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‘A briefe narration of each seuerall shew’: the Show from street to print

From 1585 onwards the Lord Mayor’s Show was with increasing frequency transmitted from event to text in the form of short pamphlets produced in print runs ranging from 200 to 800 copies. It is perhaps ironic that such ephemeral publications, relating to a fleeting day’s celebrations, have gone on to have a life beyond their immediate context. Indeed, they have almost invariably been studied as literary ‘works’ quite separate from the event upon which they are based. As a consequence, most of the commentary on these texts is predicated on the assumption that the printed text mirrors the Show unproblematically – if indeed this question is raised at all.¹ The books of the Lord Mayors’ Shows were, however, rarely, if ever, straightforward records of what took place on that day in late October. Smuts has commented that ‘printed accounts of . . . London pageants . . . appear to be full accounts of historical occasions’. However, he continues, ‘whenever we can check these narratives against other sources, we generally discover significant omissions and biases’.² Bergeron’s assertion that ‘the printed word . . . offers a kind of stability to the spoken word’, and Taylor’s similar observation that printed works ‘memorialise the momentary’ should therefore be tempered by an awareness that the printed word is not always identical to the spoken.³ As we saw in the previous chapter, there will always be elements of the festivities that print cannot capture. My intention is to bring the printed narratives alongside their sources, not in order to prioritise one over the other but rather to combine these divergent but equally important aspects of the Shows. The fundamental question to be considered is, when we talk of the Lord Mayor’s Show, what entity do we actually mean? The performance, the printed text or some ambiguous combination of the two?

Building on the large and growing body of knowledge about the London book trade, this chapter will explore who the printers and
publishers of the texts were and what connections they may have had with the writers, artificers and/or the livery companies.\(^4\) I will also address the questions of where and by whom the texts were distributed, and who owned and/or bought such books. Any proprietary authorising issues in relation to the Stationers’ Company and other bodies are also discussed here. In addition, some of the printed texts had dedications and other prefatory material: this chapter will look into the significance of such paratexts. Other questions about the printed Shows will be addressed, such as whether the texts were programmes, souvenirs or prospectuses, or a combination of all three, whether they were printed before or after the Show and, as far as it is possible to ascertain, what the relationship of the printed text to the actual event tended to be.\(^5\) These mostly unanswered – even largely unasked – questions reflect another important aspect of the Shows where scholarship has let us down. Even Peter Blayney excludes ‘all masques, pageants and entertainments’ from his account of printed playbooks, on the basis that the former were not really plays.\(^6\) Blayney’s view, which is not atypical, is part of the problem, for as hybrid cultural productions the Shows do not fit neatly into any of the categories habitually used within literary scholarship. As a consequence, no one has yet studied the full range of these texts, as a genre, in bibliographical terms.\(^7\) Indeed, the question of genre remains vexed because the Shows straddle more than one of them – or perhaps should have a new one invented for them. As an instance, the copy of *Porta pietatis* held in the National Library of Scotland has been categorised both as a ‘coronation’ and as an ‘English play’, when it is in fact neither.

In some ways, of course, treating the printed Shows as straightforward literary texts is understandable. They were, after all, largely written by professional writers and they contain what can broadly be regarded as ‘literary’ content. Indeed, it is possible to argue that, with the presence of dramatists and the like from Peele’s time onwards, there was a literary imperative for a title for these printed works, as with other ‘authored’ works such as plays.\(^8\) At times, the desire to have an impressive, classical-style title could result in authorial error. Greg notes that Munday’s secondary title for *Himatia-Poleos*, ‘The Triumphs of Old Drapery’, ‘suggests that the words “Himatia Poleos” are intended to represent . . . a possible Greek equivalent of “old drapery”, but the form “Poleos” points to confusion with . . . “of the city”’.\(^9\) Nevertheless, in the printed text the writer perforce becomes dominant, despite the conventional acknowledgements of the crucial input of the artificer (of whom
more elsewhere). Most of the title pages thus refer to the text as having been ‘invented’ or ‘devised’ by the poet. Indeed, an often overlooked and perhaps unexpected difference between the printed Shows and the equivalent accounts of monarchical or aristocratic ceremonial events is the way in which the author is foregrounded in the Shows but often uncertain in the latter type of text, in much the same way as authorship is similarly uncertain in a large number of play-texts. Conversely, for the period in question none of the printed Lord Mayors’ Shows is anonymous. Regardless of the claims of title pages, however, the collaborative reality that lies behind these texts illustrates Susan Anderson’s argument that in ephemeral texts ‘authorship must be seen as part of a set of conditions that shape the production of an occasional entertainment and its textual traces, despite the claims to authority that individual authors may make’.11

