‘A day of well Compos’d Variety of Speach and shew’: bringing the Shows to life

Given their predominantly visual appeal to the original audiences it is perhaps surprising that relatively little attention has yet been paid within literary and historical scholarship to how the visual and aural spectacle of the Lord Mayors’ Shows would have been experienced on the day of the performance. This is partly down to the general dominance within literary scholarship of printed texts, and it is also, of course, due to the elusive nature of pageantry, which would seem hard for critics to reconstruct. David Cannadine argues that ‘the invisible and the ephemeral are, by definition, not the easiest of subjects for scholars to study. But this conceals, more than it indicates, their real importance [and is] . . . no justification for failing to try.’ Smuts writes in a similar vein that ‘modern scholarship has . . . [treated] language and visual iconography as central . . . while largely ignoring . . . elements of spectacle that must often have dominated the impressions of contemporary spectators’. Even though some of the more fleeting aspects of the Shows have left no record, we must still acknowledge their existence in their own moment. Putting the printed texts to one side it is salutary to remember that, like masques, the Shows were composed of various elements, most of which were non-verbal: alongside the speeches (some in verse, others prose) there were costumes, music and dance, as well as special effects such as fireworks. Indeed, some of their more spectacular qualities far exceeded those that the playhouses were able to stage.

Despite these apparent obstacles there are, in fact, various ways to retrieve some sense of the vanished spectacle and to reconstruct aspects of the lived experience of these multi-faceted events. This chapter will therefore discuss, inter alia, the actors’ roles, the props, music and costumes used during the Show and how the pageantry was staged; it will also look at how important emblems and imagery were to these productions. The overall intention, following
Ravelhofer’s approach to the masque, is, as she writes, to ‘arrive at a fuller grasp of the . . . experience [by trying to] balance . . . various aspects of performance and textual record against each other, and compare the sartorial, kinetic, iconic, and verbal languages of the event’. One should therefore give due attention to what Davidson calls the ‘technology’ of these events. Not all such aspects were under the control of the makers of the Shows, who also had to deal with a number of practical constraints and challenges, starting with the early darkness and often-inclement weather of late October.

It is thus important to address some of those moments when things went wrong. One must also remember, as Paster comments, that, unlike masques, Shows were not presented in entirely appropriate venues: ‘with all the visual and acoustical difficulties of an open-air procession’, she writes, ‘the pageant poet faced severe handicaps’. The dimensions and acoustics of the locations of the pageant stations varied too, from open spaces like Paul’s Churchyard to narrow streets like Soper Lane, off Cheapside, to cramped conditions like the river banks. Pageant writers and artificers took advantage of the space available to them just as dramatists did on the professional stage (in many cases, of course, they were the same people). In *The triumphs of truth*, for instance, Middleton uses the relatively capacious South yard of St Paul’s as the setting for a battle between Error (in a chariot) and Envy (on a rhinoceros) with Truth in her chariot, accompanied by Zeal, whereas at the crowded riverside at Barnard’s Castle only two figures appear, both on horseback rather than on an unwieldy pageant wagon or chariot.

‘To dazle and amaze the common Eye’: eyewitnesses of the Shows

The Lord Mayor’s Show was a renowned spectacle that drew a vast audience from home and abroad. As Dekker puts it in *Britannia’s honor*, ‘What Deputie to his Soraigne [sic] goes along to such Triumphes? To behold them, Kings, Queenes, Princes and Ambassadors (from all parts of the World) haue with Admiration, reioyced’ (sig. A3v). As Dekker suggests, visitors to London often included the Show in their itinerary, and as a result there are a number of recorded experiences from across virtually our whole period. Indeed, to make the written texts come alive, those eyewitness accounts of the Shows that have survived are essential evidence for the impressions of contemporary spectators, together with the few extant drawings and other illustrations of the Shows. These are more important than the limited attention they have received
implies, for there are more eyewitness descriptions of watching a mayoral Show than there are of watching a stage-play, and, as I will demonstrate, they can be very enlightening.

Chief among these are the sketches that accompany the written descriptions of the 1629 Show made in his journal by Abram Booth, secretary to the delegation of the Dutch East India Company, of which James Campbell, the new Lord Mayor, was also a member. Booth’s account is particularly valuable because it gives visual as well as prose evidence. The images in his ‘Journael’ have been sketched out in pencil then over-drawn in ink, suggesting that Booth took the original impression from life; the ‘Journael’ itself is small enough to have been carried around and used as a notebook. Indeed, such is the detail contained in Booth’s journal that it is somewhat puzzling that he mentions no speeches, music or songs. Fifteen years previously another visitor, Michael van Meer, included in his ‘Album Amicorum’ some exquisite miniature images depicting a procession of the Lord Mayor, aldermen and sheriffs coming out of church on a ‘Veestdagen [feast day]’ in 1614: going by the participants in the procession and their ceremonial attire this was probably the mayoral inauguration. Georg von Holtzschuler recorded part of the 1624 procession in his album. (Relatedly, a contemporary witness of James I’s London royal entry preserved on a copy of Dekker’s text for this occasion his or her impression of the day in a sketch that may show aspects of the staging of the Londinium arch, along with some of the captions used on the arches.) As well as eyewitness illustrations, in 1635 a series of engraved images representing the conventional ‘Ages of Man’ transition were published, accompanied by mildly satirical verses. The images standing in for the four ages (Childhood, Youth, Manhood and Old Age) appear to have been based on some of the traditional participants in the Shows like the whiffler, although, as Astington points out, one should treat these with a degree of caution, as the satiric purpose may have dominated over the desire to reproduce elements of the Shows accurately.

A number of the spectators who have left records of their experiences of mayoral Shows were overseas emissaries, like Booth, Orazio Busino (the Venetian ambassador’s chaplain, who attended the 1617 Show), Abraham Scultetus (the German court chaplain, who was present at the 1612 Show), and Aleksei Zuizin (the Russian ambassador, who saw the 1613 Show). Lupold von Wedel, who was in London for the 1585 Show, was simply a curious traveller. They were not always voluntary spectators: Zuizin’s report relates that the Russian party were given no choice in the
matter, being ordered to attend the Show by King James despite their repeated protestations that protocol demanded they meet the King first. Regardless of the particular circumstances, however, all these witnesses can offer an insight into what Munro has usefully called ‘the framing action of the onlookers’. What they share is their ‘foreignness’. Indeed, Steward and Cowan argue that ‘much of the evidence relating to early modern cities has come from outsiders, sensitive to material and cultural differences and eager to make comparisons . . . Travellers commented above all on what was to be seen.’ Given the relative frequency of such observers it is curious, as Ravelhofer argues in relation to the masque, that ‘few critics have put themselves into the place of [an overseas visitor], trying to imagine the masque stage from the point of view of a puzzled observer’. Middleton offers a typically caustic take on this subject, arguing in *The triumphs of louse and antiquity* that

\[
\text{if Forreine Nations haue beeene struck with admiration at the Forme, State and Splendour of some yearly Triumphs, wherein Art hath bene but weakely imitated, and most beggarly worded, there is faire hope that things where Inuention flourishes, Cleare Art and her gracefull proprieties, should receive fauour and encouragement from the content of the Spectator. (sig. A4r)}
\]

In his idiosyncratic way, Middleton here implies both that the other pageant writers’ productions are artistically inadequate (as he did in *The triumphs of truth*) and also that ‘Forreine Nations’ are ignorant enough to be impressed with such poor fare. To reinforce the point he repeated the statement a few years later, in *The tryumphs of honor and industry*.

Of course, not all observers were from overseas. Other eyewitnesses were indigenous inhabitants of the city, although these inhabitants could not be relied upon to preserve their impressions. As Astington writes, ‘there is relatively little native English information about these remarkable annual events’. Paul Seaver comments of Nehemiah Wallington, a godly citizen of early modern London, that he ‘must have witnessed some of these events . . . but he has left no record of any such occasion or of his feelings about such displays’. John Greene of Lincoln’s Inn (whose birthday it was on 28 October) either did not attend or chose not to write about the 1635 Show in his diary. A Londoner who did write about the Show was William Smith, a Haberdasher who included in his ‘A Breeff Description of the Famous Cittie of London’ an account of the 1575 inauguration of Ambrose Nicholas, a Merchant Taylor.
Previous to that, we have Henry Machyn’s ‘diary’, with its descriptions of some of the Shows in the 1550s and early 1560s. Indeed, Machyn (of whom more below) is our only source of eyewitness information about the pageantry employed in this early period. Machyn’s manuscript, Ian Mortimer has stressed, has value not only for its descriptions of a period of civic pageantry about which relatively little is known but also, as Mortimer asserts, for its status as ‘probably the earliest instance in England of a poorly educated man consciously taking responsibility for systematically recording the history of his own times’. His work, Mortimer writes, testifies to ‘the beginnings of the written expression of identity by the emerging urban middle class’. Furthermore, Mortimer argues that it is possible that ‘Machyn wrote with an awareness of a wider [later] historical readership’ for a text which he himself called a ‘chronicle’. Machyn’s vantage point, then, can provide a useful contrast to that of overseas visitors and dignitaries.

Their differences notwithstanding, what can be gained from all these diverse eyewitness records – and from nowhere else – is a taste of the incidental, impromptu aspects of the Shows, those which pertain exclusively to the day itself and which are by definition very ephemeral. As Lusardi and Gras point out in connection to Abram Booth’s eyewitness account, ‘things don’t always go according to script [and] . . . Booth introduces authentic detail that was certainly not scripted’. Their comments are borne out by a moment recounted by Busino in 1617. One of Middleton’s pageants featured a man playing a Spaniard, who according to Busino ‘kept kissing his hands, right and left, but especially to the Spanish ambassador, who was a short distance from us, in such wise as to elicit roars of laughter from the multitude’. Although one has to factor in Busino’s eye to his home readership in terms of the way he chose to inflect his experiences (the same applies to Zuizin, who stressed the subordination of the City and its Show to the Crown), it remains the case that neither this actor’s stage business nor the reaction of the audience would have survived the transitory moment had Busino not included them in his report. Middleton’s text is not concerned with preserving such detail, which would doubtless have been improvised. Indeed, if his text had been printed before the Show, he would not have known about it. The tryumphs of honor and industry simply provides the Spaniard’s speech, in both Spanish and English. Conversely, possibly because of language difficulties, like both Booth and Zuizin, Busino does not mention the speeches to which the printed text devotes so much space.
Bringing the Shows to life

Booth’s descriptions, written and pictorial, of Dekker and Christmas’s pageants for *Londons tempe* (1629) bear some interesting discrepancies from the printed text. Whereas Dekker states that the ‘Londons tempe’ pageant comprised ‘an arbor, supported by 4 Great Termes: On the 4 Angles, or corners ouer the Termes, are placed 4 pendants with armes in them’ (sig. B4v), Booth records the pageant in the following manner: it contained, he writes, ‘a tree in the four seasons, crowned by Angels, richly decorated’. Booth also appears to have followed the text rather than the evidence of his eyes when he states that ‘on top of all [stood] a lion’s head, belonging to the Mayor’s coat of arms’: the drawing actually omits the lion’s head. Perhaps, if he was relying on the text to prompt his memory, Booth misread ‘Angles’ for ‘angels’ and hence invented the latter, which do not feature in the printed work. Dekker’s version is certainly more
practical: as Robertson remarks, Booth’s ‘angels’ have ‘little visible means of support’. However, Booth’s drawing of the ‘Apollo’s Palace’ pageant correctly shows seven figures (see Figure 7). There are other minor differences. The Indian boy on the ostrich is said by Dekker to be wearing ‘attire proper to the Country’, whereas in Booth’s drawing the boy does not appear to be wearing anything (unlike the turbaned and robed figures he is accompanied by) (see Figure 8). Moreover, Lusardi states that there are four figures alongside the platform on which the boy and ostrich are placed, ‘a Turke and a Persian’ – as Booth shows – and also ‘a pikeman & a Musketeere’, which do not appear in the drawing. The ‘12 siluer Columnes [and] foure golden Columnes’ cited by Dekker as part of the structure called ‘Apollo’s Palace’ are not drawn by Booth, who has substituted a more prosaic-looking stage with four columns, perhaps because it was easier to draw – or because the sixteen gold and silver columns did not materialise (see Figure 7). Neither does he depict the ‘Embosd antique head of an Emperour’ Dekker claims to have appeared at the top of this pageant. Lusardi
and Gras comment, ‘did Dekker’s ambition outstrip his resources . . . or is Booth being careless?’ It is not necessarily the case that Booth simply could not see the precise design of the pageants and thus made mistakes. There is so much other ‘authenticating detail’, as Lusardi and Gras put it, in the drawings, such as the helmeted statue with shield and lance at the top of Apollo’s Palace, and the globe and compass lying at the feet of those impersonating the seven liberal sciences, none of which is mentioned in *Londons tempe*, that the likeliest interpretation is that what Booth did depict what he could see to the best of his ability. His journal thus may reveal to us the eventual results of necessary compromises in the realisation of the Show that Dekker’s text does not disclose, or could not have disclosed. For the 1629 Show we are therefore privileged to have access to a threefold insight into the events, all aspects of which reveal the crucial role of contingency in the making of the Shows, and which taken together offer a full and lively account of the event: Booth’s eyewitness descriptions and sketches, the printed text itself
and (as we’ll see further below), remarkably revealing Ironmongers’ records.

There may well be actual connections between some of these facets of this Show, for elsewhere in his journal Booth’s account of the pageants is so close to Dekker’s descriptions that it is possible that he had a copy of Dekker’s text to hand. As a member of an important party guesting at the Show and banquet he was likely to have had access to a copy of the text, assuming, as seems plausible, that the work was available on the day and distributed to visiting dignitaries. The fact that he provides the names of the individual pageants, such as ‘the Lemnian Forge’ as well as the names of the actual figures contained in them, underlines this possibility, since these are unlikely to have been available to onlookers without the text unless placards were used to set the scene, of which there is no evidence in the printed text – Dekker being Dekker he would undoubtedly have mentioned them. Booth also follows the wording of the printed text quite closely when describing the second water pageant showing the sealion representing Campbell’s various trading roles. *Londons tempe* states that ‘his Lordship is Maior of the Staple, Gouernour of the French Company, and free of the Eastland Company’ (sig. B1v); Booth writes that Campbell is ‘mayor or dean of the staple of Cloth, Governor of the french and Freeman of the Eastland Company’.

Zuizin, for his part, and apparently without the assistance of an explanatory pamphlet, was clearly trying to make sense of a spectacle that was foreign to him in more than one way. Of the pageantry performed during the 1613 Show he writes somewhat vaguely that there were men ‘who carried on themselves wooden [models of] towns, worked and painted’. His account continues:

> And in the [model] towns were churches and on the towers and along the wall were constructed guns, and on the steeples of the churches and on the city ladder sat old and young people and boys and girls in bright dresses. And on them were masks like human faces and like all sorts of animals.

Unless these are pageant devices not mentioned by Middleton’s text, it seems that Zuizin is relating the alien devices he saw to things he was familiar with, such as towns, churches and towers (Busino too likens the spectacle to those he knew back in Venice). After all, one can hardly expect Zuizin to have recognised Middleton’s ‘Chariot of Error’, for instance. Given that his account starts with
the departure of the mayoral party up-river to Westminster it’s
doubtful that he would have witnessed the speech by ‘London’ at
the very beginning of the day, which appears to be the only part
of the pageantry on this occasion where ‘a modell of Steeples and
Turrets’ is used, and even then to quite different effect. His descrip-
tion of the physical layout of the pageant cars, however, is more
reminiscent of others’, and also of those given in the printed texts:
‘on all sides, above, and below, sat small girls and boys and here
they carried a variety of great beasts: elephants, and unicorns, and
lions and camels, and boars, and other animals’. Where Middleton
describes ‘a little Vessel’ bearing the King and Queen of the Moors
and their attendants (The triumphs of truth, sig. B4v), Zuizin recalls
something similar, ‘a small decorated ship’.

As we can see, the printed text and eyewitness accounts both
gain in credibility when they offer consistent descriptions of the
Show. The account of Abraham Scultetus, as Hans Werner states,
‘follows Dekker’s [1612] text exactly, even down to the “Speech
of Fame”’. As well as duplicating it, personal recollections could
also supplement the printed text where the latter gave relatively
little information about the visual look of the Show. Von Wedel
recounts that in the 1585 Show ‘some men [carried] a representa-
tion in the shape of a house with a pointed roof painted in blue and
golden colours and ornamented with garlands, on which sat some
young girls in fine apparel’. Von Wedel’s likening of the pageant
to a ‘house’ suggests that the structure he saw had similarities to
the sixteenth-century pageant wagons described in David Rogers’s
Breviary, which states that ‘these pagiantes or cariage was [sic] a
highe place made like a howse with 2 roomes being open on the
tope’. As we will see below, mayoral pageant cars did use multiple
tiers. Furthermore, Peele’s very short printed text supplies only the
speeches made by these girls, who are there called ‘nymphs’. Unlike
von Wedel’s description, Peele’s text tells us nothing about the way
in which the pageant was shaped and coloured, the look of which
would have been quite lost had the German traveller not chosen to
recount it. Eyewitness accounts also offer insights into the way the
Show was realised, the order of the procession and so on, relatively
prosaic but still important matters which the printed texts did not
usually focus on. Zuizin, for instance, stresses a number of times
that the new Lord Mayor was accompanied by his immediate pred-
ceessor, John Swinnerton. Swinnerton’s Show itself was witnessed
by the Elector Palatine and his entourage, who were in town for the
latter’s marriage to Princess Elizabeth. We have Scultetus to thank
for the detail that the Archbishop of Canterbury accompanied the
Elector Palatine in a coach following the aldermen in the process- 
on.38 The Goldsmiths’ Company had an expectation that Queen
Anna was ‘certainly’ to attend the 1611 Show, although on this
occasion there is no specific reference to the royal viewer in the text
beyond Leofstane’s fleeting reference to ‘Guests of great State and 
Honour’ (Chruso-thriambos, sig. C1r) and, probably, Munday’s
somewhat forced comparison between the new Lord Mayor’s
name, James Pemberton, and that of the King.39

Those instances where eyewitnesses did write down their percep-
tions emphasise that when exploring civic triumphs it is wise to 
keep, in Mulryne’s cogent formulation, ‘an alert sense of fact as well 
as intent’.40 Indeed, putting such eyewitness descriptions alongside
the sometimes extremely detailed livery company records shows 
the printed texts, on the whole, and perhaps contrary to expecta-
tions, to be a rather formal and static account of the proceedings.
As Watanabe-O’Kelly argues, the printed texts ‘present the festival
already pre-packaged, already interpreted. The iconography is
spelled out for us, the political pretensions of the ruler are under-
lined’.41 Munro writes that although the printed book may represent
‘a textual progress of quiet contemplation . . . the performed scene
of the shows remains inherently mixed and contradictory’.42 For
one thing, as Paster comments, ‘for the civic entertainments there
were audiences within audiences’, requiring a ‘sophisticated aware-
ness’ on the part of these audiences. In the Shows a larger group
of spectators were watching a smaller one, the Lord Mayor and
his entourage, being addressed by the performers. Even that larger
audience was implicitly playing a role as part of the ‘symbolic social
entity’, in Paster’s phrase, repeatedly conjured up by the Shows.43
One should not assume, however, that the desired effect on the
audience ensued, and due attention should be paid to what Mulryne
calls ‘immediate events, human motivation and accident’.44

On the basis that they are likely to be at least generally accurate,
the printed texts of the Shows themselves, naturally, do provide
valuable information in terms of their description of what took
place on the day, although there are provisos here, which I will
discuss more fully in the next chapter. Suffice it to say at this stage,
as Mulryne argues, that

however sumptuous and perfect the official records make festival
appear, the reality . . . may be very different. Inclement weather,
lack of preparation and sheer incompetence could turn formality
into chaos . . . [and] adverse circumstances could serve as ironic
counterpoint to the claims of competence and authority embedded in performance. Examples of all three of these contingencies have survived and will be discussed in due course. Nevertheless, we can look to Dekker’s account of James’s royal entry for at least a sense of the lived experience. Here Dekker is describing – or at least representing – an entertainment which bore many resemblances to the Shows and shared their impact on the city’s population. He conjures up a rich image:

the Streetes seemde to bee paude with men; Stalles instead of rich wares were set out with children, open Casements fild up with women. All Glasse-windowes taken downe, but in their places, sparkeled so many eies, that had it not bene the daye, the light which reflected from them, was sufficient to haue made one. (The magnificent entertainment, sigs B3v–B4r)

In Troia-Noua triumphans Dekker numbers the witnesses of the Show as ‘at least twenty thousand’, which may be realistic (sig. A4r). Heywood also has the figure of London refer to ‘all places . . . with people covered, as If, Tyl’d with faces’ (Londons ius honorarium, sig. A4r). John Taylor even more hyperbolically claimed that there were ‘innumerable’ spectators of Charles I’s procession into London in 1641: ‘the bankes hedges, highwayes, streets, stalls, and windowes were all embroydered with millions of people, of all sorts and fashions’, he writes (Englands comfort, and Londons ioy, sig. A2r). Exaggerations notwithstanding, various eyewitnesses echo the stress we find in all of these texts on the number and diversity of spectators. Heinemann writes that Show was ‘essentially . . . a popular holiday’, designed ‘to impress and entertain not only the Lord Mayor and his eminent guests . . . but also the crowds out for the day’. Contemporary witnesses bear her out. Zuizin, the Russian ambassador, reported that ‘many people, men, women and children – the whole City – watched this ceremony’. For Busino, as for Dekker, the sight of the citizens of London celebrating formed part of the entertainment. Conversely, Busino’s testimony indicates that watching noble audience members’ reactions to the Show could sometimes provide the ordinary Londoners with entertainment.

