European figures in the Shows are 'colonial' or 'imperial' subjects.<sup>72</sup> Although the treatment of non-European subjects in the Shows is not enlightened by modern standards (surely one can hardly expect it to be), as Taylor has argued, the Shows do at least give them some exposure and, crucially, in some cases, a voice.<sup>73</sup> Middleton's Indian Queen takes the 'most eminent Seate' in the Continent of India pageant, and she states that 'I'me beauteous *in my blacknesse*', not in spite of it (*The triumphs of honor and vertue*, sigs B1v–B2r; my emphasis). For Bach, in contrast, this queen is 'an inarticulate displayed anti-self'.<sup>74</sup> Taylor, who also criticises Bach's neglect of the wider cultural context, instances her reading of the Shows as an example of 'New Historicist and Foucauldian scholarship, [which is] dedicated . . . to the assertion of synchronic epistemic totality, without individual agency and difference'.<sup>75</sup> Bach's approach to the audience of the Shows also bears out Taylor's concerns. I am troubled by the pronouns she uses in her unevicenced assertion that the audiences of the Shows 'could celebrate their own desired transformations into vastly wealthy white English subjects at the same time as they celebrated the whitening of *their* imperial subjects'.<sup>76</sup> For one thing, the trading nations in the far and near East Indies, the focus of *The*



*triumphs of honor and vertue's* depiction of the spice trade and a number of other Shows produced for the Grocers' Company, were in no way the 'imperial subjects' of England in this period (even the colonised parts of the Americas were not referred to in these terms in the early seventeenth century).<sup>77</sup> When writers like Middleton refer to 'Indians', sometimes 'Indians', i.e. the inhabitants of India or the East Indies, is exactly what they mean. Moreover, as Bach concedes, 'pageant audiences . . . were at least as diverse as the denizens of Jonson's city comedies'.<sup>78</sup> Not all those who witnessed the Shows would have shared the city oligarchy's ideological stance (inasmuch as it is possible to generalise about this), let alone its wealth. Such was the heterogeneity of the population of London in this period that some of the onlookers may even have been black, or Irish, themselves, and thus hardly likely to 'celebrate' their 'whiteness' or their supposed status as colonial oppressors.<sup>79</sup> Relatedly, as discussed above, if Fryer is correct that some of the performers may actually have been black, this would complicate the scenario still more.

#### **'The Court and City two most Noble Friends': the Shows and Stuart state policy**

At the same time as city merchants and their associates were venturing across the globe, there were problems at home to deal with. It is possible to trace the impact of contemporary domestic exigencies – for instance, the Cockayne Project and its catastrophic effect on the cloth trade – upon mayoral pageantry.<sup>80</sup> Even the selection of the Lord Mayors in 1614 and 1615 may have been informed by the ongoing crisis in the cloth trade, for, according to Hentschell, 'the widespread concern for the state of the cloth among London merchants' may have encouraged them to nominate two Draper Lord Mayors consecutively.<sup>81</sup> Hardin writes that Munday's 1614 and 1615 Shows provide 'a consistent ideological spectacle of social and commercial stability and historical continuity'. In the context of a rising crisis in the cloth trade at this juncture, however, such continuity and stability can be regarded as a critique, or at least a defence of the status quo. Hardin argues that in the course of an 'attempt to assimilate changes in the cloth industry' these entertainments 'expose [the Drapers'] anxieties about the changing market'.<sup>82</sup> Hentschell credits Munday's works with still more edge, writing that 'recalling the past becomes, for Munday, a radical act where current policies can be challenged'.<sup>83</sup> The critique, she argues,

operates by means of an invocation of the ‘venerable past’ of the Company in Munday’s two Shows, an invocation that highlights the shortcomings of a monarch ‘who would not respect that past’.<sup>84</sup>

The fortunes of the cloth trade had an impact that went well beyond the specific interests of the Merchant Adventurers and the livery companies involved in the trade, such as the Drapers and Clothworkers. Supple argues that during the period of the Cockayne Project ‘in a very real sense England’s prosperity had become the object of a gigantic gamble’.<sup>85</sup> Munday’s Shows for 1614 and 1615 participate in a debate about the relative merits of the traditional mode of ‘old drapery’ versus the risky innovations inherent in the Cockayne Project. The thoroughgoing emphasis on ‘oldness’ in *Himatia-Poleos* works to remind the audience of the privileges of ‘Old Drapery’ – herself impersonated in the Show – which were at this point being undermined by the attempted monopoly of ‘new’ drapery in the putative Cockayne Project. It is, paradoxically, in its evocation of antiquity and tradition that Munday’s Show engages most acutely with very contemporary issues, for October 1614 was a moment right in the middle of the imposed transition from ‘old’ to ‘new’ drapery; by the end of the year, Supple writes, Cockayne and his fellow projectors ‘were left in control of the [cloth] trade to Germany and the Low Countries’.<sup>86</sup> In *Himatia-Poleos* – which celebrates the inauguration of Thomas Hayes, who was both a Draper and a member of the Merchant Adventurers, the company most affected by Cockayne’s plan – there is therefore an insistent hearkening back to ‘those blest daies of olde’ ‘when yea and nay was greatest Oath’. Even the language Munday uses is old-fashioned, such as ‘good woollen Cloath ycleped Englands Draperie’ (sig. C1r). Old drapery exports had reached an all-time high of 127,000 cloths in 1614: by early in 1615, however, they had fallen by some 50 per cent.<sup>87</sup> Nevertheless, in the following year, the subtitle of *Metropolis coronata* continues to invoke ‘ancient’ drapery. In a probable spirit of nostalgia for the years of successful trade with the continent that peaked in 1614, in this Show Munday foregrounds the way in which the Lord Mayor’s ship is represented as being ‘lately returned, from trafficking Wool and Cloth with other remote Countryes’ (sig. B2v). (It is perhaps ironic, given the turmoil of 1614–15, that Cockayne himself was to become Lord Mayor only a few years later, in 1619.)

In *Himatia-Poleos* Munday also anachronistically elides the functions of manufacture and retail which for the Drapers, as for most Companies in this period, had long since become separated.

Indeed, if anything this Show foregrounds the former aspect of the Drapers' craft at the expense of the latter. There is a Cotswold shepherd, but no London merchant, and the fact that Drapers were at this point chiefly responsible for selling rather than producing cloth barely registers. 'The best aduantage' of the Company, Munday declares, 'euer ensued by *making* of woollen Cloathes' (sig. B2r; my emphasis). Furthermore, Hentschell argues that Munday's Shows for the Drapers can be seen as 'nationalistic', celebrating as they do 'the product [wool] most closely tied to England's understanding of itself'.<sup>88</sup> By the manner in which they chose to put on mayoral Shows the Companies themselves, of course, somewhat ironically, were great consumers of the expensive, imported textiles – the kind of 'fantastick habites' that Munday criticises in *Himatia-Poleos* – that were damaging the English cloth trade (sig. B1r). As Hentschell argues, the figure of the shepherd in *Himatia-Poleos*, probably dressed in 'plain, homespun wool', would have stood out as 'an oddity in [the] sea of sumptuousness' represented by the assembled dignitaries of the City in their red garments and furs.<sup>89</sup> Indeed, Middleton (in unusually pacific mood) finesses the potential for conflict between the manufacture and importation of fabrics in another Drapers' Show, *The triumphs of integrity*, where he reconciles old and new by focusing on what he calls 'the Moderne vse of this Antient and Honorable Mistery [of the Drapers]'. He also draws attention to the importance of drapery by writing that 'it clothes the Honorable Senators in their highest and richest Wearings, all Courts of Iustice, Magistrates, and Iudges of the Land' (sig. B1r).

Even earlier still there may be signs of strain in the Shows' representation of their contemporary moment. There are traces of a response to dearth in Nelson's 1590 Show, which includes references in the first speech to food being expensive and people begging for 'releefe'. Specifically, Nelson's text implies a decline in the fish trade, claiming that if people kept 'fish dais as wel as flesh' the cost of the latter would decline, the position of those involved in fishing would improve, and stores of 'butter, cheese and beefe' would be increased (*The deuice*, sig. A2r). Later on, however, 'Plentie' makes more complacent comments about England being a land of milk and honey, chief of the 'Christian nations' (sig. A3r). Northway posits a rather mechanistic relationship between attitudes to work and consumerism in the Shows and the supposedly consequent behaviour of the populace. She argues, for instance, that the encouragement in Nelson's Show to eat more fish 'worked', as consumption

of fish rose during the 1590s.<sup>90</sup> Of course, people would have been perfectly capable of making a rational decision to purchase cheaper food, especially in a time of scarcity, without having been ‘urged’ to do so by a character in a Lord Mayor’s Show, assuming they had seen the Show in the first place. And it was, after all, a Fishmongers’ Company Show: one would expect fish to be mentioned.

Economic circumstances also seem to feature in Munday’s *Chruso-thriambos*, where a rather odd marginal note gives an account of the price of some basic commodities at the time of the famed medieval Lord Mayor Nicholas Faringdon, supplied to back up Munday’s point about the ‘plenty’ of those days. Bergeron simply calls this moment ‘puzzling’, whereas Palmer invests it with more significance, arguing that the note ‘makes clear [Munday’s] quotidian desire . . . [to make Faringdon’s] resurrection an accounting problem’.<sup>91</sup> Furthermore, Palmer posits a ‘provocative’ aspect to Munday’s ostensibly banal observations, claiming that Munday is indirectly calling attention to ‘the royal debt [of] approaching £720,000’.<sup>92</sup> Money certainly was in short supply in this period. The King had recently suspended Parliament as a reaction to its criticism of his profligacy, and there was considerable concern from the crown that currency was being debased. There are, then, grounds to support Palmer’s sense of the contemporary edge of *Chruso-thriambos*. Earlier in 1611, by attending the event, James had placed an unusually strong emphasis on ‘the trial of the pyx’, an annual ceremony held to gauge the purity of the gold and silver used by the King’s Mint. This unprecedented action was backed up nine days later by ‘A proclamation against melting or conueying out of the Kings Dominion of Gold or Siluer’. Marcus argues that the way in which James handled this traditional ceremony acted as ‘a reminder of his power, a strong hint that [the Goldsmiths] would do well to abandon certain aspects of their search for “priuate lucre” and heed his proclamation for the preservation of money’.<sup>93</sup>

Munday’s Show for the Goldsmiths therefore came at a politically sensitive moment for this Company in particular, and the decision to stage a version of the pyx ceremony in the Show can be seen to act as an implicit commentary on James’s actions only a few months previously.<sup>94</sup> For Munday, the testing of gold is wholly the Goldsmiths’ responsibility, and that the Mint belonged to the Crown and that the Master of the Mint was a royal post are facts largely excluded from the representation of the ‘ingenious Say-Maister’ in the Show. One can read Munday’s little scene as an

indirect engagement with James's attempts to control the purity of coinage. Like James at the Mint only five months earlier, the Goldsmiths' 'Essay-Maister' is an 'absolute Tryer of [gold and silver]'s vertue'; he 'makes prooffe of them in his Furnaces, and of their true worth or value' (sig. C1v). His task is to

distinguish those precious Mettals of Gold and Siluer, from base adulterating or corruption . . . euen to the smallest quantities of true valuation, in Ingots, Jewelles, Plate or Monies, for the more honour of the Prince and Countrey, when his Coynes are kept from imbasing and abusing. (sig. A4v)

Although a variety of commodities are mentioned, only 'Coynes' have a specific bearing on the 'honour of the Prince and Countrey', a phrase which also acts to foreground the connection with the ceremony at the Royal Mint. Although Marcus's identification of Munday's avaricious 'Lydian king' (Midas) with James is a tempting one to make, it is, as she concedes, 'blurry'.<sup>95</sup> Munday is nowhere *overtly* critical of the King's policy. As we have seen, he does add that the practice of assaying is intended to enhance the 'honour of the Prince and Countrey'. Exactly whose 'Coynes' are 'his', however – the (unnamed) Prince's or the Goldsmiths' Say-Maister's – is left ambiguous.

Other forms of engagement with Jacobean policy can be identified in mayoral Shows written by those more outspoken than Munday tended to be. Dekker's 1620s Shows make their point by stressing at length, but only in general terms, how powerful the City and its oligarchs are, such as when in *Brittannia's honor* he has the figure of London tell the Lord Mayor that 'the Christian World, in Me, reads Times best stories, / And Reading, fals blind at my dazling Glories' (sig. B2v). Middleton, as one might expect, offers a compelling example of how more explicitly topical political interventions can be identified in mayoral Shows. *The triumphs of integrity* of 1623 can be seen to offer a reaction to the prospect of the failure of the proposed 'Spanish marriage' between the Prince of Wales and the Spanish infanta of the same year.<sup>96</sup> Indeed, Prince Charles and the Duke of Buckingham had arrived back in England in the same month as the Show took place, and doubtless the issue had too much currency and popular appeal to be overlooked. Thus *The triumphs of integrity* seemingly cannot avoid an implicit reference to the recent failure of the marriage negotiations.<sup>97</sup> Indeed, given the fame (or notoriety) of *A Game at Chesse* in the following year it would have been more surprising if Middleton had refrained

from commenting on one of the key political issues of the day in any of the high-profile works he produced in this period.