There are significant issues that pertain exclusively to the printed work rather than the Show on the streets. Even the titles of the printed texts – Middleton’s *The triumphs of truth*, for instance – do not necessarily relate in a straightforward fashion to the day’s entertainment.12 Nowhere in the livery companies’ records detailing the commissioning of and expenditure on the Shows (even where the Company in question deals explicitly with the nature of the ‘devices’, which is infrequently) have I found the titles of the books cited, as they appeared in print. This indicates that the titles were invented purely for the instance of the printed work, perhaps at the behest of the writers. It is certainly the case that from the relative obscurity of some early writers the role of ‘the poet’ had moved more to the centre-stage by the end of our period, at least as far as the printed works are concerned. Heywood’s late 1630s Shows, *Porta pietatis* and *Londini status pacatus*, both declare on their title pages that the texts were ‘Written by Thomas Heywood’, the author’s name being separated out by two rules to emphasise it.

The titles of these works tend to allude either to the central thematic concerns of the Show, such as ‘honour and industry’, or to the name of the Lord Mayor (*Camp-bell*, for instance), or to the name or trade of his livery company, as in *Chruso-thriambos. The triumphes of golde*. The livery company records, in contrast, almost always only refer to ‘the book’, or ‘the book of the speeches’, which may indicate that the Companies usually had only limited interest in, or perhaps only limited sway over, this aspect of the Shows. The latter term is used by the Merchant Taylors to refer to Dekker and Heminges’s 1612 Show, for instance, the printed text of which
was considerably more complex than the phrase ‘the booke of the speeches’ suggests. What is noticeable is that, where the printed text (assuming there was one) has not survived, neither has any definitive title for that year’s Show. Indeed, a couple of the very earliest texts have no ‘literary’ titles, as such, but are simply called, descriptively, The device of the pageant or similar. Peele’s 1591 production, printed with the title Descensus astraeae, is the first surviving printed work with a specific name of the kind that soon became ubiquitous. The titles thereafter became increasingly formulaic: a large number of the post-1655 printed Shows were simply called London’s Triumph, or approximations thereof.

Even the names of the individual pageants and devices within a particular Show are not always the same across the texts and the livery company records. For example, the Grocers’ accounts call one of Middleton and Christmas’s 1622 pageants ‘the East Indian Paradise’ whereas the text twice explicitly states that this pageant bears ‘the title of the Continent of India’. One cannot tell if the discrepancy reflects a change in the title from project to printed text (where perhaps the Company were unaware of any changes), or whether the former name is simply the one the Company preferred. Equally, the Grocers mention ‘the Iland’ in their accounts for 1617 but no device of that name appears in Middleton’s text. Unusually, the Drapers’ accounts for both 1638 and 1639 state explicitly that the ‘Pageants or showes’ are ‘particularly described’ by ‘the printed booke’. It is rare indeed for Company records to comment on the relationship between the pageantry and the associated text, let alone to emphasise the authenticity of the latter in this fashion. Perhaps this instance indicates, as we will see further below, that in some cases the printed work was based closely on the ‘plot’ which the Company had commissioned; in both years a close correlation between the work of the artificers, the Christmas brothers, and Heywood is implied. At any rate, it certainly appears that the Drapers were especially pleased with the texts, as they ordered additional copies on both occasions, and in 1638 gave the poet £10 as a result ‘of the Companies well liking it’.

