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Planning the look and content of the Shows was a complex and expensive business. Such events, Mulryne has written, ‘represent a remarkable coming-together of organisational and management skills . . . [including] the task of harnessing and co-ordinating the talents of writers, musicians, scenographers, choreographers’, as well as performers.1 In addition, being the creator of a Lord Mayor’s Show was often (although not always) a contested position, where writers and artificers competed with each other for commissions. As well as exploring how the Show was financed and put together (a topic continued in Chapter 3), I will here, in addition, highlight the often-overlooked roles of the artificer and those other craftsmen who contributed so valuably to the day’s entertainment.

The commissioning and organising of the Shows can in themselves tell us a great deal about civic culture in this period. The records demonstrate the relative degrees of importance that the Companies laid on certain aspects of the Shows. They tended to prioritise expenditure on the procession instead of the pageantry – clothing the ‘poor men’ as well as the mayoral party, for instance – and on forms of visual representations of their power and prestige such as decorated banners, streamers, ensigns and so on. Crucially, the livery company documents help to defamiliarise many preconceptions about authorship and collaboration in this period by revealing the ways in which civic pageantry was brought to life by writers working alongside the artificers and others about whom the printed works are often silent. In particular, as we will see, the apparently pedestrian and bureaucratic livery company records are not only full of human incident, but they sometimes provide the only remaining information about what took place on those occasions when either no printed text was produced or none has survived. My practice in this regard therefore echoes that of Kara Northway, who argues that cultural history should be characterised
by a ‘reading [of] nonliterary in addition to literary texts in order to elucidate the attention given to financial and political value in the production of Renaissance occasional drama’. Such an approach is, after all, more in keeping with the ways in which these entertainments were planned and executed.

It must be stressed from the outset that the Lord Mayor’s Show was first and foremost the concern of the Great Twelve livery companies from the ranks of one of which the Lord Mayor was elected, even if, to make this possible, he had transferred quite recently from one of the smaller companies. (See Appendix 2 for the organisation of the linear companies.) The City Corporation dealt only with pageantry, entertainments and hospitality relating to visits from members of the royal family and other non-civic dignitaries, although on those infrequent occasions the set-up was very similar to the approach taken over mayoral Shows. The costs of the Shows fell to individual Company members, whose putative contribution was assessed: for example, in 1604 the highest rank of the Bachelors of the Haberdashers’ Company who were going to be ‘in foins’ (wearing pine-marten fur) paid a charge of £3 6s each, those wearing the more lowly ‘Budge’ (lambs’ wool) £2 10s, and the other members’ various sums from £4 to a few shillings; by 1620 the cost to the Haberdasher’s Company Bachelors in foins had risen to £5 each. To fund these occasions considerable numbers of the Company in question were – voluntarily or not – elevated to the Bachelor rank of the Company. Those who tried to avoid the charge without good cause were fined, and errant members (as we’ll see further below) could be pursued for outstanding contributions for years.

The Companies were assiduous at collecting contributions from their members because their main priority was to ensure that the Lord Mayor’s Show was a suitably splendid reflection of the status of the role it inaugurated. The celebration of the glory reflected on the Company by a mayoral incumbent was often informed by a competitive awareness of what the other Great Twelve were capable of doing, so competition between the Companies also played a part in their preparations. Archer notes that ‘companies tried to outbid each other in the sumptuousness of their display, and kept a jealous eye on the practice of the others’. When the Merchant Taylors heard that the Goldsmiths had purchased an embroidered cloth for their barge, they decided to do the same. The Haberdashers were equally concerned to match the new barge purchased by the Fishmongers in 1638. The civic pride manifested on these occasions
prompted satire from other quarters. Jasper Mayne’s 1639 court play *The citye match*, for instance, parodies such pride in the accoutrements of civic power via a conversation between Ware-house, a city merchant, and Plotwell, his nephew and heir. Ware-house describes his hope that his nephew would rise through the civic oligarchy to reach the ‘Citie Senate’ and take on ‘th’ sword and Cap of Maintenance’. Plotwell in turn mocks his uncle’s desire that he will attend sermons in his ‘Chaine and scarlet’ and that ‘Gates and Conduits will be dated from [his] yeare’ (sig. C1v). Later on in the play another character says to Plotwell ‘I lookt the next Lord Maiors day to see you o’th Livery, or one oth’Batchelour Whiflers’ (sig. G1v).

Mockery aside, the Companies themselves, naturally, took the trappings of mayoral inaugurations – from the ‘Cap of Maintenance’ to the ‘Batchelour Whiflers’ – very seriously, and they devoted personnel as well as money to their realisation. As well as funding the day, the detailed arrangements for the Show were typically the responsibility of the Bachelors of the livery company in question, who delegated the work to a small committee (the Bachelors would previously have taken on this role for the Midsummer Watch). In 1585, for instance, the Skinners gave the responsibility for organising Lord Mayor’s Day to some of the Wardens of the Yeomanry; on this occasion, as was commonplace, they were enjoined to arrange things ‘according as hath byn accustomid for . . . this Companye’. The ‘pageant’ for Lord Mayor’s Day in 1611 was, unusually, under the direction of the more important Wardens of the Goldsmiths’ Company (perhaps this was due to the expected presence of the Queen). Members of the Skinners’ Lord Mayor’s Day committee for 1628 were reimbursed for ‘viewing’ both the pageants and the galley foist, which shows, as was commonplace, that committee members kept a close eye on developments.

This responsibility in itself could be contested. One gains a sense of tension over the negotiations over the 1616 Show, not, as one might expect, between putative candidates for the job of producing the event, but rather between different parts of the Fishmongers’ Company themselves. Representatives of the Fishmongers’ Yeomanry ‘did chalendg to haue the managing of all that busynes to them selves’, and it seems they had to convince the Wardens and Assistants to allow them the role, which had previously been the joint responsibility of both the Yeomanry and the Wardens of the Company. The Yeomanry cited the precedent of the way things had been recently handled by the Drapers’ Company, from whose
ranks the last two Lord Mayors had been elected; this was rebuffed by the starchy response that ‘the presedents of this Companie were quite contrarye’. The new arrangement was eventually assented to, however, on the understanding that no financial call would be made on the Wardens. Flexing their newly gained muscles, the Yeomanry representatives then asked that they be allowed to ‘prefer on Cley, a carver and shipwright’ the job of making the ‘fishing busse’ (fishing boat) that the Company had already begun to negotiate with Munday (i.e. that Munday be required to subcontract this work to their candidate, Cley). Cley was ordered to present a ‘plott’ of the ship to the Wardens for their approval.¹¹ (I will explore further aspects of his particular commission below.)

The more common form of competition between potential writers and artificers was not inevitable but was probably encouraged by the Companies to ensure they got the best deal.¹² This perhaps was the cause of the ‘envy’ mentioned in the printed texts of Shows by both Middleton and Munday. In the dedication of *Sidero-Thriambos* Munday states his hope that the Ironmongers appreciate his efforts ‘in the despight of enuy, and calumnious imputations’, suggesting that someone had tried to impugn his reputation (sig. A3r). Sullivan claims that the companies ‘asked and paid for two or three sketches [of the Show] . . . and withheld payment if the final performance was not up to standard’.¹³ She has slightly over-simplified the way the business was carried on, however. There weren’t unsuccessful parties on every occasion, for one thing. In 1629, for instance, Dekker and Christmas were asked to present the Company with their ‘plot’ in order to agree a fee. There is no sign of a competitor: the Ironmongers seem to have settled on Dekker and Christmas as early in the year as August and then negotiated the sums involved. Much the same method seems to have applied in 1609, where again the Ironmongers’ Company simply requested ‘to see a plott drawne for the pageant’ and ‘the devise of the speeches’.¹⁴ In addition, on those rare occasions when their disappointment with what took place on the day was considerable the Companies only ever withheld part of the fee. Middleton and Christmas, for instance, only had their payment for some aspects of the production ‘putt of’ by the Drapers in 1626 due to an ‘ill performance’.¹⁵

Whatever the vagaries of the process, commissions of this kind were evidently sought after, for the Companies paid quite handsomely (within limits, as we’ll see below), and the Shows carried considerable prestige. Where there had been a sizeable gap between mayors for any particular Company those generally employed on
these occasions did not hesitate to make themselves known to the prospective employer. Writers and artificers presented ‘plots’, and those who undertook other roles made overtures to the Company.

For example, the keeper of Blackwell Hall (the City’s main cloth market) was present at the Fishmongers’ Court in October 1616, where he ‘made the house acquaynted, that the use and manner is, that the pageants on the Lord Maior’s day of tryumphe be sett there [i.e. in his Hall] . . . for which use of the house his usuall allowance is xls. which he desireth to have’.

Sometimes it is impossible now to tell what kind of competition and negotiation had gone on. In 1611, for instance, Munday simply appears as de facto ‘poet’ in the Goldsmiths’ Court Minutes. Similarly, and even more tantalisingly, when in September 1615 the Drapers established a sub-committee to ‘take viewe and consideracon of suche plotts and shewes as are offered to be of service to this Companie’, they were simply required to report back to the Court of Assistants. Any evidence of the identity of the other candidates for the commission – and evidently there were some – along with the Drapers’ deliberations which lead to Munday’s selection, have left no trace in the records. This is not to say that the Companies made their selection, when a selection was to be made, on the basis of specifically aesthetic considerations, or at least the kind of aesthetic considerations valued by modern commentators. As Dutton remarks, ‘visual effects and ingenious stagings seem eventually to have carried more weight with the [livery companies’] committees than the dramatists’ “inventions”’. With the political imperatives inherent in the Shows, as he points out, ‘the need to dazzle doubtless always ran ahead of calls for intellectual complexity’.

‘The need to dazzle’ invariably resulted in a concomitant need to be seen to spend lavishly; no Company wanted it to look as it had stinted on the celebrations. At the same time, the companies were habitually concerned to demonstrate that their mayoral festivities were rooted in long-standing tradition, although, as we’ll see below (in the context of a society which did not have our modern concept of ‘inflation’) this was sometimes a disguise for mere economy. Northway writes that ‘the liveries “interpreted” remuneration by searching their own and other liveries’ financial records to discover the original prices paid for work on drama and thus to restrict prices’. This practice had the desired effect: as Palmer remarks, ‘payments remained static often for years at a stretch’. The year 1609, for example, was the year of the first Ironmonger Lord Mayor since the 1560s. The Company explicitly went back to inspect the
'charges of the pageant in former tymes whereout a computation may be had of the Charge present’. This search revealed that ‘Mr Peele’ (the elder) had in 1566 received 30s ‘for his invention of speeches & paines’ and that the making of the pageant cost £18. The expense of the Show had increased considerably in almost fifty years so one wonders if the chief purpose of these earlier costings was simply to keep costs down. In the event, Munday’s agreement for ‘the setting out of the pageant’ and his other jobs came to £45, a reasonable although not munificent increase on 1566, and Grinkin received the same sum. More realistically, in 1619, after a gap of more than twenty years since their last Lord Mayor, the Skinners requested information from the Ironmongers on their expenses for the previous year’s Show (the request was granted). The Merchant Taylors paid ‘Ricknor [a clerk?] for the Coppie of a [precedent] from the Haberdashers’ in 1602, which may have been for the same purpose, as the two previous years’ Lord Mayors had been Haberdashers.

On those occasions when Companies were being unusually generous, they highlighted the fact in their minutes. In 1611 the Goldsmiths, for instance, recorded ‘a more liberall benevolence than hath bene formerlie granted to any Lord Maior of this Companie’ when they bestowed two hundred marks on James Pemberton towards his mayoral expenditure. This generosity should be considered in the context of the great wealth of the Goldsmiths, of course, and the fact that they had only two mayoral inaugurations to fund in this period: Richard Martin in 1589 and James Pemberton in 1611. With these infrequent exceptions, the Companies clearly had an eye to expense as much as spectacle, for in both 1633 and 1635 Heywood and members of the Christmas family received commissions in preference to John Taylor and Robert Norman by underbidding the latter by just £10. As Northway comments, ‘no flat rate existed for the dramatist’. The year 1595 appears to be the first in which Company records show a writer making a suit for the commission. ‘Mr Pele’ (George Peele) was appointed by the Skinners, and it was agreed that there would be a ‘lusarne’ [lynx], a pageant and a ‘moscovitor’. The Skinners’ Court minutes do not mention whether Peele had had any competitors for his ‘sute’. In general terms, the preliminary stage of the process, it would seem, would be to request a ‘plot’ for the pageantry from the would-be producer(s) – this is certainly what happened both in 1609 and in 1619, when Munday vied with Middleton for the work – but that is not to say that at every juncture more than one plot was
Writers, artificers and livery companies

evaluated, at least as far as the Companies’ archives can tell us. It is, however, certainly the case that writers and/or artificers (and sometimes other parties) were often offered money for unsuccessful bids. Mr Taylor and the Poet were given £5 by the Skinners in 1628 when they lost out to Dekker and Christmas, and the Grocers similarly reimbursed Munday and Dekker with ‘benevolences’ in 1613. The latter accounts state that Munday was paid ‘for his paines in drawing a project for this busynes which was offered to the Comytttees’: Munday received £5 and Dekker £4 ‘for the like’. These are not inconsiderable sums, and suggest that both disappointed suitors had done a lot of work in anticipation of the commission. It is also testament to the kudos associated with the Shows that at least three professional writers should vie for the role.

Sullivan makes the useful point that ‘payments [made] by a corporate body’ (such as a livery company) were undertaken in a semi-public way and documented as such in the companies’ records, making it more straightforward to determine the ‘market rate’ for cultural productions such as the Lord Mayor’s Show. Indeed, as we’ll see further below, if the Merchant Taylors had not kept such carefully itemised accounts we would know very little about their 1602 and 1610 Shows. Writers and artificers were also sometimes recompensed when the Show did not take place at all. In 1630, for instance, the Merchant Taylors’ accounts state that 20s was ‘given and paid by the consent of the Committees to Thomas Decker the Poett for his service offered to the Companie if any Pageants had been made’. There was, however, the usual triumphal procession that year, as well as the city waits playing, cannons in barges, and so on, although the total outlay was considerably less than in other years.

Twenty shillings is not all that generous: back in 1569 James Peele and Peter Baker (a painter-stainer, possibly the son of Richard Baker who worked with Peele on the 1566 Show) received 26s 8d ‘for the devise of a pageant, which tok none effecte’.

The Companies’ normal method of confining the detailed arrangements to a sub-committee means that little is generally recorded about the discussions relating to the commission, nor, in most cases, about the nature of the pageantry once the commission had been agreed (the Court of Assistants, whose deliberations were recorded, tended to concentrate almost exclusively on how to recoup the expense of the Show from Company members).

On infrequent occasions, though, the process was sufficiently transparent and recorded in enough detail for us to see the negotiations in action. In 1619 the Skinners’ Company note that Middleton
competed successfully with two other ‘poets’ for their Show: ‘Anthonie Mondaie, Thomas Middleton and Richard Grimston poetts, all shewed to the table their severall plotts for devices for the shewes and pagentes against St Symon and St Judes tide and each desired to serve the Companie’. A decision was not made then and there on this occasion, but instead ‘it was wholie referred to the Consideracon of the Committee formerlie Appointed for busines of the like nature and they are to make Choice of whome they shall best approve of’. The Court of Assistants and the Wardens reserved the right to ‘ratifi  e and allowe’ the consequent decision but made it clear that they wanted no part in the process beyond this. One unfortunate consequence of the Skinners’ arrangement at this juncture is that the subsequent planning – especially how the decision was arrived at to give the job to Middleton – is now lost to us. For cultural critics this is especially vexing: how interesting would it be to have seen how the Companies evaluated the various protagonists’ aptitude for the role.

There are exceptions, fortunately. The Ironmongers’ Company records are extraordinarily full. In 1609, for instance, its Court minutes list twenty-seven items for action of various members, and rather than simply stating that all should be done ‘as is fit’ in the usual manner, they actually explain the requirements. The level of detail is such that we can see exactly what the child actors’ ‘breakfast’ was on the day, since the Company reproduced Munday’s itemised bill. More significantly, their records for 1629 and 1635 also give a more extensive flavour of the bidding process in action than those of the other Companies; indeed, they are detailed enough to allow us virtually to re-enact the negotiations. Some three weeks before the Show, at a meeting on 2 October 1635, Robert Norman and John Taylor presented their ‘project of 5 pageantes for the Lord Maiors shewe for which they demanded 190li and under that price they would not undertake it’. Their intransigence about their fee (feigned or not) did them no favours, however, as their competitors, Heywood and John Christmas, stepped in with ‘their Invencion of 5 pageante for the said shewe . . . which Pageante they offered to make furnish well & suffi  ciently . . . for 180li’. As before, the unsuccessful candidates received compensation for their pains. Hard bargaining appears to be a feature of the commissioning process, for £180 is £20 less than Dekker and Christmas managed to extract from the Haberdashers seven years before. (£180, the sum often received by the writer and artificer in this period, is around £16,000 in modern terms.) On the other hand, the Ironmongers’ Company generously
offered Munday £3 more than his negotiated fee ‘as a free guift’ in 1618 owing to the ‘good performance of his business undertaken and of the spoyling of his Pageant apparaile by the foule weather’. Northway cites this as an instance of the Companies’ tendency to treat payment or reimbursement as ‘tips’: she points out that the ‘free guift’ ‘must have compensated for some of the income he lost from replacing damaged costumes and thus did not supplement his pay’.