Busino watched the 1617 procession from the vantage point of a house on Goldsmiths’ Row, Cheapside. His colourful account is worth quoting at length. Like Dekker, he recounts how the windows were all crowded with the sweetest faces, looking like so many pretty pictures . . . On looking into the street we saw a surging mass of
people, moving in search of some resting place which a fresh mass of sightseers grouped higgledy piggledy rendered impossible. It was a fine medley: there were old men in their dotage, insolent youths and boys, especially . . . apprentices . . . painted wenches and women of the lower classes carrying their children, all anxious to see the show.\textsuperscript{49}

In the 1580s Lupold von Wedel too was obviously struck by the large number of onlookers, and especially the presence of women, which was clearly not the convention on the continent. Indeed, he is relatively indifferent to the pageantry itself, being more preoccupied with the procession and general order of events; in particular, perhaps because of linguistic difficulties, he entirely disregards the speeches, which, in contrast, form the totality of Peele’s printed text.\textsuperscript{50} With the exaggeration we have seen in other accounts of the Shows, von Wedel writes that ‘the whole population’ followed the mayoral procession, ‘men as well as women, for the English women want to be present on all such occasions’. ‘Fine-looking women’ were spotted among the multitude, which for von Wedel ‘was wonderful to be seen’. Von Wedel also describes the way in which the crowd was controlled, which was never likely to have been a concern of Peele’s text (although one can imagine Dekker being unable to resist mentioning it): ‘there are some fire-engines ornamented with garlands, out of which they throw water on the crowd, forcing it to give way, for the streets are quite filled with people’.\textsuperscript{51}

Eyewitness accounts convey the visual and auditory impact of the day very well. After the 1553 Show Machyn recounted a dizzying combination of music (the City Waits were generally employed and the instruments included trumpets, flutes and drums), cannons, coloured banners, traditional mumming-style figures such as the devil and fireworks.\textsuperscript{52} The excellent and renowned history of the famous Sir Richard Whittington has a woodcut image of one of Whittington’s inaugural processions that clearly shows onlookers wielding fireworks (see Figure 9). As one can imagine, noise featured strongly in the experience of the event.\textsuperscript{53} Accordingly, Machyn’s impressions were primarily of colour and noise:

\begin{verbatim}
then cam [one] [with a] drume and a flutt playng, and a-nodur with a gret f[ife?] . . . and then cam xvj trumpeters blohyng, and then cam in [blue] gownes, and capes and hosse and blue sylke slevys, and evere man havyng a target and a gayffelyn [javelin] to the nombur of lxx . . . and then cam a duyllyll [devil] and after cam the bachelars all in a leveray, and skar lett hods; and then cam the pagant of sant John Baptyst gorgyusly, with goodly speches; and then cam all the kynges
\end{verbatim}
9 Woodcut of Dick Whittington’s mayoral procession showing onlookers with fireworks, from *The excellent and renowned history of the famous Sir Richard Whittington* (sig. A1r)
trumpeters blowhyng, and evere trumpeter havyng skarlet capes, and the wetes capes and godly banars, and then the craftes, and then the wettes playhyng, . . . and after dener to Powlles . . . with all the trumpets and wettes blowhyng thrugh Powlles, thrugh rondabowt the qwer and the body of the chyrche blowhyng.  

Machyn is at pains to record decorated streamers, banners and the like, probably because his work as an undertaker involved the supply of similar accoutrements for funerals. As Machyn witnessed Shows with only limited pageantry – he does mention the pageant of John the Baptist on more than one occasion, but only in passing – his account focuses primarily on the procession of Company members and various entertainers. Indeed, the very syntax of his recollections mimics the actual procession, repeating the phrase ‘and then cam . . . and then cam’ throughout. Machyn’s impressions of the day bear out Randall’s argument that mayoral Shows had a ‘mingled nature of tableau and processional’: as we have seen, contemporary witnesses are useful sources of information about how both aspects were experienced.

The printed texts of Lord Mayors’ Shows do little to convey the audience’s reaction to the Show as such, so here eyewitness accounts are especially valuable. At the same time, here and there the printed texts do self-consciously foreground the large number of spectators regularly attracted by the Show. This occurs especially when the Shows’ speeches focus on how ‘the outside world’ might perceive the city and its celebrations. Dekker’s repeated recourse to metatheatricality provides some interesting instances of this trope. In *Troia-Noua triumphans* the figure of Neptune draws the attention of the watching crowd to the watching crowd by a series of rhetorical questions:

\[
\text{. . . what does beget} \\
\text{These Thronges? this Confluence? Why do voyces beate} \\
\text{The Ayre with acclamations of applause,} \\
\text{Good wishes, Loue, and Praises? What is’t drawes} \\
\text{All Faces this way?}
\]

(sig. B1r)

Heywood adapts this tactic when in *Londons ius honorarium* he has the figure of London herself ventriloquise the amazed reaction of her ‘sister Cittyes’ (‘Westminster, Yorke, Bristoll, Oxford, Lincolne, Exeter, &c’):

\[
\text{Is it to see my numerous Children round} \\
\text{Incompasse me? So that no place is found.}
\]
In all my large streets empty? My issue spred
In number more then stones whereon they tread.

(sig. B4r)

Similarly, in *The triumphs of truth* Middleton has the King of the Moors express surprise at being the object of amazed scrutiny by ‘so many Christian Eyes’ (sig. B4v). This is often a crafty way of highlighting the delights of the Show, of course, and Munday’s treatment of the theme in *Himatia-Poleos* accordingly has a self-conscious air. The Shepherd also begins his speech with questions:

Why gaze yee so vpon me? Am I not a man, flesh, bloud, and bone, as you are? Or in these silken sattin Townes, are poore plaine meaning Sheepheards woondred at, like Comets or blazing Starres? Or is it this goodly beast by me, that fills your eyes with admiration? (sig B3v–B4r)

Here the usual dichotomy of urban sophistication versus untutored rustic credulity is turned on its head. For Munday’s Shepherd, it is in ‘silken sattin Townes’ that ‘Comets and blazing Starres’ are ‘woondred at’, rather than the rural setting in which one might find a ‘poore plaine meaning Sheepheard’, who in this instance has a better understanding of the spectacle than the urban audience are alleged to. (The ‘goodly beast’ which they are supposed to so admire, by the way, is a sheep: the beast with which, according to Heywood’s *Porta pietatis*, no other animal can compare).

As we can see, at times the onlookers themselves are described, and not only the mayoral party and other dignitaries. Dekker’s words in *Britannia’s honor* echo those of Busino and other writers I have quoted (including Dekker’s own earlier text of *The magnificent entertainment*) on the subject of the audience. One of the pageant cars in *Britannia’s honor* bears a Russian prince and princess, of whom Dekker writes:

How amazde they look, to see streetes throng’d, and windowes glaz’d
With beauties, from whose eyes such beames are sent,
Here moues a second starry Firmament.
Much, on them, startling admiration winnes,
To see these Braue, Graue, Noble Citizens
So stream’d in multitudes, yet flowing in State,
For all their Orders are Proportionate.

(sig. B3v)

The experience of such a throng was clearly so memorable and had become such a byword that it turns up in other contemporary works.
William Fennor’s *Cornu-copiæ* says of the crowd, ‘What multitudes of people thither sway, / Thrusting so hard, that many haue miscaried . . . / How mighty and tumultuous is that presse’ (sig. H1r). Similarly, it is exclaimed in the epilogue of *Eastward hoe*: ‘See, if the streets and Fronts of the Houses, be not stucke with People, and the Windows fild with Ladies, as on the solemne day of the Pageant!’

Many of the contemporary sources agree that women tended to watch the Show from buildings rather than the streets; such a good vantage point would have been in great demand, despite the fact that it would doubtless have made the speeches almost impossible to hear. Many spectators would also have thronged the river banks to watch the lavishly decorated barges and galley foist, and the river itself would have been full of smaller vessels bearing sightseers.

One can understand why the Companies needed large numbers of ‘whifflers’ to control such crowds, despite Dekker’s claim that the ‘multitudes’ were kept orderly and ‘proportionate’.

‘With much care, cost and curiosity are they brought forth’: the realisation of the Shows

This takes us on to the practical aspects of the staging of Lord Mayor’s Day. The carefully planned arrangements began early in the day. The Haberdashers’ accounts from 1632, for instance, detail the way in which the Company members were ordered to assemble at 6am at the Company Hall, in the traditional reverse order of seniority (the youngest and least important went first), in order to accompany the Lord Mayor to the Three Cranes landing stage where the party embarked on boats to go up river to Westminster. The thirty trumpeters were specifically instructed to be silent until the Lord Mayor emerged from his house, at which point they were to sound. The Company members then formed lines through which the Lord Mayor and his retinue passed.

Once the mayoral party had arrived at Westminster for the oath-taking, one of the chief ritual cruxes of the day, further formalities ensued. The new Lord Mayor, accompanied by the outgoing incumbent, took his oath of office at the Exchequer before dignitaries of the Crown and of the City. The latter body was represented, as well as by the two Lord Mayors, by the Recorder of London, who made a speech tailored to the occasion in which the rights and responsibilities of the City and its officers were laid out (this is an inversion of the traditional practice for royal entries into the City, where the Recorder would address the visitors on behalf of the City). The
Lord Chief Baron and the Lord Treasurer then responded in a like manner with speeches. These rituals are fairly well documented, and the rhetoric employed on these occasions bears scrutiny, for it reveals much about the relative positions of power between the City and the Crown, and it can, if read carefully, expose some of the latent tensions in their relationship.

Recorder Thomas Fleming’s speech for the oath-taking ceremony in 1594 is typical in many respects. As was conventional (although, as we will see, the reality was increasingly a point of contention into the Stuart period), the Recorder’s speech began with a summary of the ‘many excellent and princely grants, liberties, and privileges’ which pertain to ‘we the Citizens of London, seperatlie by ourselves’. (As with the other Recorders, Fleming’s use of personal pronouns indicates his position of spokesman for the City.) The right of the citizens to elect their chief magistrate rather than having one ‘emposed’ on them was very emphatically cited in all the Recorders’ speeches (and as we will see, in the rhetoric of the Shows themselves) as a particularly significant privilege which marked out the City’s degree of governmental autonomy from the Crown. Indeed, the oath-taking ceremony itself embodies the delicate balance implicit on the occasion between civic independence on the one hand and the simultaneous need to have their choice of Lord Mayor sanctioned by the monarch on the other. To emphasise the former point, an account was given later in this Recorder’s speech of how John Spencer’s election took place. The remainder of Fleming’s speech comprised a delineation of the virtues and characteristics required of the Lord Mayor, such as ‘integrity, prudence, moderation, and innocency’. Recorder Heneage Finch also devoted considerable space in his mayoral oath-taking speeches in the 1620s to highlighting the City’s rights and privileges. In 1621, for instance, he began his speech at the Exchequer by stating that to ‘number the priviledges and prerogatives which the grace and goodnesse of so many kings and princes for so many ages past . . . hath conferred upon this noble and famous City of London’ would ‘consume the day’. From the City’s perspective, one should note, nameless ‘kings and princes’ may come and go, but the City’s rights persist. Using what seems to have been the traditional phraseology, Finch stated that the City not only was ‘trusted’ to choose its own governor but was ‘allowed and appointed’ so to do.

I shall move on now to 1602, a year for which the exchanges on both sides have been preserved in John Manningham’s diary. Here too there is evidence of how the respective roles were negotiated.
Manningham begins by describing the way in which the Recorder, John Croke, stood formally ‘at the barr betweene the twoe Maiors, the succeeding on his right hand, and the resigning on his left’. The relative positions of the protagonists clearly had ritual significance, with the new Lord Mayor as the Recorder’s ‘right-hand man’. Croke’s speech appears to have taken a fairly predictable line, expressing sentiments that one finds repeated in the pageantry that ensued on all these occasions, such as the need for good governance during the mayoral term, ‘in regard’, as Manningham has him put it, ‘of the prayse or shame that attends such men for their tyme well or ill imployed’. This emphasis on the longer-term reputation of the Lord Mayor once his time of office has expired, along with exhortations about standards of governance one finds displayed consistently and at greater length (as we’ll see further below) in the speeches written for the pageants. ‘Then’, Manningham recalls, Croke ‘remembered manie hir Majesties fauours to the Citie, their greate and beneficiall priviledges, their ornaments and ensignes of autoritie, [and] their choise out of their owne Companies’. Here, as with Recorder Fleming, we find the key aspects of the City’s independence economically outlined and, implicitly, defended, albeit with a prefatory note acknowledging the Crown’s ‘manie fauours’ and a statement of gratitude to the Queen for her ‘great, and exceeding great . . . goodnes to this City’. Again, there is a parallel here with the rhetoric of the pageant speeches, and, especially, with the ways in which the printed texts of the Shows so often begin with an account of the City’s autonomy and privileges. Croke concluded his address by commending the performance of the outgoing Lord Mayor, John Garrard, and by presenting the new incumbent, Robert Lee, to the Court of the Exchequer.

For their part, the agents of the Crown – the Lord Chief Baron and the Treasurer, Thomas Sackville – responded with two speeches, the subtexts of which were rather more overt than those of the Recorder. The Lord Chief Baron began by stressing – as if such stress were needed – ‘hir Majesties singular benefits’ which should receive the City’s ‘thankefull consideracions’. His speech then moved directly on to a rather pointed ‘admonishment’ that the City establish ‘monethly strict searche’ for those bogeys of late Elizabethan policy, ‘idle persons and maisterles men . . . the very scumme of England, and the sinke of iniquitie’, of whom, he claimed, there were some thirty thousand currently in London, an exaggerated number for sure. His colleague, the Treasurer, then ‘spake sharply and earnestly’, as Manningham puts it, cutting
straight to the chase by announcing that ‘of his certaine knowl-
edge there were two thinges hir Majestie [was] desyrous should be
amended’. If Manningham’s account is accurate, Sackville issued
no conciliatory preamble as did the Lord Chief Baron, but simply
made the stark statement that ‘there hath bin warning given often
tymes, yet the commaundement [is] still neglected’. Sackville’s
speech appears to have been designed to make it eminently clear to
the City’s representatives that no excuses for further inaction would
be tolerated by the Crown. The new Lord Mayor is warned that
‘while [the City’s] fault sleepes in the bosome of hir Majesties clem-
ency’ there is a limited opportunity – not to be repeated – ‘to amend
their neglect’. The two areas to be addressed were the provision and
storage of corn (a major concern after the dearths of the 1590s) and
‘the erecting and furnishing [of] hospitals’. The two areas which the
City is chastised for neglecting are, ironically, exactly the kind of
acts of municipal altruism so celebrated by the Shows themselves.
The Treasurer’s speech concluded on an ambiguous note: much as
‘he honour[s] the Cytie in his privat person’, he cautioned that he
would not hesitate to ‘call them to accompt’ should they not comply
with instructions. One is left with a sense of a headmasterly scold-
ing received in silence (there is no evidence in Manningham’s diary
or any other source that either the old or the new Lord Mayor
actually spoke during the ceremony), accompanied by fairly explicit
threats of punitive action if the sovereign’s demands were not met.
It must have been quite a relief for the mayoral party to retreat back
to their area of jurisdiction, where they would hear much more in
the way of unrestrained praise for the remainder of the day, and
where their power in their own domain could be celebrated.

Once safely back within the City, then, in ordinary circumstances
the pageantry proper commenced on the Lord Mayor’s disembar-
kation from the trip up-river to Westminster. Unusually, the 1613
Show (a particularly lavish production) featured pageantry from the
outset of the day. In The triumphs of truth, having noted that the
procession began ‘earlier then some of former yeares’, Middleton
first describes at Soper Lane ‘a Senate-house . . . vpon which
Musitians sit playing’. The Lord Mayor is there greeted with a song.
Upon his appearance from the Guildhall on the way to embark on
the barge for Westminster a trumpet sounds from a scaffold, and
a speech of greeting is heard, performed by a ‘Graue Foeminine
Shape . . . representing London’. She is ‘attired like a reuerend
Mother, a long white haire naturally flowing on either side of her:
on her head a modell of Steeples and Turrets’. Because she stands
for the City she wears a ‘habite [of] Crimson silke’ to be ‘neere to the Honourable garment of the Citty’ and she holds ‘a Key of gold’ (sigs A3v–A4r).

The celebrations extended right through the day to the evening. After the banquet at Guildhall and the service at St Paul’s, the procession escorted the new mayor back to his house, which was traditionally ‘trimmed’ and sometimes redecorated for his mayorality. The other Companies which were not actually in the limelight that year still regularly hosted dinners and banquets at their Halls on the day of celebration. The Fishmongers’ Court Ledger records the menu for their Lord Mayor’s Day feast in 1595, which included ‘Brawne and mustard, Rosted Beeof, Rosted [and boiled] Capon’, and a leg of mutton (they were also to have mutton for breakfast).

One can see why Vanessa Harding notes that ‘collective celebration, including commemorative dinners, remained an important function [of the Companies], and the social side of company membership must have been one of its most valued aspects’. The feast at the Guildhall was another key concern of the Companies, who habitually spent large sums on the hire of plate for the banquet, as well as on all the food and drink. The menus that survive show that they did not stint themselves. Indeed, the Companies devoted considerable attention to the aftermath of the street pageantry. Their records reveal that it was customary for the pageants to be set up in the relevant Company Hall after the mayoral Shows. In 1613 the Grocers took the opportunity to request ‘pictures of famous and worthy Magistrates and benefactors of this Companie to be made and plated in most fitt and conveyent plates in this Hall (as in the Haberdashers Hall)’. Beautifying the Hall in this fashion was another feature of the culmination of a day of celebration: the Goldsmiths ordered ten gilded leopards’ heads for the windows of their Hall in 1611. Borrowings included the hire of pewter utensils from the Pewterers’ Company for the Lord Mayor’s feast, and, in 1610 and 1612, the hire of ‘the kings picture, and a velvett chaire’ (for the Lord Mayor, one would guess).

The main substance of the triumph itself, however, took place on the Lord Mayor’s return from Westminster; the journey down to Three Cranes was usually more of a preamble to the main event. During this focal part of the day the performers were usually, but not always, children, and girls may have performed some female roles, for many of the symbolic figures were gendered female. As well as the ubiquitous classical goddesses such as Venus, other candidates for female performers would include The triumphs
of truth’s Envy, ‘with her left pap bare’ (sig. B2r), and possibly Munday’s ‘housewifely virgin’ in *Metropolis coronata* (sig. B2v). Machyn states that ‘chylderyn’ appeared in the pageant for 1561; von Wedel’s eyewitness account of Peele’s 1585 Show refers to both boys and girls taking part, as does Zuizin’s description of the 1613 Show.\(^76\) The caption on one of the drawings related to *Chrysanaleia* includes the statement that ‘five children’ are to sit ‘at the foote of the [lemon] tree representing the five senses’.\(^77\) The use of children as actors is demonstrated by the note of a payment in 1604 to Thomas Kendall (himself a Haberdasher) for ‘furnishing the children with apparrel and other thinges needfull for the shewe’.\(^78\) Child actors were used so often because they were practically more useful: the pageant stations were sometimes tiered, child actors were obviously lighter than adult performers, and, as Harold Hillebrand comments, they also ‘would be more in proportion to the scale of the construction’.\(^79\) Indeed, one of the images from the Fishmongers’ Show for 1616 – the pageant of Richard II and the Royal Virtues – shows smaller figures who were probably children (see Figure 10). The Ironmongers’ minutes for 1609 reveal that the pageants on this occasion bore at least nine or ten costumed children each, and the main pageant in *Tes Irenes Trophaea* would have carried a minimum of twenty-one, if the text is accurate: St Katherine, twelve maids of honour, a shepherd and at least seven servants (sig. B3r).\(^80\) ‘Londons Genius’ in *Chrysanaleia* is called a ‘comely Youth’ (sig. B3r), and the Grocers’ Shows traditionally featured a boy, in Rees’s words ‘gorgeously attired in an Indian robe of divers colours’, scattering spices, fruit and nuts to the onlookers.\(^81\) On the occasion of their 1617 Show the Grocers bought ‘Nutmegges, Gynger, almondes in the shell, and sugar loves [sic]’ to be ‘throwen abowt the streetes by those which sate on the Gryffyns and Camells’.\(^82\) In his account of this Show, Busino accordingly recalls ‘bales from which the lads took sundry confections, sugar, nutmegg, dates and ginger, throwing them among the populace’.\(^83\) One of the 1616 illustrations shows the King of the Moors throwing what appear to be coins (see Figure 11). Munday suggests (as does the illustration of this pageant) that live fish were also ‘bestowe[d] bountifully among the people’ (*Chrysanaleia*, sig. B1v). (These ‘gifts’ to the onlookers represented another facet of the Company’s munificence, of course.) One of the pageants in that Show also featured, according to Busino, ‘children in Indian costume . . . [who] danced all the while with much grace and great variety of gesture’.\(^84\) In this instance Middleton’s text bears Busino out: ‘these Indians
10 The pageant of Richard II and the Royal Virtues from *Chrysanaleia*
11 The pageant of the King of the Moors from *Chrysanaeleia*
are al actiue youths, who ceasing in their labours, dance about the
trees’ (The triumphs of honor and industry, sig. A4v). ‘Indians’
appear mostly in Shows written for the Grocers’ Company, but not
exclusively so: in his 1623 water show for the Drapers Munday
stipulates that ‘Sixe Tributarie Indian Kings . . . rowe the Argoe, all
of them wearing their Tributarie Crownes, and Antickely attired in
rich habiliments’ (The triumphs of the Golden Fleece, sig. A4v).

Despite the convenience of their size, there were also disadvan-
tages in using child performers for, as Lublin comments, they may
‘have been audible when performing at the indoor theatres in front
of 500 or fewer people [b]ut surrounded by many thousands in
the street . . . the children were unlikely to be heard even by the
Lord Mayor himself’. Although it seems likely that the preferred
style for the pageant speeches, with a regular if plodding rhythm
and rather simplistic rhyming couplets, was employed chiefly for
clarity (for if the audience heard one line they were better placed
to be able to at least guess at its rhyming accompaniment), the
evidence shows that at times all tactics failed. In Camp-bell Munday
– unsuccessfully, as it turned out – tried to circumvent this potential
problem by having two adult actors (‘men of action and audible
voices’, as he calls them) impersonating St Andrew and St George
to make speeches ‘to acquaint the Lord Maior, with the relation
and meaning of both [the] devices’. With some exaggeration of the
limitations within which he and his collaborators were operating,
he explains the rationale for this overview as being twofold:

the rather haue we yeelded to this kinde of deliuery, because the time
for preparation hath beene so short, as neuer was the like vnder-
taken by any before, nor matter of such moment so expeditiously
performed. Besides, the weake voyces of so many children, which
such shewes as this doe urgently require, for personating each deuice,
in a crowde of such noyse and unciuill turmoyle, are not in any way
able to be vnderstood, neither their capacities to reach the full height
of euery intention, in so short a limitation for study, practice and
instruction. (sigs B2v–B3r)

Munday’s candour reveals some of the compromises inherent
in street pageantry. Children are both ‘urgently require[d]’ and
inaudible and under-rehearsed, although his disclaimers may have
been retrospective, for this is the very year when the Company was
displeased with the poor audibility and preparedness of the chil-
dren. It is made clear by the use of adult performers to ‘explain’ the
meanings of the pageants that for Munday the children are chiefly
in place for visual purposes: hence the emphasis one finds in all of his productions on conventional emblems which one would hope would be readily interpreted by the onlookers. As with the use of animals and porters, as we will see, there were risks involved in the employment of child actors and singers. Munday was reprimanded by the Ironmongers for various ‘defects’ in relation to the 1609 Show, including that ‘the children weare not instructed their speeches which was a spetiall iudgement of the consideration, [and] that the Musick and singinge weare wanting’. As we have seen, in the printed text – true to form – he defends himself, blaming instead the unruly crowd and the lack of time for preparation for the children’s shortcomings. Indeed, he steers very close to the wind by virtually blaming the Ironmongers for being too small and not wealthy enough a Company to produce a suitable spectacle. He articulates the problems in the final speech of the day, addressed directly to the Lord Mayor by St George: ‘And let me tell you’, St George exclaims, ‘did [the Ironmongers’] numbers hold leuell with other Societies, or carry correspondencie in the best helping manner, their bountie should hardly haue gone behinde the best’. Although his intention may have been to praise the Company’s efforts despite their shortcomings, and although he adds that the Company ‘come now but little short of precedent examples’, the effect is still that they (along with their under-rehearsed children) ‘come short’ – not Munday himself (sig. B4r).