In *The triumphs of integrity*, then, under the pretext of invoking the usual joy at the inauguration of the new Lord Mayor with the use of the conventional image of the sun breaking through cloud, Middleton at the same time gestures towards another, more pressing and controversial, source of popular celebration. In a speech located at the ‘Imperiall Canopy’, a device topped with the King’s motto, ‘Beati Pacifici’ and his coat of arms, Middleton presents one of the most direct commentaries on current events within the whole canon of mayoral pageantry. He prefaces this with an announcement that he is just about to go beyond purely civic matters to ‘bring Honor to a larger Field’ and engage in ‘Royall Businesse’. He certainly delivers on his promise. A fairly neutral account of the three graces and the three crowns of James’s triple kingdom is then followed by the explanation that the cloud represents:

Some Enuious Mist cast forth by Heresie,  
Which through [James’s] happy Raigne, and Heauens blest will,  
The sun-beames of the Gospell strikes through still;  
More to assure it to Succeeding Men,  
We haue the Crowne of Brittaines Hope agen,  
(Illustrious Charles our Prince,) which all will say  
Addes the chiefe Ioy and Honor to this Day.

(sig. C1r)

The term ‘heresie’, standing for Catholic Spain and clearly opposed to the ‘sun-beames’ of the (Protestant) ‘Gospell’, can readily be regarded as a commentary on contemporary events when put together in the same speech as a reference to Prince Charles, as well as to the succession. The nation has been saved from the prospect of future Catholic monarchs, Middleton implies. The sense of relief generated by the failure of the planned marriage is also surely the referent of ‘we haue the Crowne of Brittaines hope agen’. As Bergeron points out, the use of the word ‘agen’ raises the question of where Prince Charles had been before he came home – the answer, of course, was Spain.<sup>98</sup> Middleton’s intervention was expressed in a speech, not confined to a textual preamble, and would thus have been heard by at least some of the onlookers on the day as well as being transmitted into print. The 1623 Show can therefore be seen to partake in the same high level of public interest in the failure of the Spanish match exploited within texts such as *The ioyfull returne, of the most illustrious prince, Charles,*

also printed in October of that year.<sup>99</sup> In *The triumphs of integrity* Middleton provides another example of how a traditional pageant device – in this case, ‘a Golden and Glorious Canopy’ with the three crowns and sunbeams taken from the Drapers’ arms – could be reworked to suit the present occasion.<sup>100</sup> Only two years previously, in *The sunne in Aries*, Middleton had referred to James, albeit in parentheses, as ‘that ioy of honest hearts’ and as the king ‘that Vnites Kingdomes [and] who encloses / All in the Armes of Loue’ (sigs B2v–B3r). A rather more contingent form of goodwill towards the royal family and state policy is in evidence in 1623.

As we have seen in relation to *Himatia-Poleos*, *Chruso-thriambos* and *Metropolis coronata*, Munday’s texts can also be seen to have contemporary political dimensions. However, if he did comment on the underlying moment of the 1618 Show – the execution of Raleigh taking place simultaneously along the river at Westminster – he did so quite obliquely.<sup>101</sup> *Sidero-Thriambos* does foreground threats, not solely to the Lord Mayor’s administration as we see repeatedly in these works, but perhaps on a wider scale. The negative elements which Munday invokes as challenges to the new Lord Mayor have a slightly different flavour to the norm. ‘Those vile Incendiaries’, as Munday puts it, are on this occasion ‘Ambition, Treason, and Hostility’, rather less abstract entities than Error and the like; the former relate more directly to matters of state than to civic policy. Treason (with an underlying element of ambition) was, of course, the offence for which Raleigh had been charged and executed. As I have argued elsewhere, Munday does stress that ‘this year’ needs to be ‘better secured, against all their violences and treacherous attempts’ (sig. C1v). No other Lord Mayor’s Show cites ‘treason’ twice in this fashion, and the sense that Munday’s text has a bearing on contemporary state politics is amplified further on where, in an interesting moment of slippage, Munday states that ‘Feare and Modesty’ are on hand to assist, ‘through the darkest obscurities, when any disorder threatneth danger to *Maiesty*, or to his carefull deputie’ (sig. C1r–v; my emphasis).

The figure of Francis Drake, another Elizabethan hero who is repeatedly invoked in Shows (especially those written for the Drapers’ Company) by a range of writers, takes on a special significance in the 1620s, in a period when his enterprises against the Spanish would have had a particular valency, and when there was a political point to be made from celebrating notable aspects of Elizabeth’s reign.<sup>102</sup> Drake appears as one of ‘Seuen worthy Nauigators’ in Webster’s *Monuments of Honor*, where

he is celebrated for having ‘brought home gold, and honor from sea-fights’ (sig. A4v). Naturally, for Webster Drake is a worthy navigator rather than a privateer, as the Spanish would have seen him. His antagonists in these ‘sea-fights’ (and those of his peers such as Hawkins and Frobisher), including, implicitly, the 1588 Armada, are not named, but it would probably have been obvious. (Although Webster does not cite this aspect of their fame, navigators like Frobisher had also had an important part to play in the opening up of trade routes for the enrichment of the City.) In *The triumphs of health and prosperity*, produced during a time of open conflict between England and Spain, Middleton makes a point of linking Drake with another traditional Drapers’ icon, Jason. Drake is therefore for Middleton ‘Englands true Iason’, almost mystical in the greatness of his deeds. Drake, he claims,

did boldly make  
 So many rare Adventures, which were held  
 For worth, unmatched, danger, vnpareleld,  
 Neuer returning to his Countries Eye,  
 Without the Golden Fleece of Victory.

(sig. B1r)

The unspecified ‘dangers’ which confronted Drake and over which he was, allegedly, always victorious, were, of course, the Spanish. Middleton has elided Drake and Jason to such an extent that it is difficult to see where one ends and the other begins. The work that Middleton makes such conventions do exemplifies the imaginative ways in which pageant writers used traditional forms of representation to speak to their immediate moment. The critical edge that can be detected in the Shows – especially those by Middleton – goes some way towards refuting the notion put forward by Easterling that they ‘showcase, seemingly without irony, the values and foundational principles [Middleton’s] comedies so vividly call into doubt’.<sup>103</sup>

Middleton certainly established a habit of commenting on foreign relations during the later Jacobean period. Levin has recently posited that Spain and France, the ‘twin objects of England’s secret admiration and obsessive fears, come in for special treatment’ in *The tryumphs of honor and industry*. By staging a member of each of these nations in the Show, and having them specifically ‘utter their gladness’ at Bolles’s inauguration, Middleton, she argues, was playing to the crowd’s likely antipathy towards Frenchmen and Spaniards. Indeed, she argues for a specific connection between



this Show and ‘the latest conspiracy theory at court’, which was about a supposed French and Spanish plot to kidnap the King and Prince Charles, invade England and establish a Catholic regime.<sup>104</sup> ‘Court circles’, however, are not the same as civic circles: there would probably have been enough general anti-Spanish and anti-Catholic feeling in the City at large to prompt the audience reaction described by Busino, as discussed previously. Middleton also updates Munday’s approach in *The triumphs of re-united Britania* to King James as the embodiment of union when in *The Triumphs of loue and antiquity* he has ‘seuerall Countries . . . all owing Fealty to one Soueraigne’. By 1619 James’s realm, as depicted in the Show, has expanded across the seas to include the colonial subjects not mentioned by Munday, who concentrated on ‘Britain’.<sup>105</sup> For Middleton, however,

the Noble English, the faire thriuing Scot,  
 Plaine hearted Welch, the French man bold and hot,  
 The ciuilly instructed Irish man,  
 And that kind Sauage, the Virginian,  
 [Are] all loungly assembled.

(sig. B3v)

### ‘These twelve Noble Branches’: intra-Company politics

Commentary on current events and controversial figures within the confines of the City itself can also be traced in the Shows. Everyone knew that the Lord Mayors were members – even if in a few cases only very recent members – of what Dekker called ‘the twelue superior Companyes’ (*Troia-Noua triumphans*, sig. B3r). It was not usually ‘done’ to draw attention to the disputed hierarchy within that twelve, but in *Londini emporia* Heywood tactlessly reminds the Clothworkers that they are ‘in count the last of Twelue’. Indeed, he rather labours the point, explaining over the course of an entire page, and with reference to the debate about precedence in the two English universities, his argument that ‘in all numbers there is a compulsiue necessity of order, onely for method sake’.<sup>106</sup> The hierarchy of the Great Twelve had more than simply a methodological rationale, of course, and the Companies were more concerned with precedence and status than Heywood makes out, despite his protestations that ‘I hold them all equall without difference’ (sig. A4r). There is an irony, too, in his citation of the supremely unpopular John Spencer as one of the City’s ‘best Magistrates’ (he also mentions the unfortunate Thomas Skinner,

‘who dyed before hee was Knighted’) (*ibid.*). Perhaps because he himself was not free of the City Heywood was less aware of or less deferential to civic sensibilities than some of his contemporaries. Despite the convention of ignoring those instances when a civic dignitary did not practise the trade of the Company to which he belonged, Heywood also states in *Londini artium* that Rainton, the new Lord Mayor, ‘though free of this Worshipfull Company of the Haberdashers . . . yet was by Profession a Mercer’. This is not simply a passing reference, for the reader is given more detail of Rainton’s involvement in mercery than is strictly necessary, being told that Rainton’s ‘chiefe Trading was in Florence for Sattins, Tafatties, and Sarsnets, in Luca for Taffaties, in Gene [Genoa] for Gene Veluets, Damasks, &c. In Bolognia for Satins, Cypresse, and Sarsnets’ (sig. B4r).

One of the most controversial cases of ‘the custom of London’ coming into play related to Edward Barkham, the Lord Mayor in 1621 for whom Middleton wrote *The summe in Aries*. Barkham was a member of the Leathersellers’ Company, very much a minor concern in the hierarchy of the City, and he did not begin the process of translation to the Drapers until only four months before his mayoralty commenced. He was not welcomed, either: the prolonged negotiations over accepting Barkham are clearly visible in the Drapers’ Company minutes for that year, and the matter was resolved only on the intervention of the Privy Council.<sup>107</sup> Although *The summe in Aries* does not exactly exude enthusiasm for the new Lord Mayor, at least, fortuitously, Middleton was able to cite a precedent to legitimate Barkham’s troubled move to the Drapers, because the Lord Mayor in 1578, Richard Pipe, had translated via the same route.

Closely associated with the question of primacy, and often as controversially, was the issue of antiquity. Being able to claim first place in the historical chronology of the livery companies was a prized honour, and one which pageant writers naturally engaged with. Munday, whose Shows are closely identified with the Companies compared to those of some of his contemporaries, begins *Himatia-Poleos* by stating that time-honoured tradition, dating back to the Romans, has distinguished between the ‘most memorable Societies’ and those he dismissively calls ‘other[s] of lesse note and merite’ (sig. A3r). This process of selection, he continues, has in the context of the City itself resulted in ‘twelue graduations of honour and dignitie’. Naturally, given the sponsors of the occasion his text is celebrating, Munday then claims the status

of ‘the first Companie of all other in this Citie’ to belong to ‘the ancient fellowship or Societie of Drapers’ (sig. A4v). Corroboration of this claim is produced by reference to historical authorities – ‘William Fitzstephen, Iohn Bale, Roger Houedin, and others’ – in a way that brings to mind Munday’s marshalling of ‘Antiquaries’ like Camden to defend himself elsewhere in this text. Munday’s confidence in said authorities, however, must have been tempered by the need to add a marginal note to explain that Fitzstephen (in case the reader was unaware) ‘liued and wrote in the time of King Stephen’ (*ibid.*).<sup>108</sup> From the Drapers, the preface goes on, the trades of ‘the diuers other Companies’ were derived, like the subsidiary branches of a tree.