The beneficence demonstrated here compares interestingly with what happened to Munday nine years previously, where he was called into the same Ironmongers’ Court to be rebuked for his failings. The charge was that ‘the children weare not instructed their speeches . . . the Musick and singinge weare wanting, [and] the apparell [was] most of it old and borrowed’. He was warned, ominously, that the matter would be dealt with on the return of ‘Mr Leats’, one of the Company wardens. Typically impervious to common sense, a few days later, in the presence of Mr Leats, Munday claimed a further £5 over his agreed fee of £45 on the basis that he had written additional speeches ‘for the water [show]’. The Ironmongers responded by reminding him that ‘he performed not his speeches on land, nor the rest of his contracted service’, and refused to ‘goe beyond their bargaine’. The message seems to have been that Munday should consider himself lucky to get any payment at all, and one wonders how he thought he would get away with this request. At the same time, looking at the list of complicated devices he and his collaborators agreed to provide, including ‘2 persons upon a flyenge dragon and unicorne . . . [and] an Ocean about wherein shall moove Mermaides, Tritons & playeng on instrumentes and singing’, it is perhaps unsurprising that he and Grinkin fell short, as the original brief may have been over-ambitious. Munday, in particular, knowing that the fee was often negotiable, was an inveterate seeker after extra payments. When he made the same kind of request of the Fishmongers a few years later as repayment for 200 additional books and some damaged clothing he had to settle for a lesser amount than he had demanded.

Munday’s behaviour illustrates Northway’s comment that the writers ‘signed contracts written in the livery language of favors and service and took advantage of the implications of this language regarding parting gifts’. As Hirschfeld points out in connection to the professional stage, relations between the various protagonists can be described as ‘companionship and collegiality . . . inflected with a distinctly commercial flavor’. Such a trade-off between
‘service’ and monetary self-interest characterises the actions of all the parties when it came to the commissioning of the Shows.

The financial aspects of the Shows were never far from the surface, for the honour and prestige of the mayoralty came at a cost to the Companies, all the more so because of the expectations incumbent on them in terms of hospitality. As Heal writes, ‘members of the oligarchy had to show an appropriate face to the outside world’; the lavish dinner held on Lord Mayor’s Day was, she continues, an opportunity ‘to articulate both collective reputation and the honour due to particular sectors of the society’ and its ‘main function’ was ‘the integration of the companies who formed the basis of the freeman body into the celebration [of the mayoral inauguration]’. Corporate feasting was an important ‘bonding’ activity for the Companies. However, sometimes the face presented to the wider world was a brave one in the face of adversity. As Griffiths has argued, ‘civic pageants and parades dazzled in times when London’s prestige was said to have slumped to an all-time low, a counter-rhythm to doom and gloom’. Admission to the rank of Bachelor was considered an honour, but one suspects that many of those elevated to that rank as a money-raising measure in the run-up to a mayoral inauguration, whose names are listed so proudly in Company minutes, were not always entirely willing. It is unsurprising, then, as Archer writes, that ‘each time that a triumph was held there were difficulties in inducing men to serve as bachelors and pay the assessments that financed the costly celebrations . . . [O]ften defaulters had to be brought before the Mayor before their compliance was secured.’

Considerable anxiety on this score emanates from the Skinners’ Court minutes in the late sixteenth century, when the Company had three Lord Mayors in twelve years as well as substantial building works to pay for. Its minutes show that it was prepared to go to some lengths to ensure that its members paid their share of the expenses: in 1585 (and again in 1595) it was recorded that obstinate defaulters would ‘forthwith . . . be committed to prisone’ until they paid up. Even in 1619 more overt concern is expressed by this Company than is generally the case over how ‘money [is] to be provided for the lord maiors shewes’. Here again, with the prospect of ‘great expenses and somes of money’ to be paid out, it was twice ordered that all those eligible for the freedom of the Company should present themselves at the Hall or face the consequences. In 1597 the Skinners, who were under particular financial pressure owing to the rebuilding of their hall, complained that ‘dyvers menes
sonnes and servants . . . do not come into the said Company to be made free’. This meant that they were suffering from a shortage of funds because of an under-supply of Bachelor freemen, who contributed the lion’s share of the money required to stage a Show. Fines of £5 were proposed to ‘encourage’ members to enter their apprentices to the freedom. Almost two years after the 1619 Show the Skinners were still pursuing ‘delinquents’. Conversely, the Wardens of the Yeomanry of the Clothworkers had to wait almost a year to be reimbursed for £5 they spent in 1633 ‘towards the shewes and trymphyes late done and performed on the day of the late Lord Mayor’. The Skinners’ Company’s accounts for 1628 show that the Assistants paid the large sum of £50 each, the liverymen over £21 and some of the Bachelors £6 towards the cost of the celebrations. One of the Clothworkers ‘stubbornlie refused’ to perform his role of bachelor in budge for the 1583 inauguration, and was sent to gaol for his intransigence. Wealthier companies obviously found it less of a struggle to raise the funds. The Merchant Taylors, for example, managed to accumulate over £1000 for their third mayor in less than a decade. In 1610 they received from their members ‘threescore two poundes fyve shillinges and threepence’ more than they spent for the Show.

Even so, and although the Company members probably experienced reflected glory on these occasions, the claim in the Goldsmiths’ Court minutes that some 50 members of the Company, as well as ‘a great number of the yeomanry’, ‘gave an assured shew of their willingness’ to pay their share for the 1611 Show gives one the sense of an official line. A more realistic notion of the call on Companies’ finances, perhaps, lies behind the decision by the City Corporation to exempt the Clothworkers from the precept assessing them for £55 10s to pay their part of the pageantry laid on for the King of Denmark’s entry into the City in 1606, on the specific grounds that the Company was ‘shortlie to be at greate chardges concerninge the new lo. maior’. As well as reusing extant pageant devices, another common tactic to keep the costs under control was to set aside the same sum for a particular expense every time a mayoral Show came around, in the guise, naturally, of tradition instead of economy. Thus, for instance, in 1628 the Skinners budgeted £50 for the ‘trymmimg up’ of the new Lord Mayor’s house ‘according to an ancient order’, just as it had over twenty years previously. The rather less impecunious Merchant Taylors conferred 100 marks on William Craven on the basis that this sum had been given to two preceding mayors of its Company. These instances temper Dekker’s
claim in Britannia’s honor that for mayoral inaugurations ‘Faire, Spacious, and Pallacious Houses [are] Beautified, Painted, and Adorned’ (sig. A4r). One should remember, too, that the mayoral role (as with the roles of alderman and sheriff) was ‘an office of charge’ where the incumbent would have had to make considerable financial outlay during his time in office.\textsuperscript{64} Munday reminded James Pemberton in 1611 that although ‘prodigality’ is a ‘crime’, all the same, the role of Lord Mayor’s ‘forbids ye now to pinch or spare, / But to be liberall, franke, and free, / Such as beseemes a Maioraltie’ (Chruso-thriambos, sig. C4r).\textsuperscript{65} The Lord Mayor was supposed to hold virtually an open house during his term, which was sometimes a difficult balancing act. Bald, quoting John Chamberlain, states that Francis Jones, Lord Mayor in 1620, found the cost of bearing the mayoralty too great: ‘to escape his creditors, he decamped on the night before his term of office expired, “conveying all of worth out of his house, and he and his wife into some secret corner of the countrie”’.\textsuperscript{66} In so doing Jones had betrayed the trust laid on him during the Show that he would ‘execute [his] charge’ with ‘honor’d care’ (Tes Irenes Trophaea, sig. B4r). Somewhat unsurprisingly, Jones was subsequently to be absent – he was ‘excused’ owing to an apparent ‘sudden infirmity’ – when his successor, Edward Barkham, took his oath in 1621.\textsuperscript{67} In contrast, Barkham’s ‘greate bounty and hospitallity . . . feastes and entertainments’ were highlighted by the Recorder of London when he was presented to the Barons of the Exchequer on the latter occasion.\textsuperscript{68}

Unexpected vicissitudes had to be dealt with at times too. The Bachelors of the Merchant Taylors’ Company had to contribute more than usual in 1605, when Leonard Holliday’s Show was repeated on All Saints Day in November owing to ‘very wett and fowle weather’. Further costs on this occasion included ‘repaying the Pageant, and the rest of the other shewes’, rebuying the apparel for the child actors, purchasing coal for fires to dry out the pageants, and so on.\textsuperscript{69} The Goldsmiths found themselves in a similarly difficult situation in 1611. They had already decided that the waterborne procession would contain only the barges and the usual galley foist and ‘no extraordinarie shewes’ but had to revisit the arrangement when it became ‘certain’ that Queen Anna ‘in her royal person will . . . see those shewes and triumphes, aswell on the land as by water’. Various ‘alien’ and domestic goldsmiths saved the day by agreeing to contribute to the extra expenses.\textsuperscript{70} This ‘new devise for the shew on the water’ was then hastily cobbled together and approved by the Company only four days before the Show.\textsuperscript{71}
No hint of the Goldsmiths’ discomfort made its way into Munday’s text, however.

‘Partners in the business’: the collaborative commission

As these scenarios demonstrate, writers worked alongside artificers, and, once the role of the latter had become more significant, they usually contested and took on commissions as teams. There is ample evidence to disprove Richard Grupenhoff’s assertion that ‘from the start the playwright was the most important member of the creative team, for it was he who produced the script and set the tone of the show, while the artificer had only to mount it’.

Grupenhoff seems to be in thrall to the dominant post-Romantic attitude to literary production, which, as Osteen and Woodmansee write, ‘downplays the social aspect of writing to foreground its individual aspects [and] figures it as essentially solitary and originary rather than collaborative’.

As Hirschfeld writes in relation to the masque, ‘the relatively insignificant place of written or spoken text in comparison to scenic, musical, and costume display, should challenge any priority granted to the writer’.

Barbara Ravelhofer argues in a similar fashion that ‘a lingering contempt for the “body” [i.e. the physical aspects of the entertainment] seems to have been passed on to masque scholarship’, and, by extension, the scholarship associated with early modern performance more widely. Her own research has demonstrated how impressive and important the ‘architecture’ of the masque was, and the same principle applies to the Shows. Henslowe’s Diary and other contemporary documents demonstrate that those pageant writers who had personal experience of dramatic collaboration prior to their involvement in the Shows include Dekker, Munday, Middleton, Heywood and Webster: Hirschfeld calls Dekker, in particular, a ‘veteran collaborator’.

In some cases they had worked with each other at the Rose and/or Fortune, as I discuss further below. In all these cases (bar that of Munday, whose involvement in mayoral pageantry began unusually early), writing Shows came late to the dramatists’ careers. Working in tandem with non-dramatic collaborators was thus unlikely to have been all that unusual an experience for them; quite the reverse, in fact.

Dekker wrote in Brittanbia’s honor that ‘it would puzzle a good memory to reckon vp all those Trades-men (with other extraordinary Professions which liue not in the City) who get money by this Action’, by which he means from the making of the Shows (sigs A3v–4r). The livery company records bear out his claim, as well
as Inga-Stina Ewbank’s argument that, compared to the role of the ‘poet’, the Companies ‘would pay possibly even more attention to the artificer who was to construct the edifices, chariots and strange beasts’.\(^77\) As Northway writes, it is important to ‘acknowledge this larger network, [as] we could [then] begin to trace in the archives the names of less well known participants, such as painters, tailors, and upholsterers who might have moved easily among the liveries and the theaters’.\(^78\) Exploring these ‘concrete fields of production’, in Hirschfeld’s useful phrase, helps us rediscover the role of what she calls ‘the material contexts as well as the personal interests that structured the choices and chances’ of those most involved in the making of the Shows.\(^79\) I’ll return to the particular issue of ‘personal interests’ and the associated personal connections later in this chapter. What is for sure is that the examination of any Great Twelve livery company archive from this period demonstrates that such collaboration was integral to the Shows. In 1611, for instance, Grinkin, the painter-stainer, provided all of the numerous properties and ‘devises’ whilst Munday supplied apparel, produced ‘fitt and apt speeches’, ‘cause[d] 500 booke[s] . . . to be made and printed’ and had general responsibility for the whole event.\(^80\) As Pafford has commented, ‘their functions overlapped . . . Munday’s overall “devising” was usually done with his partner Grinkin’: one cannot image the event taking place without the work of these two men in tandem.\(^81\) It is also important not to overstate the pre-eminence of the apparently more ‘glamorous’ activity of the writers, at least as far as the sponsoring Companies were concerned. After all, as Northway asserts, ‘the primary expenses from a pageant came not from scripting, but from putting on the performance, such as acquiring and feeding actors, providing props and costumes, and building sets’.\(^82\)

Henry Turner’s analysis of the meanings of the word ‘plot’ in this period is enlightening here. He comments that the near-synonyms ‘design’ and ‘plot’ (both of which were terms regularly used for the plans for mayoral Shows) ‘carried intellectual and mechanical connotations simultaneously’.\(^83\) In other words, for civic entertainments as much as for plays, the term ‘plot’ does not signify solely the ‘literary’ or ‘artistic’ content of the Show; rather, it incorporates both elements needed to bring the design to life. Indeed, it is impossible to separate them, as we see in the Shows from Peele onwards. The latter referred to the ‘Mechanicall or Liberall’ aspects of the Show being combined ‘to honour London with [their] skill’ (The deuice, sig. Aiiv). There is also evidence of this dual approach in the ‘plot’
cited below, which bears out Turner’s conclusion that ‘action is given form within the material attributes of both stage and page’. Turner’s interpretation compares interestingly to the view of one contemporary writer, Jonson, whose view tended to be that there was a hierarchical distinction between what could be called ‘the body’ of a staged performance, created by the artificer (‘short-liu’d’, as he puts it, and appealing to the senses) and its ‘soul’, created by the poet (designed to appeal to the understanding). The former, more ‘artisanal’ part of the equation, also had connections to ‘plat’, ‘the technical term for the schematic working drawings used by the mason, carpenter and surveyor’. This highlights again the importance of physical construction in the realisation of the Shows. The artificer or other chief collaborator was often, for obvious reasons, a member of a trade relevant to the making of a Show: for instance, Robert Norman, who worked with John Taylor in 1634 and with Dekker and Garret Christmas in 1628, was free of the Painter-Stainers; the ubiquitous Garret Christmas was a carpenter.

As time wore on, the term generally used by the Companies for the writer was the rather grand ‘poet’. There is an irony here, of course, given that at the same time Jonson was striving to establish a literary reputation for himself based on the grounds that he was a ‘poet’ whereas Middleton, for instance, was but a ‘base fellow’. Although the Companies clearly saw things differently, in what Taylor calls Jonson’s ‘textual hierarchy’, pageant writing did not qualify a writer to enter the exalted realm of the poet. Robertson and Gordon draw an analogy between the author and artificer of the Show, and the author and designer of the masque, such as Jonson and Inigo Jones. Jonson’s falling-out with his erstwhile collaborator demonstrates the potential tension in the relationship between poet and artificer, in Jonson’s case anyway. The lack of stable boundaries between the major protagonists’ responsibilities is again demonstrated by the case of the 1623 Show, where Munday and Middleton collaborated, albeit, it seems, at a remove from each other: the Drapers’ accounts record separate payments to the two writers, Munday for the ‘Argoe’ and Middleton for the ‘shewes’. Both were already known as ‘poets’, of course. Unlike those of some of his peers Munday’s printed texts tend to have just ‘Written by’ on their title pages rather than ‘Devised and written by’, which gives some indication of the fluid categories at work within the context of these entertainments. David Norbrook cites an instance from 1613 where the writer of a celebratory text ‘did not . . . devise the themes of the pageantry but merely wrote the description’. The possibility
of such a division of labour taking place in the context of mayoral Shows is always worth keeping in mind. The face that a single name appears on a printed work does not necessarily mean that uncomplicated authorship, or sole authorship, occurred.

On the evidence of the Companies’ commissioning practices, the artificer’s profile rose throughout this period. By the 1630s John and Matthias Christmas (the sons of Garret) received the commission and ‘subcontracted’ Heywood as the writer. Thus in both 1638 and 1639 the Christmas brothers were required by the Drapers to ‘discharge Mr Thomas Hayward the Poet for writing the booke’ out of their total remuneration. For the 1635 Show, although the company records state that ‘Thomas Haywood’ subscribed his name with his collaborator, he did not actually sign the agreement with the Ironmongers, leaving that responsibility to the Christmas brothers. It is possible that Heywood was not even present at Ironmongers’ Hall when the contract was agreed. Similarly, Garret Christmas was paid £200 by the Haberdashers for ‘pageants and shewes’ in 1627; as with Heywood, Dekker’s name does not appear in the Company accounts in this instance. The Clothworkers negotiated directly with ‘Mr Christmas Carver towchinge the providinge of such pageants as shalbe on the day of the Lord Mayor elect his presentm’ at Westm’ in 1633; their accounts show charges for dinner following a ‘meetinge and conference . . . with Mr Christmas towchinge the shewes and triumphes’. Again, Heywood is not mentioned.

However, both Dekker and Garret Christmas are listed as being in attendance at a meeting at the house of one of the Ironmongers’ Company officials on 17 September 1629. They were also mentioned in the minutes of, although apparently not present at, an earlier Court of Wardens’ meeting in August, where they were granted the commission for that year’s Show. It’s worth pausing here, for on the later occasion the Ironmongers’ characteristically comprehensive records allow us to see the negotiations over the contents and cost of a Show in process. The negotiations of September 1629 put some flesh on the bones of Heywood’s passing remark in Londini emporia that in the early planning stages the Company perused his ‘then unperfect’ papers and made suggestions about how the ‘plot’ might be realised. Thus, much as a dramatist may have offered a theatre company an outline of their proposed play – such an outline was also, one should note, called a ‘plot’ by Henslowe, for one – Dekker and Christmas are reported to have presented the assembled citizens with
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2 Extract from the Ironmongers’ Company records (1629):
the commissioning process

a plott wherein was contayned 6 seuerall pageantes Namely A Sea Lyon
2 Sea Horses
An Estridge
Lemnions forge
Tempe or the Field of hapiness
7 Liberall Sciences.