But there is still a question as to why the Shows were printed and published at all. This ostensibly simple question is another that is rarely posed. Ephemeral texts relating to court entertainments, royal entries, tournaments and so on had been printed for some time before the practice extended to the mayoral Shows. For instance, in Munday’s 1580 work Zelauto the eponymous hero reads from a ‘Book’ of ‘a gallant deuice presented in a Tournament’ (sig. Eiiir).
The kind of immediate political contingencies cited by Smuts as reasons for the appearance in print of the more infrequent monarchical entries, progresses and other entertainments from the 1570s onwards cannot really apply to the Lord Mayor’s Show, so we must seek other explanations as to why Peele’s *Deuice of the pageant* was published in 1585 and why it was succeeded by others. Manley suggests that the recourse to print came on the back of ‘an apparent heightening of tensions between the City and both Crown and Parliament’ in the 1580s, in the face of which it was considered necessary to encapsulate these moments of civic celebration in more permanent form. The ensuing texts can be seen as part of a wider ‘ceremonial consciousness’ and ‘civic assertiveness’, in Manley’s useful phrases, also exemplified by works like the *Apologie of the Cittie of London*, produced the year before Peele’s 1585 text. It is certainly the case that the publication of Peele’s 1585 Show was considered a significant enough moment for the text to be transcribed in its entirety – even down to the slightly amended authorial citation ‘Done by George Peele, M. A. in Oxford’ – in Strype’s 1720 edition of Stow’s *Survey*. In the latter, Peele’s text appears in a list of mayors and sheriffs under Lord Mayor Dixie’s coat of arms; the only overt explanation for its inclusion is the marginal note ‘A Speech at this Ld. Maior’s Show’ underneath Strype’s initials, to show that this was an addition to the preceding editions of this work. Strype’s inclusion of Peele’s text clearly indicated an interest in these works on the former’s part which has received surprisingly little commentary, for the transcription of the 1585 text does not stand alone but is followed by regular, although not comprehensive references to later Shows, beginning at 1611. Strype must have had Munday’s 1611 text to hand – as he must have had Peele’s – for he paraphrases its title page quite closely:


Strype goes on to cite Munday’s *Chrysanaleia* and Heywood’s texts for 1631, 1632 and 1633 in the same manner.

As far as the *purpose* of these works is concerned, unlike with plays and their repeated performances, printed texts of occasional events like a Lord Mayor’s Show had no further practical function once the day was past. Indeed, a large number of the Show texts
bear the date of the entertainment, as if to underscore the point. They were, after all, only ever printed at around the same time as the event. Here they differ from masque texts, which in some cases (Jonson’s masques are of course the most notable of these) were republished, sometimes amended, a while after the performance took place. In this respect the printed texts generated by the mayoral Shows are more reminiscent in content, form and purpose of the works produced to commemorate royal progresses and the like. As with these works, printing the Shows may have been intended as largely a commemorative act. In addition, the level of symbolic and emblematic sophistication on display on these occasions might have made it helpful to have a written description to refer to. Writing of Jonson and Dekker’s accounts of James’s royal entry, Parry observes that the triumphal arches ‘were so dense with meaning [and] . . . their detail so extravagantly superfluous to the occasion . . . that it is not surprising that . . . detailed report[s] . . . [were published] so that they could be studied and deciphered at leisure’. Jonson, for one, however, appears to have taken no prisoners with the navigability of his printed text.