Regardless of their evident disadvantages, the use of children as performers goes back to the early days of mayoral pageantry, when there were closer links with City schools, such as the Merchant Taylors’, Christ’s Hospital and St Paul’s School, than became the usual mode once the poet and artificer pattern had become established. As we have already seen, William Haynes from the Merchant Taylors’ School may have co-written part of the 1602 Show, and children from Westminster School took part in the 1561 and 1566 Shows, accompanied by their choirmaster, John Tailor. Later into the Jacobean period children from choir schools were still being employed. In Himatia-Poleos Munday states that ‘diuers sweet singing youths, belonging to the maister that enstructeth the yong Quiristers of Pauls’ gave ‘a most sweet dittie’ as the barge carrying the figure of ‘Sir John Norman’ returned from Westminster (sig. B3r–v). One wonders if it was a young boy, an adult male actor or perhaps a female performer who was called on to act the part of the lascivious Medea in Metropolis coronata, who ‘sitteth playing with [Jason’s] loue-lockes, and wantoning with him in all pleasing
dailiance’; or indeed who played the ‘diuers comely Eunuches’ who rowed the Argoe (sig. A4r). Less frequently, performers from the children’s acting companies were also called upon to participate in civic pageantry. *The magnificent entertainment* (in which there were only two speaking parts) featured ‘one of the children of her Maistes Reuels’ in the role of ‘Thamesis’ and other choirboys sang to accompany the speeches.\(^89\)

Occasionally adult actors participated in civic pageantry, such as Alleyn’s role as the Genius of the City and William Bourne of King Henry’s Men as Zeal in *The magnificent entertainment*, as well as Burbage’s performance as Amphion in Munday’s *Londons loue* alongside John Rice (who also had also given a speech written by Jonson before the King, Queen and Prince Henry at the Merchant Taylors’ Hall in 1607).\(^90\) As far as mayoral Shows are concerned, an adult actor of some experience is surely Munday’s referent in *Metropolis coronata* when he writes that ‘another man, of no meane suffi ciency, both for knowledge and exquisite use of action’ appeared in two devices and also delivered the speech of Time to the Lord Mayor (sig. B3v). Apart from the regularly cited example of John Lowin performing the part of Leofstane in *Chruso-thriambos* (1611), there are only sporadic explicit references in livery company records to professional players (whether members of livery companies or not – Lowin was a Goldsmith) taking part in mayoral Shows, although they probably did so more often than we imagine. References to ‘players’ occur occasionally. For example, in 1613 the Grocers reimbursed ‘the players for boots, gloves and other thinges, and for the singing boye and also mr Godfrey whoe did sing at Sop[er] lane end’.\(^91\) Thomas Rowley, the (probable) brother of the playwright William and better-known writer and actor Samuel, and a member of the Admiral’s Men in 1602, performed as a giant in Munday’s *Triumphs of re-united Britania*.\(^92\) It is interesting to see on this occasion that the professional actor did not take on the role of one of the pageant actors giving speeches, as one might have expected, but rather was chosen to perform what would have undoubtedly been a non-speaking role. William Hall, another player (probably of the King’s Revels Company at the time), was paid by the Drapers for ‘his music and actions in Cheapside’ in 1639.\(^93\) Bentley concludes that ‘it seems likely that the various sharers in the major [theatrical] companies made a little money on the side by helping in the pageantry for Lord Mayors’ shows and other City occasions’.\(^94\)

Peter Fryer speculates that, in addition to members of the various
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theatre companies and city schools, some of those who played roles may have been black performers. Middleton does refer in The triumphs of honor and vertue to a ‘blacke personage representing India’ (sig. B1v). Pictorial images of the pageantry offer more clues still. Although the illustrations for Chrysanaleia, as Fryer concedes, shows the King of the Moors as white, one of Booth’s drawings of the 1629 Show does appear to depict a black boy playing (in Dekker’s words) ‘the Indian boy, holding in one hand a long Tobacco pipe, in the other a dart [whose] attire is proper to the Country’ seated on an ostrich (Londons tempe, sig. B2r). The presence of a tobacco pipe and dart signal that by ‘Indian’ the Americas are meant. In Booth’s drawing the figure is deliberately cross-hatched to show black skin, unlike all the other figures in his illustrations (see Figure 8). As we’ll see below, the 1609 Show may have featured a ‘Blackamore’. However, the word ‘negro’, which does not feature in the Shows in our period, was in use in the early seventeenth century, and the fact that in the 1660s and later it was invariably used for black performers in mayoral Shows does throw some doubt on the accuracy of this interpretation of Booth’s drawing. The characters were undoubtedly intended to represent ‘Moors’ or ‘Indians’; the question is whether they were performed by white actors in black face, as with Queen Anna and her ladies in Jonson’s Masque of Blackness, or actually embodied by black actors. Booth’s drawing does suggest that the black skin was not confined to the boy’s face. The livery company records for the year of Londons tempe, unfortunately, give no corroborating evidence, and Busino, who saw similar ‘Indian’ characters in 1617, merely says they were in ‘Indian costume’, but it remains an intriguing possibility.

Being written in the main by dramatists, the printed texts naturally included stage directions and other pointers as to how the action was realised. The livery company records make it clear that the performers were rehearsed, probably under the supervision of the writer himself in some cases. They were evidently called to act as well as to represent symbolic figures in a purely static way, for not all of the pageants were merely tableaux: some necessitated a fair degree of movement, dialogue and so on. Even where there were no speeches, the performers were often required to react to each other and/or to various properties, or indeed to the audience themselves (as we have seen, not always following a script), to emphasise the meanings presented to the onlookers. Munday is especially keen to include stage directions, and also regularly cites the use of musical instruments to punctuate proceedings and add emphasis. The end
result is that it is relatively easy to envisage how his pageantry was played out. Thus in *Chrysanaleia* Walworth is raised from slumber by London’s Genius, accompanied by ‘Surden Trumpets’: a marginal note in the text instructs that ‘Here the Genius strikes on him with his wand, whereat he begins to stir, and comming off the Tombe, looks strangely about him’. The performer playing Walworth then stands before the tomb, ‘doing reverence to the Genius’. Whilst he speaks ‘he doth reverence to’ the mayoral party (sigs B4v–C1r). To aid still more the audience’s comprehension of the names of ‘many famous Magistrates, / From the Fishmongers ancient name’ cited in his speech, he points ‘to the Scutchio[n]s of Armes as they hang in order on the Bower’ (sig. C1v).

As well as the performers themselves, the pageant cars on which they were placed often moved around. However, there is a question as to how the individual pageants were staged, as well as whether the separate pageant stations around which each Show was created were fixed in certain places on the route or moved around the City, following the procession. Even the waterborne procession did not always start from and arrive at the same place, owing to the vagaries of the tidal Thames. The general consensus is that the pageants were peripatetic, joining the procession at its end once their function as venues for tableaux and speeches was concluded. They also look to have been used on both land and water: Munday’s ‘Fishmongers’ Esperanza’, the fishing boat, moved on land from the river, and the five islands which the Lord Mayor first encountered in the river in the 1613 Show later reappeared at Paul’s Churchyard. Furthermore, to raise ‘greater astonishment’, Middleton has a ‘strange Ship’ with ‘neither Saylor nor Pilot’ make towards these five islands (*The triumphs of truth*, sig. B4v). Busino confirms that the ships carried ‘highly ornamented stages with several devices, which subsequently served for the land pageant, for triumphal cars, when passing through the principal street’, suggesting that the pageant devices moved from river to street. If Rogers’s account of earlier sixteenth-century pageant wagons is accurate, the use of peripatetic devices went back some time: he records that ‘when the[y] had donne with one cariage in one place theie wheled the same from one streete to another’.

Dekker’s *Troia-Noua triumphans* is especially up-front about the practicalities. Most of his individual pageants, it is clear, follow each other once their moment has passed. The first show on land, Neptune’s chariot, not only provides a link with the water show in its use of sea-imagery and characters but is then superseded by
the second Land-Triumph’ waiting in Paul’s Churchyard. ‘The former Chariot of Neptune’, Dekker informs his readership, ‘with the Ship [from the water show], beeing conueyed into Cheap-side, this other takes the place’ (sig. B2r). The same happens in turn to this second device, the ‘Chariot or Throne of Virtue’, which ‘is then set forward, and followes that of Neptune, this taking place iust before the Lord Maior’ (sig. B4r). With no apparent regard for the integrity of the theatrical impression (my view, as discussed below, is that the texts often used the original brief without much amendment), Dekker helpfully explains that later on in the procession the same device ‘passeth along vntill it come to the Crosse in Cheape, where the presentation of another Triumph attends to welcome the Lord Maior in his passage, the Chariot of Virtue is drawne then along, this other that followes taking her place’ (sig. C1r). Only the pageant of the Forlorn Castle stayed at its station, at the Little Conduit on Cheapside, to be used for ‘further pageantry’ when the Lord Mayor returned from the Guildhall to St Paul’s for the religious service after the banquet (sig. B4v). ‘All the former conceits’, as Munday calls the devices in Himatia-Poleos, are ‘gracefully borne before’ the Lord Mayor as he proceeds to the cathedral (sig. C2r). It was conventional for the last pageant car to wait until after the sermon at Paul’s and then escort the Lord Mayor to his house. The majority of the texts conclude with a speech ‘at my Lords Gate’ (in 1613, the Lord Mayor’s house was ‘neere Leadenhall’, quite a distance from the processional route). In Chruso-thriambos, for instance, Munday has Faringdon explain that, ‘as custome wils it so . . . Till you returne, heere will we stay, / And usher then a gladsome guiding, / Home to the place of your abiding’ (sig. C2v).

Munday too states explicitly that in the 1616 Show Walworth’s ‘goodly Bower . . . is appointed first to stand in Paules Church- yard: And at such a place as is thought most conuenient’ (Chrysanaleia, sig. B2v; my emphasis). This reveals a few things about the practic- alities of that year’s Show: first, that this particular pageant moved on from Paul’s Churchyard, its original location, and, second, that discretion could be exercised as to its precise location there. In its contingency, Munday’s text thereby gives the impression of being based, at least in part, on the provisional ‘plot’ offered to the Fishmongers that year. Later on, Munday explains, as if in the context of a pitch to the Company rather than as required by the printed text, that ‘in the afternoone, when the Lord Mayor return- neth to Paules, all the Deuices . . . [are] aptly placed in order neere to the little Conduit’ (sig. C2v). Walworth’s bower in Chrysanaleia,
he explains, ‘was appointed first to stand in Paules Church-yard’; the bower and tomb are then ‘borne along before him’ (sigs B2v–B3r). Always a bit of a grumbler, Munday seems especially aware of and especially willing to complain about the limitations of performances in his texts: he provides plenty of apologies and disclaimers along the lines of ‘this is the best we could do in the circumstances’. In *Metropolis coronata*, clearly produced after the event, he sounds rather aggrieved at how things worked out. The preparations, he states, which ‘require[d] much decency in order: [were] yet much abused by neglect in marshalling, and hurried away with too impudent hastinesse’. It would appear that those responsible for clearing the way and for ensuring that the pageant cars appeared in good order had fallen short, for ‘nothing but meere wilfulness’, he complains, can have ruined plans which were ‘so advisedly set downe in proiect’ (sig. B2r). More apologetically, he comments in *Chrysanaleia* that the depiction of Walworth’s famous deed at Smithfield is done ‘according to our compasse of performance’, although he admits that ‘it is all but a shaddow’ of ‘the magnificent forme [in] which it was [originally] done’ (sig. B3v). A similar note is struck more briefly in *The triumphs of the Golden Fleece*, ‘which might haue beene more, had time so fauoured’ (sig. A2r).

There were also, at times, additional pageants (some of which were static) that did not participate in the Show’s main narrative. These were often based on the traditional tropes, motifs and symbolic animals of the Company in question, such as the dolphin Munday and his artificer designed for *Chrysanaleia*, which, the text makes clear, started out as part of the entertainment on the river. Munday writes that ‘the Fishing-Busse, Dolphine, Mer-man and Mer-mayd [appeared] vpon the water fi rst, and [were] afterward marshalled in such forme as you haue heard on land’ (sig. B4r). According to Wickham, in the medieval period (and for royal entries throughout the early modern period too) the use of architectural features of the City such as the city gates, standards and water conduits as ‘stages’ resulted in a series of static tableaux, where ‘for a change of scene, the procession had to move along the street to the next major monument converted for the occasion into another stage’. He points out that those onlookers located near one of the fixed pageant stations would not necessarily have been able to witness every one of the individual pageants.

The early modern Show was more mobile, though, and in broad terms the route of the procession followed much the same pattern across the period, beginning and ending at the Guildhall via St Paul’s
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More often than not, as we’ve seen, the individual pageants and devices joined the procession once the speeches had been given. The words ‘borne before’ in the titles of two of Peele’s printed Shows – The device of the pageant borne before Woolstone Dixi and the lost Show for 1588, probably called ‘The Device of the Pageant borne before the Righte Honorable Martyn Calthrop’ – reveal that, even in the early days when there was only one such pageant, it too was peripatetic. From the evidence of Machyn’s diary it seems that the mayoral party landed at Paul’s Wharf or Barnard’s Castle on their return from Westminster, and the sole pageant presented in that period appears to have been located in Paul’s Churchyard. By 1660 Tatham referred a number of times to pageantry occurring at ‘the accustomed place’, and the procession, by his account, took ‘the accustomed way’ down to Three Cranes to embark on the barges (The royal oake, sig. B3r). He also provides a breakdown of the path taken by the procession, which few earlier pageant-writers did systematically. Pafford, however, does attempt to reconstruct the route of Munday’s 1611 Show. The pageantry began at Barnard’s Castle, where the Lord Mayor and his entourage disembarked from the trip up-river to Westminster. Pafford writes that

the procession then went, perhaps by Upper Thames Street, Garlick Hill and Bow Lane, to Lawrence Lane, and gave the second and main pageant – the Orferie – probably where the Lane joins Gresham Street (then Catte Street) near the Guildhall, and finally, in the evening, held the last show outside Camden House which was in the western part of what is now Gresham Street, close to Goldsmiths’ Hall.

As Pafford’s account shows, it is possible to recreate at least part of the route from Munday’s text. Chruso-thriambos discloses that the characters who featured in the water show joined the land procession in a chariot. Later on, Time and Faringdon followed the mayoral entourage to Paul’s, ‘as custome wils it so’, as Munday puts it. Accordingly, Leofstane’s final speech, as was the convention, was given ‘at my Lords Gate’. Middleton too embeds some of the City’s main landmarks into the pageantry. In The triumphs of truth the figure of Time gestures towards Paul’s Cross (the location is named in a marginal note for the reader’s benefit), saying to the Lord Mayor, ‘Seest thou yon place, thether Ile weekly bring thee, / Where Truths coelestiall Harmony Thou shalt heare’. Immediately afterwards, the procession moves along Cheapside where it halts beside the Little Conduit, used as a venue for the
occasion for ‘a Mount Triumphant’, albeit one ‘ouer-spreed with a thicke Sulphurous Darknesse’, the fog created by Error (sig. C2r).

As before, although he says little about the speeches, Busino provides vital evidence of how the pageants moved through the streets to supplement what the texts can tell us. His account clearly describes peripatetic pageants drawn by horses disguised in various ways. The first ones, he writes, were ‘harnessed to griffins ridden by lads in silk liveries. Others followed drawn by lions and camels and other large animals . . . The animals which drew these cars were all yoked with silken cords.’ One of the pageants in the 1609 Show, ‘the Chariot of the Bellfield’, was according to the Ironmongers’ Company to be drawn by ‘two Estriches of silver’. The performer playing Walworth in Chrysanaleia, according to the handwritten note on the image as well as the printed text, followed the procession on horseback. As we can see, here and there individual performers were seated on horseback, as also was the case with the figures of ‘Truth’s Angel’ and ‘Zeal’ in The triumphs of truth. The pageants and shows were generally performed on wagons or cars, however, a feature of the Lord Mayor’s Show that resembled the court masque as well as the Shows’ medieval predecessors. Nancy Wright draws an analogy between the vehicle for the pageants and ‘the stage car used in Jonson’s Masque of Queens, [where] characters at the apex of the pageant car sat above actors personating “famous scholars and poets of this our kingdom”’. The ‘stage car’ she describes does seem to have a considerable resemblance to those used for the Shows, especially if the illustration of the pageant chariot of Richard II and the Royal Virtues in Chrysanaleia is anything to go by. For Munday their ancestry could be traced even further back: the ‘beautiful Chariot drawne by two golden pelleted Lyons and two Golden Woolues’ in Metropolis coronata is said to be designed ‘after the manner of the triumphall Chariots of the Romaine Emperours’ (sig. B1v). As far as the dimensions of the pageant cars are concerned, Morrissey concludes that ‘eight feet by fourteen feet . . . was the average size for London pageant wagons’. He points out that the height and breadth of any peripatetic pageant wagons were determined by the breadth of the streets and lanes through which they had to pass, although the livery company records do show that shop fronts and the like were sometimes taken down to allow the procession through. One of the pageant writers bears him out: Heywood comments in Londini speculum that the skill of the artificers, Matthias and John Christmas, was such that ‘in proportioning their Workes according to the limits of the gates through
which they were to pass’, the pageants did not ‘exceede one Inch, either height or breadth’ (sig. C4v).

This could have been a difficult task, for the textual (and, in the case of *Chrysanaleia*, visual) evidence makes it clear that many of the pageants had two or more tiers. The illustrations for the 1616 Show, for instance, reveal that the pageant of Richard II and the Royal Virtues bore at least seventeen figures distributed over at least three levels (see Figure 10). In *The triumphs of re-united Britannia* Munday states that the ‘seuerall children’ in the Britain pageant speak according to their ‘degrees of seating’, indicating the same kind of staggered arrangement (sig. B2v). Following the conventional height differential between figures of varying degrees of authority, in *The triumphs of truth* Middleton’s ‘Triumphant Mount’ appears to have been built in stages too, with the ‘evil’ characters at the foot, London ‘sitting in greatest Honour’ above them, whilst ‘next aboue her in the most eminent place, sits Religion’ (sig. C2v). Dekker also stresses the significance of height differential, and in the process underlines the large number of protagonists required by some of the individual pageants (at least twelve, in this case). In *Troia-Noua triumphans*’s second land show, ‘Vertue’ takes the ‘most eminent place’ whilst ‘beneath Her, in distinct places, sit the Seauen liberall Sciences’; in addition, ‘at the backe of this Chariot sit foure Cupids’ (sig. B2r–v). Zuizin clearly saw a similar arrangement the following year, for he describes ‘a dais, or platform, with high decorated steps on four sides and on the top and on the places sat one person in each place’.

Moving these substantial structures around must also have posed some logistical problems. Unlike in royal entries (where, owing to their size and complexity, the triumphal arches and devices were static) but as with the Watch and the court masque, the mayoral pageants and other devices were usually carried around by porters (as many as 100 porters for five pageants in some Shows, such as in 1611). The Merchant Taylors spent £8 employing twenty porters ‘for carrying the pageant shipp and beaste’ in 1602, and used an even more extravagant ‘fowrescore and eight porters, for carying of the Pageant, Shipp, and the other shewes’ when the Show was repeated because of bad weather in November 1605. Zuizin’s eyewitness account of the 1613 Show refers to pageant structures carried by men. McGrath points out that the construction of the pageants could be as much practical as spectacular. She comments that mountains and the like, descending to the ground, could usefully ‘help to mask a mechanism of wheels, or even to hide the
human shunters essential to its movement'. Indeed, what she calls ‘the process of trundling around’ may have, in part, determined the way the pageant was fashioned. On the basis of the practice in continental Europe, Fairholt speculates that, when the pageants were moved around on wheels, the mechanism was hidden from the onlookers’ view by painted cloth ‘curtains’; the lower section of the pageant station or car was also used to hide the performers until they were needed. In *Metropolis coronata* Munday does state that the chariot car ‘runneth on seuen wheeles [and] is drawne by two Lyons and two Horses of the Sea’ (sig. B4r). In one of his earliest works (and in a telling prefiguration of his later career) Munday has Zelauto recount to his friend Astraepho his experience of witnessing a ‘braue and excellent deuice’ of Apollo and ‘his heauenly crew of Musique’ performed as part of a tournament for Queen Elizabeth. This device, Zelauto explains, ‘went on wheeles without the helpe of any man’, indicating some disguised form of movement (Zelauto, sig. Eiir). Likewise, one of the illustrations to *Chrysanaleia* bears a caption that states that the mermen and mermaids ‘went afore the pagent Charriot-wyse’, i.e. that their part of the pageant drew the ‘great pageant’ on its car with Richard II at the top. Munday’s text is likewise quite explicit about how the pageant cars were conveyed, stating that ‘our Pageant chariot, is drawne by two Mare-men, & two Mare-maids . . . In the highest seate of eminence, sits the triumphing Angell . . . King Richard sitting a degree beneath her’ (*Chrysanaleia*, sig. B3v).

The means of transportation were therefore various. In 1604 the Haberdashers hired horses ‘to drawe the chariott’, and paid men to ride the horses in armour. ‘Severall beasts’ were used to draw the pageant cars in the 1617 Show, but neither the Grocers’ accounts nor Middleton’s text reveal what manner of beasts these were. The ‘Chariot of Loue’ in *The triumphs of loue and antiquity* is drawn by ‘2 Luzarns’ (lynxes) (sig. C4r). Dekker wrote in *Troia-Noua triumphans* that he and Heminges had designed the pageants to be drawn by horses ‘queintly disguised like the natural fi shes, of purpose to auoyd the trouble and pestering of Porters, who with much noyse and little comlinesse are euery yeare most unnecessar- ily imployed’ (sig. B1r). Indeed, Dekker stresses the lengths that were gone to to give the impression that Neptune’s chariot was really drawn by ‘liuing beasts’. The construction, he remarks, is not ‘begotten of painted cloath, and browne paper’ as it may have been in the primitive days of what he calls ‘the old procreation’ (*ibid.*). The horses disguised as fish may have been hung with painted
Cloths to create the effect. Like Dekker, Webster states that one of his pageants, ‘a rich and very spacious Pauillion’, was ‘drawne with fower horses, (for Porters would haue made it moue tottering and Improperly)’ (Monuments of Honor, sig. B2v). Given that it is notoriously unwise to work with children and animals, and despite Dutton’s remark that ‘Webster clearly wanted something [more] stately than porters’, one might wonder how replacing human porters with ‘liuing beasts’ would have improved things. Dekker’s reference to the noise and uncomeliness of the porters offers another insight into the lived experience of the day, as he implies that the porters sometimes took advantage of being in the limelight. Webster also indicates that porters could struggle with the weight of the pageant. The Goldsmiths allocated the task of overseeing the porters to certain members of the Company, who were also to ‘comand them to do theire dueties’, suggesting that the porters, at least in 1611, were not trusted not to do their job properly.