The first two items are bracketed together (appropriately enough, given the kind of animals mentioned) as ‘for the Water’, i.e. to form part of the pageantry to accompany the barges down-river (see Figure 2). Although ‘wherein was contained’ does not disclose all that much about the way in which this ‘plott’ was presented, it seems most likely that it would have been simply a summary outline of the nature of the various pageants, albeit one written in sufficient detail for the Company to be able to make a judgement about it. The speeches themselves (the content of which is hardly ever mentioned in the Companies’ records, giving further weight to my theory) often would have required some research into topics
like the history of the Company and were as a result unlikely to have been written before the bid was accepted; furthermore, a writer might have been wasting their time had they produced such advanced content for a purely speculative bid. In this account of the 1629 negotiations a side note states that the pageants had been agreed for the sum of £180, although the minutes themselves disclose that some haggling had taken place: ‘for the accomplishing thereof’ the pair had ‘demanded 200 which theis present conceived to be an overvalue and thereupon offered them 180’. The payment was to include, _inter alia_, organising children and their apparel for the speeches, the ‘Greenmen’, fireworks, porters for both land and water-shows, and ‘to give the Company 500 bookes of the declara-
tion of the said Shewe’. The Company further demanded that the sealion, seahorses and ostrich be ‘brought into the Hall (after the Solemnity)’; Christmas requested that he be allowed to keep the seahorses for himself, which was agreed. (These animal figures, as can be seen further in Chapter 3, and as on this occasion, were almost invariably models, often made of wood: ‘Sea Horses’ refers to the mythical beasts that accompanied marine deities, not to the actual creatures we know as seahorses: see Booth’s drawing of the 1629 water show, _Figure 12_.) Four men were also appointed to help Christmas transport the pageant properties to the Company Hall. The quasi-legal, binding nature of this discussion is emphasised by the fact that both Dekker and Christmas signed the minutes to confirm their agreement (see _Figure 3_). Christmas appears once again in the Ironmongers’ Court minutes later in October 1629 to request an additional ‘allowance’ for ‘theis thinges following as is usually allowed by other Companies’, including ‘8 guides for the pageants . . . for the lighting of the Shewes from Paules 4 [dozen] of Torches . . . [and] 2 scarfes for himselfe and his sonne’. 

Apart from that, the finer details of the actual pageantry were left to Dekker and Christmas to bring to fruition. For the rest of September and October the Company’s attention then turned primarily to which roles were to be performed by its members on the day, from the wearing of budge and foins to the entertaining of guests. This is not to say that the Company washed its hands of the Show once Dekker and Christmas were commissioned, however: it appeared to take the whole business very seriously, meeting regularly throughout October (as the month drew on, sometimes more than once a day) to discuss various matters. Indeed, it was still finishing off its business into the following January, when various absentee Bachelor members were fined for their non-appearance. As
 Extract from the Ironmongers’ Company records (1629): the commissioning process
usual, the Company retained the responsibility for practical matters to do with marshals, whifflers (attendants employed to keep the way clear), porters to carry the banners, and so on, as well as for drummers, fife-players, ensign bearers, and other participants in the procession who were not strictly part of the pageantry. Individuals ‘from the Artillery Garden’ were appointed to deal with this aspect of the day’s entertainment. Company members themselves had a variety of roles to perform, from forming the procession in foins and budge, through to acting as stewards and whifflers or welcoming and serving the guests at the feast. Indeed, going by the relative levels of expenditure devoted to each facet of the inauguration, it appears that for the Companies the procession of civic dignitaries was the most important part of Lord Mayor’s Day; theatrical pageantry comes across generally as rather ancillary. Their accounts demonstrate that assessing their members for the contributions required to participate in the procession, and spending large sums on fabric for those processing (from the mayoral party to the ‘poor men’), were their two major preoccupations (I return to this subject in Chapter 3).

These multi-faceted enterprises were often organised surprisingly quickly. As we have already seen, the general pattern was to start arranging the celebrations only a few weeks before Lord Mayor’s Day, owing to the fact that the new Lord Mayor was elected on 29 September (although these elections were generally a formality, since it was the senior alderman who had not passed the chair who was elected). (‘Below’ or ‘beneath’ the chair refers to a City alderman who had not yet served as Lord Mayor; one who had ‘passed the chair’ had served as Lord Mayor.) Middleton praised Garret Christmas’s skill at putting together ‘the Fabricke or Structure of the whole Tryumph, in so short a time’ in *The triumphs of health and prosperity* (sig. B4r). Unusually, however, the Grocers started making arrangements for the 1613 Show as early as February, although there was a disingenuous pretence for some months that these arrangements were merely preparatory for whenever a member of the Company was next elected Lord Mayor. The Grocers would, nevertheless, have been fairly sure that one of their members was to be given the honour; they even had the ceiling and wainscot of the Hall painted ‘just in case’. In February the Wardens and Assistants were instructed to consider the necessary arrangements and report back to the Court, and the committee was accordingly established in March. The preparations were especially elaborate and prolonged: the Grocers were still nominating sub-committees
and appointing a treasurer months later. Munday, ever alert to an opportunity, clearly tried to get a head start, as he had already offered the Company a ‘Devise or project’ by February. He had to share the eventual commission with Middleton, however.

The Goldsmiths, too, began their planning early in 1611. In April of that year orders were made that the Company banners be repainted and trimmed, and by July Richard Kemby, painter-stainer, had agreed to supply various pavises (large shields), trumpet banners and the like. John Lowin was asked to liaise with Munday over the part of ‘Leofstane’, which implies that the speeches, at least, as Pafford points out, were available to be consulted on 3 September, when Lowin was present at Goldsmiths’ Hall. On this occasion Munday was more successful than in 1613, having prepared the ground with a presentation of a copy of his *Briefe chronicle*, which was rewarded by a generous gratuity from the Goldsmiths on the grounds that he had ‘remembered the worthie antiquity of the Companye’. Indirectly, one can suppose, this also furthered his cause when it came to gaining the commission for Pemberton’s Show, although Munday’s tactics in this regard did not always work. Despite the fact that he ‘name-checks’ both of the high-profile aldermen John Swinnerton and Thomas Middleton in *Chruso-thriambos* as ‘most worthy Gentlemen’, he was not commissioned to write either of the next two Shows on their behalf.

As the preceding discussion has demonstrated, the Company records are an under-used source of information. For one thing, it is sometimes possible to reconstruct aspects of a Show from livery company records where the printed text of the entertainment has not survived. For the early years such testimony is vital. All we know about Cuthbert Buckle’s inauguration in 1593, for instance, is that there was evidently at least a procession to the Tower (as it was a plague year the usual journey to Westminster was curtailed, a fact alluded to by the Recorder of London when the oath-taking at the Exchequer was revived the following year). The Vintners itemised their expenditure, which included banners with silk fringes (one for the Lord Mayor and one for the Company), the hire of five dozen javelins, numerous blue coats and gowns, other fabric and ten dozen torches. No mention is made of actual pageantry in the Company accounts for that year. The Lord Mayor himself received £300 ‘towards his charges’. Less comprehensive, but still revealing, are the Clothworkers’ accounts for 1606, another year with no printed Show. There was evidently some limited pageantry ordered for this occasion, including ‘beasts’ such as a seahorse and
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‘seawatte’ (a play on the Lord Mayor’s name, John Watts).\textsuperscript{110} We do know, however, from payments in the Clothworkers’ accounts that the Lord Mayor and his entourage were taken up-river to Westminster by barge in the usual manner and enjoyed the traditional feast at the Guildhall.\textsuperscript{111}

We have Edmund Howe’s assurance that the 1610 Show was both ‘pleasant’ and extraordinary’, and the Merchant Taylors themselves give a fuller sense of the spectacle.\textsuperscript{112} For example, along with the usual outlay on banners and so on, their accounts provide the detail that one of the water-borne pageants featured ‘kings that sate in the Rock, on the Thames’, and that this pageant carried ‘nyne lardg pendants’.\textsuperscript{113} The person who ‘represented . . . Merlyn in the Rock’ is also mentioned, though it’s not clear if Merlin sat alongside the kings (unusually, this actor, although unnamed, seems to have been paid direct by the Company rather than via an intermediary like Munday). The land-borne ‘Chariott’ – there appear to have been only two actual pageants, one on water and one on land – was composed of the Merchant Taylors’ traditional heraldic animals, lions, unicorns and a camel, along with ‘two gyants’. Munday supplied apparel for ‘all the children’ and was, as in 1604, responsible for arranging the printing of the books. The ‘Shipp’ contained a boy trumpeter, fireworks and 120 ‘brasse Chambers’, which were double-discharged on the day, and an ‘Ancient’ (standard bearer) ‘went on the Companies bardg’.\textsuperscript{114} Other conventional elements of the 1610 celebrations included the six ‘greenemen’ with fireworks who accompanied the procession, along with streamer bearers, thirty-two trumpeters, numerous men with lances, javelins, staves and torches, and the ubiquitous blue-coated poor men.\textsuperscript{115} The City Waits were employed to provide music, as were drummers and fifers; as a side-show, sixteen men fought with hand-swords. Large numbers of men were required to attend the procession, which was in itself composed of hundreds of Company members.\textsuperscript{116} The Ironmongers’ characteristically lengthy minutes serve to supplement the only surviving copy of Munday’s 1609 text, \textit{Camp-bell}, which is missing its first few pages. From the Company records we can tell that as well as ‘A bell field carried in A Chariott . . . drawne by ii Estriges with Children upon them’, evidence of which does survive in what is left of the text, the Show also featured ‘a flynege dragon and unicorne with their speeches’.\textsuperscript{117} This part of the Show must have been described in the section of \textit{Camp-bell} which is lost. Only the speeches by ‘Saint Andrew’ and ‘Saint George’ survive, although it appears from the Company minutes that there were others (\textit{Camp-bell}, sigs B3r–B4r).
Similar insight into the spectacle can to a lesser extent be gleaned from the Haberdashers’ Accounts and Minutes for 1627, a year which marked Dekker’s return to civic pageantry after his time in prison. Although they are fairly brief, these accounts do reveal some aspects of a production for which, in the absence of a printed text, we have no other evidence. The usual galley foist, trumpeters, streamers, torches and so on are present and correct. The terse record, ‘paid to Mr Christmas for the pageants and shewes – [£]200’, however, is all the Haberdashers thought it necessary to say about the actual pageantry, which would of course have formed the bulk of any printed text. The sum of £200, which is in keeping with the usual sum conferred on the writer and artificer in the period, certainly suggests that the full gamut of pageantry was employed on this occasion, although the Haberdashers did not see fit to record it in any detail. (Such a lack of detail about the more theatrical dimensions of the Show in the Companies’ formal records is not uncommon, as we have seen elsewhere in this book.) Their accounts for 1627 do not list any payment for books, either: perhaps on this occasion there were none, for the Haberdashers did record the cost of £2 for the printing of 300 copies of the book that accompanied their 1631 Show, Heywood’s Londons ius honorarium.

The Company records also disclose a great deal about the various makers of the Shows. Garret Christmas, who features so extensively in many Companies’ plans, was highly regarded and much sought after as a craftsman, by both City and court. He comes in for great commendation from his collaborators. Heywood is particularly effusive, writing in Londini artium that Christmas was ‘the Artist, the Moddellor and Composer of these seuerall Peeces’. Indeed, Christmas’s achievement is likened to that of Roman architects (high praise from Heywood the classicist): rather like the emperor Augustus turning Rome from brick to marble, Heywood wrote that Christmas ‘found these Pageants and showes of Wicker and Paper’ and gave them ‘sollidity and substance’ (sig. C2r–v). According to Adam White, ‘in 1620–21 [Christmas] is known to have worked on a masque performed before the king at Whitehall Palace by the gentlemen of the Middle Temple; presumably he did for the theatre largely what he did for the pageants’. He was also employed on Charles I’s abortive royal entry and is said to have produced a bas-relief of King James on horseback on Aldersgate. John Grinkin, Munday’s usual collaborator, was likewise in great demand as an artificer, being involved in at least nine mayoral Shows. Like Christmas, Grinkin had received commissions from wealthy and
powerful men from within and outside City circles. He worked for Lord William Howard, and a self-portrait of him was, apparently, in Charles I’s collection. As well as continuing their father’s work on the Shows, Garret Christmas’s sons John and Matthias were employed as master carvers; they were collaborators with Heywood in the construction of emblematic decorations to the King’s new ship *The Sovereign of the Seas*, launched at Woolwich in 1637. The input of those others who made substantive contributions to the Show, such as the artificer, painter, carpenters, and the printers and publishers, should therefore not be sidelined. The artificer had a particular responsibility to construct the most impressive spectacle, as it was unlikely that the speeches would have been heard at all well by most of the onlookers, as we will see further below. Hence, in part, the emphasis in the Shows upon easily recognisable symbolism. As the involvement of John Lowin in the 1611 Show – Lowin was an actor from the King’s Men with connections with Munday – and of Lowin and Burbage in Munday’s 1610 *Londons loue* suggests, the writers were generally responsible for arranging the actors, be they children or adults.

Gordon’s assertion that ‘we know little about the figure of the designer in connexion with the pageants’ is not really sustainable. We certainly do know what they were employed to do, often in considerable detail. Given how central the visual impact of the Shows was, it is hardly surprising that the complex role of the artificer should be so foregrounded. L. J. Morrissey writes that ‘whether or not the playwrights credited the devisers, civic ridings were dramas of symbolic material objects’. What he calls the ‘physical properties of the event’ were of crucial, perhaps primary importance to the overall effect. Most of the writers were keen to credit the work of those who made their devices a reality, and they often represent the relationship between poet and artificer as a reciprocal one. After all, as Kiefer reminds us, the concept of the ‘device’ was in itself inherently visual and related to the emblem, with its pictorial qualities; indeed, the word was sometimes used as a synonym for ‘emblem’, ‘impresa’ or ‘hieroglyph’. A device was therefore *designed*, in the fullest sense of the word; in the words of one contemporary, it functioned as ‘a delightful object to the sight’. As O’Callaghan argues, ‘the devices are absolutely integral to the allegory and its success; machinery and poetry work in harmony’.

To illustrate the point, in *The tryumphs of honor and industry* Middleton, a generous acknowledger of others’ contributions (on the whole), thanks not only Rowland Bucket but also ‘Master
Henry Wilde, and Master Jacob Challoner, partners in the business’ (sig. C2r). In *The sunne in Aries* Middleton concludes with an acknowledgement of Garret Christmas’s talent and reliability. The latter quality was clearly appreciated as Middleton regularly praises it. With only three to four weeks to bring the Show to fruition reliability is understandably a prized quality in a collaborator. Christmas is here described as ‘a Man excellent in his Art, and faithfull in his Performances’, and the ‘credit’ ‘for the Frame-worke of the whole Triumph . . . iustly appertaines’ to him (sig. B4v).

In most cases Middleton was evidently prepared to foreground the teamwork involved in producing a Show: that subsequent scholars have so often more or less erased the contribution of those who enacted the physical spectacle is unfortunate and quite misleading. For instance, Wickham claims that in 1617 ‘Middleton received £282 for his labours’, when in actuality Middleton was paid this sum ‘for the ordering overseeing and writing of the whole devyse . . . tryming the shipp . . . and for all the Carpenters work . . . and for all the portage and carryage’ and so on, which makes it clear that much of the money was intended only to reimburse Middleton for ‘subcontracting’ various aspects of the work. Pafford states that Grinkin, for one, worked with Munday ‘on a footing of equality’. Robertson goes even further, claiming that the Clothworkers’ archives from the 1630s ‘illustrate the subservience of the poet to the artist-craftsman’.

Like some seventeenth-century Oscar acceptance speech, Dekker’s *Magnificent entertainment* goes to the lengths of acknowledging everyone, from the sixteen committees elected by the Corporation to manage the entertainment to the seventy labourers who worked on it. Munday’s part in the Show that generated the work entitled *The triumphs of truth* is, in contrast, rather more briefly credited by Middleton after he has thanked John Grinkin, the painter/artificer (who was the artificer with whom Munday, in fact, had the closest working relationship), and Humphrey Nichols, the firework maker. Middleton simply records Munday’s role as ‘those furnished with Apparell and Porters by Anthony Munday, Gentleman’ (sig. D3r). This incident should temper O’Callaghan’s assertion that Middleton is ‘always careful to acknowledge the work of his fellow artisans in devising the pageant’, for Middleton does Munday a disservice. The Company accounts show that the latter, who appears first in the accounts, received £149 ‘for the devyse of the Pageant and other shewes’ as well as for more functional matters like supplying apparel, actors and porters. For his work on the production
Middleton got only £40 (see Figure 4). The payment to both is dwarfed by the £310 which Grinkin received (see Figure 5)

for the making of the Pageant, Senate Howse, Shipp, errors and truths Chariott, withall the severall beasts which drew the five llandes, and for all carpenters worke, paynting, guilding, & garnishing of them . . . and also in full for the greemen, divells & fyre works.