Regardless of any possible difficulties on that score, this kind of retrospective scrutiny by readers may well have been essential, for the printed texts, as well as the Shows on which they were based, certainly became more complex as the seventeenth century progressed. Peele’s early printed Shows were minimalist (the 1585 text contains only the speeches despite also promising ‘the Deuice’), and even in 1605 the Merchant Taylors reimbursed Munday solely ‘for printing the bookes of the speeches in the Pageant and other shewes’. It should be noted, however, that the eventual text for the latter year was rather more extensive than this record implies, as Munday included a substantial historical discussion before the speeches, as was his wont. Bergeron raises the possibility that mayoral Shows began to be printed as a way of ‘expanding and tapping into a larger audience not bound to the occasion’, although such a theory presumes a wider readership for the texts than would be the case if they were simply distributed to members of the Company, who would almost invariably have seen the Show anyway. The relationship between event and text did not always operate in the same way in all occasional works. Lauren Shohet argues that the court masque was initially ‘an elite, private . . . performance form . . . but one that was conveyed regularly into a nascent print public sphere’. For the Shows, the opposite was true: the performances were open to all but the texts were produced in relatively limited numbers and
probably to a more exclusive readership. Indeed, putting print runs and company records side by side, there does seem to be a degree of congruence between the number of copies of Shows printed in this period and the number of livery members of the Companies that commissioned them. It is therefore possible that the bulk of the copies were designed for these recipients.

The Companies certainly had a stake in the books of the Shows. Once the tradition had got fully under way in the early seventeenth century, the habitual publication of at least 200 copies of these works in this period is a phenomenon that tempers somewhat Gadd’s conclusion that the livery companies ‘were generally uninterested in how contemporary printed works were being employed to disseminate those same [corporate] attributes that they valued so highly’. In some ways these works can be seen to aid the dissemination of the livery companies’ public image. The indebtedness of the writers to the generosity of the livery companies is emphasised from the title pages of these texts onwards, and as one might expect, all the writers are at pains to celebrate traditional civic values. Although the printing of the texts was secondary in importance to the enactment and celebration of the mayoral inauguration itself, the companies’ expenditure on the texts, even if as a kind of ‘vanity publishing’, must have been for a reason. On those infrequent occasions when the printed text of a mayoral Show was entered in the Stationers’ Register to demonstrate its ownership and thus the right to publish, there must have been a concern about possible piracy of the text, or perhaps of the publication of a competing account of the Show (unlikely though this may seem).

It is a slightly different case for those ephemeral texts that describe royal events, the publication of which was most likely to have been trading on the celebrity of the protagonists as well as the immediacy of the event(s) and where a wider readership is therefore to be expected. Kipling notes that the political significance of some royal entries in the sixteenth century led to their texts being ‘published in several languages and distributed all over Europe’. This level of interest would no doubt have been the motivation for the dual publication in 1613 in both London and Edinburgh of The Magnificent, Princely, and most Royall Entertainments giuen to the High and Mightie Prince, and Princesse, an account of the entertainments held in Heidelberg to welcome the Elector Palatine and his new English spouse, Princess Elizabeth. In addition, as with other works of this kind, there would have been a ‘reportage’ aspect, where the readership might have expected to learn more
about the activities of the great and the good. These texts would have acted more as a kind of news pamphlet rather than a souvenir or programme.\textsuperscript{35} Such a work would most likely have been printed and offered for sale in the usual fashion, which is not often, if at all, the case for the mayoral Shows. This 1613 text itself (which is anonymous – another difference from the Shows) is silent about the rationale for its publication: perhaps this would have been too obvious to need comment. John Taylor’s account of the ‘Sea-fights & Fire-workes’ that accompanied these marriage celebrations, fortunately, takes the reverse approach. Indeed, Taylor is extremely candid about the purpose of this text, beginning it with the explanation that

\begin{quote}
I do not write nor publish (this description of fire and water triumphs) to the extent that they should only read the relation that were spectators of them to such (perhaps) it will relish somewhat tedious like a tale that is too often told: but I did write these things, that those who are farremoted, not only in his Maiesties Dominions, but also in foraine territories, may haue an understanding of the glorious pomp. (\textit{Heauens blessing, and earths ioy}, sig. A3r)
\end{quote}