As I have discussed at length elsewhere, Munday then becomes embroiled in a convoluted attempt to extricate himself from the embarrassment of having in 1611 ascribed Fitz-Alwin, the first mayor of London, to the Goldsmiths rather than to the Drapers.<sup>109</sup> He proffers a (kind of) apology, but pretty much cancels this out by stating that the end justifies the means: ‘I might well *justly* be condemned’, he protests, ‘if I should seeke after any other argument . . . then [the Drapers’] own due deseruing, so long time sleeping in obliuion, yet now reuiued, to their endlesse honour’ (sig. B1r; my emphasis). After this prolonged period of ‘obliuion’ the Drapers were in the civic limelight quite regularly from 1614 onwards, and the following year Munday was again writing a Show for his Company. *Metropolis coronata* accordingly begins with a reference back to *Himatia-Poleos*, where, Munday writes, he himself had ‘sufficiently approued the true antiquitie, and primary Honour of Englands Draperie’ (sig. A3r). Once again, antiquity and primacy go hand-in-hand, and once again Fitz-Alwin is asserted in this text to have been a member of the Drapers, ‘a Draper Brother’, as he puts it (sig. B1r). Although he was always drawn to the historical – or pseudo-historical – record, Munday was not alone in making such claims for the Drapers. Later writers reiterated the appropriation of Fitz-Alwin to that Company in Shows written on their behalf: Heywood in *Porta pietatis* (sig. A3v), and Middleton in both *The sunne in Aries* (sig. B1v) and *The triumphs of health and prosperity* (sig. B1v).<sup>110</sup> In the latter text Middleton also stresses the fact that Cuthbert Hacket had been the sixth Draper Lord Mayor in the last twelve years (sig. B3v). In *Metropolis coronata*, however, Munday visibly stages the Drapers’ primacy rather than restricting his claims to a preface available only to the text’s readers. Towards the end of the day a

goodly Monument or Pageant, with the glorious Sunne in continuall motion ouer it, appertaining to the Drapers Armory; presents yee London in the supreme place of eminence, and the twelue Companies (her twelue Daughters) all seated about her in their due degrees, onely Drapery is nearest to her, as being *the first and chieftest honored Society before all other*. (sig. B4r; my emphasis)

One can only imagine what the Mercers and Grocers, the two Companies that had for exactly one hundred years before this Show traditionally preceded the Drapers in the hierarchy of the Great Twelve, would have made of this public act of *lèse majesté*. As this suggests, Munday's approach towards the Drapers' Shows, due no doubt to his membership of that Company, could sometimes be openly partisan. At the very end of *Himatia-Poleos*, seemingly carried away with enthusiasm for the task in hand, he takes the opportunity to remind his readership that the Drapers' 'loue to the Citie [had] very manifestly prooued their worth' when in 1591 there were no volunteers for the vacant role of sheriff. 'As many refusalls still hapning day by day', he relates, 'to the great disquiet of the Companies, and mighty delay of time, yet when no one would vndergoe the Office and charge, a Draper hath done it, worthily and willingly'. 'Maister Benedict Barneham, a learned and iudicious Gentleman' duly stepped into the breach and 'chearefully vndertook the Shrieualty' (sig. C3v). 'Three cheers for the Drapers, and let that be a lesson to the rest of them', Munday seems to be saying.

As this discussion demonstrates, despite their ostensible purpose of celebrating civic harmony and shared values, there are moments when dissensions within the livery companies made their way into civic pageantry. One of the most celebrated civic links was that between the Fishmongers and the Goldsmiths, but the treatment of that relationship in mayoral Shows reveals that even friendship could be contingent. In an early Show, one of the characters, addressing a Fishmonger Lord Mayor, John Allot, says of the Goldsmiths that they 'haue long in loue to [the Fishmongers] been vnited' (*The deuice*, sig. A2v). In *Chrysanaleia* Munday makes even more of the long-standing bond between the two Companies. Their 'league of loue and fellowship' he dates back to the time of the Crusades through a frankly rather unpersuasive account of how the merchants then 'trading in fish, oyle, flaxe, silkes and other commodities' were 'most frequently then termed Fishmongers'; the Goldsmiths in turn offered 'many friendly helpes and furtherances' (sig. A4r). The friendship, once established, continued back home in the City and was exemplified by the joint work of rebuilding

London's wall and establishing Moorgate and Cripplegate. To enforce the importance of the bond, later in the same Show the King of the Moors is accompanied by

tributarie Kings on horse-backe [who] carry Ingots of golde and siluer . . . and in this order they attend on him: shewing thereby, that the Fishmongers are not vnmindfull of their combined brethren, the worthy Company of Golde-smithes, in this solemne day of triumph. (sig. B1v)

When five years previously he had produced a Show on behalf of the Fishmongers' ostensible great allies, the Goldsmiths, however, Munday then stressed that 'the ancient loue and cordiall amity' between the two Companies did not extend to sharing the costs:

Yet let no censure stray so far at large,  
 To think the reason of that vnity  
 Makes Fish-mongers support the Goldsmithes charge,  
 And their expenses shared equally:  
 No, t'is [*sic*] the Gold-Smiths sole Society. [*sic*]  
 That in this Triumph beares the Pursse for all . . .  
 Their loues (herein) may not be thought the lesse,  
 But rather virtuall, and much stronger knit.  
 (Chruso-thriambos, sig. C2r-v)

His intention was probably to underscore the great wealth of the Goldsmiths' Company. However, in typical Munday style he labours the point to such an extent that the end result, despite his probable intention, is to make it sound as if the much-vaunted amity is based on rhetoric alone with no material manifestation.

The general approach within the Shows to the inauguration of the new Lord Mayor was to focus on the new post holder with little explicit reference to his predecessors beyond the standard invocation of continuity and tradition, often via the impersonation of some suitably historically remote incumbent such as Fitz-Alwin, Walworth, Eyre or Faringdon. Heywood's rather guarded approach in *Londini sinus salutis* takes the middle ground. He writes in relation to previous Ironmonger Lord Mayors that

I shall not neede to borrow my Introduction from the Antiquitie of this Famous Metropolis . . . [these] being Arguments already granted . . . and yet I hold it not altogether Impertinent to remember some few things of remarke. (sig. A4r)

He then proceeds to highlight notable incumbents and moments in civic history in the usual fashion. Munday's somewhat

peculiar approach to asserting the continuity of the mayoralty in *Chrysanaleia*, pursuing the image of the selfless pelican to which he likens the role, states that ‘though the maine Authoritie of Gouernment (in him) may be sayd to dye: yet it suruiueth in other Pellicans of the same brood’ (sig. B2v).<sup>111</sup> On the eve of the 1620 Show, however, Middleton produced an entertainment to mark not Francis Jones’s inauguration but rather the *termination* of William Cockayne’s mayoralty. The entertainment was held in the private confines of Cockayne’s house but published within the composite work *Honorable entertainments* in 1621. Here Middleton offers quite a different perspective on the transition from one Lord Mayor to another. This slight piece, comprising only a couple of speeches, represents the end of Cockayne’s term of office as a kind of funeral – ‘a sad Pageant’, as Middleton calls it. The entertainment begins with ‘one attir’d like a Mourner’ accompanied by instruments ‘expressing a mournfull Seruice’. Middleton then supplies a pseudo ‘Last Will and Testament’, which has Cockayne bequeathing to his unnamed ‘Successor’ ‘all my good wishes, paines, labours and reformations’. The piece concludes with an ‘epitaph’ bemoaning the end of ‘a Yeare of goodness, and a Yeare of right’ (sigs C1v–C3r). Rhetorically, the speeches present only very limited hope and expectation that such virtue would continue into the next mayoralty.<sup>112</sup>

I have yet to come across another such an ‘anti-pageant’ in printed form. Middleton had written not only Cockayne’s mayoral Show but also the entertainments for his daughter’s wedding, and he was then in his first year as City Chronologer, having taken on the post in September 1620, mid-way through the various entertainments included into this composite work and during Cockayne’s term of mayoral office. Despite Cockayne’s leading role in the disastrous ‘new drapery’ cloth monopoly of only a few years earlier, Middleton appears to have had an especially close relationship with Cockayne as a patron in this period.<sup>113</sup> Hence, perhaps, this anomalous take on the transition to another incumbent. Parr points out that a reader of this work would be quite able to differentiate Middleton’s enthusiastic representation of Cockayne from the way in which he celebrates the Haberdashers rather than Jones himself in the entertainment that follows this one.<sup>114</sup> As we’ll see, Middleton was not averse to letting his personal feelings about members of the City oligarchy become evident in his writing. It is perhaps not a coincidence that although he would, for various reasons, have been the obvious candidate, Middleton did not write the Show for Cockayne’s successor, Francis Jones (this was John Squire’s sole

foray into the genre). Middleton was, however, to pick up the reins again in 1622; indeed, he wrote four of the following five extant Shows, running right up to the year of his death, 1627.<sup>115</sup>

As this instance demonstrates, Bald's assertion that in his civic works Middleton 'attempted no more than to flatter his hearers with what they most wanted to hear' underestimates the extent to which, as in his plays, Middleton was his own man.<sup>116</sup> As Hutchings and Bromham have argued, it is not the case that once he embarked on his civic works 'Middleton abandon[ed] his probing vision of the problems of life in the expanding city for . . . a craven attempt to please his new employers'.<sup>117</sup> There are, they write, 'expressions of concern for the poor and the powerless throughout Middleton's work'.<sup>118</sup> As we have already seen, careful scrutiny of Middleton's Shows can therefore reveal much implicit – and sometimes quite explicit – critique. In *The triumphs of truth*, written for his namesake Sir Thomas Middleton, a man of decidedly Calvinist views, Middleton takes the moral high ground from the outset. He has Error claim, for instance, that there are 'a thousand of our Parish, besides Queanes, / That nere knew what Truth meant' (sig. B3r).<sup>119</sup> In this text Middleton's tendency towards criticism of the City's inhabitants can also be seen to extend to its oligarchy. It is therefore impolitic, to say the least, to have the personification of maternal 'London' say to the new Lord Mayor that

. . . some Sonnes I haue  
 Thanklesse, vnkind and disobedient,  
 Rewarding all my Bounties with Neglect,  
 And will of purpose wilfully retire  
 Themselues, from doing grace and seruice to me,  
 When they have got all they can, or hope for, from me . . .  
 And now they show themselues, yet they haue all  
 My blessing with them, so the world shall see  
 'Tis their vnkindness, no defect in me.

(sigs A4v–B1r)

As Hutchings and Bromham observe, this work 'does not present the city family as harmonious and united'.<sup>120</sup> Indeed, the phrase 'And now they show themselues' suggests that 'London' is alluding to those dignitaries actually present at the Show, as does the use of the present tense in 'some Sonnes I haue'. There is a similar aspect to Error's speech as quoted above, where some of those who allegedly do not know what truth is are said to be 'e'en in this Throng'.<sup>121</sup> As far as the figure of 'London' is concerned, the

evils she mentions appear to emanate from some others who have previously held the mayoralty. In the course of an extended period of what Lobanov-Rostovsky calls ‘dramatic irony’, Middleton has Error give a very authentic-sounding account of how a corrupt mayoralty would work:

Heres Gluttony and Sloth, two pretious Slaues,  
 Wil tell thee . . . the worth of euery Office to a Haire,  
 And who bids most, and how the Markets are, . . .  
 They'l bring thee in Bribes for Measures and light Bread,  
 Keepe thy eye winking, and thy hand wide ope,  
 Then thou shalt know what Wealth is, and the scope  
 Of rich Authority.<sup>122</sup>

(sig. B2r)

As Heinemann asserts, here Middleton presents an ‘explicit treatment of bribery and corruption’ that with its critical edge goes beyond the traditional praise of civic good works one might expect to find in mayoral Shows.<sup>123</sup> Although Error’s speech works as a rhetorical temptation to the Lord Mayor with the expectation that she will be eventually defeated by Zeal, at the same time if you put these two passages from the same work together Middleton might be implying that some of Sir Thomas Middleton’s predecessors, rather than acting as exemplars for their successor in the usual manner of mayoral pageantry, had actually abused their office. Nepotism is an issue here, perhaps: Sullivan has speculated that Middleton may be expressing ‘some unease about a Welsh hegemony, given the number and importance of Myddeltons in London in 1613’, although significant family groups were not that uncommon in the City and Middleton himself was, of course, the new Lord Mayor’s namesake.<sup>124</sup> Certainly, Error’s accusation that ‘wealth’ and ‘authority’ (or ‘Power and Profite’, as she has it elsewhere) result from the mayoralty could be seen as being a bit close to the bone when addressed to men motivated and advantaged by both attributes, especially when presented in front of a large audience who, as Stock notes, might have ‘half expected’ ‘all the abuses of office’ the Lord Mayor is tempted to engage in. Stock argues, rightly, I think, that in this work Middleton ‘takes Dekker’s insistence on the conditional nature of civic honour even further by demanding evidence of the mayor’s probity and honour . . . on the spot’.<sup>125</sup> As Lobanov-Rostovsky argues, ‘the morality structure of this show reinforces the public awareness of such abuses . . . [and] the contingency of praise in Middleton’s pageant threatens the political value of the spectacle’.<sup>126</sup>



**‘All such pious and religious Magistrates’:  
politics and religion in the Shows**

*The triumphs of truth* is perhaps the most outspoken of Middleton’s Shows, but a cautionary note occurs in other works. Issues of religion and trade were at the heart of early seventeenth-century English politics. Reflecting these preoccupations, one can detect a seriousness about many Lord Mayor’s Shows which goes beyond the double edge of instructive praise as discussed above. Middleton’s *Triumphs of loue and antiquity*, for instance, warns the Lord Mayor that his year of office will require ‘Labour’ to avoid the perils inherent in the role, with a particular emphasis on the temptations of office:

The Rude and thorny wayes thy care must cleare,  
Such are the vices in a City sprung,  
As are yon Thickets that grow close and strong:  
Such is oppression, Cosnage, Bribes, false Hires,  
As are yon catching and entangling Briers.