On this evidence it would seem most likely that Middleton had the governing role in terms of the coherence of the Show – the ‘ordering
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overseeing and wryting of the whole device’ – but that Munday’s total responsibilities were greater.\textsuperscript{140} In this, his first mayoral work, Middleton does appear to be reluctant to admit to sharing the responsibility for the more artistic dimensions of the Show. Anyone whose understanding of the event was based solely on the printed text with its terse little acknowledgement would probably miss Munday’s contribution altogether – and some critics have done.\textsuperscript{141} Indeed, the Drapers’ records reveal that Middleton and Munday also worked together to produce the 1621 Show, although this time around Middleton does not acknowledge Munday’s input at all in the printed text.

In \textit{The triumphs of fame and honour}, however, Taylor makes it plain that he and Norman were true collaborators. Indeed, he usefully pinpoints which of them was responsible for which part of the production:

to giue desert her due . . . it were shamefull impudence in mee to affirme the inuention of these Structures and Architectures to my selfe, they being busines which I neuer was inured in, or acquainted with all, there being little of my directions in these shewes; onely the Speeches, and Illustrations which are here printed I doe justly chal- lenge as mine owne, all the rest of the Composures and Fabricks were formed and framed by the Ingenious and Industrious Mr Robert Norman Citizen and Painter of London, who was indeed the prime inventor prosecutor and finisher of these works.\textsuperscript{142} (sig. B4r)

Here Taylor admits to being a tyro in civic entertainments (either modestly or disingenuously, as he had in fact written a celebration of the marriage of Princess Elizabeth and Duke Frederick in 1613, \textit{Heauens blessing, and earths ioy}). He emphasises that the speeches for which he was responsible would have been as nothing without their physical embodiment in Norman’s ‘Composures and Fabricks’. Perhaps because of Taylor’s inexperience, Norman’s involvement was such, as Williams has pointed out, that he appears to have invented at least some of the Show’s themes, a job normally reserved for the ‘poet’.\textsuperscript{143} She rightly states that ‘to refer to the devices of \textit{[The Triumphes of] Fame and Honour} as Taylor’s is more a matter of convenience than of accuracy’, and it belies Taylor’s conscientious efforts to confer praise where praise is due.\textsuperscript{144} Conversely, in \textit{The triumphs of the Golden Fleece} Munday seems reluctant to accept any praise for the achievements on display on the Thames, writing that ‘whatsouer credit or commendation (if any at all) may attend on the Artefull performance of this poore
de[v]ice: it belongeth to the Arts-Maisters, Richard Simpson, and Nicholas Sotherne’ (sig. A4v). Perhaps he is passing the buck for a weak production in what was, after all, his last year of involvement in civic pageantry.

Apart from the fairly common acknowledgements by the writers of the expertise of the artificer, and although the printed texts invariably highlight the ‘cost and charges’ of the Companies, the writers, perhaps to retain the dignity of the occasion, only infrequently defamiliarise the commissioning process by discussing it overtly. Working for the livery companies, as Northway has shown, tended to be treated not as waged employment but as ‘service’, with all its connotations of moral value transcending bare payment. This practice also, implicitly, reveals the relative positions of the protagonists. Fleetingly, Munday states in Chrysanaleia that the description he provides in the text relates only to those parts of the Show for which he was responsible, those aspects which ‘appertaineth to my charge and place’, as he puts it, referring simultaneously to both parts of the equation (sig. B4r). There are exceptions to this norm, however, and when the writers do engage with the process it reveals a lot about the varied relationships between the pageant poets and the Company officers with whom they dealt so closely. Heywood interrupts the speeches in Londons ius honorarium to inform the reader of what took place behind the scenes. In the process he gives the impression of a relatively interventionist approach, albeit benignly so, on the part of the Company. He writes:

I cannot heare forget that in the presentment of my papers to the Master, Wardens and Committees of this Right Worshipfull Company of Haberdashers . . . nothing here devised or expressed was any way foraigne vnto them, but at all these my conceptions, they were as able to Iudge, as ready to Heare, and to direct as well as to Censure; nether was there any [sic] difficulty which needed a comment, but as soone known as showne, and apprehended as read. (sig. C3v)

Heywood’s experience seems to have been uniformly positive – or at least, he was keen to represent it as such, perhaps in the interests of further commissions, despite a disclaimer that he wishes to avoid ‘the imputation of flattery’ – for a couple of years later he again praises the discrimination shown by the Company (in this case, the Clothworkers), this time at even greater length. Heywood concludes Londoni emporia by acknowledging not only Garret Christmas, as was the norm, but also the input of the Clothworkers’
sub-committee. As well as trying to strike the appropriate balance between ‘vaine glory’ and ‘parsimony’ by emphasising that neither ‘incouragement’ nor ‘bounty’ were lacking, he also presents a personal testimony of his experience as follows:

I cannot without just taxation of ingratitude, omit to speake something of this Worshipfull company of the Cloath-Workers . . . for the Master the Wardens and the Committi, chosen to see all things accommodated for this busines then in motion, I cannot but much commend both for their affability and courtesie, especially unto my selfe being at that time to them all a meere stranger, who when I read my (then vnperfect) Papers, were as able to iudge of them, as attentiuely to heare them, and rather iudicially considering all things, then meerly carping at any thing. (sig. C1r–v)

In the preface to his only Show, Webster refers in an apparently similar fashion to the practical arrangements that enabled his work to take place by praising

the great care and alacrity of the Right Worshipful the Master and Wardens, and the rest of the selected and Industrious Committees; both for the curious and judging election of the subject; and next that the working or mechanicke part of it might be answerable to the Invention. (Monuments of Honor, sig. A3r–v)

This provides a further insight into how the commissioning process was perceived by one of its beneficiaries. It also suggests that, like Jonson, Webster may have perceived a subordination of the ‘working or mechanicke part’ of the Show, for which the artificer was responsible, to the poet’s more cerebral ‘Invention’. Webster clearly found the experience of being ‘judged’ by a bureaucratic committee unusual, although it is hard to tell if he also found it unpalatable, as this would hardly be the right place to air such a misgiving. He does state in the dedication that his ‘indeuours . . . haue receiued grace, and alowance’ from the Company (sig. A2v). He also indicates that the Merchant Taylors took a particular interest in the realisation of the Show in relation to the ‘Invention’ they had accepted. Indeed, it is possible that Webster’s artificer was chosen for him. As we have seen, he stresses that the Company committees took care that the ‘working’ dimension of the Show should be ‘answerable to the Invention’ and the text lacks the usual thanks to the artificer. The Show as a genre does not appear to have suited Webster all that well, for he complains in the preface that ‘both my Pen, and ability . . . are confin’d in too narrow a Circle’. As a result, he has insufficient space to do justice to ‘the Original and cause of
all Tryumphes’. ‘So short a Volume’, he continues, permits him ‘to express onely with rough lines, and a faint shadow . . . the great care and alacrity’ of the Company’s committees (sig. A3r). Dutton has speculated that Webster’s complaints about being ‘confin’d’ may mean that the Company ‘may have imposed some limits’ on his invention. 147 This is possible, for even Munday, by 1614 quite an old hand at mayoral pageantry, alludes somewhat huffily to constraints he experienced in the planning of the Show that was printed as Himatia-Poleos. ‘As meane additions’, he writes, ‘to giue some small luster to the Showe, because ouer many were thought inconuenient, we make vse of a golden pelleted Lyon . . . and with these fewe slender deuices, we vsher his Honors way towards Guilde-Haule’ (sig. B4v). ‘Meane’, ‘small’, ‘fewe’ and ‘slender’: a disgruntled air comes across quite strongly in his words, and although he does not identify those who thought his proposals ‘inconuenient’, he still manages to make it clear that the decision was not one he agreed with. 148 He appears to have had a more agreeable experience in 1616, when in Chrysanaleia he praises the ‘discreete and well aduised iudgement of the Gentlemen, thereto chosen and deputed’ to agree the devices for that year’s Show, which ‘were and are accordingly proportioned’ (sig. B1r; my emphasis).

Webster is therefore not alone in at times differentiating his artistic desires from the forces of economy or indifference. In the face of such a collective endeavour he consistently tries to emphasise his own personal contribution. His description of the various pageants is notable for its use of the first person pronoun – for Webster, it is always ‘I present’, ‘I fashioned’, and so on. He also, perhaps indelicately, draws attention to the role of the Company officials as ‘supervisors of the costs of these Tryumphs’ (sig. A2v). 149 In Monuments of Honor, as Bergeron has noted, ‘Webster as writer sketches the space in which he works’. 150 Indeed, as Dutton argues, Webster’s text is notable for (or ‘marred by’, in Dutton’s view) the author’s ‘repeated assertion that he would [as a ‘learned poet’], given the opportunity, have produced a more impressive volume than this’. 151 Whether it was the genre or brevity of the mayoral Show (or both) that caused the problem, or simply that the Shows did not suit the slow, painstaking way he preferred to work, it is not altogether surprising that Webster wrote only one of these entertainments, despite the fact that he flags his availability for further civic employments in the dedication to Monuments of Honor. Nevertheless, however things may have worked out for Webster, the Company were obviously pleased with the production as they
awarded the team ‘by way of Gratuity’ an additional £10.\textsuperscript{152} In contrast, Middleton’s account of his dealings with the Grocers’ Company takes a more familiar, and less complicatedly deferential tone. Unlike Dekker, who tries to square the circle of generosity versus thrift, Middleton praises the Grocers’ indifference to cost. ‘It hath beene twice my fortune in short time to haue imploiment for this Noble Societye’, he begins \textit{The tryumphs of honor and industry}, ‘where I haue alwayes mette with men of much vnderstanding, and no lesse bounty, to whom cost appears but as a shadow, so there be fulnesse of content in the performance of the solemnity’ (sig. A4r). Webster was unusually explicit about his role and that of others, perhaps because he was less familiar with the process than some of his peers and thus noticed its peculiarities.

In some (early) cases, however, it can be quite difficult to determine the extent of the involvement of any given writer or other contributor to the content of the Show. The earliest reference to a named author, according to Robertson and Gordon, was one ‘Mr Grimbold’ (probably Nicholas Grimald) in 1556.\textsuperscript{153} Subsequently, the role and prestige of the ‘poet’ seems to have increased during the latter half of the sixteenth century. In 1566 James Peele (father of George), who also wrote the (unperformed) Show for 1569, received only 30s whilst the fee for Richard Baker, the painter-stainer, was £16 with the offer of a further 40s ‘if it fortune him to be a loser at that price’.\textsuperscript{154} However, the rise of the writer was not at the expense of the artificer, whose responsibilities were considerable once lavish pageantry had become the expected form of the day. Indeed, in some ways the role was amplified. In 1609, for instance, Grinkin agreed to make and paint a dragon, unicorn, two ostriches, some trees, a fountain, a golden field, an ocean complete with ‘Mermaids and Tritons artificiallie mooving’, ‘a maiesticall throne’ and ‘iii maiesticall diadems’. For all these substantial labours he was granted £45.\textsuperscript{155} Munday too received £45 for his work that year, which included furnishing and clothing the child actors for the pageants, writing the speeches, and providing the Company with 500 copies of the book; it is also implied that he shared the design of the pageants with Grinkin.\textsuperscript{156} Only a few years later the Merchant Taylors paid Dekker and Heminges ‘one hundreth fourescore and seventeene pounds’ for the device of their land shows, and for printing the books and clothing the actors.\textsuperscript{157} One of the perks of the job, it would appear, is that the poet and artificer could sometimes join the procession, for in 1610 both Munday and Grinkin were given money for their ‘cullors [colours]’ by the Merchant Taylors in the
same way as were those ‘that did beare streamers’; Munday was also given eight dozen ribbons in the Company colours to wear. With Munday’s allegiance to all things civic this must have been a proud moment for him.

The various roles were, perhaps of necessity, fluid, and the protagonists would have been expected to be versatile. In 1605, alongside his work as the ‘poet’ Munday was reimbursed 10s for the cost of providing ‘one dozen of staff torches, which he used in bringing the Pageant and other shewes into Carter Lane’. In 1602 he was paid 30s ‘for prynting the booke of speeches in the pageant’. Munday may not have actually written the speeches he arranged to have printed on this occasion. William Haynes, the schoolmaster of the Merchant Taylors’ School, is recorded in the Company’s accounts for 1602 as receiving a fee in the following terms: ‘Mr Heynes the Companies schoolem at their schoole at St Lawrence Pountneis for the Chardge of p’paring a wagon, and appeling ten schollers, wch did represent the nyne muses and the god Apollo, before my Lord Maior in Cheapside’. It is not known for sure whether Haynes or Munday wrote the children’s speeches; they may even have collaborated. Sayle asserts that ‘without any doubt [Munday was] the author of the speeches’, evidencing that Munday’s remuneration was ‘somewhat excessive [for printing the speeches alone] and . . . probably included his fee for writing the speeches besides the repayment for having them printed’. Even if he only printed the speeches Munday certainly supplied apparel for the 1602 Show, for which he also received payment. Haynes is still a candidate for the authorship of the speeches, however, as he was required to write a speech for one of his pupils to deliver before King James at his coronation celebrations in 1604. On this occasion, in addition, there was an explicit reference back to what must have been the recent mayoral inauguration, when, it is recorded, Haynes was paid for ‘preparing his schollers, to make a shew and speeche in Cheapsyde, on the day my Lord Maior went to Westmynster’. As the answer seems to hinge on the meaning of ‘preparing’ in this context, it remains the case that there is no conclusive evidence either way.

As is evident, it is not always clear who was being recompensed for what. From the early days (as with George Peele, for instance), it would appear from the scant extant evidence that the writer was sometimes required to ‘oversee’ the whole production. Conversely, in his only recorded foray into mayoral pageantry Jonson received £12 from the Haberdashers in 1604 for ‘his device, and speech
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for the children’. The Haberdashers’ Court Minutes for that year give merely a perfunctory insight into what the device may have consisted of, as they requested only ‘a faire Pageant Chariat and a Lion’. Munday was allocated £2 ‘for his paines’, and a person unknown £1 for ‘printing the booke of the device’. The implication here by the repetition of the word ‘device’ is that it was Jonson’s work which was printed, although no publication from that year has survived; indeed, Dutton’s view is that ‘Jonson did not choose to preserve [this work] in print’. Other examples of writers and/or artificers being rewarded ‘for their pains’ suggest that on this occasion Munday either did not manage to make a substantial contribution to the Show or his role was very much that of an assistant. The word ‘device’ is also that which was used in relation to Peele’s even earlier productions, so in the absence of a printed text or much other evidence it seems sensible to assume that the 1604 show was of the same minimalist nature as Peele’s.

Robertson and Gordon remark in passing that ‘Munday may have written those [Shows] for 1597, 1598, 1600, and 1601’, but they do not supply any evidence for this supposition. In fact, a transitory moment in the livery company records appears to have been overlooked by their otherwise diligent scholarship, for there is evidence in the Skinners’ Company Court minutes for Munday’s involvement in some capacity in the 1597 Show, along with ‘Mr Kendall’, whom I take to be Thomas Kendall, the Haberdasher who supplied the apparel for the 1604 Show. Just above a payment to ‘the bargman’, the Court minutes record that ‘Mr Sturman shall paye unto Mr Kendall and Mr Mondaye in benevolence xs but that it shalbe noe peyment hereafter’. This suggests to me four possibilities: Munday and Kendall had supplied apparel for the Show and were being paid an additional sum for their labours; Munday (and Kendall?) had bid for the Show but not been chosen, and 10s was their compensation; they had indeed undertaken work on the entertainment and this payment was a kind of extra bonus (as, for instance, Munday received from the Ironmongers in 1618 and Dekker and Christmas from the Skinners themselves in 1628); or the Show was commissioned but did not take place.

On balance, given that 10s is a small sum and that its description as a ‘benevolence’ indicates an optional payment rather than a reimbursement for something specific, I think the first is the most likely scenario, in part because if they had received the commission they would probably have featured elsewhere in the Skinners’ records for this year, and they do not, as far as I have found. All in all this
probably indicates only a small-scale role for the pair; even so, this
demonstrates that Munday’s civic pageantry work can indeed be
dated back before 1602, as has been speculated. It also adds to the
case that Munday had sufficient visibility in the world of civic enter-
tainments by the time Jonson chose to satirise him as the ‘Pageant
Poet to the City of Millaine . . . when a worse cannot be had’ in the
1609 edition of his play *The case is altered* (which, incidentally, was
first performed in 1597).  

In addition, any prospect of a collabora-
tion in this context between Kendall and Munday, who regularly
supplied apparel for Shows, is intriguing.

Inconclusive though they may sometimes be, these earlier records
do preserve some sense of how the various tasks were allocated. By
the 1620s the artificer often received the total payment and it is not
often possible to tell how the responsibility was spread, if at all. A
person unknown was paid £2 in 1631 for ‘printing 300 books of
the shew’: this may have been Raworth (the printer), Heywood,
or someone else entirely, although the syntax of the entry both
here and the following year does imply a direct payment from the
Company to the printer. Similarly, the trend towards appoint-
ing a sub-committee to oversee the arrangements lead to a kind of
shorthand in the Companies’ minutes, where those delegated the
responsibility for the Show are often simply asked to ensure that
the triumph, pageant(s), galley foist, banners, streamers and so on
are in order. For example, the Ironmongers’ Court of Wardens
appointed a committee ‘for the Maior daye’ in the September of
1618. At a later meeting on 30 September responsibility for the
‘pageant’, ‘gallies’ and barges was appointed; on 5 October the
usual arrangements were made to assess the Bachelors in foins and
in budge. Explicit reference back to the precedents established in
previous years is also common, and appears to have given certain
conventions a degree of authority as far as the Companies are con-
cerned: the phrase ‘as in former years’ comes across as a kind of
trump card.