Taylor’s estimation of the likely reach of his readership is perhaps over-ambitious (although the text does seem to have gone to at least two editions) but he does helpfully flag up the ‘reportage’ element of such works. Later in the seventeenth century a number of ephemeral works were produced to accompany – or to cash in on – the infamous Pope-burning processions in London in 1679–81, which also had a propagandist function. Again, these works were published anonymously, although, suggestively, it looks as though Elkanah Settle, a writer of mayoral Shows in the 1690s, may have been involved in the Pope-burning processions too. Events of the latter kind and any ensuing texts were, of course, much more a product of topical political contexts than the mayoral Shows – and in the case of the Pope-burning processions they were only temporarily accommodated by the authorities – but all the same they appealed to the same appetite for street pageantry, in the widest sense of the term, as did the Shows.

\textbf{‘A Booke of the Presentatiens’: printing the Shows}

Although they were in some ways anomalous and we should keep these differences in mind, it is at the same time instructive to examine the printed texts of mayoral Shows in the context of the
usual printing and publishing practices of the period. They were, after all, printed in the same shops by the same printers as numerous other works. However, as we have seen with so many aspects of the Shows, the history of their appearance in print is not clear-cut. The earliest instance where at least part of a Show seems to have made it into print is 1566, when 5s was paid by the Ironmongers for printing the ‘poses speches and songs, that were spoken and songe by the children in the pagent’ (the resulting text has not survived).\(^{36}\) Robertson and Gordon speculate that this early printed text ‘may have been for use by the performers rather than for the convenience of the spectators’.\(^{37}\) They do not cite any evidence to support this claim, though, nor is there any indication in the Ironmongers’ records of how many copies were printed, nor by whom. Peele’s 1585 *Devise of the pageant* thus appears to have been the first printed for wider circulation in a relatively straightforward fashion.

The identity of the printer is one of the few aspects of the printed Shows that we can almost always be sure about.\(^{38}\) The printers used for the Shows often had extant connections with the writers. This is the case for Robert Raworth and Heywood in the 1630s, a time when Raworth was simultaneously printing some of Heywood’s plays.\(^{39}\) Indeed, from the evidence of the company accounts, where the name of the printer is often left blank, the Companies do not appear to have expressed any especial interest in who printed these works, which suggests that they were content to leave these arrangements to the writers and artificers. Professional writers were, after all, often well placed to liaise with printers. Munday, for instance, had a long-standing connection with Edward Allde, having been apprenticed to his father, John, at the same time as Edward in the late 1570s.\(^{40}\) Allde junior printed *Himatia-Poleos* (and, it seems, *Camp-bell*, another Munday work, too, for which the imprint is lost) as well as *Londons loue* and other works of this type such as the second edition of Dekker’s *Magnificent entertainment*.\(^{41}\) William Jaggard printed two of Munday’s extant Shows (1605 and 1611). Jaggard’s connection with Munday may well have derived from the lineage of the former’s print shop in Cripplegate, home consecutively to Charlewood, Roberts and then Jaggard, all of whom printed Munday’s works.\(^{42}\) The Stationer Henry Gosson, one of the few *publishers* involved with printed mayoral Shows, had a close relationship with John Taylor over some twenty years and probably published his Show in 1634.\(^{43}\) Similarly, Nicholas Okes, who printed *Troia-Noua triumphans* in 1612, also printed *The famous history of Sir Thomas Wyatt* (a Dekker and Webster
collaboration) in the same year and Dekker’s *Guls horne-book* in 1609. Okes had been printing Heywood’s works since at least *An apology for actors* in 1612 and their relationship was to persist until Okes’s death. In his *Apology* Heywood testified to Okes’s care and industriousness as a printer, even if he did so in passing in the course of a savage attack on the ‘negligence’ of the printer of a previous work. Interestingly, in 1623, when Middleton and Munday were wholly responsible for separate sections of the Show (the water show and the land show), the resulting two texts were produced by different printers: Nicholas Okes printed Middleton’s share and Thomas Snodham, Munday’s. Munday, in fact, is the least likely of these writers to have developed a consistent relationship with one particular printing house. Of the nine mayoral works by Munday printed between 1605 and 1623, five different printers were involved, including Okes, Purslowe and Allde.