Many other people were employed to help the event run smoothly, for apart from their essential if implicit role as the audience (and occasional acts of over-excitement), there were other forms of impact on the locality. Care was taken to minimise the inconvenience both to the onlookers and to the traders and residents of the City. There are numerous references in livery company records of payments to carpenters for preventative measures to enable the Show to pass through the narrow streets, and to citizens being reimbursed for damage to their property. In 1602, for instance, the Merchant Taylors’ Company paid 2s 6d for ‘breaking pte of a shopp for the pageant to passe out of Chrystchurch’, and in the same year the churchwardens of St Peter’s in Cheapside received compensation from the Merchant Taylors for the City Waits ‘standing on their Leades of the Church’. The Merchant Taylors’ records from 1612 refer to the ‘taking up and setting downe [of] the postes at Paules gate, as in former yeres hath byn accustomed’. This would have been to allow the pageant cars and the spectators to pass. In 1624 the City Carpenter was paid to take down and afterwards put back up ‘xxiii signes, 12 signe postes, and six Taverne Bushes, in diverse streets where the Pageants were to passe’. In the narrow city streets large pageant cars and the volume of onlookers would doubtless have damaged any overhanging signs and the like.

It was not only buildings that were in danger of being damaged, especially when one considers the chaotic crowds and the potential perils of the ordnance, fireworks and so on. It would have required
some skill to fire off cannons across the river and not hit any of the spectators, and those who operated the cannons themselves did not always escape unscathed. The Skinners paid one William Adames 20s in 1585 ‘towards his releife because he was maymed at Baynardes Castle on Symon and Iudes daye aboute the Companynes Busynes’. Richard Lambert was even unluckier: in December 1619 his widow Alice was granted a weekly pension by the Skinners in recompense for the loss of her husband, a gunner ‘who was slaine on the baek side by the breaking of one of the chambers on the daie of triumph’. Another fatal incident was also recorded by the Vintners in 1593: 9s (a paltry sum, in the circumstances) was paid to ‘Singwills wyfe the Auncient [ensign] bearer whose husband died flourishe the Auncient in the Hall’.

Despite such unfortunate accidents, the Companies did try to ensure that the procession was orderly and dignified, although, as we’ll see, not always successfully. They employed numerous whifflers and ushers armed with staves and swords to control the crowds, as well as costumed figures like the greenmen and giants. As Astington comments, ‘the difficulties of coordinating and moving the show through crowded and frequently unruly streets must have been considerable’. Busino records the appearance of ‘the City Marshal on horseback’ as well as the use of ‘lusty youths and men armed with long fencing swords’ to clear the path of the procession, although he also recounts an outbreak of disorderly behaviour from the onlookers. In 1624 ‘the Porter of the gate at the Heralds yard’ (i.e. the College of Arms, between the river and St Paul’s) was paid to call and ‘sett in order’ the names of the Bachelors as the Lord Mayor returned from Westminster and the former joined the procession going towards St Paul’s. In 1608, the Grocers’ Court minutes give a list of the Company members for the procession which shows that they marched in pairs in order of seniority, starting with the Wardens: the names are ‘redd and marshaled accordinge to theire ancienties’. Thought also had to be given to how the onlookers would be able to see the latter stages of the day’s events. To that end, a large number of tall staff torches was needed (the Merchant Taylors paid for eight dozen in 1612), partly for dramatic effect, no doubt, but mainly because the final events of the day would have taken place in autumnal darkness, a fact sometimes integrated into the speeches which took place at the end of the day. As Munday puts it in the farewell speech of Chrysanaleia, ‘And now are spred. / The sable Curtaines of the night . . . The twinkling Tapers of the Skie / Are turn’d to Torches’ (sig. C4r).
‘With Barges, Ensignes; Trumpets, Fyfe and Drum’: the water show

Returning to the earlier part of the day, once the mayoral party had left the Guildhall in the morning, the pageantry proper generally began with the ‘Service . . . performed upon the Water’, as Munday puts it in The triumphs of the Golden Fleece (sig. A4v). The role the river Thames played in the Shows is another aspect that has, in the main, lost its original significance for modern commentators, although it is clear that the Companies considered the barge, galley foist and entertainments accompanying the Lord Mayor along the river to be at least as important as the pageantry on land. Indeed, Palmer argues that ‘the use of ceremonial barges gradually developed into the most visually spectacular part of the triumphal day. Barges allowed much more scope for lavish splendour with such items as banners, streamers, musicians, water-borne pageants, fireworks, and cannon fire from the shore’.  

The river would have been packed with craft ranging from large, highly decorated state barges to smaller boats manned by ordinary citizens. In 1555 Machyn recalled that ‘ther wher ij goodly pennes [pinnaces] deckyd with gone and flages and stremars, and a m. penselles, the penes pentyd, on whyt and bluw, and the thodur yelow and red, and the oars and gowne [guns] lyke coler’. Some sixty years later Zuizin recounted a similar picture:

before the [Lord Mayor’s] ship and behind and on the sides, over the whole river, sailed on many boats, the King’s gentlemen, and knights, and aldermen, and merchants, and traders, and the bodyguard of the King’s court, and all sorts of people of the land in bright costume.

Heywood presents a quite nationalistic account, differentiating the ‘strong’, masculine, Protestant English barge from the ‘wanton’, Catholic Venetian gondola. The single most marvellous aspect of London, he claims in Londini artium, is that its magistrate is

not waited on by Boats made of the Trunks
Of Canes, or hollowed Trees, or petty Junks,
Or wanton Gondelaes: but Barges, strong,
And richly deckt.

(sig. B2r).

The livery companies took the barges as seriously as did Heywood. The Company barge, in particular, was often ordered well before the detailed content of the Show was even considered. The
Companies also usually paid out for the hire or purchase of barges (plus watermen) for other Companies’ Shows. Hunting provides a detailed account of the state barge used for the Shows, as well as for other events such as coronations and so on. Each barge, she writes,

was built along similar lines, being basically an elongated, more elegant version of the Thames wherry [the boat used for passenger traffic]. The length of a state barge was between 60 and 80 feet, nine oars a side was the norm, and the cabin increased in size as time went on. Musicians, an essential part of the enjoyment, sat in a well or cockpit and the Bargemaster perched in the stern. The most luxurious state barges were richly carved and painted with the Company’s coat of arms on the stern.

Von Wedel’s recollections of the 1585 Show, when taken alongside evidence of expenditure from the livery companies’ accounts and the testimony of Zuizin quoted above, confirms that the barges were highly decorated. The Lord Mayor’s barge, von Wedel says, was festooned with the City’s colours, red and white, in taffeta, and the Company barges flew flags to indicate their corporate allegiance. Zuizin notes that ‘as is the case with a straight [sided] ship, the lower decks had windows and in these windows were rowers on both sides’. Von Wedel also states that there was ‘a very large barge, painted black and white, which was called the apprentices’ barge’. The water procession was an important part of the day’s events, and one for which the companies were prepared to dig deep. The Drapers invested in a new barge upon the election of Thomas Hayes in 1614, as did the Salters in 1633, for which John Hartwell, their usual supplier, was paid £4. Where the Companies did not own barges they were borrowed or hired: the King’s bargemaster supplied two barges, the galley foist and a galley to the Fishmongers in 1616.

In 1638 members of the Drapers’ Company incited its bargemen to out-row and thereby overtake the Lord Mayor’s barge, suggesting, as Williams says, that the ‘order of precedence was sometimes taken unexpectedly lightly’. The Drapers’ Company seems to have been especially pleased with its feat, as there is quite a long entry in their accounts to record the reward of drink received by the bargeman and his colleagues. The accounts rather gloatingly comment that the Company barge landed at Westminster ‘before the Lo. Maior and Aldermen were landed (the Lo. Maiors barge being allmost out of sight rowing towards Westminster before
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our Company barge tooke water). Indeed, Dekker, with his usual endearing frankness, states at the end of London's tempe that 'this yeere, giues one Remarkable Note to after times, that all the Barges followed one another (euery Company in their degree) in a Stately and Maiesticall order' (sig. C2v). Other records show that the coming and going of the barges at Westminster could be 'disorderlie': there was an attempt to marshal the barges in better order, although Dekker's comment indicates that this may not have been wholly successful in most years. Beyond that, relatively little is known about the mechanics of the water show compared to the shows on land. One of the few texts to mention the practicalities of how the river was used, Heywood's Londini emporia, has a side-note from which it appears that on the river there were 'sun[dry] water-[en]gines', the function of which is unclear (sig. A4v).

Another aspect of the water show that has often not been properly understood is the nature and function of the galley foist. Carnegie has corrected a longstanding and widespread misconception about what the galley foist was. Rather than the ornate barge in which the mayor travelled down river to Westminster, he explains that it was actually 'a small escorting war-ship famous for its incessant gunfire'. The Ironmongers' minutes record it as '60 Foote longe well rigged and furnished with 16 bases & 10 small shott' as well as 'powder and fireworkes'. That the galley foist was a distinctive accompaniment to the city barges is made apparent by the ways in which contemporary writers used it, often as a metaphor, and often gendered female. As Carnegie comments, the galley foist's ubiquity as a point of reference in the drama of this period demonstrates that it 'was an enormously popular annual attraction'. In Dekker's Match mee in London, a character likens the King's mistress, 'a Citizens wife' to 'a Pinnace [which] (Was mann’d out first by th’City,) [and] is come to th’Court, New rigg’d, a very painted Gally foist' (sig. F2r). In The Honest Whore, too, Mistress Horsleach, a woman of low virtue, is likened to a showy 'Gally-foist' (sig. H5v). Even Jonson deigned to pay it attention: in Epicoene, he refers to 'sonnes of noise and tumult' 'begot' on an auspicious day such as 'ill May-day', or 'when the Gally-foist is a-floate to Westminster' (sig. I3r).

One of the main functions of the galley foist was simply to make a tremendous racket. The foist, which was probably wider than the barges which it accompanied, as Carnegie comments 'invokes far more noise than even trumpets and drums'. Contemporary descriptions of the Shows do highlight the noise, size, smoke and
overall impact of the galley foist and the other river traffic. Busino, for instance, relates how

a dense fleet of vessels hove in sight, accompanied by swarms of small boats . . . The ships were beautifully decorated with balustrades and various paintings. They carried immense banners and countless pennons. Salutes were fired, and a number of persons bravely attired played on trumpets, fifes and other instruments . . . the discharges of the salutes were incessant.\(^{148}\)

The noise of the gun salute, Busino wrote, ‘made a great echo’ which was ‘repeated even more loudly when my Lord Mayor landed at the water stairs near the court of Parliament’.\(^{149}\) Once again, other sources bear him out. Sharpham’s *The fleire* refers to ‘all the Gunners’ that fire off ‘at Lambeth, whe[n] the Maior and Aldermen land at Westminster’ (sig. F4r). The eyewitness Zuizin concurs: ‘they fired a great salute from the ship in which the Lord Mayor sailed and from other ships which were there and from big boats and from the City wall. And from all the small boats there was a great shooting of muskets’.\(^{150}\) The ‘salute’ they both mention would probably be the ‘Noble Volley[s] at his Lordships landing’ mentioned by Middleton in his 1619 Show (The triumphs of loue and antiquity, sig. B1v). The pageant writers and artificers may understandably have felt that their elaborate land-based tableaux were in danger of being eclipsed by the more unsubtle appeal of the non-stop gunfire from cannon and musket, and the drums and other instruments carried on this ship. Indeed, Dekker admits as much in *Troia-Noua triumphans*, writing that ‘their thunder (according to the old Gally-foyst-fashion) was too lowd for any of the Nine muses to be bidden to it’ (sig. D1v); in a more positive light, he also has Neptune refer to ‘this warlike thunder of lowd drummes, / (Clarions and Trumpets)’ (sig. B1r). For Munday, ‘the seuerall peales of Ordinance . . . can make better report in the aire, then they can be expressed by pen’ (*Metropolis coronata*, sig. B3v). The Companies’ records show the care that went into this aspect of the preparations. In 1635 the Ironmongers instructed Tilbury Strange, a Waterman, to prepare the galley foist with ‘10 peeces of ordnances’ and numerous other armaments.\(^{151}\) For the Drapers’ Show in 1621, seventy cannon ‘were placed against Westminster [and] 50 against Paules Wharfe’.\(^{152}\) According to the Merchant Taylors’ accounts, ‘chambers [cannon]’ were ‘dischardged doble at two places viz Lambeth and the bankesyde’.\(^{153}\) The Companies also invested further large sums in making the galley foist ready for Lord
Mayor’s Day; the foist, like the barges, was painted and decorated with banners, shields and the like. Back in 1556, the Merchant Taylors requested that ‘a foyst . . . be well appoynted with ordnaunce and shott’ (it had twenty cannons), which shows that the gun and cannon-fire were important aspects of the use of the foist from early on.\(^{154}\)

Although (with the exception of Munday’s *Triumphs of the Golden Fleece*) the water show was never the main focus of attention, the printed texts do mention the galley foist and other aspects of the water-borne part of the entertainment in passing. Heywood’s 1635 text has the marginal ‘stage direction’ of ‘A Peece goes off’ alongside a speech by Mars; later on Heywood comments, ‘the speech being ended, the Ordnance goeth off from the Castle’ (*Londinius sinus salutis*, sigs A8r and Br). Webster too refers to the ‘peale of Sea-thunder’ from Bankside that accompanied the entourage back on shore after the trip to Westminster (*Monuments of Honor*, sig. A4r). In *The triumphs of truth* Middleton presents the water show in more detail than is often the case, describing ‘the Riuver deck’t in the richest glory . . . [with] fiue Islands art-fully garnished with all manner of Indian Fruite-Trees, Drugges, Spiceries; and the like, the middle Island with a faire Castle especially beautified’ (sig. B1r). All this evidence makes it hard to understand why the water shows have been so relatively neglected by critics, who invariably focus on the street pageantry.

Munday dealt with the water show in unusual depth in his mayoral Shows, which taken alongside other texts such as *Londons loue* suggests that this was an aspect of civic pageantry in which he took an particular interest. He was especially prone to use ships, in various guises, within the pageantry he devised. This interest went as far back as *Zelauto* in 1580, where the protagonist recalls within a triumph ‘a braue and comely Shippe . . . wherein were certaine of [the Queen’s] noble Lordes’. This device ‘ran upon a Rock, and was displayled’ (sig. Eii). *Zelauto* emphasises the importance of the ship device with a full-page illustration. Once Munday embarked on creating mayoral Shows his predilection for ships was given even fuller rein. *Chruso-thriambos* begins with a description of ‘sundry Ships, Frigots, and Gallies’, one of which bears ‘Chiorison the Golden King, with Tumanama his peerlesse Queene’. ‘Diuers Sea-fights and skirmishes’ take place on the journey to Westminster and back again, and the Indian king and queen then become part of the land procession, there ‘beeing mounted on two Golden Leopardes, that draw a goodly triumphall Chariot’ (sig. A3v). *Metropolis*
coronata has two ships, Jason’s Argoe and the ‘Ioell’, and the first speech of the Show takes place on the water, whilst the Lord Mayor and his party are embarking on the barges for Westminster. Indeed, Metropolis coronata demonstrates that the water show featured pageantry at least as elaborate as that on land. Fitz-Alwin’s speech to John Jolles is delivered from a tiered sea-chariot upon which also sit the ‘eight Royall Vertues’ and the figures of Fame and Time, along with numerous painted heraldic shields (sig. A4r–v). Even ‘the Shewes appointed for service on Land’ in this work have a nautical aspect. After the appearance of the ‘Ioell’, which bears Neptune and Thamesis, another pageant appears: ‘in stead of Neptunes Whale on the water, commeth another Sea-device, termed The Chariot of Mans life’ (sig. B2v). The water show, these sources demonstrate, went beyond the use of barges and other vessels to include elaborate water-borne devices like the five islands created for the 1613 Show. The writers and artificers had the Thames to hand, so to speak, and were understandably keen to exploit its potential as a venue for pageantry.155

‘The true morality of this device’: emblems and symbols in the Shows

The stages, wagons, chariots, barges and so on were used to convey pageantry composed of elaborate, often highly symbolic content. Before moving on to discuss the nature of the emblems and symbols used in the Shows, however, I should point out that the term ‘pageant’ often seems to be distinguished from the other ‘shewes’ and ‘devices’ employed on these occasions. For instance, in 1611 the pageant featured, as the Goldsmiths put it, ‘leopards unicorns and mermaids’ and was placed in the gallery of Goldsmiths’ Hall after the Show; the entertainment on the river is called a ‘shew’, as are Munday and Grinkin’s set pieces accompanied by speeches. The Merchant Taylors’ accounts invariably separate pageants from shows, too. In Cooke’s Greenes Tu quoque the character Spendall aspires to become Lord Mayor, ‘and haue three Pageants carried before me, besides a Shippe and an Unicorne’ (sig. C2r; my emphasis). This suggests a generally understood separate identity for the pageants, perhaps indicating that the practice within religious civic drama and the Midsummer Watch of having traditional freestanding ‘pageants’ like the Mercer’s Maid still had currency. Indeed, in 1607, during a period when the Shows seem to have been in abeyance to some extent, the Mercers required the use only of ‘the
maid’, their traditional emblem. The distinction between pageant and show thus persisted, as far as the Companies were concerned, for in 1612 Dekker and Heminges were paid for ‘land shewes’ and at least two pageants. For the 1613 Show, the Grocers’ accounts even more carefully differentiate between the two terms. As we have seen, Middleton was paid £40 for ‘the ordering overseeing and wryting of the whole Devyse and alsoe for the appareling [of] the p[er]sonage in the Pageant’, whereas Munday received £149 ‘for the devyse of the Pageant and other shewes, and for the appareling and fynding of all the p[er]sonages in the sayd shewes (excepting the Pageant)’. The ‘Pageant’ itself comprised a ‘senate howse, Shipp, 2 Chariotte, the 5 Ilande with all the severall beaste’. Ships are almost always singled out; indeed, the Companies’ minutes often bracket these off separately. Generally speaking, the Shows were more fragmented than one might have assumed from the coherence attempted by the printed works.

Their content, too, was often eclectic. Munday manages to combine Jason, Medea and the argonauts, Neptune and Thamesis, the river gods, Fitz-Alwin, the first Lord Mayor, and Robin Hood and the rest of his merry men in the course of one single Show; indeed, the pageant of ‘Metropolis Coronata’, the apparent focus of the Show (going by the name of the printed text) barely features at all. Heywood is very given to using stories and characters from classical mythology – he himself calls this an expression of ‘grave History’ – the significance of which, beyond showcasing his erudition, is sometimes quite hard to fathom. Londini sinus salutis, for instance, includes a device featuring ‘the twelue Caelestiall signes’ (sig. A5v). Although Heywood goes to some lengths to expound on their provenance and various meanings, he does little to signal why they are in any way relevant to the matter in hand – they are, it transpires, used to stand in for the Great Twelve livery companies, although Heywood never makes this explicit. This is despite his claim that they ‘were for our example made’ (sig. A8r). Relatedly, he refrains from embarking in the usual, and probably expected, account of ‘the commodiousnesse of Iron and Steele’ (this is an Ironmongers’ Show) on the basis that the onlookers and/or readers can see this for themselves. As this indicates, Heywood does seem to have a lack of interest in purely civic imagery when compared to contemporaries such as Munday or Dekker. The slightly disengaged quality to some of his Shows is exemplified in Londini sinus salutis, where the final speech at the Lord Mayor’s gate is prefaced by the remark that this is ‘onely a Summary, or reiteration of the former Showes’ (sig. B3r).
The emblems employed in the Shows were thus taken from a range of places. Civic histories and archives and related texts like John Stow’s *Suruay of London* were utilised in the writing of the Shows, as were other, wider sources. The *Suruay* would naturally have been one of the first places of resort for information about the history of the various civic roles and of their notable incumbents.\(^\text{162}\)

For Munday, that would have been a task very close to home given his work on the 1618 edition of Stow’s text.\(^\text{163}\) Eclectic or not, Munday’s cited authorities for his foray into the non-metropolitan past in the quasi-historical account of ‘Britain’ in *The triumphes of re-united Britania* include Bale, Camden, Leland and Geoffrey of Monmouth, who constitute pretty much the full panoply of chroniclers used in this period, with the notable exception of Stow (who does feature in a marginal note in *Chruso-thriambos*).\(^\text{164}\)

*Chrysanaleia* commences in characteristic Munday style with an invocation of historical authorities. ‘I finde it faithfully recorded in Authors of reuerend Antiquity’, Munday begins, before going on to trace the antiquity of the Fishmongers’ Company back to the time of the Crusades (sig. A4r). Where the image requires it, other notable writers are marshalled: for his explication of the meanings of the female pelican in the same work, Aristotle and Pliny are the ‘cited Authors’ used to ‘variously affirme’ that Munday’s account is correct (sig. B2r). In the same work Munday’s opportunistic use of the image of the lemon tree to celebrate John Leman brings in the five senses of which this tree is an ‘admirable preservative’: here his classical authorities (‘Iulius Solinas Polyhistor, Dioscorides, Pomponius Mela, Petrus Mexius and Antonius Verdierus’) are even more ‘various’ and certainly more obscure (sig. B2v). As Kate Levin observes (ironically enough, given Jonson’s view of his contemporary), Munday’s mayoral texts ‘teem with scholarly justifications and marginal glosses, as if aspiring to the solidity and profundity of a Jonsonian entertainment’.

As previously indicated, pageantry had been a feature of mayoral inaugurations for some considerable time. For 1554, Machyn describes ‘a goodly pagant, a gryffen with a chyld lying in harnes, and sant John Baptyst with a lyon’.\(^\text{166}\) William Smith’s account of the 1575 Show gives an even fuller sense of how those entertainments that preceded the Shows of the later period looked. They contained most of the elements of the later, more complex pageantry in embryo. Smith tells how the procession included ‘the pageant of Tryumphe rychly decked, whereupon by certayne fygures and wrytings, (partly towchinge the name of the said mayor), some matter
‘Towchinge the name of the said mayor’ was quite a tradition. Back in 1561, for example, the pageant produced for William Harper, a Merchant Taylor, contained many references to famous harpers of antiquity. Earlier still, in 1431, according to Lydgate, the pageantry for John Wells was ‘devised notabely inde / For to accordyne with the Maiers name’. Middleton presents a rather obvious (he calls it ‘fit’, of course) use of William Cockayne’s name in the figure of ‘yon Bird of State, the vigilant Cocke . . . at whose shrill Crow the very Lyon trembles’ (The triumphs of honor and industry, sig. B3r).

For The sunne in Aries Middleton uses the synonym ‘bark’ for boat as a way of exploiting the Lord Mayor’s surname, Barkham. The ship that Munday invents for John Jolles in 1615 is neatly called the ‘Ioell’, ‘stiled by the Lord Maiors name’, as he puts it (Metropolis coronata, sig. B2v). As well as trading on the possibilities of the specific Lord Mayor’s name, other common elements in the Shows (as we’ll see further in Chapter 5) were the symbolic representation of aspects of the office of a magistrate, with the emphasis on giving advice on how best to govern the City.