As I have already suggested, artificers and painter-stainers were
well remunerated. In 1631 the sum of £200 was paid to Garret
Christmas ‘for pageants and shewes’; Heywood’s name does not
appear in the Haberdashers’ records for that year, nor for the
following year, where again it was only Christmas who received
payment. ‘Mr Scarlett’ and ‘Mr Hearne’, painters, received
considerable sums from the Merchant Taylors in both 1602 and
1605 for decorating the banners, staves and the actual pageants.
Indeed, Hearne’s responsibility was like that of an artificer in 1602,
when he made as well as painted the pageant beasts. Careful scrutiny of the livery company records shows that the responsibility for the Show was often more complex than might appear from the text alone. Middleton’s name may be on the title page of *The triumphs of truth* (indeed, this is his best-known mayoral text) but Munday is listed first in the Grocers’ accounts and, as we have seen, his payment was the greatest. From this evidence, in contrast to that of the text, it appears that the two had at least equal roles: as far as it is possible to tell, Munday may have produced the ideas (he was, after all, a noted ‘plotter’) and Middleton may have then carried them out and written them up.

If the experience of those who produced the 1988 re-enactment of part of Middleton’s *Triumphs of truth* is anything to go by, the artificers (and those others whose names have not been recorded) earned their fees. In the programme written to accompany this event, Sue Mallett records ‘the feat of structural engineering’ required to bring the spectacle to reality. Indeed, this event provides an interesting retrospective insight into the practical issues inherent in staging the Shows, such as the need for the costumes to be ‘visible from the river banks and bridges . . . sturdy enough to withstand the weather, and practical for moving on and off the barges’.¹⁷⁶ What was a challenge in the 1980s must have been an extraordinary achievement some four hundred years earlier. The artificer’s role, in particular, was obviously a crucial one, and, in order to understand these events in their own terms, we must try to lose the writer-centric view that the printed text is the most important part of the Lord Mayor’s Show rather than being an ancillary component which has sometimes not survived. Munday and the artificer Grinkin clearly shared the work for the 1610 Show: indeed, from the Merchant Taylors’ accounts it would seem that the latter had the more ‘creative’ role, being recompensed for ‘making, painting, and gilding the Pageant, Charriot, Three Lyons, two Unicornes, a Camell, Two Gyantes [and] new painting the Shipp’. Munday’s responsibility extended to ‘providing Apparell, for all the Children, and . . . printing the booke’. The pair received a joint fee of £126.¹⁷⁷

The making of the Shows should rightly be assigned to the team: thus, in 1621 the Show was produced by Middleton, Munday and Christmas.¹⁷⁸ Indeed, the Company accounts usually make this clear: in 1622 the Grocers, for instance, paid £220 to ‘Thomas Middleton gent and Garrett Christmas carver for orderinge overseeing and wrytinge of the whole device’, including the printing of 500 books and all the necessary porterage.¹⁷⁹
Certain teams dominated for periods of time, such as Munday and Grinkin’s near hegemony between 1602 and 1618, Middleton and Garret Christmas’s thereafter, and Heywood and the Christmas family’s in the 1630s. John Squire’s artificer in 1620 was Francis Tipsley, a member of the Haberdashers who also worked in some capacity (chiefly as a painter-stainer, it seems) on all the other Haberdashers’ Shows in this period.\textsuperscript{180} Squire thanked his collaborator thus: ‘the credit of this workmanship (curiously exceeding many former shewes, and far more ritch then any, in regard no mettall was used to adorne it but gold and siluer) I impose on Francis Tipsley Cittizen and Haberdasher of London’ (\textit{Tes Irenes Trophaea}, sig. C2r).\textsuperscript{181} Expenditure on the Shows was fairly lavish, but Squire’s claim that only gold and silver metals were used ‘to adorne’ the pageants strikes me as an exaggeration. Indeed, had gold and silver been used to decorate the devices of this Show the Haberdashers would have been disregarding a royal proclamation of the previous year which stipulated that gold was only to be used for ‘Armons, or Weapons, or in Armes or Ensignes of honour, at funerals, or Monuments of the dead’.\textsuperscript{182} Gold and silver may have been used for gilding, but the livery company committees, after all, were composed of tough-minded businessmen, and the commissioning process did sometimes involve haggling. As we have seen, Dekker and Christmas’s initial request for £200 for the Show for James Campbell in 1629 was negotiated down to £180, including all props, transport, music and the cost of 500 copies of the books.\textsuperscript{183} The haggling could work both ways, though: for the same Show, the trumpeters desired a price rise of £2 and refused an increase of £1 from the Ironmongers from their previous Show over ten years previously.\textsuperscript{184}

Dekker himself attempted to represent the correct balance between ostentation and economy in \textit{Troia-Nova triumphans}. He begins the text, somewhat unpromisingly, by drawing a distinction between ‘the Rich and Glorious Fires of Bounty, State and Magnificence’ on the one hand, as opposed to ephemeral triumphs which are ‘but a debt payd to Time and Custome’. The Lord Mayor’s Show, he controversially claims, is in the latter category, whereas rich, glorious bounty is preserved for ‘the courts of Kings’. He goes on to explain, though, that the Merchant Taylors’ approach to the Show encompasses the best of both worlds, demonstrating a sumptuous Thriftinesse in these Ciuil Ceremonies . . . for it were not laudable, in a City (so rarely gouerned and tempered) superfluously
Dekker’s use of the oxymoron ‘sumptuous Thriftinesse’ may point to an uneasy awareness of the compromises that had to be made on these occasions, or perhaps to a sense that such ostentation was not really in keeping with the civic virtues of prudence and economy. In *Chruso-thriambos* Munday grapples with the same problem when reminding the new Lord Mayor of the financial commitment implicit in his role:

> your former care
> Forbids ye now to pinch or spare,
> But to keepe good Hospitality,
> Such as beseemes a Maioraltie,
> Yet far from prodigiality.
> To be too lauish, is like crime
> As being too frugall in this time.

In general, the Companies can sometimes be seen to struggle to reconcile the prosaic matter of affording the entertainment with the desire to appear to be indifferent to the cost. Although the Companies’ accounts and minutes are, of course, full of records of payment, at the same time, as Northway argues, they can be seen to demonstrate a kind of denial that the financial relationship between the various parties is the crucial one. Northway writes that the Companies ‘depict the worker not as working, but performing favors, [and] they also portray themselves not as paying pre-determined wages, but as awarding gifts’. The lexicon of ‘pains’, ‘rewards’ and ‘benevolences’ therefore acts as a mystification of the true nature of the business in hand and represents the power as being in the hands of the giver, not the receiver.

‘Your poore louing Brother’: forms of association in the making of the Shows

In the context of a competitive environment, it is instructive to explore the reasons why one team was preferred to another. At times, as we have seen, the successful bidders simply undercut their competitors, but in other cases different reasons come into play. Personal networks and contacts in the City were important, if sometimes underestimated, factors and there were often connections between the writers and the livery companies, such as membership
of the Company. For instance, it is probable that George Peele was commissioned to write the Shows for 1585 and 1591 as a direct consequence of his father’s employment in the same business in 1566. There were also familial connections between the Lord Mayors: two daughters of the Lord Mayor on the latter occasion (1566), Christopher Draper, married Wolstan Dixie and William Webbe, who were mayors in 1585 and 1591 respectively. Like the Peeles, father and son, Webbe was a Salter. Some two years before his first Lord Mayor’s Show Peele may have worked in some capacity in dramatic productions at Oxford, which, in Horne’s words, ‘involved the devising and presentation of special stage effects’ and thus would have acted as a direct precursor to his civic pageantry productions. The writers and artificers were also required to know something of the new Lord Mayor – his personal background, notable civic achievements and so on – in order to incorporate such facts into the Show to tailor the entertainment to its recipient.

Rather missing the point, his analysis side-tracked by the mistaken belief that the theatre was uniformly ‘abhorred’ by the City oligarchy, Hardin claims that it is ‘ironic . . . that [the livery companies] employed both dramatists and actors’ for mayoral Shows. It seems ‘ironic’ only if a wholesale split between these two worlds is posited. In fact, the Companies were doubtless well aware of the theatrical careers of those they commissioned. Indeed, this factor probably played a large part in the commissioning process itself, as it would have been unwise to have given this role to someone with no experience of writing dramatic-style entertainments. As Lancashire has shown, some of the livery companies had been employing players since at least the fifteenth century; in some cases, these were members of professional troupes such as the (sixteenth-century) King’s Players. Overall, in terms of both participants and creators, there were considerably more overlaps between the professional stage and mayoral Shows in the post-Peele period than there were between the latter and forms of courtly pageantry. Furthermore, in the small world of London culture the dramatists, in particular, tended to know each other and in many cases they had worked together in the theatre. Munday, for instance, had collaborated on plays for the Admiral’s Men with Webster, Dekker and Middleton, and Middleton co-wrote with Dekker in the genres of both drama and prose; indeed, Dutton makes the reasonable speculation that it may have been the prior collaboration with Dekker that paved the way for Middleton’s first mayoral
Show in 1613. Both Taylor and Webster produced congratulatory verses for their ‘friend’ Heywood’s *Apology for actors* in 1612. Likewise, marking out their future territory, both Dekker and Webster produced prefatory odes for Harrison’s *Arch’s of triumph*. Middleton’s foray into civic pageantry began with a small-scale contribution (one speech) for the same event, James’s royal entry in 1604, in which Dekker, of course, had a more extensive part to play.

Such connections were not always amicable. On occasion Middleton attempts to create an artistic identity for himself by criticising the flaws of his contemporaries. He begins *The triumphs of loue and antiquity* with the desire that the ‘Cleare Art and her gracefull properties’ contained within his work will be appreciated by the spectators as well as by the Lord Mayor and his Company. As far as the former constituency is concerned, however, Middleton is not altogether sure that they are sufficiently discriminating to appreciate the difference. His work, he claims, ‘takes delight to present it selfe’ despite the fact that ‘common fauor . . . is often cast vpon the undeseruer, through the distresse and miserie of Judgement’ (sig. A4r). The same note is struck in *The triumphs of truth*, where he launches another, even more direct attack on some unnamed contemporary. The title page foregrounds the antagonistic element of this work, stating that the Show has been ‘directed, written, and redeemed into Forme from the Ignorance of some former times, and their Common Writer’. Middleton expands on the theme at greater length in the prefatory section following the dedication, where he criticises the failings of ‘the impudent common Writer’ for whom he feels both ‘pitty and sorrow’. ‘It would heartily grieue any vnderstanding spirit’, he goes on, ‘to behold many times so glorious a fire in bounty and goodnesse’ – by which he means the patronage of the Lord Mayor – ‘offering to match it selfe with freezing Art, sitting in darknesse, with the candle out, looking like the picture of Blacke Monday’ (sigs A3r–v). Because of the reference to ‘Blacke Monday’, and with his track record of prompting hostility from his contemporaries, most commentators have (understandably) claimed the object of Middleton’s scorn to be Munday. However, as Bergeron pointed out when he revisited this issue, one must remember that Munday and Middleton collaborated in the making of the 1613 Show (as they had on the lost play *Caesar’s Fall* more than ten years previously). This is not to presume that all writers were great friends with their collaborators, but to explore more critically the assumption that Munday must be the target. Furthermore, if,
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as Middleton’s prose suggests, he is directing the criticism towards his immediate predecessor in the writing of mayoral Shows, then the target may in fact have been Dekker rather than Munday, for Dekker wrote the 1612 Show and bid unsuccessfully for the job in the following year.\textsuperscript{197} In the dedication of his 1612 Show \textit{Troia-Noua triumphans} Dekker claims that triumphs are ‘the Rich and Glorious Fires of Bounty, State and Magnificence’ (sig. A3r). Unless it’s just a coincidence, or he was simply consciously or unconsciously plagiarising, it may be that Middleton picked up on the phrase ‘Glorious Fires of Bounty’ and turned it into a way of impugning the artistic ability of its originator.

For that 1612 Show Dekker worked with John Heminges, who is now, of course, remembered chiefly for his co-editorship of the first Shakespearean folio. Dekker was called ‘the Poet’ by the Merchant Taylors, which implies that Heminges’s role was that of the artificer or impresario. Certainly, the two are named by the Company as jointly responsible for the production of the ‘devices’. Although they were both free of major livery companies it is perhaps most likely that Heminges became acquainted with Dekker through the theatre, despite the fact that at that date Dekker was writing mostly for one of Heminges’s competitors, the Queen’s Majesty’s Company at the Red Bull. Heminges, who had been made free of the Grocers’ Company in 1587 and became a liveryman in 1621, had by 1612 already established a theatrical career for himself, initially as an actor and then as a manager (he was manager first of the Chamberlain’s Men, then the King’s Men, for over thirty years). Both roles would have served him well when it came to civic pageantry. Mary Edmonds writes that ‘in court records [Heminges] is constantly referred to as “presenter” of plays for command performances: in consultation with the master of the revels he would presumably have made the arrangements about places, times, dates, rehearsals, temporary seating in palaces, and transport’.\textsuperscript{198} Such experience would have made him eminently well placed to be co-producer of a mayoral Show; indeed, it is rather surprising that he appears only to have done so once.

Family connections came into play too. As we have seen, George Peele succeeded his father James, and Munday’s son Richard was a painter-stainer and worked on Shows (decorating banners and the like) regularly from at least 1613 onwards.\textsuperscript{199} John Webster the younger would quite probably have attended his father’s Company’s school, which itself had connections with mayoral Shows – providing child actors and speech-writers – at least as
far back as Richard Mulcaster in the 1560s. In 1620, William Squire and Francis Squire (who may have been relations of John Squire, that year’s poet) received various payments although the Haberdashers’ records do not say what for. Others who worked to bring the Show to life were employed repeatedly, and in many cases for a number of years, often regardless of which Company was paying for the Show. Thomas Jones, for instance, was a fencer who is mentioned in the Drapers’ accounts for every one of their Shows between 1621 and 1639; Tilbury Strange, a waterman who provided the galley foist, was just as ubiquitous. Connections did not always benefit the writers, though. When Dekker was arrested for debt in late 1612 and then gaoled in the King’s Bench prison, in one of those haunting coincidences that demonstrates what a nexus London was, one of his creditors was John Webster senior, the playwright’s father, who was regularly involved in supplying wagons and horses for mayoral pageantry; another was Nicholas Okes, the printer of that year’s Show. Bradbrook states that *Troia-Noua triumphans* ‘ruined’ Dekker: if, as seems plausible, his debts were indeed accrued as a result of his commission for the Show, it looks like he may not have given the printer and coach-maker their share of the payment.

The overall range of connections that come into play in the context of the mayoral Shows exemplify Bradbrook’s comment that ‘Londoners were self-conscious and intensely organised’. Indeed, almost all the pageant writers in this period, from Peele to Middleton, were Londoners born and bred, as were the artificers, the Christmas family. This in itself marks a major difference between mayoral inaugurations and civic entertainments for the monarchy where writers with connections at court, such as Thomas Churchyard, rather than local poets or playwrights, were preferred. George Peele, as we will see below, had both court and civic links; the writers chosen thereafter, however, were predominantly not of courtly provenance. Consequently, their treatment of the City and its Lord Mayor tended to focus on the reigning monarch to a lesser extent than Peele had done in 1585 and 1592. Heywood, somewhat surprisingly for a writer who, David Kathman notes, ‘had been a booster of apprentices and tradesmen since his earliest plays’, was originally from provincial Lincolnshire and came to London via Cambridge. Although he only mentions his own connection with the county in passing, Heywood makes a great deal out of Nicholas Rainton’s Lincolnshire origins in his 1632 Show, as well as those of other important men from that
county, including a number of Lord Mayors: ‘not so many [Lord Mayors] haung attained to the same Dignity [were] bred in any one County’, he claims (Londini artium, sig. A2r). Heywood had been living and working in the city for over three decades before his first Show in 1631, however, and his allegiance to London is unquestionable: Howard rightly calls him ‘that tireless apologist for the city’.207

John Taylor, who was from Gloucestershire, was another exception, but by the time he produced his Show in 1634 he was very well established in the Watermen’s Company (indeed, he was notably active in the Company in 1634) and he too had been living in London for around forty years.208 The Watermen’s Company was not one of the Great Twelve, of course, but it was probably the largest of the companies. Bernard Capp points out that, from his profession as waterman, ‘Taylor’s links with the Bankside theatres included actors, writers, and spectators with court connections’, as well as, no doubt, many bargemen.209 Specifically, Taylor appears to have known Dekker, Heywood and Jonson, and he also wrote an account of the celebrations of the marriage of Princess Elizabeth in 1613, which would have served as a useful precursor to his Lord Mayor’s Show some twenty years later.210 Capp asserts that Heywood helped Taylor gain a lucrative post at the Tower. Given the former’s ubiquity in terms of pageant-writing in the 1630s it is possible that he may have recommended Taylor to the Clothworkers for their 1634 Show (1634 was the only year in the 1630s, apart from 1636 when no full Show took place, when Heywood did not write the Show); the two men certainly seem to have had a connection over many years.211 It is a reasonable supposition that Taylor may have gained the commission in 1634 in preference to Heywood because Garret Christmas, Heywood’s long-standing collaborator, had recently died, which may have impacted on Heywood’s ability to bid for that year’s Show, and perhaps even on his credibility without the estimable Christmas alongside him. Taylor did have the right kind of experience, as well as useful contacts. Amongst his other varied activities, he also acted occasionally as a kind of promoter and impresario for ad hoc entertainments in London and elsewhere, not all with himself as a protagonist (Capp calls him a ‘showman’), which in itself drew on some of the talents required for mayoral Shows.212 His ability to write fast under pressure would doubtless have served him well too. Indeed, as is the case with Taylor, pageant writers tended to be versatile and productive, and to work across genres:
Munday’s career was notable for its variety, Jonson seems to have co-written at least one mayoral Show as well as plays, masques and other entertainments put on at court, and Heywood wrote plays, an elegy on the death of King James and a wide range of prose works too.