(sigs B2v–B3r)

There is also an aside in the same vein in the later work *The sunne in Aries*, where Fame comments that the notable deeds of civic worthies have not always been upheld by their successors. Past Lord Mayors, Middleton writes, were ‘Erecters some, of Granaries for the Poore, / Though now conuerted to some Rich mens Store / (The more the Ages misery)’ (sig. B2r). Again, it is almost as if Middleton has someone specific in mind who has so degraded their predecessors’ benevolence. He emphasises in *The triumphs of honor and vertue* that Proby’s wealth was attained ‘with an unusuring hand’. This feat implicitly differs from the way in which others enriched themselves, for Middleton adds that this ‘is not the least wonder worthy note’ on Proby’s inauguration (sig. B3v). The point is made clearer still later in the same work, when ‘Honor’ claims that Proby is due honour because he ‘stands free’ from the unworthy conduct indulged in by others, such as ‘making Friends / Of Mammons Heapes, got by unrighteous Ends’ (sig. C3r).<sup>127</sup> Without this kind of personal reference to the new Lord Mayor Middleton covers much the same ground in *The triumphs of integrity*, where the virtues of the past are compared to the failings of the present. Men like Fitz-Alwin, it is asserted, ‘heapt up Vertues, long before they were old [whereas] This Age sits laughing vpon Heapes of Gold’ (sig. B2r). One wonders how this speech would have been received by a civic oligarchy which was so notably founded on ‘Heapes of Gold’.

Such tactics were not confined to Middleton's work. Less stringently, Munday too has Fitz-Alwin mourn the decline of the representatives of civic paternalism, 'right worthy men' as he calls them, in *Metropolis coronata* (sig. B1r). Heywood could be as outspoken as Middleton on occasion. Rowland has argued that in his final Show Heywood puts forward 'a provocative interrogation of [the new Lord Mayor] Garway's reputation' which amounts to 'an act of considerable effrontery'.<sup>128</sup> In this text Heywood takes the opportunity to run through some instances in Roman history where civic rulers engaged in conduct damaging to their citizens. These ostensibly historically remote examples of how not to run a city can, however, be regarded as admonitory when directed towards a Lord Mayor whose loyalties tended to lie more in the direction of Whitehall than the Guildhall. Indeed, Janus 'admonisheth all Magistrates . . . to be constant in all their courses', especially when it comes to matters spiritual. Heywood enjoins Garway both to establish and maintain 'true Religion' in such a way as to suggest that such sustenance is required (sig. B2r). Moreover, he stresses how important 'free and frequent Preaching of the Word and Gospell' is for the 'Prosperity, Plenty, Health [and] Wealth' of the country (sig. C2r). The emphasis on 'free and frequent Preaching' of the gospel aligns Heywood – if not Garway – with a particularly stringent Protestant stance. Four years earlier Heywood seemed to have been expecting Clitheroe to be a veritable paragon of virtue, for *Londini sinus salutis* recommends that he fosters traits of 'constancy of mind', 'gentleness', 'sincerity', philosophical patience, 'placabilitie', and 'humanitie', as well as the kind of exacting and ardent religious zeal one finds in Middleton's works (sigs B1v–B2v). There is an equally Middletonesque note to the figure of Piety, the eponymous pageant in *Porta pietatis*, who is accompanied by Zeal with her ever-burning heart, although in *Londini sinus salutis* Heywood seems considerably more positive about the new Lord Mayor's stance on matters religious than on the later occasion.

As this suggests, Middleton was not alone in attempting to put ethical and spiritual constraints on the Lord Mayor's behaviour. The preamble to *Londini emporia*, for instance, lists the eight 'Offices of Piety [which] are in a Merchant required'. Amongst these, Heywood touches on those activities which have the strongest bearing on how men like Ralph Freeman gained their wealth and prestige. Like many of his peers, Freeman was active in trading companies such as the Levant Company. All the same, he is told to abjure 'all fraud and deceite in bargaining', to avoid the practice of 'Extortion and

Oppression’, ‘out of his abundance to bee open-handed vnto all, but especially the poore and indigent’, and ‘to bridle the insatiate desire of getting’ (sig. A3r–v). Heywood also attempts to mystify the reality of overseas commerce. Mercury states that trade with numerous European countries is almost altruistic: ‘What’s best in them, comes frequent to our hands. / And for transportage of some surplus ware, / (Our owne wants furnisht) what we best can spare’ (sig. B3v). There is no mention here of how fraught these trading connections often were in this period. Moreover, realistically, of course, a desire for great wealth was integral to these men’s practices, and Heywood’s moral exhortations to Freeman do sit somewhat uncomfortably with the unmitigated praise for merchants and merchandising elsewhere in this text. In this respect Heywood’s tricky position may have been the result of the ideological conflicts that lay behind it. Rowland argues that ‘the symbiotic relationship Heywood posits between the upholding of religious principle and the conduct of trade was a profoundly and increasingly contentious issue at precisely the moments at which Heywood introduced it into his writing, and the Merchant Adventurers [of which Freeman was a member] were at the heart of the controversy’.<sup>129</sup>

A similarly serious note pervades Middleton’s mayoral Shows, in particular. One cannot imagine such a high-minded writer including knockabout verses by Robin Hood and his comrades, as Munday does in *Metropolis coronata*.<sup>130</sup> As Heinemann argues, in *The triumphs of truth* Middleton attempted ‘much more in the way of sustained moral allegory than was usual’ in mayoral Shows.<sup>131</sup> O’Callaghan concurs, writing that this work ‘is notable for its promotion of godly Protestantism’ and that Middleton ‘sees public office in distinctly Calvinist terms’.<sup>132</sup> Although all Shows highlight to various degrees the labours and personal sacrifice inherent in the Lord Mayor’s term of office, Middleton does so in a particularly emphatic fashion. Indeed, Middleton’s characteristic tenor can be used to dispute Bach’s assertion that the Shows were ‘first and foremost mercantile spectacles’.<sup>133</sup> For Middleton, almost invariably, *moral* questions are first and foremost. To demonstrate the point, on his return to his house at the end of the Show in 1621, Middleton has Edward Barkham greeted by a positive array of moral qualities. ‘Iustice, Sincerity, Meeknes, Wisedome, Prouidence, Equality, Industry, Truth, Peace, Patience, Hope, [and] Harmony’ are all present, along with Fame, to remind the new Lord Mayor of his responsibilities, ‘illustrated by proper Emblems and expressions’ to emphasise the point (*The sunne in Aries*, sig. B3v). Middleton,

could, however, produce work on behalf of those whose political position was not wholly civic. He highlights Peter Proby's court connections in *The triumphs of honor and vertue*, emphasising in the dedication that Proby was a man who 'hath seru'd / Two Royall Princes' and was a 'Scholler, Souldier, Courtier [and] Citizen' (sig. A4r and B3v). That this was an unusual combination is revealed by the manner in which Middleton foregrounds Proby's transition to civic authority: the figure of Antiquity informs the City that 'you haue a Courtier now your Magistrate' (sig. B3v).<sup>134</sup> O'Callaghan argues plausibly that this demonstrates that 'it is difficult to sustain the argument that Middleton's civic entertainments are motivated by an ideological opposition between the city and the court', or at least not a wholesale one.<sup>135</sup>

All the same, Middleton's first Show, *The triumphs of truth*, can be characterised as stern, seeking to instruct much more than to entertain. As well as being the longest Show from the period, it makes its moralistic point again and again and again, and dramatises the threats to the Lord Mayor perhaps rather too aggressively for popular taste. O'Callaghan rightly characterises the key figures of Zeal and Truth as 'militaristic' and 'God's soldiers', as with Heywood's 'Church militant' in one of his Shows some years later.<sup>136</sup> In *Metropolis coronata* Munday's equivalent character is named 'Discreet Zeale' (sig. B2r): there is nothing discreet about Middleton's version in *The triumphs of truth*. Munday's treatment of the threats to the new Lord Mayor in the former work consists simply of a rather throwaway reference to 'all occasions which may seeme sinister or hurtfull' (sig. B2r-v). In this respect *The triumphs of truth* also differs a great deal from some of the early, pre-1600 Shows, where various virtuous figures greet and bless the Lord Mayor with little sign of any danger to any of them. Nelson's 1590 text, for instance, presents a bevy of civic virtues, including 'Plentie', 'Wisdomes', 'Gods Truth', 'Pollicie', 'the peace of England', 'Loialtie and Concord' and others; 'Ambition', the sole negative figure, is allowed only one brief speech (*The deuice*, sigs A2v-A3v). It is notable Middleton's next Show – after a three-year hiatus – was more purely celebratory than *The triumphs of truth* (as well as being a great deal shorter – perhaps he had received some feedback), with only a passing moment of potential conflict between 'Reward' and 'Justice', speedily resolved.<sup>137</sup>

There is also something rather ascetic about Middleton's Shows. Even in the lavish *Triumphs of truth* 'Perfect Love' emphasises that 'from this Feast of Ioy' 'all Excesse [and] Epicurisme' are prohibited

(sig. D1r). There may be a feast, but it is a ‘Reuerend’ one. In *The triumphs of integrity* Middleton produces such a sustained defence of true virtue that the form of the event itself comes into question: ‘tis not shoves, Pompe, nor a House of State / Curiously deckt, that makes a Magistrate’, he claims (sig. B2v). Perhaps inevitably, given its conceptual focus on unshowy integrity, the Show (on the evidence of Middleton’s text) seems to have used less exciting pageantry than many others from this period. Even the ‘Cristall Sanctuary’, the device that culminates the day, although undoubtedly beautifully designed, does not have the spectacular features of the pageants and devices employed in *The triumphs of truth*, for instance. There is little here of the crowd-pleasing nature of the pitched battle between Zeal and Envy, or fireworks setting fire to a chariot, which the audience would have seen in 1613. The later work does have a rather static and preachy quality, being concerned with that which is ‘manifest, perspicuous, plaine, and cleere’ (sig. B3v). A ‘Temple of Integrity’ featuring ‘Santimonious Concomitants’ is probably not what the audience would have expected or appreciated, despite Middleton’s claim that it is aimed at ‘the content of the Spectators’ (sig. B2v). To a lesser extent, *The sunne in Aries* too implicitly undercuts its own status as a lavish triumph. Here Middleton has Fame argue that the most virtuous are the least likely to boast about their merits:

Diamonds will shine though set in Lead, Truworth  
 Stands alwaies in least neede of setting forth:  
 What makes Lesse Noyse then Merit? Or Lesse Showe  
 Then Vertue?

(sig. B4r)

Only ‘the Vulgar Will’ is impressed by ‘Vaine-glory’, it is stated, somewhat paradoxically given the context. Likewise, the new Lord Mayor is invited to the feast at the end of *The tryumphs of honor and industry* in the usual form, but the promised feast is but a ‘solemne pleasure’, where ‘all Epicurisme is banisht’. At this event, the writer stresses, ‘Moderation and Grauity are alwayes attendants’ (sig. C1r). In this later instance it is possible that Middleton deliberately tempered this aspect of the day’s celebrations to fit the predilections of the Lord Mayor, George Bolles. Heinemann calls Bolles a ‘Sabbatarian’, and there is an anecdote that, immediately after the publication of James’s *Book of Sports*, he allegedly intervened to stop the royal retinue in its progress through the City on a Sunday, during church services.<sup>138</sup> She also argues that the 1613 Show

too was 'evidently tailor-made to suit [Sir Thomas Middleton's] personality and interests'.<sup>139</sup> The phrase 'tailor-made' is an oversimplification, however, and her potentially reductive approach to the relationships between mayoral politics and Middleton's own agenda has recently been critiqued by O'Callaghan.<sup>140</sup> Another problem with Heinemann's approach (important though it is for Middleton criticism) is that it implies that Middleton chose the men for whom he wrote mayoral Shows, depending on the congruity of his views and theirs, rather than the Lord Mayor's Company choosing him.

Nevertheless, there is undeniably a 'godly' aspect to Middleton's Shows. In *The triumphs of loue and antiquity* he emphasises 'the noble and reuerend Ceremonies which Diuine Antiquity religiously ordained' (sig. C4r). A Websterian note is struck in *The triumphs of honor and verue*, where the Globe of Honor contains 'eight bright Personages . . . representing the *Inward Man*, the Intentions of a Vertuous and Worthy Brest' (sig. C1v). This device serves to depict an almost doctrinal struggle between virtue and human frailty (a theme which, on the face of it, does not appear altogether suitable for spectacular pageantry). The mist that descends over the globe is intended to demonstrate that 'the best men haue their Imperfections, and worldly Mists oftentimes interpose the cleerest Cogitations' (sig. C2r). Another statement in the same work reinforces Middleton's views on the importance of real virtue: 'It may be said you did but late passe by / Some part of Triumph that spake Vertuously, /And one such Speech suffices; 'tis not so' (sig. C1r). *The triumphs of truth* certainly does not content itself with only one 'vertuous' speech. The rarefied religious politics of Middleton's Shows compares interestingly to Heywood's rather more targeted approach. As Rowland has demonstrated, in *Porta pietatis* Heywood specifically celebrates the brothers of the new Lord Mayor, both of whom were clerics of a distinctly nonconformist persuasion. As Rowland argues, Heywood is 'enthusiastic' about the anti-Laudian Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, a man who had come into conflict with both the present monarch and his father.<sup>141</sup> The pageant of Piety with which this Show concludes seems full of confidence in the religious rectitude of the new incumbent, invoking a time when Piety, 'shining in her pure truth', stands firm in the face of both 'Atheists' and 'Schismaticks' (sig. C1v). She has no need to fear what Heywood calls 'the Faggot and the stake', the instruments of *Catholic* religious persecution.