Symbolic meanings were put across to the onlookers in part by the extensive use of properties. Animals were quite ubiquitous, for they had multiple symbolic functions and were (usually) recognisable. They also feature repeatedly in eyewitness and other contemporary accounts of the Shows, such as Cornu-Copiae, which refers to ‘Elephants and Vnicornes pass[ing] by’ (sig. H1r). Where they were not performed by masked actors, as sometimes appeared to have been the case, most of the animal figures in the Shows were made of lath and plaster or wood. Dekker helpfully states that the ‘sea Lyon’ on which Tethys rides in Londons tempe was ‘cut out of wood to the life’; the ‘Estridge’ on which the Indian boy sits is likewise ‘cut out of timber to the life’ (sigs B1v–B2r). This seems entirely likely, as Garret Christmas, the artificer, was, after all, a very celebrated wood carver; indeed, if Booth’s drawings of the ostrich and Tethys’s lion are accurate, the phrase ‘to the life’ seems justified (see Figures 8 and 12). For obvious reasons the Companies’ traditional beasts, symbols and imagery played a large part in the content of the Shows as well as in their titles, on occasion (The triumphs of the Golden Fleece for the Drapers, for example). These iconographic traditions are part of what Kiefer calls ‘a rich fund of symbolism’ drawn upon by the writers and artificers, and he makes the point that although the inclusion of such figures may appear ‘contrived, conventional, or even archaic’, they ‘had long
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been a feature of English culture’ and were as a result less likely to seem strange or inappropriate to a contemporary audience. Ironmongers’ pageants usually featured ostriches, and in 1556 the Merchant Taylors hired a camel – a real one, it seems, sweetened with rose water – which was, Sayle states, ridden ‘by a man and as many children as it could probably carry’. In September 1601 the Haberdashers’ Court of Assistants stipulated ‘that there shalbe a faire pageant, an Ounce [leopard] & a lyon, a Castle [,] foist . . . banners streamers and all other things provided’, singling the Company’s heraldic animals out for inclusion.

As these examples suggest, animal symbolism was as prevalent in the Shows as elsewhere in early modern culture: witness Middleton and Grinkin’s use of ‘an Eagle, a Hart, a Spider, an Ape and a Dogge’ as the ‘proper Emblemes’ to represent the five senses in *The triumphs of truth* (sig. B4v). Webster adorns the figure of Prince Henry in *Monuments of Honor* with a veritable zoo of symbolic

12 Abram Booth’s drawing of the 1629 Show: the water show
creatures to emphasise the greatness of the dead heir. His ‘Circklet . . . [is] charged with foure Holy Lambes’, there is ‘a Bee Hiue, to expresse his Grauity in Youth’ and ‘a Dromedary shewing his speed and alacrety in gratifying his Followers’; ants are used to signify ‘his forward inclination to all Noble exercise’, Chastity’s unicorn is ‘a guide to all other vertues’, Obedience’s elephant is ‘the strong-est Beast, but most obseruant to man of any Creature’, and finally there is ‘a Serpent wreath’d about [a pillar] to expect his height of minde’ (sigs C1v–C2r). Although they were usually conventional, such images were not always used in the same way. Whereas for Heywood in *Porta pietatis* the ‘Rinoceros’, a ‘harmlesse and gentle’ creature, stood as the ‘enemy of all beasts of rapine and prey’ (sigs B2v–B3r), for Middleton’s *Triumphs of truth* this animal is a sinister beast, the bearer of Envy, one of the threats faced by the new Lord Mayor. Envy herself, however, is depicted in *The triumphs of truth* in a way that would have been instantly recognisable to anyone familiar with her conventional emblematic appearance (see Figure 13). Middleton’s text describes her as ‘attired in red silk . . . [with] her left Pap bare, where a Snake fastens, her Armes halfe Naked, holding in her right hand a Dart tincted in blood’ (sig. B2r).

Munro comments that the extensive use of allegory and symbolism in the Shows represents ‘a constant looking-backward to a supposed time when sign and referent did cohere, [and] significance was stable’. In these terms the conventional imagery of the Shows can be seen to exhibit the same kind of ‘nostalgia’ that many commentators have ascribed to Stow. The Shows’ symbolism provides further evidence of a general concern for tradition and antiquity within the Companies. As Gadd writes, ‘antiquity . . . was the highest compliment that could be paid to any institution in early-modern England . . . [and] it also provided a fundamental basis upon which customary and legal rights could be justified’. The emphasis on ‘trade symbolism’ is a case in point, as by the period in question the Great Twelve Companies were no longer exclusively concerned with the trades that they had been set up to protect and oversee. Lord Mayors’ Shows were not simply backward looking, however: on occasion, as I’ll demonstrate in Chapter 5, they could engage with contemporary matters, some quite controversial. As we have seen, emblems often in themselves bore didactic or even critical meanings. As Bergeron argues of John Taylor’s use of Fame in his 1634 Show, ‘Fame teaches partly through citing notable people of the past’ whose estimable deeds the new Lord Mayor is thereby encouraged to aspire to.
Originality was not a prized virtue in mayoral pageantry, on the whole, although Heywood explicitly praises himself in *Londini speculum* for the novelty of having St Katherine, patron saint of the Haberdashers, form part of the water show. She tells the Lord Mayor and aldermen...
Oft have I on a passant Lyon sate,  
And through your populous streets been borne in state:  
Oft have I grac’t your Triumphes on the shore,  
But on the Waters was not seene before.

(sig. B3v)

Opportunistic use of mythological figures was commonplace: for example, Vulcan and Lemnion’s forge invariably features in Shows put on for the Ironmongers. As with most aspects of the Shows, these conventional images can be dated back to earlier times. Kipling notes, for instance, that ‘London trade-symbol pageants almost always [took] the form of portable structures carried in procession . . . [here] the pageant serves as an identifying totem, a mascot, for the guild’. Busino, the Venetian ambassador’s chaplain, emphasised this aspect of the Show, writing that the Lord Mayor, George Bolles, ‘arranged his installation with the greatest pomp, but always with allusion to his trade of grocer’. Equally, it had long been the tradition to refer to the individual being celebrated in a civic triumph – be they monarch or mayor – as London’s bridegroom, an analogy Munday uses to rather peculiar effect in 1616. The Merchant Taylors’ records for 1602 make it clear that the Company was insistent that the content of the Show should be ‘appropriate’. They state that the ship, lion and camel, long-standing symbols of the Merchant Taylors, ‘doe properly belong unto our Companie, and are very fitt and answerable for this tyme . . . the Lyon being parte of the Companie’s Armes, and the Cammell the Companie’s supporters’. Even Nelson’s 1590 Show, which appeared to comprise only one pageant, featured William Walworth, as Fishmongers’ Shows tended to do henceforth. Munday’s 1616 Show for the Fishmongers incorporated emblems associated with the Goldsmiths, traditional allies of the former Company, as his text explains. Such ‘swapping’ was unusual, however, as Heywood’s concern to explain the potentially contentious nature of his usage of animal symbolism in Garway’s 1639 Show demonstrates:

though the pelleted Lyons might have serv’d more properly to this place, as being supporters of the Armes belonging to the Right Worshipful Company of the Drapers; yet these [camels] are as genuine to the purpose: to show his Lord-ships generall negotiation in all kinds of Merchandise whatsoever. (Londini status pacatus, sig. B4v)
Unfortunately, Heywood’s excuse is itself rather problematic, as it hinges on an overt reference to the ways in which drapery, the original concern of the Company, has been subsumed by involvement in ‘all kinds of Merchandise whatsoever’ (a topic to which I shall return). In addition, camels were traditionally associated with the Merchant Taylors, not the Drapers.

The Shows also used properties and/or costuming that was conventionally associated with figures outside of the Companies’ specific iconography, such as the greenman, or figures from classical and other forms of mythology, such as Munday’s ‘fiue Sences’ in *Chrysanaleia*. Squire’s four figures for the ‘4 parts of the World, Asia, Africa, America, and Europa’, all with their proper garments and accessories, would doubtless have resembled the ways in which these continents were represented in other texts of the time. ‘America’, for instance, is ‘a tawny Moore’ wearing ‘a crowne of feathers, and bases of the same; at her backe, a quier of shafts, and in her hand a Parthian bow’; the less exotic ‘Europa’ is dressed in ‘a robe of Crymson taffaty, on her head an imperiall crowne conferred on her by the other three as Empresse of the earth, and holding in her hand a cluster of grapes’ (sig. A3v). Other pageant texts demonstrate that certain figures were not the exclusive property of the livery companies. Neptune in his sea-chariot drawn by seahorses features in mayoral Shows – Dekker’s 1612 Show, for instance – as well as, reportedly, being part of the ‘tilt and tourney’ held in Heidelberg in 1613 to honour Palsgrave and his wife.

‘What the others had I forget’: (mis)understanding the Shows

It is important to consider how these symbolic meanings were experienced as much as how they were conveyed. In *A contention for honour and riches* Shirley refers, no doubt ironically, to ‘understanders on Cheapside’ watching the Shows, and both the printed texts and other sources reveal many aspects of how this ‘understanding’ – or lack of it – manifested itself. Once again, eyewitness accounts come into their own. Although Smith and Machyn experienced Shows that were not printed, so to a large extent we only have their word for it, Busino’s account of the 1617 Lord Mayor’s Day, in contrast, can fruitfully be placed alongside Middleton’s text, *The tryumphs of honor and industry*. It is rare for eyewitness descriptions to be read against the printed texts of Shows, although as Palmer points out, ‘no dramatic genre presents the critic with more subtle – and less studied – complications of mediation’. In
some ways, the two accounts of the 1617 Show complement each other. Busino spends more time on the look and sound of the Show, whilst Middleton, naturally, emphasises the symbolic content and the speeches. However, it appears that Middleton’s efforts to invest the pageantry with significant meaning were largely lost on the ambassador’s chaplain, who refers to the Show’s ‘symbols of commerce’ very much in passing. Busino’s experience here bears out Smuts’s argument that unlike viewing a performance, ‘reading [a printed text] facilitates reflection and systematic comparison, making it easier to discern complex intellectual meanings’. Although Busino was evidently impressed with the spectacle there is no sign, for instance, that he realised that the Indian in the first pageant car was supposed to represent ‘Industry’, one of the chief symbols of the entire Show, let alone that he noticed the detail that she was holding ‘a faire golden Ball in her hand, vpwn which [stood] a golden Cupid’ (sig. B1v). Middleton’s ‘Castle of Fame or Honor’, his venue for the traditional survey of the Company’s great and good, becomes simply ‘a fine castle’ for Busino. In the textual commentary, in contrast, Middleton invests this pageant with considerable importance as he here outlines the Grocers’ history:

the Noble Allen de la Zouch, Grocer, who was Maior of London the two and fiftieth yeare of the same Henry the third, which Allen de la Zouch, for his good Gouernement in the Time of his Maiorality, was by the sayd King Henry the third, made both a Baron of this Realme, and Lord Chiefe Iustice of England: Also that Famous Worthy, Sir Thomas Knoles, Grocer, twice Maior of this Honorable Citty. (sig. B3v)

This historical digression is unlikely to have featured in the day’s entertainment; it pertains to the text, not the event. The placards about which Jonson was so scathing in his part of The magnificent entertainment may well have been of assistance to Busino. Jonson stated ‘neither was it becomming, or could it stand with the dignity of these shewes . . . to require a Truch-man [interpreter], or (with the ignorant Painter), one to write. This is a Dog; or, This is a Hare’ (B. Ion: his part, sig. B2v). One can imagine that Dekker’s disclaimer in Londons tempe might be aimed at Jonson or someone of a similarly pedantic outlook. Dekker anticipates criticism as follows:

Some Hypercriticall Censurer perhaps will aske, why hauing Tytan, I should bring in Apollo, sithence they are both names proper to the Sunne. But the youngest Nouice in Poetry can answer for me, that the
Sunne when he shines in heauen is called Tytan, but being on earth (as he is here) we call him Apollo. (sig. C1v).

Regardless of Jonson’s views, these devices were used in pageantry from time to time. One of the pageants for Queen Anne’s entry into London in 1533 had placards and scrolls bearing Latin phrases, and Dekker’s account of the 1604 royal entry makes it clear that some of the figures were labelled. In France in 1600 a royal entry supplied a considerable degree of explication: as was commonplace, the printed text for the triumph was, in McGowan’s words, ‘crammed with commentaries on the meaning of images, Latin inscriptions and emblems’. However, in addition, the actual procession included ‘summaries of the principal content . . . translations into French of the inscriptions, and indications of the meaning of the entire enterprise’.

Some writers – Munday in particular – were keen to assist their audiences and readers in comprehending the allegories and emblems the Shows used. Indeed, Munday’s approach could be quite direct. The figure of Time addresses the Lord Mayor towards the end of Metropolis coronata with the aim of summing up all the preceding pageantry: ‘Time hath nothing else to tel you’, he says to John Jolles, ‘but the briefe meanings of these seuerall inventions’ (sig. B3v). The ‘meanings’ are duly conscientiously, if somewhat laboriously, worked through: ‘a Spheare or Globe’, for example, stands for ‘the world’ (sig. B4r). The following year Munday’s text follows the same pattern: the whole array of devices are lined up ‘neere to the little Conduit’ on the Lord Mayor’s return to St Paul’s for the sermon, and once again their meanings are fully expounded, just in case Leman had missed anything earlier in the day (Chrysanaleia, sig. C2v). Zeal’s speech in The triumphs of truth works as a supplement to the visual symbolism the staged character of Truth possessed, explaining it for those who had not picked up on every aspect of the significance of Truth’s attire and properties. Both possible ways of gleaning the symbolic meaning are thereby covered. Zeal tells the audience:

That Crowne of Starres showes her descent from heauen;
That Roabe of white fild with all Eagles eies,  
Her piercing sight through hidden mysteries;  
Those milke-white Doues her spotlesse Innocence;  
Those Serpents at her feete her victory showes  
Ouer deceite and guile, her rankest foes,
And by that Cristall Mirrour at her Brest,
The cleernesse of her Conscience is expresst.

(sig. B3v)

In his 1616 Show Munday helpfully ‘impos’d’ (his term) on the figure of William Walworth a requirement to explicate, at some length, the meaning of each individual device (*Chrysanaleia*, sig. C2v). In the same work he also comments that the characters of ‘Iustice, Authority, Lawe, Vigilancy, Peace, Plentie and Discipline . . . as all the rest [of the Show’s figures], are best obserued by their seuerall Emblems and properties’ (sig. B4r; my emphasis). In *Campbell* the figure of ‘Religion’ is clothed in ‘a Virgin vesture of pure white, vayled round with a flame colour Tinsell shadowe. She holdes a rich Booke in one hand, and a siluer rod in the other, as her Ensignes of good reward and encouragement’ (sig. B1r). ‘Religion’ is thus made recognisable both by colour (as we will see below) and by her traditional ‘Ensignes’. Munday’s use of the pelican in *Chrysanaleia* is a good example of the use in these works of the conventional qualities of an animal to serve as an emblem: in this case, the pelican’s selfless care for her progeny epitomises the Lord Mayor’s equivalent role in relation to the citizenry, just as she does in Whitney’s *Choice of emblemes* (see Figure 14). *Sidero-Thriambos* makes the motivation for the use of such emblems clearer still. Here Munday explains their multiple functions, some very practical, and puts forward a defence of the idea that a picture speaks a thousand words. He writes that

for better understanding the true morallity of this deuice, the personages haue all Emblemes and Properties in their hands, & so neere them, that the weakest capacity may take knowledge of them, which course in such solemne Triumphes hath alwaies beene allowed of best obseruation: both for avoiding trouble to the Magistrate, by tedious and impertinent speeches, and deuouring the time, which craueth diligent expedition. (sig. C1v)

As Munday implies, emblems often had a didactic function. Indeed, Jonson himself differentiated pageant devices from simple ‘hieroglyphickes’ on the basis that the former bore a message peculiar to the occasion: ‘the Garments, and Ensignes deliuer the nature of the person’, he writes, ‘and the Word the present office’ (*B. Ion: his part*, sig. B2v). As Munday’s use of the phrase ‘the true morallity of this deuice’ indicates, this use of emblematic figures drew on conventions going back to the morality dramas of the preceding centuries. The figures of ‘Iustice, Authority, Lawe’ and the rest thus
have their roots in this allegorical tradition. As Bergeron notes, Munday’s use of the word ‘emblem’ both here and in other texts such as *Chrysanaleia* demonstrates that ‘he quite obviously understands the tradition’. In addition, Munday’s practice in these two works exemplifies Kiefer’s claim that pageant writers ‘were mindful that spectators might need help in understanding what they saw’. Munday is also concerned here to make use of the inherent economy of the emblem: its ability to encapsulate meanings which when expressed verbally might be ‘tedious’ to the onlooker. In other works he is more expansive. In *Chruso-thriambos* Leofstane describes ‘the Orferie or Pageant’ at length on behalf of the Lord Mayor, making an exception only for those aspects ‘that do sufficiently speake themselues in their distinguished places . . . [where] your eye of heedefull obseruation may spare their further relating’ (sigs C1v–C2r).

Not all these writers took the same approach, though. In contrast, Heywood was more of Jonson’s mind, and his discussion of how one should interpret his 1631 Show echoes his contemporary’s contemptuous phraseology in *The magnificent entertainment* quite
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closely. It is noticeable, in addition, that Heywood writes as if his readers would have witnessed the Show and also would have had no difficulty ‘deciphering’ the symbolism he had used:

I have forborne to spend much paper on neede lesse and Impertinent deciphering the worke, or explaining the habits of the persons, as being freely exposed to the publicke view of all the Spectators . . . I shall not need to point vnto them to say, this is a Lyon, and that an Unicorne, etc. (Londons ius honorarium, sig. C4v)

He is not altogether consistent, though, for in the same text Heywood does imply that ‘Labels’ were supplied to ‘shew what fruit [the trees] . . . beare’, and Time and Truth have an ‘inscription’ showing their motto (as do Justice and Mercy later on) (sigs B2v–B3r). It is interesting to note that Munday’s ‘impertinent speeches’ have been replaced by Heywood’s ‘Impertinent deciphering’. For Heywood, the printed text is not a comprehensive account of the visual spectacle of the Show, but rather a truncated supplement to it.197 Dekker’s approach in Troia-Noua triumphans is almost throwaway at times. There is a perfunctory feel to the list of figures in this work:

Mercury hath his Caduceus, or Charming Rod, his fethered Hat, his Wings, and other properties fitting his condition, Desire carries a burning heart in her hand. Industry is in the shape of an old Countryman, bearing on his shoulder a spade, as the Embleme of Labour. (sig. B2v)

Webster, in contrast, goes to some lengths to ensure that the symbolism he employed was understood in its printed form. For instance, he writes of his description of a tableau which featured Sir Thomas White that ‘this relation is somwhat of the largest, only to giue you better light of the figure’ (Monuments of Honor, sig. B4v). His discomfort with having to take a middle way between the need for detailed exposition and the danger of insulting his heterogeneous audience and/or readership is clear. His text concludes with a brief epilogue which explains the problems he faced: ‘I could, a more curious and Elaborate way haue expressd my selfe in these my endeauors, but to haue bin rather too teadious in my Speeches, or too weighty, might haue troubled my Noble Lord, and pusled the understanding of the Common People’ (sig. C2v).

‘Neede lesse and Impertinent’ such extrapolation may have been to Heywood, but Webster’s anxiety is shown to be justified in one documented case. The German traveller von Wedel confesses that he
remembered only part of the content of Peele’s 1585 tableau: ‘one of [the characters was] holding a book, another a pair of scales, the third a sceptre. What the others had I forget’. He gives no indication that he understands the significance of the items cited. Although one has to factor in their nationality and hence probable lack of familiarity with some of the more arcane symbolism they witnessed, Busino’s, Booth’s and von Wedel’s experiences of mayoral Shows, when taken alongside that of an Englishman, Gilbert Dugdale (of whom more below), do tend to bear out Wickham’s assertion that ‘the primary appeal of these occasional festivities . . . was visual’. Furthermore, the difference in approach between Heywood and Webster echoes the debate within the theatre over the relative merits of seeing or hearing a play. Heywood touches on this issue in *Londini emporia* when he refers to onlookers ‘who carry their eares in their eyes’ (sig. B4r). As with Heywood, Kiefer writes that Jonson’s ‘condescension’ towards those members of the audience who come to see, not hear, a play ‘reflects distain for the multitudes who, missing a playwright’s profundity, find more entertainment in what they see than in what they hear’.

As an illustration of the potential difficulties, McGrath outlines the numerous contingencies upon which a complete understanding of the precise detail of pageantry (in this case, Rubens’s ‘Arch of the Mint’) could be dependent: ‘the keen-sighted spectator who knew something about the natural history of the New World – and . . . the subject would not have been unaccessible – would perhaps have recognised in the small, unprepossessing creature [otherwise designated a rabbit] . . . the chinchilla’. All this, of course, is dependent on said well-informed spectator being sufficiently keen-sighted actually to spot this small animal and its ‘somewhat weighty symbolism’, let alone distinguish it from a rabbit. These difficulties aside, Watt is justified in her view that in this period ‘a highly developed sense of visual allegory’ existed, meaning that people were generally habituated to interpreting the more common and conventional forms of allegory and symbolism, which, after all, pervaded much early modern culture. Thus a figure bearing a trumpet would doubtless have been readily identifiable as Fame, even to an onlooker who had not had the benefit of a classical education but who might have browsed a copy of Whitney’s *Choice of emblems* or a similar work. At the same time, it is important to foreground the actualities of those occasions when the more ‘writerly’ dimensions of the Shows may have passed the audience by. Lublin emphasises that ‘more than the productions of the professional [theatre] companies, the
children’s troupes, or even the court masques’, the Shows ‘deserve consideration primarily as a visual spectacle’. For one thing, as Smuts comments, ‘contemporaries had to content themselves with a . . . fragmentary view’ of the pageantry, ‘since painted emblems could not always be seen clearly from a distance and the noise of the crowd frequently drowned out recited speeches’. 

An important aspect of the material history of the Shows is thus the effect of practical constraints on the viewers’ experience. The streets were thronged with people, disparate sources indicate that the speeches were at times inaudible and the onlookers must have sometimes struggled to make sense of the entertainment. As Lublin points out, ‘the large crowds . . . no doubt created a level of ambient noise far greater than that which would have been found in the public playhouses’. In addition, some of the onlookers would have failed to get much of a decent view of proceedings. The latter obstacle is certainly implied by Gilbert Dugdale’s eyewitness account of James’s 1604 royal entry, published as *The time triumphant declaring in briefe, the arival of our soueraigne liege Lord, King Iames into England*. Crucially, and unlike most of the other eyewitnesses discussed above, Dugdale was an English onlooker, and so linguistic difficulties cannot be blamed. Although his description is not of a mayoral Show, the same general issues would have applied. Dugdale attempted, not entirely successfully, to ‘interpret’ a figure on one of the ceremonial arches but he ended up mistaking the Genius of London for a hermit. His account is reluctant to claim any particular authority and is full of provisos and apologies such as ‘I was not very neare’, ‘I heard it not’ and ‘as I take it’. When one considers how Busino and von Wedel retold their experiences of mayoral Shows it is plain that Dugdale’s experience cannot have been unique. For instance, Dekker’s ‘Mermaids’ are called ‘Sirens’ by one eyewitness of the 1612 Show, Abraham Scultetus.