The commissioning of royal civic entertainments, however, did not work in quite the same way as it did with the mayoral Shows. As Kipling remarks, before their employment on Anne Boleyn’s coronation entry neither John Leland nor Nicholas Udall ‘had any significant prior – or subsequent – association with the City’. In contrast, despite his later court connections, George Peele had been brought up and educated in Christ’s Hospital, under the aegis of the City Corporation; his father James had been the Clerk of the Hospital. To compound the interconnections, both Dixie and Webbe, the Lord Mayors for whose inaugurations George Peele was employed, were Governors of Christ’s Hospital. Thomas Nelson, who like Squire and Webster seems to have written only one Show, was probably a Londoner too: he was a bookseller and ballad maker, and a member of the Stationers’ Company. He also wrote a handful of quasi-political texts, including, the year after his Show, *The blessed state of England. Declaring the sundrie dangers which by God’s assistance, the queen’s maiestie hath escaped*, and an epitaph for Francis Walsingham in 1590.

Corporate identity, too, was evidently significant when it came to the mayoral Shows. As well as having a proven track record in playwrighting, the majority of the pageant poets were members of one of the Great Twelve companies (even Jonson was free of the minor company the Tylers and Bricklayers), and companies do seem to have employed their own members from time to time. The artificers, painter-stainers and others who made substantial contributions were also, naturally, members of the relevant trades. John Lowin, the King’s Men actor, appeared in the Goldsmiths’ Court minutes as a ‘brother’ of the Company when he was required by the Wardens to perform the role of Leofstane in the 1611 Show. Lowin’s membership of the Company evidently came into play explicitly here. However, although it may have been taken as read, I have not discovered any tangible evidence that the companies deliberately, let alone invariably, took writers’ company membership into consideration when determining commissions. In the absence of such evidence, Charles Forker’s claim that the Merchant Taylors ‘would not have paid an outsider to do what one of their own number [Webster] had already proved he could do so well’ remains
unsubstantiated.\textsuperscript{217} Equally, Hardin asserts that the Drapers commissioned Munday to write their 1614 and 1615 Shows for the ‘strategic’ reason of wanting to have ‘a yeoman [of their Company] speaking for the livery’.\textsuperscript{218} He thus appears to assume that Munday was specifically selected by the Drapers, rather than winning a commission. However, nothing in the Drapers’ records leads one to that conclusion, nor do the texts reveal any such selection process beyond Munday’s own undoubted pride in writing for his Company. At the same time, membership of one of the Great Twelve Companies gave the writers access, in a limited fashion, to the inner workings of these organisations. It is possible therefore, in some instances, that they had prior acquaintance with those who commissioned their Shows. From the beginning of this period, writers were regularly members of livery companies. Both the Peeles, father and son, were members of the Salters’ Company (James probably by redemption; George by patrimony).\textsuperscript{219} Middleton was free of the Drapers by redemption (his father had been a member of the Tylers and Bricklayers and his stepfather was a Grocer). Munday was also a Draper, by patrimony. Webster was, as Monuments of Honor claims, ‘borne free’ of the Merchant Taylors (his coachmaker father John supplied ‘horses and Charrett’ for the 1602 Show for that Company).\textsuperscript{220} Webster’s only Lord Mayor’s Show was therefore written for his own Company; indeed, the text foregrounds the poet’s membership on its title page as well as elsewhere in the text, notably in the dedication, where he implies to the Company that he ought to be considered for that reason for future preferment.\textsuperscript{221} Dekker and Heminges may have won the commission for the Show in 1612, in preference to Munday or Middleton, in part because Dekker was a member of the Merchant Taylors. Indeed, some contemporary owner or reader of the text has written ‘Marchantailor’ next to Dekker’s name on the title page of one copy of this Show.\textsuperscript{222} Sayle speculates, in addition, that Dekker may have been chosen to write the 1612 Show because of its proximity to the festivities surrounding the marriage of Princess Elizabeth to the Elector Palatine and Dekker’s past involvement in James’s accession royal entry, although Taylor might be considered even more appropriate on the first score.\textsuperscript{223}

Dekker himself was unable to bid for the Show in the year after Troia-Noua triumphans as he was in a debtor’s prison in 1613, where he remained for the next seven years. He was back in the frame, though, after Middleton’s death in 1627, which ended the latter’s predominance from c.1617 to the mid-1620s.\textsuperscript{224} Dekker
himself, in the dedication to the Lord Mayor, Sir Hugh Hammersley, in his 1628 work *Warres, Warre[s], Warres*, reveals that he had been involved in Hammersley’s mayoral Show the previous year, although Dekker’s name does not feature in the Company’s accounts (Christmas’s payment of £200 ‘for the pageants and shewes’ was probably shared between them). As Dekker puts it, ‘it was some ioy to me, to bee imployed in the Praesentation of your Triumphs, on the day of your Lordships Inauguration’ (*Warres, Warre[s], Warres*, sig. A2v). Munday was getting on in years by 1627, Middleton had just died and Heywood had yet to come on to the scene, so perhaps Dekker was the only likely candidate. Indeed, had Dekker’s pageants been used in 1630 (when a full-blown Show did not take place) he would have dominated the scene for four consecutive years. Middleton, in turn, was unlikely to have been in the frame to write the 1624 Show – which became Webster’s sole commission – because of the controversy provoked by the former’s *Game at Chesse* the previous year.

As we have seen in relation to Webster, the writers themselves often flagged up their citizenship. As a Draper, Munday approached the task of writing Shows for his own company with considerable enthusiasm and pride. Indeed, regardless of which Company sponsored them, all his printed Shows proclaim his identity as ‘Citizen and Draper of London’. In contrast, with the exception of his first, *The triumphs of truth*, all Middleton’s printed Shows call him ‘Thomas Middleton Gent.’. Even though by 1626, the year of his last Show, Middleton had actually become a member of the Drapers, his affiliation is not cited in the text despite the fact that Cuthbert Hacket, the new Lord Mayor, was himself a Draper. Nevertheless, Taylor speculates that Middleton’s ‘family link’ to the Grocers’ Company, of which his stepfather was a member, ‘might have helped him secure’ the commission for his first Show, written for a Grocer Lord Mayor. Like Munday, Webster highlighted the fact that he was a Merchant Taylor (there are two references in *Monuments of Honor* to ‘our Company’, for instance). Forker even argues, somewhat implausibly, that by choosing to claim his freedom by patrimony in 1615 Webster was ‘positioning himself as a candidate to write the Lord Mayor’s pageant next time a brother of the guild should be honoured by election’. There were, of course, other contenders for that role, and in any case Webster had to wait almost a decade for his sole turn. Membership of one of the Great Twelve Companies, after all, conferred more advantages than the faint prospect of a commission to write a Show. One writer
who we can be fairly sure had such ulterior motives was, of course, Munday, who via judicious use of dedications and gifts of his books actively endeavoured to make himself the likely candidate for such work.  

Writers who were, for whatever reason, in favour with the Corporation and/or individual Companies sometimes received other, related civic commissions at around the same time as a Show. In Middleton’s case, this happened at least twice: he produced an entertainment to celebrate the opening of the New River in 1613, the year of his *Triumphs of truth*, and his *Honorable entertainments* was printed in 1621, the same year as his mayoral Show *The sunne in Aries*. Only on the latter occasion was Middleton the City Chronologer, and thus an obvious choice for such work; indeed, Bald asserts that Middleton’s ubiquity at this juncture (including his contribution to some of the various entertainments contained in *Honourable entertainments*) ‘helped him to win the office [of City Chronologer]’. In the latter text Middleton does refer to the Mayor, Aldermen and Sheriffs as ‘all of them . . . his Worthy and Honorable Patrons’ (sig. A2r). It is Heinemann’s view that Middleton’s ‘Puritan’ leanings enhanced his connections with some of those in the City of like mind, especially in the Grocers’ and Haberdashers’ Companies. The post of City Chronologer in the 1620s would have increased his profile in civic circles even more. Taylor calls Middleton at this point civic pageantry’s ‘dominant, and most inventive, practitioner’.

Munday too was commissioned to write another ad hoc entertainment, *Londons loue*, an account of the civic celebrations held to celebrate the investiture of Prince Henry as Prince of Wales. Chronologically, as with Middleton, this work was both preceded and succeeded by Munday’s mayoral Shows. Relatedly, as we have seen, Heywood wrote both a mayoral Show and a description of the King’s new flagship, the *Sovereign of the Seas*, in 1637. Indeed, in his mayoral Show of the following year he takes the opportunity to plug his other publication (which must have been successful, as it went to two editions). ‘Concerning Ships and Nauigation’, Heywood writes,

> with the honour and benefits thence accrewing. I haue lately delivered my selfe so amply in a Book published the last Summer of his Majesties great Shippe, called the Soveraigne of the Seas, that to any, who desire to be better certified concerning such things, I referre them to that Tractate, from which they may receive full & plenteous satisfaction. (*Porta pietatis*, sigs B3v–B4r)
Only John Squire’s commission to write the 1620 Show looks especially anomalous, for he had no major civic or court connections, being a sermon-writer and preacher at St Leonard’s, Shoreditch. Were it not for the fact that the dedication to the 1620 Show is signed ‘Io. Squire’ it would be hard to credit Squire as the mayoral poet for that year. Indeed, apart from this name, the only evidence seems to be that Squire (the cleric) had sermons published at around the same time as the Show. The sole pretext for choosing Squire to write this Show might have been that he also preached the inaugural sermon for the Lord Mayor, Sir Francis Jones. By the time of Thomas Jordan in the 1670s–80s, however, the job of writing the Show went to ‘the poet of the Corporation of London’, an established post (Jordan, who followed Tatham, was succeeded by Matthew Taubman, and the latter by Elkanah Settle, the City laureate from 1691). The institutionalisation of the role of pageant poet in the later seventeenth century shows how far things had moved on from the days when ‘Mr Pele’ was offered a handful of shillings to write a few verses.

Notes
3 For instance, in July 1606 Sir Stephen Soame and Sir John Garrard were ordered by the Court of Aldermen to ‘joine with the committie lately appoynted for preparation of the pageantes showes and other servyces at the Royall passage of the Kings most excellent majestie and King of Denmark through this Cittye’ (Court of Aldermen Repertories, vol. 27, fol. 248v). The City Corporation records do not typically mention the Lord Mayor’s Show, even in times of crisis such as outbreaks of plague when the full pageantry was suspended.
4 GH MS 15,869, fols 3–7; GH MS 15,869, fol. 10r–v. I discuss attire within the Shows in more detail in the next chapter.
6 See Sayle, Lord Mayors’ Pageants, pp. 60–1.
7 The Bachelors or Yeomanry were those members of the Company who had yet to be elevated to the Livery.
8 GH MS 30,708/2, fol. 120r. The Merchant Taylors too note in a memorandum in their accounts that ‘the charge of the barge . . . which in former yeres was paid out by the yongest Renter Warden . . . was this yere [1602] paid by the Bachelors Company’ (GH MS 38,078/8, fol. 220).
9 Goldsmiths MSS vol. 14a, fol. 4v.
10 GH MS 30,708/6, fol. 361. For more on the galley foist see Chapter 3. The money spent whilst viewing pageants was probably for the
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‘severall dinners’ for which they billed the Company over £23 (livery company officers seem as assiduous as any modern politician at claiming expenses). The children participating in the Merchant Taylors’ pageant for 1602 rehearsed their performance before the Master and Wardens of the Company, and received ‘a smale banquet’ for their pains (GH MS 34,048/8).

GH MS 5570/2, fols 183–4.

11 For fifteenth-century royal entries, in contrast, it looks as if the pageantry was designed according to a pre-set ‘ordinance, or specification’ (Barron, ‘Pageantry on London Bridge’, p. 94).

12 Sullivan, ‘London’s early modern creative industrialists’, p. 381. The Ironmongers’ minutes are particularly likely to preserve evidence of their displeasure when things did not go according to plan, such as when Munday was rebuked for using ‘old and borrowed’ clothing in 1609, and when a bargeman was ‘complained of’ in 1629.

13 GH MS 16,969/2, fol. 225r.

14 Drapers MS III, fol. 202r. O’Callaghan erroneously claims that Middleton received no payment at all in this year; the Drapers’ accounts, however, make it clear that he was rewarded for at least some of his work (Thomas Middleton, p. 15).

15 As Ravelhofer comments, presenting draft summaries to commissioning bodies also took place as a matter of routine within the court masque in this period, although without the competitive element of the Shows (The Early Stuart Masque, p. 188).

16 Drapers MS III, fol. 165r. This seems to have been the Drapers’ usual practice, for in 1623 too it was stated that ‘fowre Mr Wardens shall take present course for the fittinge providinge and compoundinge for of [sic] all things as shalbe fitt and necessarie for or touchinge the said showes and triumphes’ (Drapers MS III, fol. 182v).

17 Jacobean Civic Pageants, p. 10.


19 Palmer, ‘Music in the barges’, p. 174. The Clothworkers gave Ralph Freeman the same benevolence for ‘beautifynge’ his house, £25, as they had given John Spencer forty years previously (Clothworkers’ accounts, 1633–34, fol. 12r). All the same, some Lord Mayors were extremely wealthy: it has been estimated that James Campbell, Ralph
Freeman and Robert Ducy left estates of at least £50,000 (see Lang, ‘Social origins’, p. 30).

23 GH MS 16,969/2, fol. 216v. £18 is around £3000 in modern values.

24 Northway remarks that ‘instead of estimating a new price comparable to former prices plus inflation, the former prices became the prices to beat’ (‘I desyre to be paid’, p. 409).

25 See Robertson and Gordon, Collections III, p. 99. The Drapers conferred a benevolence of £40 on Martin Calthorpe, the Lord Mayor elect in 1588 ‘accordinge to an order taken the first daye of October 1578’ (Drapers MS I, fol. 327).

26 GH MS 34,048/8. This incident exemplifies Woolf’s comment that ‘in London and in provincial towns, documents were borrowed and sent from place to place with a freedom that would make a modern archivist swoon’ (The Social Construction of the Past, p. 283).

27 Goldsmiths MSS vol. 14a, fol. 15r. A mark was worth 13s 3d. As Julia Merritt has shown, the Companies contributed to the refurbishment of many City churches, although they expected their generosity to be made evident in stained glass and the like (‘Puritans, Laudians’, pp. 945–6).


29 GH MS 30,708/2, fols 229v–30r. ‘A pageant and a luserne’ were also ordered for 1597 (see GH MS 30,708/2, fol. 252r).

30 In 1632 one ‘Widdowe Walker’ was paid by order of the Haberdashers’ Court the sum of £5, ‘her husband having made suite to make the pageants’ (GH MS 15,869, fol. 31r). It is not possible to tell if her husband’s ‘suite’ failed due to his demise or for other reasons, nor is it clear what is meant by ‘making’ the pageants; perhaps he was a carpenter.

31 GH MS 30,708/6, fol. 359 and GH MS 11,590, fol. 15.

32 GH MS 34,048/15; my emphasis. The Company accounts for 1630 list only 200 members assessed for their contribution to Lord Mayor’s Day rather than the 320–360 of previous years, and the sums required of the members were smaller than had been the norm for this Company (around 50s for the Bachelors in budge; in contrast, in 1613 the Grocers assessed their Bachelors for individual sums as high as £8 (GH MS 11,590, fol. 1v)). As a result, the total sum received by the Merchant Taylors was less than £500, whereas in 1624 the Company accumulated more than twice this amount, and in 1613 the Grocers received nearly £500 from the Bachelors’ liverymen alone (total receipts for that year came to nearly £1300 – about £127,000 in modern terms) – perhaps times were hard in 1630 even for the Merchant Taylors. Richard Wunderli has calculated that there was a pronounced ‘spike’ in the number of aldermen being fined out of office in the later 1620s, showing that the City’s funds were tight (‘Evasion of the office of Alderman’, pp. 5–8). For an account of how
the financial pressure of civic office was lessened by statute in the later seventeenth century, see Stow ed. Strype, *A survey of the cities of London and Westminster*, p. 246.

33 GH MS 34,048/15. John Terry, the painter-stainer who worked with Webster in 1624, was once again employed to paint and gild various banners, pavises and targets.

34 Robertson and Gordon, *Collections* III, p. 50.

35 The Haberdashers’ Court minutes for 1627 – where it seems pretty certain that Dekker wrote the Show – exemplify this convention: they tell us nothing but how members were to be assessed for their contribution and who was responsible for collecting this money (see GH MS 15,842/1, fol. 248r–v).

36 GH MS 30,708/2, fol. 33v (I have been unable to identify Richard Grimston, unfortunately). The following April ‘Thomas Middleton poett’ was granted 23s: the Skinners’ minutes do not say what for, but it is likely to be an additional payment following his Show the autumn before (GH MS 30,708/3, fol. 42r). Despite the Skinners’ concerns about how they were to afford it, the total cost of the 1619 Show was over £725 (see GH MS 30,727/6, fol. 47r).