Although he does not always spurn them altogether (the

Companies were unlikely to have sanctioned this), in his earlier works in this genre Middleton is less likely than his peers to spend time on the history of the Company in question, such as anecdotes about previous Lord Mayors. His preference wherever feasible is for lengthy moralising exhortations to the new incumbent. Middleton's practice is in notable contrast to that of at least one of his contemporaries, Munday, who often placed figures from civic history and mythology at the forefront of his Shows. Middleton's first Show contains nothing of the Company's history whatsoever; perhaps he was required to include such detail, albeit briefly in some cases, in his later Shows. Where he does place the new Lord Mayor in a historical lineage, as in *The triumphs of integrity* with its procession of rulers who rose exclusively from 'humble beginnings', this often serves, as Heinemann writes, to emphasise his 'central theme', which is 'that greatness derived from merit is far superior to greatness derived from high birth'.<sup>142</sup> Rather than celebrating monarchical greatness, the text puts civic meritocracy in the foreground. 'All this is instanc't onely to commend', Middleton writes in this work, 'the low condition whence these Kings deesend'; even King David is cited in this regard, as not scorning 'to be a Shepheard' (sig. A4v). 'Low-obscure beginnings' are no impediment to 'Fame' as far as Middleton is concerned (sig. A4r). The main body of this work thus belies its dedication, where Middleton praises Martin Lumley's 'Descent Worthy . . . [being] Sprung of an Antient, and most Generous Race' (sig. A2r). As its title suggests, in this work Middleton defends quite boldly the superiority of 'vertuous strife' over 'high Place', emphasising that 'meane wombs / No more eclipse braue Merit, then rich Toombes / Make the Soule happy' (sig. A4r-v). His rhetoric here brings to mind the dedication in Webster's *Dutchesse of Malfy*, where the latter writes that 'the ancient'st Nobility [is] but a rellique of time past, and the truest Honor indeede [is] for a man to conferre Honor on himself' (sig. A3r). There is a degree of irony, given its setting, in the final line of the argument Middleton presents in the speech in the 'Mount Royall'. The repetition of the harsh consonants 't' and 'd' conveys the scorn in the sentiment quite strongly:

'Tis the Noblest Splendor upon Earth,  
 For man to adde a Glory to his Birth . . .  
 Then to be Nobly-borne and there stand fixt;  
 As if 'twere Competent Vertue for whole Life  
 To be Gegot a Lord.

(sig. A4r-v)

Similarly, in *The triumphs of truth* the Lord Mayor is asked the rhetorical question, 'For what is Greatnesse if not ioyn'd with Grace?' (sig. D2r). Naturally, Webster's own mayoral Show takes the same line, pursuing a theme of 'honour' derived from noble deeds, not noble birth. Sir John Hawkwood relates that 'My birth was meane, yet my deservings grew / To eminence . . . From a poore common Souldier I attained, / The stile of Captaine, and then Knight-hood gaind' (sig. B2r). Taylor focuses on the specifically civic means by which one could attain the heights, in the process giving a more direct account of the route to 'fame' and 'honour' taken by the Lord Mayor himself. As 'Great Rivers have their heads in little Rills', he explains, so

from th'apprentice seven yeares servitude  
Proceeds the grave gowne, and the Livery Hood,  
Till (in the end) by merit, paines and care,  
They win the Grace to sit in Honours chaire.

*(The triumphs of fame and honour, sig. B1r)*

Dekker writes more broadly in *Troia-Noua triumphans* that 'Arts, Trades, Sciences, and Knowledge' are 'the onely staires and ascensions to the Throne of Virtue' (sig. B2v). Once again social status associated with high birth does not get a look-in. Indeed, Dekker reminds the reader that 'Time hath his wings, Glasse, and Scythe, which cuts downe All' (*ibid.*). In a proto-existentialist moment Dekker expresses the idea that it is all about proving yourself. Swinnerton is sombrely told by Fame at the culmination of the day's festivities that his previous successes are irrelevant and must now be laid aside,

. . . for the wayes which thou hath past  
Will be forgot and worne out, and no Tract  
Of steps obseru'd, but what thou now shalt Act.  
The booke is shut of thy precedent deedes.

(sig. C1v)

Dekker emphasises to Swinnerton that 'in this Court of Fame / None else but Vertue can enrol your Name' (*ibid.*). Middleton concurs, arguing in *The triumphs of integrity* that 'tis the Life, and Dying / Crownes both with Honors Sacred Satisfying' (sig. A4r). In *Londons ius honorarium* Heywood addresses the Lord Mayor thus, echoing Middleton, Dekker and Webster before him: 'more faire and famous is it to be made, then to be borne Noble, For that Honour is to be most Honored, which is purchased by merritt, not



crept into by descent' (sig. A2r).<sup>143</sup> Furthermore, 'Vertue' reminds the courtier Peter Proby in *The triumphs of honor and vertue* that it is a mistake to place wealth and power above moral sanctity: 'Selfe-Opinions Eye', she announces, may pass her by 'As if the Essence of my Deitie / Were rais'd by Power, and not Power rais'd by me'. Those rulers who make this mistake, it is warned, 'build the Empire of their Hopes on Sand' (sig. C1r). Given that Proby's rise to civic power was generated in part by his connections with *royal* power, this is a potentially cutting observation. All these works bear out Paster's argument that 'the pageants ministered to the city's self-esteem by challenging aristocratic assumptions that birth, courtly grace, and royal favor matter most of all'.<sup>144</sup> An entirely different perspective on merit and advancement is offered by Mayne's 1639 court play *The citye match*, where, amidst a number of what *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* calls 'girds at citizens', the merchant Warehouse bemoans his *lack* of high-born nobility with reference to Lord Mayor's Day. Warehouse is, he admits, 'a man that hath / No scutcheons but them of his Company, / Which once a yeare doe serve to trim a Lighter / to Westminster and back againe' (sig. M2v). Livery company 'scutcheons' are much more highly rated in the Shows, naturally.

The concerns in terms of large-scale political changes which this chapter has dealt with so far can now be brought together. As I have argued elsewhere, the Shows tend to cite historical monarchs only in terms of what they have contributed to the livery company in question and/or to the City as a whole. That these charters, rights and monopolies had at times been 'wrestled from English kings', in Manley's phrase, is an aspect of them which the Shows usually leave unspoken, although there is such an implication in the way in which in *Monuments of Honor* Edward III is made to state that these eight kings 'held it a special honor, and renowne . . . to unite themselves into the [Merchant Taylors'] Brotherhood' (sig. B3r).<sup>145</sup> Nevertheless, selectivity was the inevitable consequence. The effect of such a perspective on *Monuments of Honor* is to produce a roll of honour with unexpected results. 'Henry the sixt' is both 'religious' and 'unfortunate'; Edward IV is 'Amarous and Personable', and Richard III manages to be both a 'bad man' and a 'good King . . . for the Lawes he made in his short Gouernment' (Munday deals with King John in much the same way: his evil deeds are outweighed by his generosity towards the City). For Webster, the highest place in the Merchant Taylors' pantheon is reserved for Henry VII, the 'wise

and politique' king during whose reign the Company received its charter (sig. B2v). Dekker's pageant 'Brittannia's Watch-tower' represents solely 'those Kinges . . . whose loues and Royall fauors' were bestowed upon the City: accordingly, only Edward the Confessor, Richard I, King John and Henry III are mentioned (*Brittannia's honor*, sigs B4v–C1r).

Famous Lord Mayors of antiquity, in contrast to monarchs, were regularly represented in the Shows to act as exemplars, and they were often introduced alongside Fame, to emphasise the point. Companies such as the Fishmongers (whose chief hero was William Walworth) and the Mercers (who could boast Dick Whittington) would no doubt have expected the pageant writers to exploit previous glories associated with the company in question.<sup>146</sup> As Woolf has stated, Walworth 'turns up again and again in mayoral processions, up to the end of the eighteenth century', although he points out that 'the reputation of such a character could be inflated and embellished over time'.<sup>147</sup> Middleton foregrounds the rather more obscure Henry Barton, a Skinner whose mayoralty was notable not for saving the nation from rebellion but for the more prosaic feat of being the one in which 'for the safety of Trauellers, & strangers by night through the Citie, caused lights to be hung out fro[m] Alhollontid [All Hallows] to Candlemas' (*The triumphs of loue and antiquity*, sig. B4v). Indeed, figures like Walworth, Faringdon, Fitz-Alwin and the rest had taken on a pseudo-mythical character over the years, as the dispute between 1611 and 1614 about Fitz-Alwin's corporate affiliation shows.

For this reason pageant writers like Munday felt able to play fast and loose with the historical record by placing real historical figures alongside those of dubious provenance such as Robin Hood, and by juxtaposing classical, legendary and medieval contexts even if this practice was criticised by chroniclers, Stow included. Indeed, Bradbrook argues that combining disparate contexts in this fashion – as Munday did in *Metropolis coronata* where he has Robin Hood as Fitz-Alwin's son-in-law – 'is something better than mere ignorance': in this Show, she writes, Munday 'joined the ancient figure of woodland freedom . . . with an ancient emblem of civic power'.<sup>148</sup> As with Robin Hood, the Shows also included references to figures with limited civic significance, but who could be used to reflect the thematic concerns of the production, such as Sir Francis Drake, who as we have seen features in a number of Drapers' Shows as a famous 'brother' of the Company.<sup>149</sup> That Drake was repeatedly juxtaposed to Jason and his argonauts as part of the treatment

of the golden fleece trope points up the hybrid nature of the Shows' sources. The bulk of the spectators of the Shows would have been very likely to be familiar with these characters from the City's past and elsewhere, even if their sense of the historicity may not have been all that secure.<sup>150</sup> Other contemporary sources such as Stow's *Suruay* and various chronicle histories, as well as the proliferation of London-focused plays during this period (some written by the same men as the mayoral Shows) repeatedly rehearsed the notable and charitable deeds of deceased dignitaries.<sup>151</sup> They did so, too, with the same kind of nostalgic valorisation of these men that one finds in the Shows. As Hardin notes, the invocation of, and, in some cases, actual impersonation of previous Lord Mayors accentuates 'the sense of historical immutability by bridging the gap between the thirteenth century . . . and the early seventeenth century'.<sup>152</sup>

Past mayors also acted as models for the current incumbent and his administration, although not always positive ones. Northway presents a complex, if at times convoluted, account of what lies behind an apparently harmless song contained within Dekker's 1629 Show for the Ironmongers, *Londons tempe*. Dekker's use here of a vernacular verse form indebted to Richard Stanyhurst's derided translation of *The Aeniad*, she argues, works as an implicit message to the new mayor, James Campbell, *not* to follow the path of his unpopular father Thomas, Lord Mayor in 1609. 'A copy of something bad', she states, can take the form of 'an egregious translation, [or] an unpopular mayor'.<sup>153</sup> In the same Show, however, Dekker does not in any way criticise the City itself. Indeed, he presents a characteristically patriotic defence of the Thames against all comers, claiming that all other supposedly great rivers of the world – the Ganges, Nile, Euphrates and so on – 'would weepe out there eyes, / Madde that new Troys high towers on tiptoe rize / To hit Heauens Roofe'. Heywood is just as nationalistic at times: compared to the Thames, he boasts in *Londini artium*, the Seine is but 'a Brooke' and Rome's famous Tiber is merely 'a Ditch' (sig. B1v). (That Rome is the capital of Catholicism may have had an impact on Heywood's approach here, as with his claim in *Londini status pacatus* that Rome 'Tyranniz'd over the whole World' (sig. A3v).) Dekker begins *Brittannia's honor* in the same style, praising London as a city 'able to match with the Fairest in the World . . . renowned Abroad [and] admired at Home'. Indeed, in 'Forraine Countries' London, he claims, 'is called the Queene of Citties'. Westminster, one should note, is but London's 'Royall Daughter' (sig. A3r). 'Fully to write downe all the Titles, Stiles, and Honors of

this our Metropolis', he concludes, 'would weary a 1000. pennes' (sig. A3v). Indeed, the three full pages of civic hagiography which he supplies are for Dekker only a taster. In his preamble, he writes, he has merely 'shewne you the Toppes onely of our City-Buildings; and in a little Picture drawne the Face of her Authority, giuing but a glimpse of her Prator as hee passes by' (sig. A4r). Heywood is equally prone to this kind of exaggeration, writing in *Londini status pacatus* that 'Rome it selfe the Metropolis of the Roman Empire' could not, even 'in her most flourishing estate and Potency . . . in the least compare with London' (sig. A3v).