Smuts convincingly demonstrates that what might be regarded as irritating or inexplicable inconsistencies in fact ‘help us grasp the variety [of] meanings that an occasion like this possessed and the complexity of the cultural issues it raised’. He concludes that ‘the muddles and confusions in Dugdale’s narrative are . . . revealing, for what they tell us about the difficulty of absorbing complicated pageantry while manoeuvring through tens of thousands of cheering and sometimes inebriated spectators’. Munro too emphasises how ‘the inaugural shows could be understood by contemporaries in terms of the violence, density, and impenetrability
of the crowd’. As Burden puts it, for many people the Shows were an opportunity ‘to shout, wave, drink and in general live it up’. Indeed, unauthorised use of ‘squibs and crackers’ could sometimes get one into trouble. In November 1629 Benjamin Norton, a Clothworker, appeared before the Court of Aldermen after having been ‘arrested for throwing squibs into the streete upon the Lord Maiors Day past’. Busino relates how an outraged woman struck ‘with a bunch of greens’ a Spaniard thought to be part of the ambassador’s party; the unfortunate man’s fine garments were also ‘embroidered’ with ‘soft, fetid mud’. For Parry, even in the context of the aristocratic masque ‘most of the actual audience of the time probably remembered it for an extraordinary series of capers cut by Prince Henry or Buckingham, or for the colourful costumes’, rather than in its full metaphorical and symbolic complexity. This is not to claim, however, that none of the audience outside of the Lord Mayor and his party were able to hear and understand any of the speeches, resulting in a ‘purely visual’ experience of the Show, as Bromham assumes: doubtless some of the speeches were audible and comprehensible to some people, and some not. In any case, the Shows were sufficiently broad in their range to appeal to different tastes and interpretative abilities.

To be fair to the viewers, given the practical constraints of the day as outlined elsewhere, many of the pageants piled significance upon significance in a way unlikely to be readily or fully accessible to onlookers. In *Porta pietatis*, for instance, Heywood presents the figure of Piety, upon whose hand sits ‘a beautilfull Childe, representing Religion, upon whose Shield are figured Time, with his daughter Truth’. Piety is also accompanied in ‘another co[m]partment’ by representations of the blessed virgin, the ‘three Theologicall Graces’, and, in addition, the persons of Zeal, Humility and ‘Constancies’, all of whom bore the appropriate devices (sigs B4v–C1r). Such relatively tiny details would have been hard to ascertain from a distance, and might have been overcome by all the other distractions of the day. Visual impressions would inevitably have dominated the viewers’ perceptions. Indeed, Watanabe-O’Kelly asserts that one should not assume that ‘the learned aspect’ of festivals was that which necessarily ‘most interested the spectators’. The speeches that ‘explained’ the tableau to its audience would have been helpful to them only if they were audible, and we do know that in some cases they were not. In *Metropolis coronata*, for instance, Munday warns that the first speech of the Show should be heard with ‘such silence . . . as the season can best permit’ (sig. A4v). Furthermore,
despite what many modern commentators tend to assume, the
descriptions in the printed pamphlets may not correspond precisely
to what was experienced on the day. Smuts too argues that many
‘have failed to recognise . . . that the elaborate allegorical schemes
recorded in printed accounts of . . . processions often bear little
relationship to what most spectators actually saw’. Carnegie
summarises the likely outcome thus: even if ‘out of earshot of the
speeches . . . [spectators] would see the mythological figures borne
by baroque conveyances of scallop shells or sea-horses, catch the
glint of sun on rich gilding . . . They would also see the array of silk
flags and painted decoration . . . [and] would probably hear at least
some of the music.’ There would have been plenty to enjoy even
if the minutiae of the pageantry escaped many people.

‘To humour the throng’: ‘popular’ elements of the Shows

If the content of the mayoral Shows reflected popular London taste,
at least to an extent, then they might be considered analogous to
the popular taste in printed texts of ‘the general [non-elite] reading
public’, where, as Watt argues, ‘conservatism’ and a ‘persistence of
old-fashioned beliefs’ can be detected. Accordingly, there were
other elements to the entertainment that, perhaps because they
were so taken for granted, or because the poets had little to do with
them, were never mentioned in the printed texts. Long-standing
traditional figures such as greenmen or ‘wild men’ should therefore
not be overlooked, nor should ancillary roles like that of the man
disguised as a giant who went on stilts ‘to make roome’ in the 1604
Show. Machyn wrote of ‘ij vodys [woods, i.e. wild men] and a
dulle [devil] with squybes bornyng’ in the 1554 Show. Other eye-

witness accounts demonstrate that such features of the Shows clearly
made an impact on the audiences. They were sometimes employed
in other forms of culture as metonyms for the overall entertainment.
For instance, the giants in stilts are mentioned in Marston’s Dutch
Courtezan, where a character says ‘Yet all will scarce make me so
high as one of the Gyants stilts that stalkes before my Lord Maiors
pageant’ (sig. D4v). Like Eastward hoe, which also refers to the
Lord Mayor’s Show, Marston’s play was printed in 1605, suggest-
ing that the semi-revival of the Shows in that year, after the plague
hiatus, had increased their cultural currency.

By foregrounding the ‘special effects’ employed in the Shows one
can apprehend more clearly the reasons why the more spectacular
aspects of the entertainments are so frequently cited in other works
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of the period, as well as why eyewitnesses remembered them so vividly. Considerable attention was paid to putting on the most impressive spectacle that ingenuity and funds permitted. I discuss the use of fireworks, one of the chief elements of this kind, further below, but the printed descriptions of the pageant devices themselves provide ample evidence of elaborate and complicated effects. In *The triumphs of honor and vertue*, for instance, Middleton gives an account of the two-part device called ‘the Throne of Vertue, and the Globe of Honor’. The device would have taken considerable expertise to bring to life, for the text relates that this ‘Globe suddenly opening and flying into eight Cants or distinct parts, discouers in a twinkling, eight bright Personages most gloriously deckt’. This ‘Engine’, as Middleton calls it, then ‘conuert[s] it selfe into a Canopie of Starres: at the foure corners below are lac’d the foure Cardinal Vertues’ (sigs C1v–C2r). As well as being quite a feat of early seventeenth-century engineering (no wonder Garret Christmas is called ‘an Exquisite Master in his Art’ in this text), the device must have been large enough to house eight performers; how the Globe was then transformed into a canopy of stars one can only imagine. Middleton rightly refers to the device as an ‘Vnparalel’d Master-piece of Inuention and Art’ (sig. C2v). The ‘Cristall Sanctuary’ in the 1623 Show is equally ornate, with golden columns and silver battlements. Middleton states that it ‘is made to open vp in many parts, at fit and conuenienc Time’s’, and it is also called ‘an vnparaled Maister-peece of Art’ (sigs B2v–B3r). Munday, in contrast, simply refers to the first device of *Sidero-Thriambos* as ‘very ingeniously and artificially fitted [and] suitable to the dayes solemnity’ (sig. A4v). Indeed, Munday’s accounts of some of his Shows’ more complex devices tend to be more self-deprecating than celebratory: in the latter text he concedes that ‘fauourable conceit, must needs supply the defect of impossible performance’ (*ibid.*). His disclaimer is borne out by the bathos later on conjured up by the British Bard, who ‘smiteth [his] Staffe vpon his foot, & suddenly issueth forth the three seuerall letters of H’ pertaining to the names of the Lord Mayor and both Sheriffs, all of which began with an ‘H’ in 1618.

One cannot imagine Middleton admitting to an ‘impossible performance’. Indeed, he and his collaborators had an especial interest in special effects, for their Shows tended to make greater use of them than some of their peers, and accordingly they pervade the printed descriptions. *The triumphs of truth* is particularly preoccupied with such tricks. As well as the ‘fiue Islands’ artfully
constructed on the river, the ‘strange Ship’ which conveys the King and Queen of the Moors is expressly designed to ‘astonish’ the onlookers by its ability to move with no visible means of control, ‘it hauing neither Saylor nor Pilot’ (sig. B4v). Elsewhere, the battle between Zeal, Truth and Error, which forms the narrative spine of this text, would have required much use of smoke, mists and the like: the ‘Mount Triumphant’, for instance, is ‘ouer-spred with a thicke Sulphurous Darknesse . . . being a Fog or Mist raisde from Error’. At Truth’s command, this mist rises and is transformed into ‘a bright spredding Canopy, stucke thicke with Starres, and [with] beames of Golde shooting forth round about it’ (sig. C2r–v). Zeal’s enemy Error has ‘Mists hanging at his Eyes’ (sig. B2r), the effect of which was probably created by some kind of gauzy grey fabric. To defeat these mists Truth bears ‘a fan fild with all Starres . . . with which she parts Darknesse’ (sig. B3v). Some local butcher must surely have supplied the supposedly ‘human’ heart that Envy eats whilst seated on her rhinoceros.

As with these striking devices, other elements of the actual pageantry – such as Munday’s inclusion of Robin Hood in Metropolis coronata – may also have had a largely crowd-pleasing intent. Like the giants and greenmen, ‘popular’ taste of this kind was indulged but sometimes with ambivalence. Heywood, in particular, seems regularly to express distain for populist entertainments. In Londini emporia he dismisses the third show by land as ‘a Modell deuised for sport to humour the throng, who come rather to see then to heare: And without some such intruded Anti- maske, many who carry their eares in their eyes, will not sticke to say, I will not giue a pinne for the Show’ (sig. B4r). As there were no speeches within this show – had there been any, he argues, they would ‘be drown’d in noyse and laughter’ – he gives no further account of it. His use of the term ‘anti- maske’ indicates an aspect of the pageantry that might be considered antipathetic to the rest. It is hard to say if Heywood is correct that crowd-pleasing spectacle was an essential – if for him, perhaps unpalatable – part of the pageantry, or if his words are more a reflection of personal bias. The frequency with which he makes statements in his mayoral Shows along the same lines, however, suggests it may be the latter. In Londini artium, for instance, Heywood says little about the fifth show by land, on the basis that ‘the nature thereof being in the Poeme layd open euen unto the meanest capacity’ (sig. Cr), and in Londini sinus salutis ‘the Third Plat-forme’ is apparently ‘contrived onely for Pastime, to please the vulgar, and therefore deserues no further Charractar,
then a plaine nomination, as devised onely to please the eye, but no way to feast the eare: and so I leave it’ (sig. A8r).226

Despite this body of evidence, however, Heywood’s treatment of an equivalent ‘eye-pleasing’ pageant in Londini speculum may, as Richard Rowland has argued, indicate a more teasing than wholly censorious approach.227 Heywood here expounds in more detail, and with more empathy than in his other Shows, on the rationale for not including an account of a show which ‘meerly consisteth of Anticke gesticulations, dances, and other Mimicke postures’. On the face of it, the rhetoric in this passage begins along the same lines as that quoted above, but Heywood does go on to say that these ‘vulgar’ devices are not ‘altogether to be vilefied by the most supercilious, and censorious’, for they take place in a heterogeneous environment – ‘where all Degrees, Ages, and Sexes are assembled’, as he puts it – and they should therefore be considered in a more generous light. All these constituencies, he argues, are ‘looking to bee presented with some fancy or other, according to their expecta-
tions and humours’. Indeed – and for Heywood this acts as a kind of trump card – ‘grave and wise men have been of opinion, that it is convenient, nay necessitous, upon the like occasions, to mixe seria iociis; for what better can set off matter, than when it is interlaced with mirth?’ (sig. C2r).

One can look to the work of a contemporary of Heywood, James Shirley, for a less ambivalent treatment of popular entertainments. Like Jasper Mayne (whose work is quoted in Chapter 5), Shirley approached the Lord Mayor’s Show from the vantage point of a court writer. He describes the Show in his 1633 play A contention for honour and riches, and here offers quite a lengthy and detailed satiric account of the persistence of ‘popular’ elements in the Shows of Heywood’s period of dominance.228 Two characters, Clod (a country gentleman) and Gettings (a London merchant), are at odds over the affections of a ‘Lady’ they are both courting. Their dispute ends in a duel, in the run-up to which Clod mocks Gettings’s civic pretensions. The passage is worth quoting at length:

the next day after Simon and Jude; when you goe a feasting to Westminster with your Gallyfoist and your pot-guns, to the very terror of the Paper-whales, when you land in sholes, and make the understanders in Cheapside, wonder to see ships swimme upon mens shoulders, when the Fencers flourish . . . when your whifflers are hangd in chaines, and Hercules Club spits fire about the Pageants, though the poore children catch cold that shew like painted cloth, and are onely kept alive with sugar plummes, with whom, when the
word is given, you march to Guild-hall, with every man his spoone in his pocket, where you looke upon the Giants, and feed like Sarazens, till you have no stomacke to Pauls in the afternoone: I have seene your Processions, and heard your Lions and Camels make speeches, in stead of Grace before and after dinner. (sigs B4v–C1r)

His satiric purpose to one side (lions and camels do not deliver speeches in the Shows), Shirley provides some lovely detail in this speech. He reveals the way in which ‘whales’ were constructed from paper, the fact that the water-pageant featured ships and was carried ‘upon mens shoulders’, that fireworks would have been used to make ‘Hercules Club’ ‘spit fire’, and that Company dignitaries carried their own spoons to the Guildhall banquet. Parodic or not, the account appears to be accurate in a number of respects. For instance, the Ironmongers’ records for 1609 indicate that ‘a whale’ was used in the water show: it was ‘to row with Fins open for Fireworkes at the mouth and water vented at the head’ and it may even have carried ‘a Blackamore’ in its mouth. This beast must have been quite a spectacle: if such devices were commonly used it is no wonder that Shirley mentions it. In Metropolis coronata too Munday describes a ‘Sea Chariot . . . shaped like to a Whale, or the huge Leuiathan of the Sea’, which bears Fitz-Alwin and the ‘eight royall Vertues’ (sig. A4r).

Shirley and Heywood in their different ways reveal that traditions died hard. Despite Jordan’s claim in the dedication to the Grocers in London’s Joy (1681) that ‘in these Triumphs there is nothing Designed, Written, Said or Sung, that was ever Presented in any Show till this present Day’ (sig. A2v), in fact where the pageants reflected the traditional iconography and symbolism of the Companies they were understandably reused, as the properties were expensive. Indeed, on some occasions they were even borrowed between companies. Not only were the properties reused in subsequent Shows. In 1616 the Fishmongers’ Company and the Corporation liaised with the master of the King’s barges to share the use of barges for two events that happened to take place within a few days of each other, the Lord Mayor’s inaugural show and Charles’s investiture as Prince of Wales (the text of which Middleton wrote and which was published as Citatatis amor). Compared to professional stage companies, MacIntyre and Epp assert, ‘the same few costumes and properties were generally used every year [for the Shows], with only occasional updating’; the court masque, in contrast, where money was not an issue, ‘always used specially designed garments’. Munday, for instance, reworked a pageant
ship at least four times (five, if one includes Londons loue), signal-
ing the importance of ships to the trading companies to which many
Lord Mayors belonged. The ship was named the ‘Barke-Hayes’ for
the Drapers in 1614 (associated on this occasion with Sir Francis
Drake), was reinvented the following year as Jason’s ‘Argoe’, and
then again as ‘the Fishmongers Esperanza, or Hope of London’ for
the latter company in 1616, where it also doubled up – ‘by generall
sufferance’, as Munday puts it – for ‘the same fishing Busse, wherein
S. Peter sate mending his Nets’ (Chrysanaleia, sig. B1r–v). If said
‘general sufferance’ is not forthcoming and the reader is not happy
to accept the analogy, Munday has another to hand: the ship can
alternatively be taken for ‘one of those fishing Busses, which not
only enricheth our kingdome . . . but helpeth also . . . all other lands’
(sig. B1v). In The triumphs of the Golden Fleece, a text which
uniquely focuses exclusively on the water show, Munday again
nominates the ‘Barge of apt conueyance’ as ‘a beatifull and curious
Argoe . . . wherein Prince Jason, and his valiant Argonautes’ went
to fetch the golden fleece (sig. A3v).

As this suggests, the Shows regularly reused pageant images, and
Munday is especially prone to take advantage of such economies. In Chruso-
thriambos Nicholas Faringdon, the four times Lord
Mayor from the Goldsmiths’ Company, is wakened from his tomb
by the figure of Time; five years later William Walworth, an equally
famed Fishmonger, is similarly raised from death or slumber to
participate in that year’s inauguration. Munday’s liking for the
trope of resurrection is expounded in Metropolis coronata when
Robin Hood declares ‘Since Graues may not their Dead containe,
/ Nor in their peacefull sleepe remaine, / But Triumphes and great
Showes must use them’ (sig. C1v). Resurrection applies to the
devices themselves, too. Chruso-
thriambos contains a number of
features of the pageantry that was to reoccur a few years later in
Chrysanaleia. As well as having tombs, an Indian king and queen
ride on a leopard in both productions. Munday goes beyond civic
pageantry to reuse some of the characters from his popular Rose
plays The Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntington and The Death
of Robert, Earl of Huntington in Metropolis coronata, down to
the Skeltonic verse of Friar Tuck. Indeed, the text at this point
lapses into a dramatic dialogue that emphasises the extent to which
Munday is revisiting earlier works.234 This practice of reuse was
not restricted to Munday’s Shows, however. The 1637 Show has St
Katherine riding in a scallop drawn by a sea-chariot, a device with
many similarities to that used in other Shows, such as Troia-Noua
triumphans, although on the earlier occasion it was Neptune who rode in the scallop-shaped chariot. Heywood was then to revive the same chariot in Londini status pacatus, where this time the figure it bore was ‘Nilus’.

As well as the devices, sideshows and so on, music was also an essential element of the Shows. Palmer writes that in civic pageantry music had from the very first been ‘used to separate the various components of the procession and to emphasise the grandeur of both the occasion and the participants’. Even the instruments that were habitually employed – trumpets, drums and fifes – were those conventionally used for processions; they were chosen to produce the loudest and most robust sound possible. On land, the City Waits usually stood on the leads above the porch of St Peter’s church on Cheapside. The trip back and forth to Westminster along the river also had a musical accompaniment, where again trumpets and drums were used. In The triumphs of the Golden Fleece Munday testifies to the employment of ‘Drummes, Fifes, Trumpets, and other Iouiall Instruments’ during the water show (sig. A3r–v). Trumpets were used particularly to punctuate proceedings and to draw the audience’s attention to significant events, as in Chrysanaleia: ‘so soone as the Lord Maior is come neere, and way made for his better attention: the Genius speaketh, the Trumpets sound their seuerall Surden flourishes [and] Walworth ariseth’ (sig. B3r).

The evidence indicates that accompanying music for the procession (especially on the water) was probably instrumental, but the pageantry did include songs as well as speeches, evidently sung by the characters in the various devices. These too are often overlooked. In Tes Irenes Trophaea ‘The Song of the Muses’ meets the Lord Mayor at Paul’s Churchyard; the words and music are provided in the text. This ‘song’ looks to have been composed for the occasion: Euterpe and Terpsichore sing that they ‘are come to meet thee [the Lord Mayor] on the way, / that vnto thy honours shrine, / We might dedicate this day’ (sig. B2r). There is ‘the Song of Robin Hood and his Huntes-men’ in Metropolis coronata; in Dekker’s Londons tempe the smiths sing ‘in praise of Iron’ (sig. B2v) and in Troia-Noua triumphans a song is heard from a hidden singer (sig. C3v). The Robin Hood song in Metropolis coronata has a ballad-style quality in keeping with the anachronistic tenor of the treatment in this work of Robin Hood and his crew. As in Squire’s text, the song in Troia-Noua triumphans was also specific to the Show, for it picks up on the emblematic figures utilised in the
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pageantry such as Fame and Envy, and it also mentions Swinnerton, the new Lord Mayor, by name. The first device of *The triumphs of truth* features ‘a sweet voyce married to [the] words’ of a song, the music for which – or ‘the Song with the Note’, as the text has it – is also printed in this work. Going by the allusion to ‘his Honors Confirmation’, this song was also likely to have been composed for the day (sigs A3v and D3v–D4r).

To add to the din there was, according to Busino, ‘an incessant shower of squibs and crackers’ thrown from windows down on to the streets.\(^{239}\) Once again, a focus on the printed text can give only a limited or perhaps even misleading sense of the full range of the day’s festivities, some of which had little to do with the pageantry as such but which might have been there to offer what Williams calls ‘light relief from allegory and history’.\(^{240}\) Indeed, because there were no actual pageants in 1630 – and thus no printed text – this year is absent from most commentaries, although the Merchant Taylors’ accounts make it clear that the full range of other entertainments did take place that year. Sideshows were surprisingly ubiquitous. As Shirley mentions ‘fencers’ in *A contention for honour and riches*, so the Merchant Taylors, for instance, employed ‘viii men which did fyte with hand swordes’ in 1602, as in other years, to provide the crowds with further entertainment.\(^{241}\) In 1605 the Show included the traditional giant, carried about on stilts. Giants had since time immemorial been very common in all forms of civic drama, and they were sometimes included in the more formal pageant devices of the mayoral Shows in our period. For instance, Dekker has ‘Ryot and Calumny, in the shapes of Gyants’ accompanying Envy in the ‘Forlorn Castle’ device that concludes *Troia-Noua triumphans*; they then shoot off fireworks (sig. B4r).

As we saw above with Shirley’s reference to ‘Hercules Club [that] spits fire’, fireworks were clearly extremely popular for these occasions, both on land and as part of the water show. Indeed, they stand as a metonym for the Show as a whole in Fennor’s 1612 *Cornu-Copiae*, which refers to the spectators’ experience of ‘when . . . the fire-workes flye’ (sig. H1r). Their use is quite extensive when one starts looking for it in the printed texts of the Shows themselves, and they demonstrate a range and originality that few other cultural forms from this period share. The whale used for the 1609 Show appears to have issued fireworks from its mouth, in much the same way, one can assume, as a hell mouth would have been used in earlier civic drama. Going by other references in livery company accounts, this effect was likely to have been created by the use of
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The use of fireworks in the water show is also signalled in *Londons ius honorarium*, where Heywood states that ‘two craggy Rockes . . . are full of monsters, as Serpents, Snakes, Dragons, &c. some spitting Fier’ (sig. A4r). *Londons tempe* has the figure of Jove with ‘a Mace of Triple fire in his hand burning’ (sig. B2r). In this instance we are fortunate to have a pictorial impression of the effect of his ‘triple fire’. Booth’s drawing of the ‘London’s tempe’ pageant does show flames shooting out from Jove’s hand; he calls the device ‘the sceptre of triple fiery beams’ (see Figure 6). The three feathers used to indicate the arms of the Prince of Wales in *Monuments of Honor* somewhat riskily ‘haue lights in them’ to make ‘a more goodly’ show in the darkness (sig. C1v). Middleton too mentions the use of pyrotechnic devices throughout *The triumphs of truth*. On his arrival back at the City, the Lord Mayor is greeted by the figure of Zeal, dressed ‘in a Garment of Flame-coloured Silke, with a bright haire on his head, from which shoot Fire-beames’; in his right hand he holds ‘a flaming Scourge’ (sig. B1v). At the end of the Show Zeal reappears with ‘his head circled with strange Fires’. From his head – one assumes by dexterous use of a firework or by some combustible element being thrown – ‘a Flame shoots out’ and sets fire to Error’s chariot ‘and all the Beasts that are ioynde to it’ (sig. D2v). The wooden chariot and beasts would probably have had rosin thrown on them for even more spectacular incendiary effect when the flame reached them. This Show must have attained an extraordinary climax, especially if the chariot was left ‘glowing in Imbers’ in the dark October evening, as Middleton’s text has it.