37 GH MS 16,969/2, fol. 248v (they ate mutton and rabbit).

38 GH MS 16,967/4. Two weeks later Christmas was granted an additional 40s for providing ‘2 great horses’ and two men in white armour for the Show.

39 *Ibid*.

40 Northway, ‘I desyre to be paid’, p. 408.

41 GH MS 16,967/2, fol. 66v. John Grinkin, the artificer, was paid his £45 in full with no complaints. Pafford claims that Munday ‘was also a keeper and apparently a hirer-out of clothing and properties used in pageants’ (*Chruso-thriambos*, ed. Pafford, p. 45).

42 GH MS 16,967/2, fol. 68r.

43 GH MS 16,969/2, fol. 223v. See Chapter 3 for more on ‘special effects’ of this kind.

44 GH MS 5770/2, fols 201–2; see also Hill, *Anthony Munday*, pp. 82–3. On the same day Kemby, a painter-stainer, had his ‘unreasonable’ bill reduced (this is probably ‘Richard Kimby’, the arms painter mentioned in the Painter-Stainers’ records for 1620: see Englefield, *The History of the Painter-Stainers Company*, p. 92). Munday had made similar ‘newe demands’ from the Goldsmiths in 1611, but there is no indication in the Company records if a further sum was conferred (see Goldsmiths MSS vol. 14a, fol. 20r). Kemby worked with Munday on both the 1611 and 1616 Shows.

45 Northway, ‘I desyre to be paid’, p. 419.


GH MS 30,708/2, fol. 122r.

GH MS 30,708/3, fol. 33r.


GH MS 30,708/2, fol. 253r.

GH MS 30,708/3, fol. 53r. Another miscreant was brought before the Court in 1622 to pay a 40s fine relating to this Show (*ibid.*, fol. 63r). The Grocers fined John Smyth £25 for ‘not performing his Stewardship on the Lo. Maiors day’ in 1622 (GH MS 11,88/3, fol. 222).

Clothworkers’ Court Orders, July 1634, fol. 150r.

GH MS 30,727/6, fols 358 and 366.

Clothworkers’ Orders of Courts, October 1583, fol. 30r.

GH MS 34,048/10. A total of 320 Company members contributed on this occasion. The expense of Webster’s Show in 1624 was such, at over £1000, that even the Merchant Taylors gained only ‘eight pounds fifteen shillings [and] one penny’ from their contributions in excess of the cost of the Show (GH MS 34,048/13). One should bear in mind, however, that royal entertainments were considerably more expensive than mayoral Shows: Smuts states that the cost of Princess Elizabeth’s marriage in 1613 totalled over £90,000 (‘Public ceremony’, p. 89).

GH MS 34,048/10. The excess, where there was one, tended to be given to the Warden of the Company, who was then billed for it in due course (see, for instance, GH MS 34,048/13).


Clothworkers’ Court Orders, July 1606, fol. 9v.

Dekker, once again, gives a sense of how widespread and well-known the practices associated with mayoral inaugurations were: in *The guls borne-booke* the ‘cherry lippes’ of the would-be fashionable gull are ‘open like the new painted gates of a Lord Maiors house’ (sig. C3v). Nashe uses much the same image in *Pierce Penilesse* (1592).

GH MS 34,048/10. As well as the conventional £40 for the new mayor, the Grocers also conferred £30 on one of their Sheriffs elect in 1622 ‘towards the beautifyinge of his house’ (GH MS 11,588/3, fol. 217). In 1611 James Pemberton himself requested additional plate from the Goldsmiths for his mayoralty (Goldsmiths MSS vol. 14a, fol. 4r; the Court Minutes list the inventory too, as one might expect of this particular Company, and also note that the plate was returned the year later). Owing to a relative scarcity of ‘great houses’ in London, Lang writes, ‘succeeding generations of Lord Mayors and Sheriffs tended to occupy the same houses’, and in some cases the livery companies owned the houses, which were leased out (‘Social origins’, pp. 40–1). Lang has calculated that, even
for those men with suitable houses for the roles, the offices of sheriff
and mayor could cost their incumbents between £2000 and £4000
for the year; for those who had to buy or lease a house the cost was
higher still (ibid., p. 45).

64 See Wunderli, ‘Evasion of the office of Alderman’, p. 4, and Heal,
Hospitality, p. 310.

65 Palmer makes the interesting suggestion that this passage ‘may quote
the Geneva Bible’s translation of Psalm 112.9’, which also uses the
words ‘pinch’ and ‘liberal’ (‘Metropolitan resurrection’, p. 378).

Jones ‘fiscally unreliable’ and ‘an altogether less impressive man’
than Cockayne, his predecessor (Middleton: The Collected Works,
p. 1434). The Lord Mayor was also sometimes instructed to provide
accommodation for visiting diplomats.

67 BL Add. MS 18016, fol. 152r. There may be a deliberate irony in
Finch’s remark that Jones had ‘willingly’ laid down the burden of
office (fol. 150r) and also in his ambiguous comment that Jones
‘cannot give a greater testimony of him[self] than his meane estimation
of him selfe’ (ibid.). In 1622 Barkham was given a valedictory testi-
monial by Finch in which it was stated that – unlike his predecessor,
Jones – he performed the role with ‘dilligence from the first [day] of the
[mayoral] yeare to the last’ (fol. 165v).

68 Ibid., fol. 166r.

69 GH MS 34,048/9. Some thirty men, according to the Company
accounts, worked through two nights and a day and a half to make it
possible to restage the Show (and the Company clerk charged 10s for
once again entering the accounts). Pepys and Tatham testify to inclem-
ent weather for the Show in 1664.

70 Goldsmiths MSS vol. 14a, fol. 19r.
71 Ibid., fol. 20v.
72 Grupenhoff, ‘The Lord Mayors’ Shows’, p. 20. In the same vein,
Munro calls the Londinium arch for James I’s coronation entry
‘Jonson’s creation’, overlooking Stephen Harrison’s essential contribu-
tion (The Figure of the Crowd, p. 51).

73 Osteen and Woodmansee, ‘Taking account of the New Economic
Criticism’, p. 9. Bergeron comments that such an approach to early
modern culture is grounded in ‘a romantic cult of the proprietary
single author . . . who dismisses [and] erases competitors’ (‘Middleton
and Munday’, p. 477).

74 Joint Enterprises, p. 63.
75 Ravelhofer, The Early Stuart Masque, p. 5.
76 Joint Enterprises, p. 34.
77 Ewbank, ‘Masques and pageants’, p. 110.
79 Hirschfeld, Joint Enterprises, p. 5.
Goldsmiths MS vol. 14a, fols 9v–10r. Grinkin was paid £75 and Munday £80.


Turner, ‘Plotting early modernity’, p. 87). ‘Plot’, as used in livery company records, is obviously also related to the kind of ‘plot’, summarising the play’s action, which was hung up on the back of the stage in professional theatres.

Ibid., p. 95; my emphasis.

Jonson sets out the distinction in his preface to his masque Hymenaei. Turner notes that Jonson often uses ‘plot’ ‘in this restricted and quasi-mechanical sense’ (ibid., p. 88).

Ibid., p. 91.

Heinemann notes that Christmas also held the position of woodcarver to the Navy, a post to which he had been appointed by the Earl of Nottingham, the Lord Admiral. As she points out, this may stand as another personal connection, for Middleton began his theatrical career writing for the Admiral’s Men at the Rose (Puritanism and Theatre, p. 122 n. 3).

Thus, the Ironmongers refer to Dekker as ‘Mr Tho: Decker the Poett’; Garret Christmas is simply a ‘workeman’ (GH MS 16,967/4). On this occasion (1629) Dekker and Christmas were commissioned in August, relatively early; the usual pattern was restored in 1635, when Heywood and John Christmas won the commission on 2 October.

Companion, pp. 45–6. Jonson’s collaborator George Chapman was of the same mind, disparaging Middleton as ‘a poore Chronicler of a Lord Maiors naked Truth (that peraduenture will last his yeare)’, which is perhaps a jibe directed specifically at The triumphs of truth, given the 1614 date of Chapman’s attack, and the way in which Truth is depicted as ‘thin and naked’ in the Show (Homer’s Odysseys, sig. A4v). As Bergeron points out, ‘ironically, Chapman helps confer permanence on Middleton’s [Show] by this very reference’ (Middleton: The Collected Works, p. 963).

See Robertson and Gordon, Collections III, p. xliii.


‘The Masque of Truth’, p. 106 n. 15. Williams states that ‘it was very unusual to employ one person to devise spectacles and another to describe them’ (‘A Lord Mayor’s Show by John Taylor’, p. 530).

Robertson and Gordon, Collections III, pp. 127 and 129.

GH MS 15,869, fol. 21v.

Clothworkers’ Court Orders, September 1633, fol. 140r; Clothworkers’ accounts, 1633–34, fol. 11v. In 1634 on at least two occasions the Wardens of the Yeomanry met Zachary Taylor and Robert Norman, the artificers, not John Taylor, the poet (unless he was one of the
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‘others’ mentioned, although not by name) (Clothworkers’ accounts, 1634–35, fol. 11r–v).

96 Watanabe-O’Kelly has aptly noted ‘the mania of early modern . . . bureaucracy for recording everything’ (‘Early modern European festivals’, p. 19). The almost neurotic level of detail in the Ironmongers’ minutes is such that we even learn that some of the trumpeters absented themselves for part of the day.

97 The Ironmongers’ Registers for 1629 say: ‘paid Thomas Decker Poett and Garrett Christmas workeman for 6 [several] Pageants which with the Contracte is particularly entred in Court Booke’ (Robertson and Gordon, Collections III, p. 119). The word ‘particularly’ reveals that the Company was aware that this was not usual practice.

98 GH MS 16,967/4. Perhaps because the clerk and/or the Company was especially interested in these matters, the Ironmongers’ records for 1629 also contain ‘The explanacion of the Shewe on the Lord Maiors day’, which describes Dekker and Christmas’s proposed pageants in some detail. I will discuss how these ‘explanations’ compare to the printed text, Londons Tempe, in Chapter 4.

99 GH MS 16,967/4.

100 The Artillery Garden often supplied drummers and fifers, and payments to them appear regularly in Company records (there are references to ‘Captaines’ and sergeants in the Merchant Taylors’ accounts for 1624, for instance). In Porta pietatis Heywood singles out ‘two eminent Gardens of Exercise . . . [one] Artillery’ as notable features of the City (sig. A3v).

101 See GH MS 11,588/2, fols 733 and 740. The related ‘Triumphs Accounts’ for this Show run from October 1613 to April 1614 (these beautifully presented accounts emanate excitement and pride). At a total cost of well over £1000 it was a very expensive production: Sullivan comments that its overall cost was around the same as for the building of the second Globe theatre (‘Summer 1613’, p. 168). The lavishness is understandable if the Grocers’ two preceding inaugurations in this period (1598 and 1608) were, as it seems, somewhat curtailed; as a comparator, the Haberdashers’ total expenditure on the 1620 Show was just over £750. Another parallel for the level of expenditure is aristocratic funerals: the cost of the Duke of Norfolk’s funeral in 1524 was £1300 (Loach, ‘The function of ceremonial’, p. 60).

102 The Grocers’ forthcoming Show must have been an open secret for some time, for in July two watermen petitioned to supply the galley foist (GH MS 11,588/2, fol. 770). In the same way, the Fishmongers were approached by ‘one Hynxman’ offering to sell them ‘Redd Capps’ for the procession in early July 1616 (GH MS 5570/2, fol. 178).

103 Goldsmiths MSS vol. 14, fols 710 and 721.

Goldsmiths MSS vol. 14, fol. 722. The Goldsmiths also rewarded Munday in 1617 for a copy of his Survay, which he had explicitly presented for ‘recompence’ (vol. 14a, fol. 162r). Munday wrote Pemberton’s epitaph, too: another spin-off from his earlier employments with the Goldsmiths (see my Anthony Munday, p. 157, and Munday, ed. Pafford, Chruso-Thriambos, pp. 55–7).

Munday, Chruso-thriambos, sig. C3r. Munday had also dedicated two religious works to Swinnerton in 1602, the year he became alderman (see my Anthony Munday, p. 90–1).

He stated ‘it is full three years past . . . that by occasion of God’s punishment, the Citizens of London have been constrained to forbear their coming to this honourable place’ (Nichols, The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth, p. 254).

The Vintners were not the wealthiest of Companies: Anne Crawford states that this ‘total sum [was] almost equivalent to an entire year’s income for the Company’ (A History of the Vintners’ Company, p. 94). £300 was only a contribution to the likely costs: for more on the considerable personal expense involved in the mayoralty, see Tittler, Architecture and Power, pp. 106–7.

Clothworkers’ Accounts, 1606–1607, fol. 11r. As 1606 was a plague year, the street procession and shows were called off ‘by reason of the sicknes then increasinge in this Cittie’ (Clothworkers Court Orders (1621), fol. 245r).

The Grocers evidently held a procession and feast in 1608, another year when records are scant; there is, however, no reference in the Company minutes to any pageantry (see GH MS 11,588/2, fols 512–15). The Grocers didn’t hold the Warden’s election dinner in July of that year either, ‘in respect of the dearenes of the tyme’ (GH MS 11,588/2 fol. 495), and the Company’s ‘garner’ was called upon, suggesting a time of dearth (fols 516–17).

In 1624 the number of cannons had been increased to 140 (see GH MS 34,048/13).

A ‘gilded head of Iron, cutt through’ was hired for ‘the cheif Ensigne’ (GH MS 34,048/10).

In 1612 the Merchant Taylors employed ‘Threescore and eight gentlemen ushers’. The Grocers hired 130 javelins and 29 dozen staves for whifflers for their 1613 Show, which probably indicates the numbers involved (GH MS 11,590, fols 4v–5r). They really pushed the boat out in 1613, spending over £36 on 47 dozen torches alone (ibid., fol. 5r).

Oxford DNB, ‘Christmas family’. I have preferred ‘Garret’ for
‘Gerard’, as he is sometimes called (as in the DNB), because that is what his collaborators called him.

119 Pafford notes that ‘payments to Grinkin are always among the highest’ (Munday, ed. Pafford, *Chruso-Thriambos*, p. 52).


121 As discussed below, Heywood mentions this work, *A true description of His Majesties royall ship*, in *Londini speculum*, sig. C4v. He praises the Christmas brothers’ artistry in the latter text too (see sig. G4r).

122 As well as the painter-stainers, armourers and wax and tallow-chandlers benefited from civic ceremony, as did musicians (see Palmer, *Ceremonial Barges*, p. 130). ‘Mr Ridg Armorer’ got 30s ‘for the hyer of the Javelyns’ in 1602 (GH MS 34,048/9).

123 GH MS 16,967/2, fol. 66v.

124 See the Merchant Taylors’ accounts (GH MS 34,048/10) for their outlay on the latter occasion.

125 Gordon, ‘Poet and architect’, p. 177.


127 Post-1640s mayoral texts did the same: for instance, although for some reason the artificer ‘desired to have his Name concealed’, Tatham did thank the painters, joiner and carver employed in the making of the 1659 Show (*London’s Tryumph*, sig. C4r).


130 *The triumphs of truth* was the first mayoral text where the writer thanked his collaborators. Henry Wilde, mentioned in 1617, was a painter-stainer who worked on a number of Shows, decorating ‘targets’ and the like; Challoner collaborated with Richard Munday on the 1613 Show, too (see GH MS 11,590, fol. 6v). The Companies’ accounts often record recompense paid to individuals for their ‘greate and extraordinary paynes’, as the Merchant Taylors put it (GH MS 34,048/10). The Company emphasised in 1624 that such ex gratia payments were ‘not hereafter to be a president [precedent]’, however (GH MS 34,048/13).

131 Masque texts often bore similar acknowledgements of the work of designers and the like (see, for example, Jonson’s *Masque of Queenes* (1609)).

132 Wickham, *Early English Stages*, vol. I, p. 110; Robertson and Gordon, *Collections* III, p. 92. It is perhaps this lack of knowledge about the range and subtleties of the roles behind the Shows that leads Kathman to call one Christopher Beck ‘an actor in Lord Mayor’s shows’ when the livery company records actually indicate that he (and a colleague called Hugh Watts) was often called upon either to find ‘woodmen’ or to take on such a role himself: the word ‘actor’ is somewhat misleading in this context (*Bibliographical Index of English Drama*).
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133 Munday, ed. Pafford, *Chruso-Thriambos*, p. 54.
134 Robertson and Gordon, *Collections III*, p. 5.
135 See Dekker, *The whole magnificent entertainment*, sigs I3v–I4r.
136 Grinkin himself received £46 from the Haberdashers in 1604 ‘for the pageant, lion, mermaid, chariott & other things’ (GH MS 15,869, fol. 7v).
138 GH MS 11,590, fol. 6r (see also Munday, ed. Pafford, *Chruso-Thriambos*, p. 47: Pafford’s discussion of Munday’s larger role in the 1613 Show appears to have passed most commentators by). The Grocers make a point of calling both writers ‘Gent’.
139 GH MS 11,590, fol. 6. The 1611 court entertainment *Oberon* won Jonson £40 and Inigo Jones, as the equivalent of the artificer, at least £390 (*Middleton: The Collected Works*, p. 1255). £310 converts to around £30,000 in modern prices.
140 GH MS 11,590, fol. 6.
141 Donna Hamilton’s argument that Munday’s alleged crypto-Catholicism resulted in the properly Protestant Middleton being chosen to write the 1613 Show is fatally damaged by the fact (of which she seems unaware) that the two were actually collaborators that year (*Anthony Munday and the Catholics*, pp. 159–60).
142 Taylor also thanks Zachary Taylor, ‘a quaint and well knowne curious Carvar’ (*The triumphs of fame and honour*, sig. B4r).
144 Williams, ibid., p. 509. Even Ceri Sullivan, a scholar more attuned to the pragmatics of literary production than most, claims the commissions were contested by ‘dramatists’, which disregards both the artificers and those pageant writers – like Squire and Taylor – who were not dramatists (‘London’s early modern creative industrialists’, p. 381).
145 ‘I desyre to be paid’, p. 405.
146 Dekker offers a similar account of the making of the 1604 royal entry: ‘for more exact and formall managing of [the] Businesse, a Select number both of Aldermen and Commoners . . . were . . . chosen forth, to whose discretion, on the Charge, Contriuings, Proiects, and all other Dependences, owing to so troublesome a worke, was entirely, and Iudically committed’ (*The magnificent entertainment*, sig. B2v).
147 *Jacobean Civic Pageants*, p. 175 n. 2.
148 He strikes a similar note more briefly in *Sidero-Thriambos*, referring to the defects of a performance designed ‘in so slender a compasse’ (sigs A4v–B1r).
149 There is no evidence in the Merchant Taylors’ accounts whether or not Webster or his collaborators, the painter John Terry, William Patten and George Lovett, arranged for the printing of the books, as was usual. We do know that the sub-committee met at least twenty-one times to ‘confer concerning the provision of shewes’ because they
charged the Company for the expenses of that many dinners (GH MS 34,048/13).