The treatment of London's primacy in these works, as I have indicated above, at times engages with the central political battles of the age, such as the intermittent conflict between England and the Catholic nations on the continent, and with the growing domestic tensions between the Crown, City and Parliament at home. Echoing his chauvinistic treatment of London versus its foreign competitors above, in *Londons tempe* the famed 'Sposalizio del Mare', the marriage of the sea ceremony at Venice, is for Dekker merely 'a poore Lantscip' when compared to the 'full Brauerieis of Thamesis' (sig. B1r).<sup>154</sup> To some extent Dekker is being typically bombastic, but his representation of the Thames in *Londons tempe* is only a wider-scale version of the way in which Munday had claimed the status of 'Queene of all Britanniaes streames' for the river in *The triumphs of re-united Britania* (sig. B4v). Webster too has Oceanus correct Thetis's misapprehension that they are witnessing 'the marriage of the sea'. 'That beateous seate is London', he states, which with its 'Eminent Marchants . . . [is] as rich, and venturous as euer grac't, / Venice or Europe' (*Monuments of Honor*, sig. A4r). 'Th' rest ath World', Webster claims, 'cannot shew the like' worthies as Drake and the other famous English sailors, a fact which, he asserts, generates envy in foreign nations (sig. A4v). In the 'Temple of Honor' pageant Webster locates 'Troynouant or the City' seated above other 'eminent' but 'admiring' cities: 'Antwerp, Paris, Rome, Venice and Constantinople'. Heywood takes the idea further still, arguing in *Londini speculum* that London's virtues are such that 'all forraigne Cities' are taught by it 'how to correct their vices' (sig. B1r). To further demonstrate the superiority of the English capital Webster marshals 'foue famous Schollers and Poets of this our Kingdome' from Chaucer to Sidney; the latter, as Carnegie comments, is 'not only a poet but also a soldier', and a soldier 'who fought and died in the Low Countries for the Protestant cause', to boot (sig. B1r).<sup>155</sup>

Such nationalistic pride does not constitute wholesale xenophobia,

though. As with *Monuments of Honor*, many of these texts only care to diminish the achievements of *Catholic* countries. In the same vein, Taylor has the figure of London announce that for ‘Rome, and all Cities that hold Rome supreme, / Their glorie’s [*sic*] are eclips’d or but a dreame’ (*The triumphs of fame and honour*, sig. A7v). Indeed, in his mayoral Shows as well as in the speeches he wrote for James’s 1604 royal entry, Dekker emphasises the amity between the City and certain kinds of ‘foreigner’: those from Protestant nations or denominations. In *Troia-Noua triumphans*, Gasper has argued, Dekker demonstrates the triumph – in more senses than one – of ‘militant Protestantism’ by celebrating both the marital alliance between the Stuart monarchy and the Elector of Palatine and ‘the emergence of a new religious-political figurehead’ in Prince Henry.<sup>156</sup> In his text Dekker welcomes

our best-to-be beloued friends, the Noblest strangers, vpon whom, though none but our Soueraigne King can bestow Royall welcomes; yet shall it be a Memoriall of an Exemplary Loue and Duty (in those who are at the Cost of these Triumphs) to haue added some Heightening more to them then was intended at first, of purpose to do honor to their Prince and Countrey. (sig. A3v)

The ‘well-beloved’ overseas visitors on this occasion were Frederick, the Elector Palatine and his entourage.<sup>157</sup> Dekker was clearly aware of the implications of the presence of the new ruler of Bohemia and leader of the Protestant Union – soon to be James’s son-in-law – when he states that the Company in question, the Merchant Taylors, took it upon itself to ‘heighten’ the welcome he received (his comment also reveals that their attendance was confirmed late in the day). Frederick’s coronation as Elector had already been marked with celebratory bonfires in London. The year 1612 (or at least part of it) was an encouraging one for English Protestants. Prince Henry looked set to be their ideal monarch in due course, and during the year his father had established strong links with overseas Protestant states and communities, leading to the Palatine marriage of 1613. Henry’s untimely death, however – his attendance at Dekker’s Show was expected but thwarted by terminal illness and he died about a week later – only increased the sense in some quarters that James took too conciliatory an approach to the Catholic nations (we have already seen one response in mayoral pageantry to the proposed Spanish match of 1623). For Dekker in October 1612, however, Henry was still the great Protestant hope. To that end, his description of the pageant of the House of Fame

stipulates that ‘a perticular roome [is] reserued for one that represents the person of Henry the now Prince of Wales’ (sig. C1v).<sup>158</sup>

Even after his early death (perhaps in a way heightened by it) Henry remained a totem for many Protestants, and a decade later Webster revived the prince in *Monuments of Honor*. Webster had written *A monumental columnne*, an elegy for Henry (Heywood also wrote one), published in 1613, and the former took the opportunity to resurrect the figure of one of the few Stuarts with whom the Protestant City was then able to feel comfortable.<sup>159</sup> The topicality of this Show is relatively pronounced, in fact. Carnegie suggests quite plausibly that since the figure of Queen Anna in Webster’s Show ‘seems to have been identifiable only by an escutcheon bearing the arms of Bohemia, spectators may well have imagined her to be James’s daughter, Elizabeth of Bohemia, the current exile from the Palatinate’. Furthermore, the use of ‘the impresa of Amadeus V of Savoy’ might, for a well-informed spectator, have brought to mind ‘the intended marriage of Elizabeth’s dead brother Henry’ as well as the continued significance of Savoy to continental Protestantism.<sup>160</sup>

Within the Show’s emphasis on the ‘monuments’ of dead worthies the dead Prince is given considerable prominence, partly as a famed previous member of the Merchant Taylors, the Company behind the Show, but also as a model of virtuous princedom. After a passing reference to the year in which Henry was conferred the freedom of the Company (1607), Webster’s last and most significant pageant then centres on Henry, who is impersonated like a statue or funeral monument upon ‘an Artificiall Rocke, set with mother of Pearle, and other such precious stones’. This rock, as Webster puts it, ‘expresses the riches of the Kingdome Prince Henry was borne Heire to’. The figure of Henry himself stands ‘vpon a pedestall of gold’ ‘with his Coronet, George and Garter; in his left hand he holdes a Circklet of Crimson Veluet’ (sig. C1v). At the very end of the Show ‘Amade le Graunde’ delivers a speech to the Lord Mayor which emphasises Henry’s importance through an extended tribute to the latter’s virtues:

This [pageant] chiefly should your eye, and eare Employ  
That was of al your Brother-hood the Ioy,  
Prince Henry fames best president,  
Cald to a higher Court of Parliament,  
In his full strength of Youth and height of blood,  
And which Crownd all, when he was truly good . . .  
Such was this Prince.

(sig. C2r-v)

Celebrating the qualities of English Protestantism's lost cause in such a pronounced fashion only a year after the furore over the proposed marriage between Henry's brother and a Spanish Catholic princess might, at least in principle, have thrown a less than flattering light on to Charles, only a year away from his own accession. Webster's Show demonstrates how powerful the myth of Henry was in the 1620s. Twelve years after his demise, Henry, Webster asserts, is still a 'Iewell [that has] not quite lost his Ray'; the Merchant Taylors, standing in for a wider constituency, 'Haue not forgot him who ought ner'e to dye'. Charles himself is alluded to in far less enthusiastic terms only as Henry's (nameless) successor, who 'seconds' his brother in 'grace' and '*may* second him in Brother-hood, and place' (sig. C2v; my emphasis). Indeed, Charles featured by name in only one civic pageant (either as prince or as king), and this sole citation took place, as we have seen, in the course of Middleton's trenchant take on the failed Spanish match in *The triumphs of integrity*. Henceforth, Charles's lack of sympathy with civic pageantry was to work both ways.

The gulf between the mayoral Shows and a gradually more beleaguered monarchy can, in retrospect, be glimpsed in those Shows produced in the mid-1620s. Although the Shows were to continue in increasingly strident terms to articulate civic values for another fifteen years, the positive involvement of the Stuarts in mayoral pageantry, pre-Restoration, seems to have ended with Webster's belated panegyric to Henry. When the Shows were restored along with the king in the 1660s, although attempts were made to conjure up the glory days I have been exploring, they could never retain their confidence nor their unique ability to comment in such complex ways on their own moment. It is therefore perhaps inevitable that once the eighteenth century arrived they soon experienced what can be described as a dying fall. All the same, their vigour and their relevance belonged to, participated in, and, I would argue, helped to shape the early modern moment in the many ways which I have attempted to encapsulate in this book.

### Notes

- 1 *English Civic Pageantry* (revised ed.), p. 5. Northway has demonstrated that the adherence to the ideal of 'industriousness' in the Shows extends to their poetic form, too (see 'To kindle an industrious desire', pp. 173–4).

- 2 'The masque of truth', p. 86.
- 3 'Urban political culture', p. 260.
- 4 *Ibid.*, pp. 240–1. Withington quotes Hobbes to demonstrate the important role played by the City of London in the 'ousting' of Charles I (p. 266).
- 5 Brenner has argued that 'the company merchants of London [shared] a profound dependence on the Crown-sanctioned commercial operations that provided the foundations for their protected trades'; conversely, 'the merchants offered loans and taxes, as well as political support, to the Crown' (*Merchants and Revolution*, pp. 83 and 200).
- 6 *Ibid.*, p. 201.
- 7 Such a strategy, Bradbrook argues, 'did not involve the difficulty of putting new political statements into direct words' ('The politics of pageantry', p. 73).
- 8 *The Making of Jacobean Culture*, p. 209.
- 9 'City metal', pp. 44–5. However, the connections between these kinds of productions were probably not as direct as she assumes when she claims that *Sidero-Thriambos* was 'Munday's response to [Jonson's masques] *The Golden Age Restored* and *The Vision of Delight*' (*ibid.*, p. 44).
- 10 *Literature and Culture*, p. 221.
- 11 *Two Pageants*, p. 3. Richard Rowland, as we will see, has ably shown how Heywood's Shows responded to the heightened politics of the 1630s.
- 12 'Civic drama', pp. 294–5.
- 13 *The Drama of Coronation*, p. 9.
- 14 Recorder Finch's speech given when Barkham took his oath at Westminster also strikes a sterner note than usual, although that might be largely a reflection of the extent to which Barkham's predecessor, Francis Jones, had failed to live up to the demands of the mayoralty. 'Magistrates are not sett in Authority for their owne sakes', Finch proclaimed, 'but for the people'. The office of Lord Mayor, he emphasised, involved 'a number of cares' which 'cannot [be] putt off with [the Lord Mayor's] clothes now layed under his pillow', and those who take on high office ought to 'consider well the weight of government' (BL Add. MS 18016, fl. 149r).
- 15 In this context, the way Heywood addresses Richard Fenn in the 1637 Show is unusually apologetic: he asks the Lord Mayor to 'excuse' his 'boldnesse . . . in presuming to prompt your Memory in some things tending to the greatnes of your high place and Calling' (sig. A2r).
- 16 *The Idea of the City*, p. 125.
- 17 *The Culture of Cloth*, p. 5.
- 18 'Metropolitan resurrection', p. 382.
- 19 There was no Guildhall feast that year either. The records of the Court of Aldermen for 1625 contain many references to pesthouses, the appointment of surgeons and the like, and also to numerous reversions



- of civic roles which must have come about because of the death or desertion of the incumbents.
- 20 In 1609 the King apparently returned from hunt specifically ‘to demonstrate his respect for the Lord Mayor’s Show’ (Wright, ‘Rival traditions’, p. 199).
  - 21 Conversely, as Robertson and Gordon point out, in *The triumphs of truth* ‘Middleton takes over a figure from the masque [Jonson’s *Hymenaei*] and applies it to the uses of the citizens’ (*Collections* III, p. xl). Court writers targeted civic pageantry on other occasions too, such as William Hopkins (a friend of Davenant and Jonson), who made sarcastic reference to ‘the learned layes / That make a din about the streets’ (cited in Rowland, *Heywood’s Theatre*, p. 335).
  - 22 *Winter Fruit*, p. 142.
  - 23 Cited in Bergeron, ‘Venetian state papers’, p. 42. There’s a full account of the delays to and subsequent cancellation of Charles’s abortive royal entry in *Middleton: The Collected Works*, pp. 1898–1900. Ian Gentles argues that Charles’s lack of interest in civic ceremony was ‘fatally to weaken royal charisma in such a way that the king was unable to control London on the eve of, and during, the Civil War’ (‘Political funerals’, p. 206).
  - 24 ‘Charles I’s royal entries’, p. 91. Brenner dates ‘the profound alienation of the [City] merchants from the Crown’ from the beginning of Charles’s reign onwards (*Merchants and Revolution*, p. 218).
  - 25 Since only the schematic ‘plot’ was generally agreed to by the livery company, it seems likely that the printed work gave the writer the chance to add ‘unauthorised’ material, especially when the writer often liaised with the printer directly.
  - 26 BL Add. MS 18016, fol. 178v. In 1624 he pronounced that the ‘dignity’ of London was ‘above my power of expression’, and that the City was not only the highest in the land but also above ‘most of the cityyes of the world’ (fol. 184r).
  - 27 *The Making of Jacobean Culture*, p. 190.
  - 28 As Woolf notes, in early modern London, memories of monarchs ‘invariably revolve around something done by a king *to* or *for* London and its citizens’ (*The Social Circulation of the Past*, p. 321; see also my ‘Monarchs and mayors’, pp. 22–4).
  - 29 *Literature and Culture*, p. 284.
  - 30 BL Add. MS 18016, fol. 186r.
  - 31 See also Rowland, *Heywood’s Theatre*, pp. 343–4.
  - 32 ‘City, capital, and metropolis’, p. 137.
  - 33 See *Lost Londons*, pp. 8–11.
  - 34 The building of the new Exchange outside of the City on the Strand in 1609 was also perceived as a rival to the Royal Exchange in the City. For more on the varying responses to urban growth within the City and the Crown, see Griffiths, *Lost Londons*, pp. 50–2.