Pyrotechnic devices had practical as well as spectacular functions. Busino tells how in 1617 ‘there were . . . men masked as wild giants who by means of fireballs and wheels hurled sparks in the faces of the mob and over their persons’. Zuizin saw the same device, which he recounted explicitly as part of a crowd control technique: ‘people in masks’, he wrote, ‘carried palms with fireworks, and they threw from them sparkling fire on both sides because of the great press of people, that they might give way’. Another contemporary source testifies to the regular appearance of such figures in mayoral pageantry, even in their early days. In Whetstone’s *Promos and Cassandra* (1578) there are ‘two men, apparrelled, lyke greene men at the Mayors feast, with clubbes of fyre worke’ (sig. N1r). Going by eyewitness accounts and some contemporary images (see Figure 15), these ‘fire clubs’ look to have sprayed sparks around to produce what Butterworth calls ‘a powerful pyrotechnic and
dramatic effect’. The greenmen were regularly accompanied by ‘devils’ spitting fire. No wonder they were remembered by onlookers for their effectiveness in clearing the way.

‘All the bachelars in cremesun damaske hodes’: colour and costume in the Shows

From the start of the day to its torch-lit end the spectacle was, of course, predominantly visual, and another way in which meanings were conveyed to the mayoral procession and to the onlookers was through the use of particular kinds of fabric and colour. The majority of the extant eyewitness accounts of mayoral Shows provide considerable detail of the clothing worn for the occasion, in terms of both colour and fabric, which echoes the attention paid to such matters in the livery company records. The drawings of the Lord Mayor, sheriffs and aldermen in 1614 in van Meer’s album, for instance, show them on fine horses wearing resplendent red robes (see Figure 16), echoing Machyn’s repeated references in his diary to red, crimson and scarlet robes. Elements of costuming can also be gleaned from the illustrations relating to the 1616 Show. Smuts

15 ‘Wild man’ with fire club, from John Bate, _The mysteryes of nature, and art_, sig. N1r
16 The Lord Mayor in procession, from Michael van Meer’s ‘Album Amicorum’
Pageantry and power

has commented that ‘the single most impressive expression of royal grandeur . . . was ornate clothing. In Tudor England the sight of rich silks, brocade and jewels was a compelling expression of prestige and power.’ His argument applies equally to civic ‘grandeur’. Indeed, expenditure on fabric for the Company members and others in the procession encompassed a considerable share of the total cost of the Show, comparable in many cases to the costs of the pageants and greatly eclipsing the sums spent on costumes for the actual performers. The Merchant Taylors, for instance (who tended to spend lavishly on fabrics) paid over £170 for material for ‘poore mens gownes’ for the procession in 1602, a token of the importance the Companies attached to this aspect of the event. Similarly, the Haberdashers’ second largest outlay for the 1631 Show (after £200 to Christmas for ‘pageantes and shewes’) was over £140 for ‘17 blew clothes’ alone. Even the ‘marryners that went in the Galley and Galley foyst’ wore blue silk coats. The Skinners were less extravagant, but even so they paid out almost £100 on the purchase of ‘blew cloth’ for ‘74 gownes & 44 coates’ in 1629 (not including the additional expense of making the garments).

Here is another divergence with the masque, incidentally. Although, as we have seen, they devoted considerable expense to furnishing their members and the usual roster of ‘poor men’ with clothing for the occasion, the Companies do not appear to be especially interested in the costumes used for the pageant performers. Their records tend to refer only rather tersely to ‘apparelling personages’, with no detail of what said personages were apparelled in. For earlier guild plays and for the Midsummer Watch, in contrast, it seems either that there was a store of properties and costumes held by the guilds or that these were purchased specially. For the Shows the responsibility for arranging costumes for the performers was invariably delegated to the writer and artificer team. As a result, only occasionally do the livery company records reveal much about how these costumes were acquired: they were hired in 1609, for instance – or ‘old and borrowed’, in the Company’s view. Indeed, if, as seems likely in Munday’s case at least, those who worked behind the scenes on mayoral pageantry had connections with the clothing trade, then costumes would have not needed any specific comment in Company records. It is equally possible that with the stage connections of almost all of the writers, and with the involvement of men like Thomas Kendall on occasion, the costumes may have been borrowed from theatre companies. In contrast, extensive records survive of the planning of masque costumes for their aristocratic
performers, as well as quite a number of the actual designs. This also stands as a point of departure between the practices of the professional stage and those of the mayoral Shows: in the case of the latter the Companies appear to have had little interest in how the performers were costumed beyond requiring the creative team to organise ‘apparel’.

There is one notable exception to this norm, however, in the Ironmongers’ Court Book for 1629. As I have already signalled, these records are extraordinarily explicit about the content of the Show and as such have a great deal of as yet unexplored value for the history of pageant performance. They surely contain the text of Dekker and Christmas’s original ‘plot’ for the various devices, which reveals the costuming of the characters in considerable detail, thus enabling even the modern reader to visualise their appearance. For instance, Oceanus, the King of the Sea, bore on his head ‘a diadem’ of gold, which was ‘a Coronett of Siluer Scollops’ topped with coral and pearl. The rest of his apparel is also described: ‘his habitt is antique, the stuffe watchett [light blue] and siluer, a mantle crossing his body with siluer waues’ and he also wore ‘Bases and Buskins’. His wife Tethys, who rode on a sealion, had ‘longe disheuelled’ hair; she too wore a coronet, in this case of ‘gold and [purple] pearle’. Her ‘garments [were] rich’ and her mantle made of ‘Taffaty’. Of the other pageants, we are told that the Indian boy held ‘a longe Tobacco pipe’ and a dart, and that Lemnion’s forge featured smiths dressed in ‘waste Coats and Lether Aprons [with] their hair blacke and shaggy’.\(^\text{254}\)

The royal couple’s gold and silver attire exemplifies the richness of the colour and fabrics used on these occasions, evidence of which is available fairly often in the printed texts. Descriptions of costume also occur from time to time in eyewitness accounts (from the latter, for instance, it appears that the some of the performers wore masks).\(^\text{255}\)

One can readily visualise how the figure of Oceanus would have appeared in the 1620 Show, with his sceptre of green weeds, ‘azure locks’ and ‘mantle of sea greene taffaty, lymed with waues and fishes’ (Tes Irenes Trophaea, sig. A3r). In Metropolis coronata Munday describes how the argonauts wear ‘faire guilt Armours’ and carry ‘Shields honoured with the Impresse of the Golden fleecie’; even the rowers of the Argoe ‘had all their garments . . . sprinkled ouer with golde, euen as if it had showred downe in droppes vpon them’ (sig. A4r). Likewise, ‘Londons Genius’ in Chrysanaleia wears ‘a golden Crowne on his head [with] golden Wings at his backe’ and he bears ‘a golden Wande in his hand’ (sig. B3r). Gold and silver performed a
dual purpose. They signalled the sheer ostentation of the event and the willingness of the Companies to spend lavishly, and they also added to the spectacle: one can imagine the light catching the gilded armour worn by Munday’s argonauts.

It was not only the actual performers who were costumed. The Lord Mayor himself would have been resplendent in red, with his chain and cap of office, riding a horse with elaborate trappings (see Figure 16). To accompany him, the Bachelors of the Company were ‘in foins’ and ‘budge’ to mark their status within the Company.\(^{256}\) Given the attention within the Companies’ accounts to the cost of dressing their own members up for the inauguration, it is unsurprising that Busino devotes an entire section of his report to describing the attire of the civic dignitaries, especially the Grocers’ liverymen:

their gowns resemble those of a Doctor of Laws or the Doge, the sleeves being very wide in the shoulder and trimmed with various materials, such as plush, velvet, martens’ fur, foynes and a very beautiful kind of astrachan, while some wear sables . . . Over the left shoulder they wore a sort of satchel, one half of red cloth and the other black, fastened to a narrow stole. There were other gownsmen in long cloth gowns with satchels of red damask . . . Others again wore another kind of appendage, also red, on the shoulder, and a fourth set had small stoles about the throat.\(^{257}\)

Lupold von Wedel, over thirty years earlier, also began his description of a mayoral inauguration with his recollections of what the chief protagonists were wearing. His account demonstrates that the traditional attire had not substantially changed in the interim. On the day of the handover from one Lord Mayor to another in the Guildhall, 28 October, von Wedel reports that both the new Lord Mayor and his predecessor

wear long coats of a brownish violet coloured cloth, lined with marten, and over these other coats of the same colour faced with calabar [squirrel] skins . . . On their heads they wear black caps . . . After them marched twenty-four councillors clad in the same manner, and in the town hall [Guildhall] stood forty-eight men . . . in long black coats also lined with marten, wearing on their backs large bags . . . of cloth half red half black, with a bandalier of the same colours over the shoulder and fastened before the chest.\(^{258}\)

Vivid colour and the prevalence of luxurious furs and fabrics are among the strongest impressions one gains from the varied accounts of mayoral inaugurations. Indeed, the ‘Tryumph’ is cited alongside
‘Maske, Tilt-yard [and] Play-house’ by the anonymous author of the anti-cross-dressing pamphlet *Hic mulier* as one of the specifically urban venues for the transgression of clothing norms.\(^{259}\) The use of fur and rich fabrics, naturally, was intended to reflect the wealth and prestige of the Lord Mayor and his Company, whilst colours would have helped the onlooker ‘read’ the Show as it passed by. Anne Sutton concurs that ‘the increasingly elaborate ceremonial – of which liveries were such an important visual expression . . . supported the authority of the civic officials’.\(^{260}\) The display of the symbolic regalia like the sword and the Lord Mayor’s collar was an important aspect of the procession. As Heywood puts it, ‘you this Day behold this Scarlet worn, / And Sword of Iustice thus in publike borne; / The Cap of Maintenance, [and] Coller of Esses [chain of S-shaped links]’ (*Londini artium*, sig. B3r). Accordingly, the image of the Lord Mayor in procession in van Meer’s album depicts the sword-bearer marching in front of the mayor, aldermen and sheriffs. Contemporary witnesses of the Shows would have been habituated to ‘reading’ social status and other signs of identity from clothing and regalia. Von Wedel comments that ‘the queen gives [a golden] chain to every newly elected [mayor], the members of the town council who have been elected [mayor] once before, wear likewise such chains, the other have only stripes of black velvet on their coats’.\(^{261}\) The significance of such accoutrements was well known: Dekker’s Simon Eyre in *The Shoemaker’s Holiday*, for instance, cites the gold chain as a symbol of his newly gained mayoral status.

Livery companies, of course, habitually used clothing as a means of corporate identity, and this tendency was indulged to the maximum during the Shows. Catherine Richardson notes that public displays of civic structures, designed to strengthen the perception of hierarchies of government and the right ordering of society, necessarily employed visual spectacles of allegiance. The strength of identification with or exclusion from such groups was frequently negotiated and expressed through what people wore, especially on extraordinary communal occasions.\(^{262}\)

To illustrate her point, one can see that certain colours had meanings just as animals and other emblems did, such as red for the dignitaries and blue for the ‘poor men’.\(^{263}\) The very distinction between those Bachelors of the livery company dressed in ‘foins’ and those in the lowlier ‘budge’ demonstrates how graduations in civic status were reflected visually. Thus, as Richardson suggests, specific forms of
clothing can be seen as ‘one of the boundaries between the personal and the communal’. 264 Children were also used as ‘pages’ within the procession, carrying nosegays of flowers on staffs.265 One cannot, therefore, make hard and fast distinctions between costumed performers per se and those citizens who processed. The dignitaries in procession were an integral part of the spectacle, as were the ‘poor men’, dressed by the Company’s munificence for the occasion and in themselves a public embodiment of that generosity.266 Indeed, Archer notes that to manifest further the City’s munificence ‘the poor at the head of the procession carried shields with coats of arms of company benefactors’.267 The temporary inclusion of representatives of ‘the poor’ into the corporate body of the livery is also another marker of the putative inclusiveness of the Show. 

As well as clothing, to add to the overwhelming sense of colour and ostentation, banners, pavises, streamers, many made of silk and other expensive fabrics, as well as ‘targettes’ (decorated shields), featured heavily in the Companies’ expenditure and were highly decorated for the occasion with coats of arms and so on.268 Heraldic emblems were also an important part of the symbolic lexicon of Lord Mayor’s Day. Munday notes in *Metropolis coronata* (a text particularly interested in heraldry) that a ‘pelleted Lyon’ and a ‘sea-Horse’ were chosen for heraldic reasons, the first being ‘the supporter to the Drapers Armes’ and the latter ‘belonging to the Lord Maiors Armorie’, as he puts it (sig. B2v). The Company records show that the banners and the like were usually painted and gilded and bore coloured silk fringes.269 In addition, the barges were furnished with embroidered cloths. Typically, in 1610 the Merchant Taylors required ‘fowre Banners, for the shipp, one with the kings Armes, an other with the Princes Armes, one with the Citties Armes, and an other with the Companies Armes’.270 One eyewitness, the Russian ambassador Zuizin, relates that the Lord Mayor travelled to Westminster in ‘a decorated ship, painted in all sorts of various colors . . . and there were banners and great decorated flags’.271

Companies usually employed one or more ensigns to flourish their colours during the procession and feast. Here too the use of colour was predominant, for even the staves were painted (‘whyte and blewe’, in the case of the Merchant Taylors in 1602). The latter Company also paid £5 for ‘fiftie pensilles [small pennants] a foote and a halff long a peece, wrought in fyne gould and silver in oyle’.272 Large silk pavises were normally ordered, featuring the arms of the City, the monarch, the Lord Mayor himself, and his Company. For the banquet after the Show, the Guildhall was hung with tapestries for the Lord Mayor’s
feast, and often a painting of the monarch was brought in especially for the occasion.\textsuperscript{273} The attention to detail is quite extraordinary: the Merchant Taylors stipulated, for instance, specific quantities of coloured and blue and white ‘silke frindg’ and twelve feathers for the standard bearers.\textsuperscript{274} From starting the events with a procession accompanied by trumpeters to ending it with a feast served on gold and silver plate (even the ‘ale potts’ were gilded in 1622), no one could have been in any doubt that this was a special day indeed.

The high-profile splendour of Lord Mayor’s day did not end at nightfall but was conferred a kind of immortality (or at least a greater longevity than that of a fleeting day) through the medium of print. There are, as I’ll show further in the next chapter, many fascinating and complex relations between the event on the streets and the event perpetuated in textual form. Neither, I believe, should be regarded as having primacy: to understand the Show in its fullest dimensions, textual traces must be explored alongside and as a complement to the vestiges in the first-hand accounts and other contemporary witnesses discussed in this chapter.
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94 Bentley, The Profession of Player, p. 60.

95 Staying Power, pp. 26–7. In later years the use of black performers is more conclusive: for instance, there are references to ‘Negroes’ in Tatham’s 1663 Show and in many others thereafter (indeed, they seem to have been quite ubiquitous in the 1670s).


98 Cited in Davidson, Technology, p. 28. Unfortunately no printed mayoral Show from this period has images of pageant wagons: the earliest such depiction was an engraving of the Chariot of Justice (on a folded sheet) in Settle’s 1698 Show, Glory’s Resurrection.


100 Munday, ed. Pafford, Chrysanaleia, pp. 14–15; see also Manley, Literature and Culture, p. 272. The route of royal entries was rather different, beginning at the Tower and processing westwards back to Westminster.

101 CSP Venetian, vol. XV, p. 62. Booth’s drawings of the 1629 pageants, in contrast, bear no sign of the means of transportation; indeed, if anything they look quite fixed; they also don’t appear to be tiered.

102 GH MS 16,969/2, fol. 223v.


104 ‘English pageant wagons’, p. 368 (incidentally, this is the same size given by Davidson for medieval wagons in York: see Technology, p. 23). Similar pageant wagons were used on the continent: in the Low Countries they were called ‘praalwagens’ and were sometimes wind-powered (see Cartwright, ‘The Antwerp Landjuweel’ and Schlueter, ‘Michael van Meer’s Album’, p. 303). The pageant wagons were usually made and stored in Leadenhall. The Haberdashers’ records suggest that Christchurch was used as a place to make or store their pageants, as the churchwardens received £1 in 1604 for the use of their ‘rome’ (GH MS 15,869, fol. 7v).

105 ‘English pageant wagons’, p. 361. Davidson points out that pageant
wagons did have steering mechanisms: the narrow lanes of cities like York and London would have required such a means of negotiation (Technology, pp. 19–20).

106 Pre-Reformation pageants also had various levels, used to reflect the hierarchy between the human and divine, as shown in the ‘Pentecost’ pageant reproduced in Davidson, Technology, p. 22. The height of medieval pageant wagons has been estimated at ‘about five foot above street level . . . [with] the roof . . . about eight feet above the stage’ (ibid., p. 29).


108 See, for example, Goldsmiths MSS vol. 14a, fol. 19v. Porters were paid for carrying the pageants from Blackwell Hall, where they were often stored before the event. Blackwell Hall was on the west side of Basinghall Street, located conveniently close to the Guildhall, to which it was connected by a passage; it was evidently still being used for the same purpose in the 1660s. Company records often indicate the need for the pageants to be ‘contynually watched’ (as the Merchant Taylors put it) in the run-up to the event; in 1621 the pageant was watched for seven days by ‘a poore man’ (GH MS 34,048/10). As before, the pageant and shows in 1610 were made in ‘Xpist [Christ] church’; the ground of the church was paved to accommodate this (GH MS 34.048/10). In later years a barn in Whitecross Street, in Cripplegate just north of the City, was used (see, for example, GH MS 34,048/13; see also my Anthony Munday, p. 136).

109 GH MSS 34,048/8 and 34,048/9. A hundred porters were paid in 1610 for carrying the ‘Pageant, Chariott, Shipp, and all the rest of the other shewes’ (GH MS 34,048/10). For more on porters and their roles within livery companies, see Ward, Metropolitan Communities, pp. 58–64. There is an illustration of a ‘pageant litter’ carried by men in Davidson, Technology, p. 18.

110 See Jansson and Rogozhin, England and the North, p. 163.

111 McGrath, ‘Rubens’s Arch of the Mint’, p. 208.


113 See Nichols, The Fishmongers’ Pageant, pp. 12 and 16.

114 GH MS 15,869, fol. 7v. One of the pageant wagons for the 1686 Show was drawn by ‘nine white Flanders horses’ (Murdoch, ‘The Lord Mayor’s procession for 1686’, p. 208).

115 GH MS 11,590, fol. 14.

116 For a French royal entry horses disguised as elephants were used to transport the triumphal cars (McGowan, ‘The Renaissance triumph’, p. 32). There is a somewhat fanciful image of such a ‘disguised’
pageant in Fairholt’s *Lord Mayors’ Pageants* (vol. I, p. xvii). In *Cor努-Copiae*, contemporary with Dekker’s 1612 Show, Fennor implies that porters are employed ‘vpon that solemnne day, / when as the Pageants through Chepe-side are carried’ (sig. H1r; my emphasis).

Later on Webster remarks that only ‘twelue of the foure and twentie Cities’ endowed by Sir Thomas White had been placed on one of the pageants, ‘for more would haue ouer-burthened it’ (sig. C1r).

*Jacobean Civic Pageants*, p. 181 n. 4.

118 Goldsmiths MSS vol. 14a, fol. 20r. The porters were also required to act as ‘bouncers’ outside the Company Hall to keep out ‘loose people’.

119 GH MS 34,048/8; GH MS 34,048/10. Fortunately, it does not appear that any of the musicians was injured by this surely rather dangerous practice.

120 GH MS 34,048/10.

121 GH MS 34,048/13.

122 Robertson and Gordon, *Collections* III, p. 54.

123 GH MS 30,708/3, fol. 38v. William Stokes, another gunner, was lucky to escape the carnage with only ‘splinters in his hand’ (fol. 38r). An eyewitness account of an Elizabethan progress records that a firework set fire to nearby houses (see Butterworth, *Theatre of Fire*, p. 168). The amount of engaging human detail in these records is very striking: in 1602 the Merchant Taylors, for instance, reimbursed ‘a poore woeman . . . towards the buying of a hatt, her husband having lost one’ (GH MS 34,048/8).

124 GH MS 15,333/2, fol. 184.

125 ‘The ages of man’, p. 81.

126 *CSP Venetian*, vol. XV, p. 61. The Drapers used thirty dozen whifflers’ staves, seventy-six javelins, and two and a half dozen ‘trunchions’ to order the crowds in 1621, which totals around 450 men (Drapers’ Bachelors Accounts, fol. 27). In 1613 the Grocers paid the City Marshall £4 for his assistance on the day (GH MS 11,590, fol. 6v).

127 ‘Music in the barges’, p. 171. As an indication of the importance of the Company barge, in 1622 the Grocers dismissed their barge master from any further service to the Company for ‘the greate wronge and abuse offred to this Company’ and the ‘disgrace’ they received as a result of the ‘slowe and heavy’ barge he provided (GH MS 11,588/3,
The Companies supplied food and drink for those travelling on the barges.


133 Jansson and Rogozhin, England and the North, p. 163.

134 In a fit of charitable nostalgia, in 1988 the City re-enacted the water show from Middleton’s 1613 Show. The barges used in 1988 were, accurately, around 80 feet long.


136 Jansson and Rogozhin, England and the North, p. 163.

137 Von Wedel, ‘Journey through England’, p. 253. The Merchant Taylors hired two barges to accommodate their liverymen in 1612 (see GH MS 34,048/10).

138 Drapers MS III, fol. 104. In a gesture that rather undermines the Salters’ extravaganza, Hartwell was made to promise that he would never request more than this annual sum (‘John and Goodwife Hartwell had been supplying barges, drummers and trumpeters for the Company since the 1620s, mainly for Lord Mayor’s Day’ (Barty-King, The Salters’ Company, p. 51)). James Ruffell was paid £40 ‘for the galley and the galley foist and all other things belonging to them’ in 1604 (GH MS 15,869, fol. 8r); ‘Samuell Erbury’ some £27 by the Skinners for the ‘Gallifoyst’ in 1628 (GH MS 30,708/6, fol. 359). The Goldsmith’ first barge was built in 1617, the Mercers’ in 1632, the Fishmongers’ in 1634 and the Grocers’ in 1637; prior to these dates they would have hired barges (Palmer, Ceremonial Barges, pp. 24 and 33; Munday ed. Nichols, Chrysanaleia, p. 25).

139 GH MS 5770/2, fol. 196. The Drapers ‘hired the great barge of the Archbishop of Canterbury’ in 1533 and ‘the Greyhound, the royal barge of Henry VIII’ in 1540, and the Skinners had used Wolsey’s barge back in 1518 (see Palmer, Ceremonial Barges, pp. 30 and 42).