151 *Jacobean Civic Pageants*, p. 170.
152 GH MS 34,048/13.
154 GH MS 16,967/1, fol. 53v. It seems that Baker acted as an artificer on this occasion as his role extended to making ‘the pageant’, and it was noted that Baker’s role did not extend to providing the children and their apparel: John Tailor from Westminster School undertook this.
155 GH MS 16,969/2, fol. 225.
156 In a rather loose use of the term, Hardin claims that Munday acted ‘as artificer for later Lord Mayor’s shows written by others’ and he instances the supply of cloth to back up this view (‘Spectacular Constructions’, p. 77). The role of artificer, however, cannot be defined simply by supplying cloth, and Hardin’s understanding of Munday’s civic career is a little garbled.
157 GH MS 34,048/10.
158 *Ibid*. Bradbrook states that Webster too participated in the procession of his own Show, in 1624, although he is not present in the list of members in the Company records for that year: perhaps he did not process as a member, or alternatively Bradbrook may have confused John Webster with Edward Webster, who did join the procession (see *John Webster*, p. 166). She also speculates that Milton, a student at Paul’s School in 1624, may have either acted in or marched in the procession accompanying Webster’s Show (‘The politics of pageantry’, p. 74).
159 GH MS 34,048/9. Munday was also reimbursed nearly £4 by the Grocers in 1613 for ‘the cleareing of all Chardges for the standing of the Pageant etc at the bell in Carter lane’ (GH MS 11,590, fol. 6r). Carter Lane runs parallel to the southern edge of Paul’s Churchyard and is thus just off the route back from Paul’s Stairs; it features in a number of the Companies’ accounts. It was blocked off to traffic with a chain when the cathedral was being used, as in mayoral Shows: hence ‘Paul’s Chain’.
160 GH MS 38,048/8.
161 *Ibid*.
164 GH MS 15,842/1, fol. 142r.
165 GH MS 15,869, fol. 7v; *Jacobean Civic Pageants*, p. 24. Jonson did allow other suitably courtly works of pageantry to be printed, however, such as the entertainments he wrote for the new royal family for performance at Althorp and at Highgate in 1603–4, as well as his ‘part’ of *The magnificent entertainment*. 
Pageantry and power

166 Robertson and Gordon, *Collections III*, p. xxxv.

167 For some reason, there are quite a few details relating to Skinners’ Shows not transcribed by Robertson and Gordon, and there are also a number of relevant items in the Clothworkers’ accounts for 1594–95 (John Spencer’s inauguration) which they omitted to record.

168 GH MS 30,708/2, fol. 254v.

169 In 1628 Dekker was given an additional £3 and Christmas £10 ‘in benevolence’ and ‘over and above the several somes agreed’ (GH MS 30,708/3, fol. 119r). The Skinners were evidently very pleased with the production: even the boy drummer was granted an extra 20s.


171 GH MS 15,869, fol. 26r.

172 The Grocers’ Court minutes for 1617 are exemplary in this respect: a committee of wardens was appointed in July (again, relatively early) ‘generally for to doe and order all matters of triumphes and shewes’, reporting back to the Court of Assistants when required (GH MS 11,588/3, fol. 48).

173 The use of St Peter’s Church on Cheapside as a venue for the city waits to perform is an example of this trend: one can imagine Company officials telling the churchwarden ‘but we’ve always done it this way . . .’. Of course, those affected by these traditions were generally compensated for their trouble too.

174 GH MS 15,869, fols 26r and 31r.

175 GH MS 34/048/8 and 34,048/9. Richard Scarlett and George Hearne were senior members of the Painter-Stainers in 1605 (see Englefield, *The History of the Painter-Stainers Company*, p. 64 n. 5); Scarlett, who decorated ‘targettes’ in 1602, also worked on the 1610 Show alongside Rowland Vaughan. Large quantities of banners and the like were used: even the trumpeters had banners on their instruments.


177 GH MS 34,048/10.

178 The artificers in 1624 were John Terry, William Patten and George Lovett.

179 GH MS 11,590, fol. 21.

180 ‘Francis Tipslie and Mr Squire’ were paid £180 for the ‘pageants’ for the 1620 Show. In 1604 Tipsley was paid £5 for painting two banners (see GH MS 15,869, fol. 8r). For the 1631 Show he got £56 ‘for painting & guilding the streamers and banners’ (fol. 26r), and in 1632, over £20 for ‘work done about the streamers’ (fol. 31r). The case of Thomas Kendall also indicates that the Haberdashers’ Company seems to have been prone to employ its own members.

181 Although Tipsley was the main co-producer with Squire, Grinkin
was still involved, receiving over £54 for ‘the silke workes’ (GH MS 15,869, fol. 16r).

182 Quoted in Wortham, ‘Sovereign counterfeits’, p. 345.

183 Financially cautious they may have been, but Company officials were not soulless bureaucrats: the Drapers record a payment of 2s 6d to a boy ‘who should have been a drumer but was disappoint’d’ (Robertson and Gordon, Collections III, p. 105), and in 1602 the Merchant Taylors paid someone sixpence ‘for carying one of the Children home’ (GH MS 34,048/8).

184 See Collections III, p. 116. Palmer comments that it was ‘common for musicians . . . to demand what Companies regarded as too high a fee, requiring negotiation’ (‘Music in the barges’, p. 174).

185 Gasper argues that Dekker may also have been motivated by a political desire to distinguish civic entertainments from what he may have regarded as ‘the pointless extravagance and display of Whitehall’ (The Dragon and the Dove, p. 130).

186 Northway, ‘I desyre to be paid’, p. 408.

187 Such family connections were legion: two of James Campbell’s daughters married men who eventually become Lord Mayors, and the 1613 Lord Mayor Sir Thomas Middleton’s first wife was the daughter of the Lord Mayor of 1597, Richard Saltonstall. Munday understates the situation for rhetorical impact when in Sidero-Thriambos he claims that Campbell’s mayoralty, following that of his father, ‘is no commo[n] thing’ (sig. B4v). Many of these families also had long-standing involvement in trading companies like the Merchant Adventurers and East India Company, an issue I explore further in Chapter 5 (see Brenner, Merchants and Revolution, p. 90, for an account of the marital connections between the Campbell, Clitheroe and Garway families).


189 Ibid., p. 73. On the basis of a passing reference in the posthumous Merry Conceited Jests of George Peele (1607) to Peele having ‘had all the ouersight of the pagiants’, Horne concludes that ‘Peele had acquired sufficient prominence and experience to be regarded as a man who might be called upon to produce the pageant as well as write the device for it’ (ibid.).

190 Hardin, ‘Spectacular Constructions’, p. 142.

191 See ‘Medieval to Renaissance’, pp. 306–8; she concludes that from 1516 the Drapers’ Court minutes ‘show that the players . . . are almost invariably well-known professionals with court/aristocratic patronage’ (p. 310).

192 Jacobean Civic Pageants, p. 137.

193 See Heywood, An apology for actors, sigs A2r–A4r.


195 Heinemann claims that Middleton may have gained the commission for his first Show in 1613 through the offices of Sir Thomas
Middleton, that year’s Lord Mayor, but she provides no evidence for this (*Puritanism and Theatre*, p. 125).

196 Middleton speaks highly of Munday’s work on the water show in 1623, calling it ‘Glorious and Apt’ (*The triumphs of integrity*, sig. A3v).

197 As Bergeron points out, J. P. Collier made this connection many years ago, but no one subsequently pursued it (‘Middleton and Munday’, p. 466; see also my *Anthony Munday*, pp. 77–9). Bergeron provides a painstaking account of the lineage of the alleged Middleton/Munday rift which I do not need to rehearse here. Times have changed: in his introduction to *The triumphs of truth* in the *Middleton Collected Works* Bergeron does not mention Munday at all in this regard.

198 Edmonds, ‘Heminges, John’, *Oxford DNB*. ‘Heminges had been employed by the Merchant Taylors several years before [his Show with Dekker] in training his apprentice John Rice to deliver a speech at the Merchant Taylors’ dinner for royalty’ (Bentley, *The Profession of Player*, p. 61). Neither Heminges’s *DNB* entry nor Andrew Gurr’s potted biography of him in *The Shakespeare Company* (see p. 230) mentions his work for the Shows. The cultured alderman John Swinnerton (Lord Mayor in 1612) acted as a kind of producer for the entertainment given on the occasion of this visit by the King and Prince Henry to Merchant Taylors’ Hall, when the latter was conferred the freedom of that Company: Swinnerton’s responsibilities included liaising with Jonson over the speech and organising the boy actors (for a full discussion of this event and its wider implications, see Perry, *The Making of Jacobean Culture*, pp. 193–8).

199 GH MS 11,590, fol. 7r. In 1613 Richard Munday received £14 for ‘working silvering guilding and paynting of one long streamer of 14 yards long, with the image of St Anthony’, plus other work, the cost of which is not recorded. By 1639 he had risen to be Upper Warden of the Painter-Stainers and his own arms appeared in the windows of the Company Hall: his father would have been very proud, no doubt, had he survived that long (Englefield, *History of the Painter-Stainers Company*, pp. 92 and 109 n. 3).

200 See Bradbrook, *John Webster*, p. 20. Admittedly building speculation upon speculation, it is just possible that Webster himself may have performed in civic entertainments in the mid-1580s to early 1590s.

201 GH MS 15,869, fols 16r–17r. William Squire was at that point the Beadle of the Yeomanry of the Haberdashers, and doubtless assisted them in that capacity (see Archer, *The Haberdashers’ Company*, pp. 53–4).

202 See Forker, *Skull Beneath the Skin*, p. 20. Dekker apparently owed Webster £40 for the cost of the pageant wagons from the previous year’s Show (see Bradbrook, *John Webster*, p. 180), although Gasper is sceptical about this claim (*The Dragon and the Dove*, p. 132).
Yet another creditor was Ralph Savage, the manager of the Red Bull theatre, who may have lent Dekker money.

Yet another creditor was Ralph Savage, the manager of the Red Bull theatre, who may have lent Dekker money.

203 ‘The politics of pageantry’, p. 68.
205 One of the writers for the Queen’s 1578 entertainment in Norwich is identified as ‘Citizen of London’ in the printed text.
206 Kathman, ‘Heywood, Thomas’, Oxford DNB.
207 Howard, Theater of a City, p. 28.
208 See Capp, ‘Taylor, John’, Oxford DNB, and The World of John Taylor, p. 8. Capp does not mention Taylor’s Lord Mayor’s Show in his DNB entry, and merely dismisses it as having ‘very little literary or dramatic merit’ in The World of John Taylor (p. 33). Tessa Watt remarks that ‘Taylor’s corpus does seem to occupy an ambiguous place . . . probably coming into some degree of contact with both the highest and the lowest levels of literate society’ (Cheap Print, p. 293).
209 Two years before his mayoral Show Taylor won a case for slander at the Guildhall so he would have been known to City leaders (Capp, ibid., p. 32).
210 He knew Munday, too, at least by reputation: we have Taylor to thank for the anecdote that ‘Mr. Anthony Munday (sometimes a Writer to the City of London) would run from the Table at the sight of a forequarter of Lambe roasted’ (Taylors feast, sig. E4v). The (posthumous) identification of Munday as a City writer is notable here. If his late work The hierarchie of the blessed angells is anything to go by, Heywood knew a considerable number of his contemporaries, ranging chronologically from Peele to Ford (Webster, apparently, was known as ‘Jacke’ rather than John, and Middleton and Dekker were both ‘Tom’) (sig. S1v).
211 Capp, The World of John Taylor, pp. 43–4. Williams comes to the same conclusion as I do (‘A Lord Mayor’s show’, p. 506). Taylor included a work by Dekker in a 1615 collection of verses (Capp, ibid., p. 44).
213 The two were chosen because of their court connections (see Kipling, ‘Anne Boleyn’, p. 50, and, for Udall, Streitberger, Court Revels).
214 Unlike some of the later writers, both of Peele’s Shows celebrate the fact that he was ‘Master of Arts in Oxford’, not that he was a citizen and Salter.
215 If membership of a livery company, especially one of the Great Twelve, came into play for other roles in mayoral Shows too, then it is possible that John Wilson, a theatre musician who was free of the Grocers and also a member of the City Waits, may have participated in post-1622 Shows (see Kathman, ‘Grocers, Goldsmiths and Drapers’, p. 9).
Goldsmiths MSS vol. 14s, fol. 8r. Gurr suggests that Lowin’s Goldsmiths’ Company membership was the sole reason for his employment on this occasion (The Shakespeare Company, p. 233). Robert Armin was also free of the Goldsmiths.

Forker, Skull Beneath the Skin, p. 9. The Merchant Taylors did at one point choose a writer, but for his specific expertise rather than company membership: their account of commissioning Jonson to write a speech to welcome the King to their Hall prefers the dramatist to the ‘Scholemaster and Schollers’ of their school because the latter ‘be not acquainted with suche kind of Entertagnements’ (see Hirschfeld, Joint Enterprises, p. 66). It’s notable that in the forty years or so since Mulcaster wrote civic pageantry the Merchant Taylors’ school had lost its reputation for writing and performing speeches.

Hardin, ‘Spectacular Constructions’, p. 78.

See Horne, George Peele, p. 10. Horne speculates that James and George Peele may have been descended from Sir John Piel, Lord Mayor in 1372 (ibid., pp. 11, 132 and 139). Bradbrook asserts that Webster’s membership of the powerful Merchant Taylors was ‘the most important fact about [his] origins’ (John Webster, p. 11).

GH MS 34,048/8.

For instance, he refers to ‘our Hall’ when discussing the Company in the time of Edward III (sig. B1r). Gasper speculates that Webster may have been present at Dekker’s 1612 Show (The Dragon and the Dove, p. 131). Webster was not made free of the Merchant Taylors until 1615, however, so if he did attend the Show it would have been merely as a spectator. One ‘Edward Webster’ is assessed for a contribution to the 1624 Show (see GH MS 34,048/13).

See the copy held in the British Library, sig. A1r (the title page is reproduced in Sayle, Lord Mayors’ Pageants).

Sayle, Lord Mayors’ Pageants, p. 97.

Dekker continued to write during his time in prison – chiefly about his experience of imprisonment – although he would not have been able to bid for a mayoral Show. Perhaps not knowing that Dekker was in prison at this time, Lobanov-Rostovsky prefers to see Dekker’s absence from the scene during these years as a reflection of the livery companies’ distaste for his alleged unwillingness to take on an ‘exclusively celebratory tone’ in Troia-Noua triumphants (‘The Triumphes of Golde’, p. 885).

GH MS 15,869, fol. 21v.

See Hill, Anthony Munday, pp. 171–4. The copy of Munday’s Triumphes of re-united Britania held in the Bodleian has ‘Champion for the Cittie or the Citys Champion’ written in a contemporary hand on its title page.

Buying Whiteness, p. 140. Taylor also claims that Middleton ‘could
hardly have avoided thinking about his Grocer-stepfather when writing *The triumphs of truth* (ibid.). This, of course, we can never substantiate.

228 Webster, *Monuments of Honor*, sigs B2r and B3v; see also sigs A1r and A2v.

229 Forker, *Skull Beneath the Skin*, p. 9. Forker (who does not seem to know that Dekker too was a Merchant Taylor) rather hyperbolically calls Webster ‘the official poet of the [Merchant] Taylors’ and their ‘laureate’. With three Shows for this Company Munday, in fact, had a better claim to such a status.


232 Heinemann, *Puritanism and Theatre*, p. 126. I think she overstates the case that Middleton was ‘a protégé of Parliamentary Puritans among the City oligarchs’, however (ibid.); Taylor disputes her views too, arguing that Middleton is more accurately seen as a Calvinist (*Oxford DNB*, ‘Middleton, Thomas’).


234 According to the title pages of his other publications (all of which are religious works), Squire had a Master of Arts from Jesus College, Cambridge.

235 See Heinemann, *Puritanism and Theatre*, pp. 122–3. For Heinemann, Squire is an example of the appointment by the Haberdashers of ‘Puritans’ to jobs in their gift.

236 Jordan was a poet, playwright and actor who was responsible for thirteen mayoral shows.