- 35 'Conceiving cities', p. 20. As he comments, the new system of gaining 'freedom' of this New Incorporation on payment of 20 or 40 shillings to the Crown 'is reminiscent of King James's sale of baronetcies' (p. 24).
- 36 See Robertson, 'Persuading the citizens?', p. 530.
- 37 'City, capital, and metropolis', p. 137.
- 38 *Lost Londons*, p. 5.
- 39 The City Corporation had had since the twelfth century the responsibility for managing the river from Staines to Yantlett Creek, Kent. (Civic control of this stretch of the river was kept until 1857.) A reminder of this responsibility often featured in the speeches given at the Lord Mayor's oath-taking by the representatives of the Crown (see, for instance, BL MS 18016, fol. 167r).
- 40 'Conceiving cities', p. 34.
- 41 Sayle, *Lord Mayors' Pageants*, pp. 124–5.
- 42 Tatham had to change his tune quite radically in the space of two years. Whereas in 1658 Honour's speech begins 'Though some dark clouds do interpose our joy', with a marginal note to explain that this relates 'to the death of the Protector' (*Londons Tryumph*, sig. C1v), in 1660 Tatham's mayoral text was loyally entitled *The royal oake*, and by 1664 his Show included speeches addressed to the King and Queen.
- 43 See GH MS 11,590, fol. 30. Fewer than half the number of non-members of livery Companies were assessed for contributions in 1640 compared to 1613. It was a different story when the incumbent was a parliamentarian: a letter from Isaac Pennington, the radical Lord Mayor and eventual regicide, in the Grocers' Court minutes for August 1643 refers to 'great . . . danger this cittie is in . . . [from] the kings forces' (GH MS 11,588/4, fol. 83).
- 44 GH MS 11,588/4, fols 3 and 15. The Wardens' election day feast did go ahead, however. Another 'moderate' dinner ('without any second course') was ordered on Lord Mayor's Day the following year, when two members of the Grocers also pleaded to be released from their duties as Stewards (their request was granted on payment of a fine of £25 apiece) (GH MS 11,588/4, fol. 34).
- 45 GH MS 11,588/4, fol. 15. The Grocers do refer to 'deepe' debts in the same minutes, and it is clear from contemporary Corporation records that the Crown owed considerable sums to the City of which the latter saw little prospect of repayment.
- 46 Fairholt, *London Pageants*, p. 70 (as he notes, the City entertained Fairfax and Cromwell in 1649).
- 47 Englefield, *The History of the Painter-Stainers Company*, p. 120.
- 48 GH MS 11,588/4, fol. 330. A 'moderate dinner' was the order of the day for the Grocers in October 1650 and 1652 (GH MS 11,588/4, fols 254 and 296). The Companies' records of expenditure on Shows retain exactly the same format in the Restoration period; apart from

- some price rises it is almost as if nothing had changed between the 1630s and 1660s. Randall argues that this ‘marked a calculated effort [on the part of the City] to pull things together [and] to construct an image of normalcy’ (*Winter Fruit*, p. 142). Englefield writes of the Painter-Stainers that ‘the ordinary [Company] records . . . succeed each other with astounding sang-froid at periods when the train bands were marching out to meet the victorious Royalist Army, [or] when the plague cart was making its ghastly round of the city streets’ (*The History of the Painter-Stainers Company*, p. 91).
- 49 *Heywood’s Theatre*, p. 360. As Rowland points out, Garway had in fact already been involved in impressing men to serve in the campaign in Scotland. George Whitmore, for whom Heywood wrote the 1631 Show, was also a supporter of Charles I: when the first Civil War broke out he was imprisoned by Parliament. Nicholas Rainton, in contrast, Whitmore’s successor, was allied to the more radical elements in the City, such as Isaac Pennington, and has been described as having ‘undoubted puritan sympathies’ (see Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution*, p. 310). Heywood tells Freeman, Rainton’s successor, that there is no ‘better President to imitate then your Predecessor’ (*Londini emporia*, sig. A2v).
- 50 *Heywood’s Theatre*, p. 358.
- 51 *Ibid.*, p. 351.
- 52 Glover, *A History of the Ironmongers’ Company*, p. 64.
- 53 *Two Pageants*, p. 10.
- 54 *Heywood’s Theatre*, p. 358.
- 55 ‘In August 1620 Spain’s Army of Flanders had invaded the Palatinate’ (Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution*, p. 248). Morris Abbot (to become Lord Mayor in 1638) had apparently investigated the possibility of support for an Anglo-Dutch war against Spain in 1620–21, and in 1621 Parliament openly if unsuccessfully asked the King to declare war (*ibid.*, pp. 249 and 252).
- 56 *Middleton: The Collected Works*, p. 1399.
- 57 *Ibid.*, p. 1432.
- 58 Fairholt claims that Dekker’s use of the phrase ‘the wilde boar has tusked up his vine’ in *Londons tempe* is ‘an allusion to the famous thirty years war . . . Dekker’s simile is obtained from Psalm lxxx, verses 8 and 13; the vine is the church, or the true faith; the wild boar its enemies’ (*Lord Mayors’ Pageants*, vol. II, p. 185).
- 59 Earlier that year Christopher Clitheroe (the Lord Mayor in 1635) made a speech to Parliament about the dangers of Dunkirk privateers (see Thrush, *Oxford DNB*, ‘Clitherow, Sir Christopher’).
- 60 See Kellett, ‘The breakdown of gild and corporation control’, pp. 382–4. ‘Foreigners’ were non-free inhabitants of the City; ‘aliens’ or ‘strangers’ were the terms used for those from overseas in this period.
- 61 See Hardin, ‘Spectacular Constructions’, p. 76. Brenner writes that the Merchant Adventurers ‘at the turn of the seventeenth century

- . . . held unquestioned leadership in London's merchant community' (*Merchants and Revolution*, p. 3). The fact that Brenner's 700-page overview of the rise of overseas trade within the City barely mentions the *livery* companies speaks volumes, and backs up Manley's argument that the merchant companies were 'bypassing and rendering obsolete the traditional government and companies of the City' (*Literature and Culture*, p. 291).
- 62 *Joint Enterprises*, p. 10.
- 63 *Literature and Culture*, p. 292.
- 64 The East India Company was founded in 1599; thereafter, a number of livery companies 'underwrote' its activities and as we can see from the Shows their oligarchs were frequently members of it. Brenner has calculated that 'of the 140 aldermen elected in the period 1600–1625, about half . . . were overseas traders' (*Merchants and Revolution*, p. 82).
- 65 In the preceding year's Show, however, although Dekker refers in passing to the 'Armes of the foure Companies' of which Richard Deane is free (along with the Skinners, these were the Levant, Virginia and North West Passage companies), the latter three are not named and as a result are not given anything like the profile we see elsewhere, although the Russians he depicts and the 'goodly Russian prize' he cites may refer to the Russia Company (*Britannia's honor*, sigs B4v and C2v).
- 66 Rowland calls Abbot's governorship of the East India Company 'aggressive' (*Heywood's Theatre*, p. 342).
- 67 *Ibid*, p. 346. Brenner comments that 'what is truly impressive is the degree to which the leading merchants who originally established the [Levant] trade in the later sixteenth century were able to make their influence felt through their descendants' (*Merchants and Revolution*, p. 72). The 'great wealth' this trade generated 'routinely provided [City merchants] with the opportunity for magistracy', and, ultimately, the mayoralty in the case of Richard Saltonstall (1597), Thomas Middleton (1613) and Ralph Freeman (1633) (*ibid.*, p. 74). Although Brenner does not mention the fact, of the five men who held senior positions in the East India Company in the 1630s, all but one had been Lord Mayor: indeed, they dominated the mayoralty in this period (see *ibid.*, p. 78).
- 68 Rowland has demonstrated the interconnections between trade and nonconformist religion for the Merchant Adventurers' Company, especially in the 1630s (*Heywood's Theatre*, pp. 340–2). Heywood's list makes it clear that the Merchant Adventurers did *not* trade with the Americas or West Indies. This is not to say, of course, that colonies and plantations were insignificant in this period, but rather to stress that those who engaged with these more risky and unpredictable colonial areas were 'an entirely new group of traders, originating

- almost totally outside the company merchant community' (Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution*, p. xii; see also pp. 108–12). Only infrequently did City merchants become involved in the Virginia Company (Thomas Hayes, Lord Mayor in 1614, was one).
- 69 Taylor makes the point that the rowers were two 'Saylours [and] two watermen', a distinction that the other writers were less likely to be aware of. His empathy with boatmen comes across when he writes that 'being ouer-joyed . . . every one of them drinks his Kan as a health . . . and presently fall[s] into a Rugged friskin daunce' (sig. A6r).
- 70 *Middleton: The Collected Works*, p. 1718. I would dispute her blanket use of the term 'colonial', however.
- 71 *Ibid.*, p. 1716.
- 72 *Colonial Transformations*, p. 161.
- 73 See, for example, *Buying Whiteness*, where Taylor calls Middleton's King of the Moors 'an 'unequivocally positive representation of a black speaker' (p. 126). Bach also does not appear to realise that the 'exotic animals' employed in the Shows, such as the ostrich or camel, were traditional emblems of the Companies and employed for that reason rather than to foster a sense of 'wildness' (*Colonial Transformations*, p. 161).
- 74 *Ibid.*
- 75 Taylor, *Buying Whiteness*, p. 411 n. 17.
- 76 *Colonial Transformations*, p. 162; my emphasis. (I am grateful to Stephen Gregg for his advice on this section.)
- 77 Middleton here distinguishes between those countries where the East India Company was actively trading, in which England had no imperial or colonial interests at this juncture, and 'plantations' like Virginia. Trade with the *East Indies* (particularly the spice trade) was, as Brenner writes, 'of great significance to the overall structure and character of London's merchant establishment'; conversely, 'by the end of the 1620s, all of the great City merchants had entirely forsaken the American trades' (*Merchants and Revolution*, pp. 77 and 92).
- 78 *Colonial Transformations*, p. 162.
- 79 There is evidence of 'blackamores' living in London from at least the 1590s onwards; parish records also show that the urban population was quite mixed in terms of its nationality and ethnicity, which included Irish people (see Griffiths, *Lost Londons*, pp. 72–6).
- 80 I don't propose to rehearse at much length the series of events that has become known as the Cockayne Project: for a full account of the series of events and their consequences, see Supple, *Commercial Crisis and Change*, pp. 33–51. Hardin notes that Jonson was commissioned by William Cockayne to write an entertainment in support of his attempt to secure a monopoly over the cloth trade ('Spectacular Constructions', pp. 72–3).

- 81 *The Culture of Cloth*, p. 162.
- 82 'Spectacular Constructions', pp. 75–6.
- 83 *The Culture of Cloth*, pp. 154 and 163. She goes so far as to call Munday's approach 'subversive', which may be overstating the case (p. 171).
- 84 *Ibid.*, pp. 162–3. Brenner calls James's support for the Cockayne Project 'an unspeakable betrayal' of the Merchant Adventurers (*Merchants and Revolution*, p. 210).
- 85 Supple, *Commercial Crisis and Change*, p. 34. 'Old drapery' refers to the long-standing trade in high-quality undressed and undyed English broadcloth.
- 86 *Ibid.*
- 87 See *ibid.*, pp. 34 and 39.
- 88 *The Culture of Cloth*, p. 168. It is certainly noteworthy after all the discomfort inherent in Munday's construction of 'Britishness' in *The triumphes of re-united Britania* that by 1614 he has defaulted to calling the nation 'England' once again.
- 89 *The Culture of Cloth*, pp. 168–9; see also Northway, 'To kindle an industrious desire', p. 178.
- 90 'To kindle an industrious desire', p. 176.
- 91 *Pageants and Entertainments*, p. 70 n. 225.
- 92 'Metropolitan resurrection', p. 379 (see also my *Anthony Munday*, p. 146).
- 93 'City metal and country mettle', p. 29. 'Priuate lucre' refers to the fraudulent practices associated with the manufacture and circulation of coinage. Edmund Howe's account of the 1611 ceremony is reproduced in Wortham, 'Sovereign counterfeits', pp. 334–5. The King's goldsmith in 1611 was Hugh Middleton, sponsor of the New River.
- 94 James's policy may have had an impact on the election of Pemberton in 1611, for it was rare for a Goldsmith to become Lord Mayor.
- 95 'City metal', p. 33. Once again Munday's weak classical knowledge lets him down: as Marcus points out, Midas was from Phrygia – King Croesus was from Lydia.
- 96 O'Callaghan offers a similar account of this text (*Thomas Middleton*, p. 97).
- 97 The failure of this match led to widespread celebrations in the City; the parishioners of St Mary Whitechapel even put up a plaque to record their 'thankfulness' that Charles had returned unscathed and unengaged from 'the Dangers of his Spanish Journey' (see Merritt, 'Puritans, Laudians', pp. 952–3). Cressy also discusses the 'spontaneous' and 'improvised' celebrations in London in 1623 of Prince Charles's return from Spain, writing that the Prince's 'participation in the celebration was minimal' (*Bonfires and Bells*, p. 101).
- 98 *Middleton: The Collected Works*, pp. 1767–8.