140 Williams, ‘A Lord Mayor’s show’, p. 503.

141 Drapers’ Bachelors Accounts, fol. 88.

142 See Collections V, p. 6 n. 4.

143 Only one copy of this work has survived, and unfortunately the side-note is cropped.

144 Such an entrenched misconception is puzzling, for the difference is clear from the Companies’ records and would no doubt have been clear to onlookers too: for instance, in 1620 the Haberdashers paid £29 to ‘Mr Erberry for the galley foist’ and £7 5s to ‘Mr Sparrowhawke for the barge’ (GH MS 15,869, fol. 16r). Jane Palmer is one of those scholars who confuses the foist and the barge, leading her to misinterpret evidence from the Ironmongers’ records (‘Music in the barges’, p. 171). Even the OED gets it wrong, calling it ‘a state barge’.

145 GH MS 16,969/2, fol. 222r.

He explains that ‘it had in theory to be able to give armed protection to the lord mayor’ (p. 53). A ‘galley fuste’ appears on the river in Visscher’s 1616 panorama.

A ‘galley fuste’ appears on the river in Visscher’s 1616 panorama.

In 1618, according to the Ironmongers, a cannon fired off ‘almond comfetes [comfits]’ rather than shot (Robertson and Gordon Collections III, p. 97).

Drapers’ Bachelors Accounts, fol. 28. Exactly the same arrangement took place in 1623.

See GH MS 34,048/8. The Merchant Taylors tended to use 120 ‘brasse chambers’, each firing twice (the noise must have been deafening): see, for instance, GH MS 30,048/9. The Goldsmiths’ Company, for one, bought its own powder.

GH MS 34,105, fol. 2. Numerous trumpeters were also required for the Show.

In some royal progresses, in contrast, natural features were not available, such as the entertainments held for Elizabeth in 1591 at Elvetham where an artificial lake had to be dug for the occasion.

Robertson and Gordon, Collections III, p. 70.

Ibid., p. 85.

GH MS 11,590, fol. 6r. In Zelauto Munday refers to ‘a Pageant’ as well as ‘a number of strange deuices’ (sig. Eiir).

Robertson and Gordon Collections III p. 87.

Robin Hood, Friar Tuck and ‘his other braue Huntes-men’, Munday comments, were ‘at last’ able to address the Lord Mayor at the very end of the day: their ‘dutie . . . the busie turmoile of the whole day could not before affoord’ (sig. C1r). (Note that Munday’s remark is retrospective.)

The function of the lengthy and almost incomprehensible account of Pythagorean mathematics in his 1637 text remains obscure (Londini speculum, sigs B4v–C1r). Heywood’s inveterate classicism can result in unintentional bathos: in Porta pietatis the historical archive has produced the snippet that in ‘Arabia [sheep] have tayles three Cubits in length’ (sig. B1v).

Stow himself participated in mayoral pageantry for his Company, the Merchant Taylors. He was in 1561 one of the eight Company members appointed to ‘attend vpon the pageant to see that it be not borne against penthouses & to attend vpon the children and thire appell [sic] and to see it [the pageant] be safely sett vp within the hall accordingly’; in 1568 he acted as a whiffl er (Robertson and Gordon, Collections III, p. 41).

The Merchant Taylors’ accounts for 1601–3 show an annual pension being paid to ‘John Stowe a brother of this company and a maker
of chronicles’ (GH MS 34,048/8, fol. 35). Stow was paid 10s by the same Company in 1602 for the ‘great paynes by him taken, in [searching] for such as hath byn Maiors, Shereffs, and Aldermen of this Companie’ (ibid.). The results of Stow’s labours may have been reused five years later, when James I was presented with ‘a roll listing all those who had been chosen honorary members of the Company’ (Davies and Saunders, History of the Merchant Taylors’ Company, p. 162). As an example of how Stow’s fame as a citizen historian outlived him, Mayne’s The citye match (1639) has a satirical reference to a ‘Merchant Taylor that writes chronicles’ (sig. B2r). The historian and mapmaker John Speed was also a member of the Merchant Taylors, as was William Fleetwood, the Recorder of London. Sullivan has helpfully documented the library purchases of chronicles and related texts like Stow’s Suruay by some of the Companies (see ‘London’s early modern creative industrialists’, pp. 316–19).

As discussed elsewhere, Stow would have been scornful towards Munday’s error in Chrysanaleia where he claims that the City arms feature Walworth’s, rather than St Paul’s, dagger (sig. C3v; see also my Anthony Munday, pp. 159–60).


Cited in Sayle, Lord Mayors’ Pageants, p. 2. Smith implies that this pageant was carried along with the rest of the procession.


Cockayne’s coat of arms featured three cocks too.

The Ironmongers asked for ‘two Estriches of Silver’ from Grinkin in 1609 (perhaps the wooden animals were painted silver) (GH MS 16,969/2, fol. 223v).

See Utrecht MS 1196, fol. 48v.

Kiefer, Shakespeare’s Visual Theatre, pp. 16 and 213.

Sayle, Lord Mayors’ Pageants, p. 21. Sayle states that ‘a camel [was] hired from one Southwall for £1’ (ibid.).

GH MS 15,842/1, fol. 119r.

Carnegie remarks that ‘the spectator lacking [Webster’s] explanation might be hard-pressed to identify Liberality on the sole basis of this [dromedary] . . . Possibly Liberality has another property as well’ (‘Introduction to Monuments of honour’, p. 291). As Dekker chose to celebrate ‘fur’ in the 1628 Show for Richard Deane, a Skinner, he had to mention a whole ‘wildernesse’ of furry beasts, from wolves and leopards to ferrets and squirrels (Britannia’s honor, sig. C2r).
Pageantry and power

The Figure of the Crowd, p. 57.


‘The emblematic nature’, p. 182. I find Bergeron’s imagined ‘inveterate pageant-goer’ watching the Shows with ‘his well-thumbed copy of Whitney’s Choice of Emblemes’ just a little far-fetched, however (ibid., pp. 197–8).

Kipling, Enter the King, p. 14.


Sayle, Lord Mayors’ Pageants, p. 60.

Lindenbaum states that ‘smaller properties were kept in one of the companies’ great chests’ (‘Ceremony and oligarchy’, p. 176). In the earlier period these properties were accompanied by ‘records of the event “entred into a booke” so that the pageants could be reproduced in “tymes hereafter”’ (ibid., p. 181). The Clothworkers had a ‘pageant house’ for storing the artefacts for their Shows (Collections V, pp. 4 and 15–16).

The Magnificent, Princely, and most Royall Entertainments, sig. C2r. This text also describes mermen and mermaids, Jason’s ship with the golden fleece and the figure of Envy, amongst others, all of which appear in mayoral inaugurations too. Indeed, although it lacks civic imagery, in other respects this latter work is so reminiscent of a Lord Mayor’s Show that one wonders if one of the pageant poets may have had a hand in it (the text, unfortunately, is anonymous).

Palmer, Hospitable Performances, p. 119. Munro too comments on how Busino’s eyewitness account has received ‘surprisingly little critical analysis’ (The Figure of the Crowd, p. 60).


Ravelhofer points out that Busino was very short-sighted and so may not have been able accurately to make out the detail of what he saw on these occasions (The Early Stuart Masque, p. 23).

Levin’s account of the way in which the devices were designed ‘with an eye toward their effect in performance’ and ‘need only be seen’ rather understates the importance of the complex imagery to which the printed texts devote so much space (Middleton: The Collected Works, p. 1252).

Jonson, of course, is being unfair: such simple images would not have been identified in such a fashion, only the more obscure mythical figures: for an alternative view, see Dekker, The magnificent entertainment, sig. B1v.

See Osberg, ‘Humanist allusions’, p. 29.


As Levin remarks, by summarising all the devices in this fashion, Munday’s mayoral works ‘segregate performance and explication’ (Middleton: The Collected Works, p. 1251).
Bringing the Shows to life

192 Bergeron comments that ‘with slight variation Middleton’s Truth could have walked off the pages of Peacham’s [emblem book] Minerva Britannia and into the pageant’ (Middleton: The Collected Works, p. 967).

193 Munday’s interest in emblems was of long standing: he wrote a prefatory poem to, and may have co-edited, John Bodenham’s Bel-vedére, or, The Garden of the muses (1600), a miscellany of commonplaces which took much of its material from emblem books.

194 Bradbrook comments that Truth in The triumphs of truth was ‘copied in the greatest detail from that Truth whom Jonson had depicted in the Barriers for the marriage of the Earl of Essex [in 1606]’ (‘The politics of pageantry’, p. 69).

195 ‘The emblematic nature’, p. 171.


197 Heywood appears to have had an especial interest in emblems: as Bath points out, two of his other 1630s works contain a large quantity of emblematic material (Speaking Pictures, p. 25).


201 ‘Rubens’s Arch of the Mint’, p. 196. Ravelhofer argues, in relation to a late court masque, Salmacida Spolia, that ‘spectators needed eagle eyes and advanced emblem reading skills to identify the small grasshopper squatting on the proscenium arch as “Affection to the Country”’ (The Early Stuart Masque, p. 264).

202 Watt, Cheap Print, p. 138.

203 ‘Costuming the Shakespearean Stage’, p. 157.


205 ‘Costuming the Shakespearean Stage’, p. 156.

206 See Bergeron, Practicing Renaissance Scholarship, p. 156. Smuts comments that ‘it is easy to understand how a Genius with loose hair and a long robe might have been mistaken for a hermit, especially when seen from a distance’ (‘Occasional events’, p. 197).

207 The time triumphant, sig. B3r–v. Christine Stevenson comments on Dugdale’s ‘authentic spectatorship’ (‘Occasional architecture’, p. 41).

208 See Werner, ‘A German eye-witness’, p. 252.


210 The Figure of the Crowd, p. 72.

211 Burden, “‘For the lustre of the subject’”, p. 586.

212 Court of Aldermen Repertories, vol. 44, fol. 2r.


215 ‘Thomas Middleton’s The Triumphs of Truth’, p. 17.

Smuts, ‘Public ceremony’, p. 67. I will return to this issue at greater length in the next chapter.


Watt, Cheap Print, p. 330. As an illustration of her point, Munday’s medieval-style ‘romances’, some of which were first published in the 1580s, were still being reprinted well into the 1660s.

In 1604, the Haberdashers record a payment of £5 to those who ‘served as greenemen with fireworks’ (GH MS 15,869, fol. 8r). The terms ‘woodsmen’, ‘greenmen’ and ‘wildmen’ can be treated as synonyms in this context. These characters persisted into the later seventeenth century: greenmen were still used to clear the route in 1686 (see Murdoch, ‘The Lord Mayor’s procession of 1686’, p. 210). I have seen no reference in the context of mayoral Shows to the ‘morris dancers’ who Munro claimed performed on the day, although they were definitely employed for the Midsummer Watch (The Figure of the Crowd, p. 52; see also Robertson and Gordon, Collections III, p. 17).


Dekker is particularly likely to refer to aspects of the Shows in his other works: for instance, the galley foist features in Westward Hoe, The Honest Whore II and Match mee in London.

Rick Bowers notes that Dick Whittington (and his cat) feature for the first time with the full famous and apocryphal story in two 1605 plays, one of which is Eastward Hoe (‘Dick Whittington’, p. 34); Whittington was also the subject of a ballad produced in the same year.

In Britannia’s honor Dekker praises ‘the workes, that for many yeares, none haue been able to Match them for curiosity’; they are, however, ‘not Vast, but Neate, and Comprehend as much Arte for Architecture, as can be bestowed vpon such little Bodies’, and on that basis he commends Garret and John Christmas (sig. C2v).

Perhaps he was aware of the deficiencies of this work, which is comprised in the main of unrelated and often rather banal emblems. For instance, it’s not clear why he introduced the figure of the British Bard, and the Show as a whole does have a rather tired feel to it compared to some of his others. Given its date, it is possible that his edition of Stow’s Surnay had taken up most of his time and energies.

The Ironmongers’ minutes say of this third pageant that it is ‘an Antique pageant for pleasure’ (Robertson and Gordon, Collections III, p. 123).

Heywood’s Theatre, pp. 262–3.

Shirley himself was to collaborate only the following year over the production of a masque with Rowland Bucket, a painter-stainer who
worked on a number of the Shows (Middleton: The Collected Works, p. 1262).

229 GH MS 16,969/2, fols 222r and 243v. The whale ‘vented’ water through ‘squirtes’, according to the Ironmongers’ accounts.

230 It is likely that the Companies already owned some theatrical-style properties dating back to the pre-Lord Mayors’ Shows period of pageantry (see MacIntyre and Epp, “Cloathes worth all the rest”, pp. 279–81).

231 Bergeron, Practicing Renaissance Scholarship, p. 118. The Prince’s drummers and fifers were employed by the Merchant Taylors in 1610 (see GH MS 34,048/10). In 1599 the Clothworkers hired a barge from ‘Mr Dorrett’, the master of the Queen’s barge (Clothworkers’ accounts 1599–1600, fol. 7v).

232 MacIntyre and Epp, “Cloathes worth all the rest”, pp. 277 and 282.

233 In the same vein, as far as Munday is concerned the crowned dolphin in Chrysanaleia ‘can serue indifferently’ for two symbolic purposes (sig. B1v). For the King and Prince Henry’s entertainment at Merchant Taylors’ Hall in 1607 a ship was hung from the roof, bearing three men attired as sailors who sang accompanied by a lute (Nichols, The Progresses, vol. II, pp. 141–2) (I am grateful to Anne Saunders for drawing this to my attention).

234 Munday has Friar Tuck state that with Christmas approaching ‘our seruice may appeare, / Of much more merit then as now’, suggesting that they may be presented before the Lord Mayor at greater length. Perhaps, in the course of a fictional appeal for festive patronage Munday is covertly requesting that his own be considered ‘when any occasion shall require’ (sig. C2r–v).


236 See GH MS 34,048/10 and GH MS 34,048/13, where the Merchant Taylors’ Company states that this (surely rather dangerous) practice had been allowed ‘in former yeares’.


238 ‘Surden’, probably a variant of ‘sordine’ or muffled, appears to be a neologism.

239 CSP Venetian, vol. XV, p. 60. Somewhat hyperbolically, Munro concludes from Busino’s account that this Show was more like a ‘near-riot’ than a ‘dignifi ed marriage of mayor and city’ (The Figure of the Crowd, p. 61). Butterworth defi nes a squib as ‘a fi rework that squirmed erratically to produce a fi  zzing shower of sparks that sometimes ended in a small report’ (Theatre of Fire, p. 1).

240 Williams, ‘A Lord Mayor’s show’, p. 515.

241 See GH MS 34,048/8. The Goldsmiths employed fencers in 1611 (see Goldsmiths MSS vol. 14a, fol. 8v) and in 1620 ‘Mr Bradshawe fencer
and his sonnes’ were paid £8 5s ‘for their service with others with two
handed swordes’ (GH MSS 15,869, fol. 16r). As late as 1671, a rope
dancer called Jacob Hall (whose fame is testified to in a poem about
Bow church) performed at the Lord Mayor’s Show (see Oxford DNB,

242 See Butterworth, Theatre of Fire, pp. 15 and 81. In this same Show St
George is accompanied by ‘his conquered Dragon’, but Munday does
not say if the dragon issued fire (Campbell, sig. B2v).


244 The Russian ambassador Zuizin does not mention this undoubtedly
impressive incident: perhaps his party had departed the City by then.
As we have seen in Chapter 2, Middleton praises Humphrey Nichols’s
work in this aspect of the Show. Butterworth has shown that other dra-
matic performances in this period required ‘the ability to target fire in
some sort of controlled way’; he reproduces a sixteenth-century image
of a man spouting fire through a tube (Theatre of Fire, pp. 5 and 40).
Taylor’s 1613 text Heauens blessing, and earths ioy demonstrates the
elaborate effects that seventeenth-century pyrotechnics could aspire to.

245 CSP Venetian, vol. XV, p. 61. Scherb dates the use of giants in civic pageantry back to at least 1415 (‘Assimilating giants’, p. 71). They
persisted despite a decline in ‘belief in the existence of real, histori-
cal giants’ ‘among the educated classes’ in the late sixteenth century
(Woolf, The Social Construction of the Past, p. 326). Woolf com-
ments that giants ‘frequently featured in processions, entries, and
certain other sorts of local ritual, as ludic figures of aberrant nature,
as symbols of misrule, and, sometimes, as examples of men of humble
origin achieving fame and prosperity’ (p. 327).


247 Theatre of Fire, p. 2. They appear to have been made with cane
baskets or pasteboard and canvas clubs attached to a long pole (see
ibid., pp. 22–3): John Babington’s Pyrotechnia gives instructions on
how the effect could be attained (sigs D3v–D4v) (I am grateful to
Elaine Tierney for this reference).

248 Bergeron notes ‘the concern for costume’ in Elizabeth’s 1559 royal
entry (Practicing Renaissance Scholarship, p. 39). Costumes and
fabrics for the latter event were loaned to the City by the Revels Office,
as they had been for previous royal entries (see Streitberger, Court
Revels, pp. 220, 285 and 298). Again, costumes were a major aspect of
the 1988 re-enactment, where ‘metres of bright coloured silk and poly-
ester chiffon’ were used to create some seventy-eight individual cos-
tumes (see The Lord Mayor of London’s Jacobean Thames Pageant,
p. 9). For royal funerals and coronations even greater outlay on cloth
took place (see Loach, ‘The function of ceremonial’, pp. 67–8).


250 See GH MS 34,048/8. By way of context, this is some £50 more than
a relatively expensive masquing suit provided for the King in 1634 (see Ravelhofer, The Early Stuart Masque, p. 150). As one might expect, given the nature of their trade, the Merchant Taylors’ accounts provide more detail than is usually the case about how the coats and gowns were actually manufactured. Taffeta sarsnett (‘a very fine and soft silk material made both plain and twilled, in various colours (OED)’) is one of the fabrics most commonly used. In 1610 and 1612 the cost of the ‘azure’ fabric for ‘poore mens gownes and Coats’ came first in the list of the Merchant Taylors’ expenditure (GH MS 34,048/10).

251 GH MS 15,869, fol. 26r.
252 GH MS 34,048/10. The Goldsmiths made similar arrangements for the watermen (see Goldsmiths MSS vol. 14a, fol. 19r).
253 GH MS 30,708/6, fol. 361.
254 GH MS 16,967/4.
256 See Glover, A History of the Ironmongers’ Company, p. 63. Tittler comments that ‘observations of proper dress . . . seems [sic] to have been expected of officials in the guildhall at all times, and, indeed, often in the streets on daily business’ (Architecture and Power, p. 107). Liveried Company members often attended funerals too; indeed, with Company arms being displayed in the procession, ‘poor men’ in attendance and dinners being held at Company halls after the events (as well as the short timescale for organisation), funerals bore many resemblances to civic pageantry (see Harding, The Dead and the Living, pp. 241–4 and 248, and for John Leman’s funeral in 1632, pp. 251–2). Michael Neill writes that ‘funeral “shewes” belonged to precisely the same order of pageantry as coronations, royal weddings, entries, and progresses – all were forms of “Triumph”’ (‘Exeunt with a dead march’, p. 154).
257 CSP Venetian, vol. XV, p. 61. One of the texts produced to mark Christian IV’s visit to London in 1606 devotes almost two pages to detailing the garments worn by both the performers and the procession of dignitaries (The king of Denmarkes welcome, pp. 4–5).
259 Hic mulier, sig. C1r. Similarly, Prynne’s Histrio-mastix mentions ‘pageants’ as one of many ‘reliques of Paganisme’ to be avoided by Christians (sig. D3r), and he repeatedly cites pageants alongside stage-plays, ‘enterludes’ and similar abominations: ‘how many men are vainely occupied for sundry dayes (yea sometimes yeeres) together’, he asks, ‘in making theatricall Pageants, Apparitions, Attires, Visars, Garments, with such-like Stage-appurtenances, for the more commodious pompous acting and adorning of these vaine-glorious Enterludes?’ (sig. Rr1r–v).
260 Sutton, ‘Civic livery’, p. 21. She focuses on the role of the Lord Mayor’s sword-bearer, who marched at the front of the procession to
emphasise the power and authority of the City’s leader. Her discussion of a mayoral inauguration in 1419, with its emphasis on ‘the suits of [the participants’] respective mysteries’, shows that this dimension of the Lord Mayor’s inauguration was a long-standing tradition (p. 22).


263 Ravelhofer notes that ‘the early Stuart court . . . was obsessed with colour symbolism’, and, as we see here, that ‘colour determined a social dress code’ (The Early Stuart Masque, p. 159). Lublin writes that, as red was ‘the color of the court’, the donning of red attire ‘serves to identify [the city oligarchy] as servants of the monarch’; the act of swearing allegiance to the Crown at Westminster underscored the same function of the day (‘Costuming the Shakespearean stage’, p. 163).


265 Astington likens these pages to ‘tiny maids of honor accompanying modern brides’, and he notes that those selected to perform this role were probably the ‘younger sons of prominent members of the company from which the Mayor had been chosen’ (‘The ages of man’, pp. 80–1). The ‘serjeants’ also played a part in the procession: Sutton writes that ‘they accompanied the leading civic officials about their business as required and particularly on ceremonial occasions, clearing the way for processions’ (‘Civic livery’, p. 12).

266 The livery companies regularly provided poor men with clothing, not just on Lord Mayor’s Day. Sheila Sweetinburgh has commented that ‘the giving of clothing . . . offered donors the opportunity to act charitably towards their social inferiors, using the form of the gift to reflect the relative status of the benefactor and beneficiary’. She usefully refers to this exchange as a kind of ‘symbolic capital’ (‘Clothing the naked’, pp. 112–13). Harding writes that ‘a hundred poor men attended the funeral of Sir Cuthbert Buckle in 1594 . . . [and] seventy-two were at Sir William Webbe’s funeral in 1599’ (The Dead and the Living, p. 243). Hardin, somewhat implausibly, likens the poor men on such occasions to ‘captured slaves’ (Spectacular Constructions, p. 154).


268 Barron discusses the use of heraldry in mayoral processions from the sixteenth century onwards (‘Chivalry, pageantry and merchant culture’, pp. 231–2).

269 The Merchant Taylors stipulated that the Lord Mayor’s banner should be made from ‘rich’ silk (GH MS 34,048/10). Imported silk was extremely expensive.

270 GH MS 34,048/10. Woolf notes that ‘in the course of the sixteenth century, arms increasingly figured as domestic, ecclesiastical, and civic decorations’ (The Social Construction of the Past, p. 102).

271 Jansson and Rogozhin, England and the North, p. 163.

272 GH MS 34,048/8.
As was customary, the Grocers appointed twelve members of the
Company ‘to welcome the Guests’ at the feast (GH MS 11,588/2, fol.
784). In 1617, the new Lord Mayor’s butler, Francis Downes, was sent
to the Company court to request the loan of plate and linen for the
feast (see GH MS 11,588/3, fol. 57).

GH MS 34,048/8. It’s no wonder that the Company also needed to
purchase ‘a paper booke to wryte the chardges of the busines in’.