- 99 This latter text was entered in the Stationers' Register on 13 October 1623, a few days after Taylor's similar work *Brittaines Joy* (Arber, *Transcript*, vol. IV, pp. 67–8).
- 100 Philip Collington suggests that the staged figure of Antonio's dead wife in *The Revenger's Tragedy* is an early example of Middleton's habitual use of the 'animated emblems' which so regularly feature in his mayoral Shows ('A puppet-play', pp. 114–15). His characterisation of Middleton as a writer who 'creates scenes that are visually dazzling, morally edifying, and thematically controversial all at once' can be applied as much to the Shows as to Middleton's plays (*ibid.*, p. 123).
- 101 John Aubrey wrote that 'the time of Sir Walter Raleigh's execution was contrived to be on my Lord Mayor's day, that the pageants and fine shows might avocate and draw away the people from beholding the tragedie of the gallantest worthie that England ever bred' (cited in Fairholt, *Lord Mayors' Pageants*, vol. II, p. 261). One can compare this moment with the timing of Sidney's funeral *vis-à-vis* the execution of Mary, Queen of Scots, in 1588 (see Goldring, 'The funeral of Sir Philip Sidney', pp. 209–10). I have discussed the contemporaneity of *Sidero-Thriambos* elsewhere (see *Anthony Munday*, p. 159).
- 102 Merritt argues that the figure of Elizabeth was invoked in the 1610s–20s as a means of expressing 'anti-Spanish' Protestant feeling and accompanying reservations about James's 'pacific' attitude towards the erstwhile Catholic enemy ('Puritans, Laudians', p. 953). Cressy writes that 'London and rural churches tended to celebrate Elizabeth's accession day more enthusiastically than her successor' (*Bonfires and Bells*, pp. 59–62).
- 103 Indeed, Middleton's first foray into mayoral pageantry, *The triumphs of truth*, has a title notably similar to *The Masque of Truth*, a political masque which takes up a strongly pro-Protestant position towards the imminent marriage between Frederick, the Elector Palatine, and Princess Elizabeth. Norbrook has speculated that Middleton may have written the masque, which was unperformed for disputed reasons. As he points out, Middleton did write another court masque celebrating a Jacobean union, the scandalous marriage of the Earl of Somerset and Frances Carr in December 1613 ('The masque of truth', p. 94).
- 104 *Middleton: The Collected Works*, pp. 1252–3. Although she does acknowledge his 'obvious and ardent anti-Spanish sentiments', I would treat Busino's eyewitness account of the Spaniards in the Show *and* in the crowd with more caution than Levin does, as this would surely have been mediated by his role as chaplain to the *Venetian* ambassador (*ibid.*, p. 1264).
- 105 Squire too refers to 'our foure Kingdoms, England, Scotland, France and Ireland' in *Tes Irenes Trophaea* (sig. B2v).
- 106 Rowland argues that Heywood stresses procedure at this juncture 'because he was aware that this was one company amongst several in

- which artisans were agitating, with increasing intensity as the 1630s wore on, for more extensive participation in the choice of their governors' (*Heywood's Theatre*, p. 305).
- 107 See Drapers MS MB13, fols 163–4. Bergeron helpfully summarises the debate over Barkham's translation in *Middleton: The Collected Works*, pp. 1586–7.
- 108 Bergeron notes that 'Fitzstephen's history of London is included in Stow's *Survey*': perhaps Munday's research was not so extensive as he makes out (*Pageants and Entertainments*, p. 83).
- 109 See my *Anthony Munday*, pp. 166–71.
- 110 According to Hentschell, Taylor may have been following Munday's example (or, given its date, possibly Middleton's) in respect of Fitz-Alwin in *Taylor's pastorall*, an 'historicall and satyricall' work about sheep and shepherds (sig. D2r–v) (*The Culture of Cloth*, p. 170 n. 38).
- 111 This text is unusual too in listing all previous Lord Mayors from the Fishmongers' Company, not just the famous ones (see sig. C1v).
- 112 See Patterson, 'Married to the town', p. 160, for a discussion of the recorder of King's Lynn's 'reservations' about the abilities and religious views of the new mayoral incumbent.
- 113 Manley argues that Middleton's use of the figure of Orpheus in his Show is a compliment to Cockayne's famous eloquence, and he comments on Cockayne's 'complex place' within the 'current political scene' in the early 1620s (*Middleton: The Collected Works*, pp. 1398–9).
- 114 *Ibid.*, p. 1434.
- 115 Middleton may have been foresighted: as we have already seen, Jones fled the City and his creditors before the end of his term of office (see Chapter 2, above).
- 116 Middleton, ed. Bald, *Honourable Entertainments*, p. vi.
- 117 *Middleton and His Collaborators*, p. 12.
- 118 *Ibid.*, p. 13.
- 119 Taylor's loose description of Thomas Middleton, the new Lord Mayor, as a 'Puritan' is rather unhelpful (*Buying Whiteness*, p. 131): for a more nuanced account of Middleton's religio-political preferences, see Welch (rev. Dickie), *Oxford DNB*, 'Myddleton, Sir Thomas'.
- 120 *Middleton and His Collaborators*, p. 13.
- 121 Bromham claims that in this text Middleton is attacking Robert Carr and the Howard faction at court. Dutton writes that this might explain why 'George Chapman, who was identified with court patronage, and especially Robert Carr . . . sneered at Middleton's [1613] pageant' (*Jacobean Civic Pageants*, pp. 138–9). Heywood comes close to the same position in *Londini status pacatus* when 'Nilus' speculates about the likelihood of 'crocodiles' breeding 'here . . . in place and office' (sig. B1v).
- 122 Lobanov-Rostovsky, 'The Triumphs of Golde', p. 887.



- 123 Heinemann, *Puritanism and Theatre*, p. 128. Bribery is also cited as something to abjure in *The sunne in Aries* (sig. B3r).
- 124 ‘Summer 1613’, p. 169. She notes the prevalence of Welsh references in Middleton’s *A Chaste Maid in Cheapside*, produced in the same year (pp. 171–2).
- 125 ‘Something done in honour of the city’, p. 143.
- 126 ‘The Triumphes of Golde’, p. 890. This is a valid reading of Middleton’s text but it is somewhat undercut by Lobanov-Rostovsky’s two problematic assumptions: that City oligarchs were all uniformly hostile to theatricality (a point I have addressed elsewhere), and that the livery companies took subtle dramatic ironies into account when conferring the commissions for Shows. I have seen no evidence of the latter kind of deliberation.
- 127 To contextualise Middleton’s ‘Mammon’s heapes’, Brenner states that ‘a fortune of £10,000 was a minimum requirement for eligibility’ to become a member of the Court of Aldermen (*Merchants and Revolution*, p. 81). William Cockayne left around £72,000 at his death in 1626.
- 128 Rowland, *Heywood’s Theatre*, p. 348.
- 129 *Ibid.*, pp. 340–1.
- 130 Woolf discusses the ubiquity of Robin Hood in forms of popular culture; he points out that ‘Robin featured prominently in May games and morris-dancing’ (*The Social Construction of the Past*, p. 336). Owing to an unduly narrow definition of ‘drama’, however, he does not challenge Malcolm Nelson’s assertion that Robin Hood features only in one work from the early Stuart period, Jonson’s incomplete *The Sad Shepherd*; Munday’s *Metropolis coronata* makes this claim erroneous (‘Of Danes and giants’, pp. 191 and 206 n. 80).
- 131 *Puritanism and Theatre*, p. 127.
- 132 *Thomas Middleton*, p. 92. In *Londini sinus salutis* Heywood pronounces that ‘every Magistrate is a minister vnder God’, an unusual take on the role (sig. B1v).
- 133 *Colonial Transformations*, p. 155.
- 134 Middleton’s treatment of Proby is echoed in the Recorder’s speech at the Exchequer. Finch commented that Proby attained the freedom of the City ‘by guift’, and on the basis that he already had the patronage of the recently deceased Queen Anna. Despite his court connections, though, Finch’s speech makes it clear that Proby’s suitability for the mayoralty derives wholly from his election by his civic peers; royal favour, it is implied, is in itself inadequate (BL Add. MS 18016, fol. 166v).
- 135 *Thomas Middleton*, p. 94.
- 136 *Ibid.*, p. 92. Middleton’s opinionated manner manifests itself elsewhere, too. Rather digressively, he praises Queen Anne, the wife of Richard II, for being the first to introduce riding side-saddle for

- women: 'Who it was that taught 'em [women] to ride stradling', he rages, 'there is no Records so immodest that can shew me, onely the impudent Time, and the open profession' (*The triumphs of loue and antiquity*, sig. C2v).
- 137 Northway has usefully charted the length of the speeches in the Shows in this period, with a noticeable peak in 1613 for *The triumphs of truth* and an equivalent dip for Middleton's next Show in 1617, the shortest in the whole period (see 'To kindle an industrious desire', p. 170).
- 138 *Puritanism and Theatre*, p. 128 n.14; see also *Middleton: The Collected Works*, p. 1254.
- 139 *Puritanism and Theatre*, p. 128.
- 140 *Thomas Middleton*, pp. 93–4.
- 141 Rowland, *Heywood's Theatre*, p. 343. The Lord Mayor himself, Morris Abbot, had been 'a prominent member of the vestry of St Stephen's, Coleman Street', one of the most fervently nonconformist parishes in London (and incidentally, Munday's parish for his last decade or so) (*ibid.*, p. 344). For more on the Abbot family in the 1620s, see Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution*, pp. 224–5.
- 142 *Puritanism and Theatre*, p. 129.
- 143 In some cases the dignitaries celebrated by the Shows did not have unproblematic pasts: Sir Thomas Middleton, for instance, had been committed to Newgate for 'contempt and refusall of his oathe [of Alderman]' ten years before his mayoralty (*Corporation of London Repts*, vol. 26, fol. 159v).
- 144 *The Idea of the City*, p. 149.
- 145 *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*, p. 221.
- 146 For more on Whittington's role in the Mercers' 'corporate memory', see Robertson, 'The adventures of Dick Whittington', p. 61.
- 147 *The Social Circulation of the Past*, p. 314. Henry Machyn, as Woolf notes, misremembered Walworth's notable deed at Smithfield.
- 148 'The politics of pageantry', p. 66.
- 149 Drake and his fellow mariners Hawkins and Frobisher feature in Heywood's 1637 text, *A true description of His Majesties royall ship* (sig. D4r), as they do in Webster's *Monuments of Honor* (sig. A2v).
- 150 Woolf discusses how in this period 'the division of sacred from secular, with respect to the past . . . did not prevent the intermingling of episodes from the Bible with those of classical, medieval or recent history' ('Of Danes and giants', p. 176).
- 151 Howard argues that London-focused plays 'educate[d] playgoers about the lives and deeds of the city elite' (Howard, 'Competing ideologies of commerce', p. 170; see also Wheatley, 'The pocket books of early modern history', pp. 190–2).
- 152 'Spectacular Constructions', p. 86.
- 153 'To kindle an industrious desire', p. 183.

- 154 The gold ship used on this occasion (the Buchintoro) was described by a slightly less partisan witness, Thomas Coryate, as ‘a thing of marvellous worth [and] the richest galley of all the world’ (cited in *Middleton: The Collected Works*, p. 1265).
- 155 ‘Introduction to *Monuments of Honour*’, pp. 233 and 246.
- 156 *The Dragon and the Dove*, p. 131. Behind this denigration of Venice may have lain the reality of ‘the perceptibly declining power’ of Venetian trade in the Mediterranean (Brenner, *Merchants and Revolution*, p. 45).
- 157 An eyewitness account of this Show by one of the party is discussed in Chapter 3. Visitors attending the 1624 Show included members of the Dutch government, in town for negotiations with King James over a truce with Spain.
- 158 Bradbrook comments that the ‘Merlin in the rock’ device for the lost 1610 Show ‘reproduced the [Arthurian] theme of Prince Henry’s Barriers of that same year’ (‘The politics of pageantry’, p. 67).
- 159 Interestingly, Recorder Finch’s speech at the Lord Mayor’s oath-taking in 1624 also emphasises continuity and perpetuity in a way that resembles Webster’s text. After a reference to the raising of ‘Piramids’ that will outlive their builders, his speech expresses a desire that there will be ‘lasting monumentes of [the Lord Mayors’] goodness and greatnes’; the City, he argues with an elegaic note, ‘is still the same, and I hope the honor and dignity of the Citty shall still be the same’ thereafter (BL Add. MS 18016, fol. 185r).
- 160 ‘Introduction to *The Monuments of Honour*’, p. 235 (see also p. 246).