Nicholas Okes was also the printer of some of Webster’s plays and his solitary mayoral Show. Indeed, John and Nicholas Okes were by some measure the most commonly used printers for the Shows, being responsible for seventeen of the thirty-one extant works from this period. Okes senior dominated the printing of mayoral Shows from 1612 until 1633; only a handful were produced by other printers in that period. There was a break in the Okes family’s hegemony in 1634, when John Taylor wrote the Show text and probably brought his own publishing and printing team along with him. Taylor’s Show does not cite a printer, but he was likely to have been Augustine Mathewes, who printed all Taylor’s books published by Gosson in 1634–35 (the text is neatly but very sparingly printed, with the use of only rather primitive devices). The standings of the printers varied. The majority, like Raworth and Okes senior and junior, were associated with what Watt calls ‘cheap print’ – pamphlets, play quartos, popular histories, and so on – whereas others, like the Printer to the City, William Jaggard, had more stature in civic circles. Nicholas Okes was primarily a printer and typesetter of drama and as such would have had the right kind of experience to print mayoral pageants, for, as well as being set out in similar ways to play-texts as far as the verse elements were concerned, the printed Shows were almost all quartos, the form many plays first appeared in (*Londini sinus salutis* and *The triumphs of fame and honour* are, unlike most, in octavo format). Since the texts were published unbound and in quarto or octavo form, their tendency to survive in only very small quantities (if at all) is perhaps only to
be expected. Given the extent of Okes’s experience by the time he was involved in printing mayoral Shows, one can only assume that the poor quality of the print job evident in some texts was as much the result of a lack of time as of a lack of expertise, and possibly that by the mid-1630s John Okes – who obviously had less experience than his father – may have increasingly been taking over the business. That said, Blayney argues that ‘less reputable establishments’ ‘would have offered the publishers low rates and speedy delivery’, both of which would have been relevant factors for the printing of mayoral Shows. Of Nicholas Okes in particular he concludes that ‘it is unlikely that workmanship was as high on [his] list of priorities as was profit’, and he characterises Okes’s output as ‘small and cheap’.

In at least two cases – Chruso-thriambos (1611) and The triumphs of truth (1613) – two substantially different editions of the work were printed, which does show that it was thought worthwhile to issue a revised edition, as a printer or publisher’s decision to reprint would indicate that further demand for the work was expected. In the case of Middleton’s text, the most egregious mistakes were corrected for the second edition, when, Greg argues, the work was ‘completely reset’. The opportunity was then taken to combine with The triumphs of truth another Middleton text, The manner of his Lordships entertainment on Michaelmas day last. This is an account of the entertainment held when Sir Thomas Middleton was elected to office in September at ‘that most Famous and Admired Worke of the Running Streame’, the Lord Mayor elect’s brother, Hugh Middleton’s ‘New River’. Greg comments of the latter, combined text that

this publication is unusual. It is possible that the printer intended two simultaneous issues, one containing the oath-day entertainment only, the other the election entertainment as well. It seems more likely, however, that when the copy for the latter was received the type of the four sheets of the earlier [mayoral Show only] issue was still standing, and that advantage was taken of the fact to print a further impression (with . . . alterations) and append new matter to it.

Unfortunately Greg does not address the question of why a second edition of Middleton’s text was printed. What motivation could there have been to reissue a work that was printed for a particular occasion in limited numbers and not offered for general sale? Perhaps, contrary to the usual assumptions, the second edition, with its additional text, was to be sold commercially. Indeed, this
yoking together of two or more distinct works is much more commonly seen in relation to royal entertainments, masques and the like than with mayoral Shows. If, as speculated below, Shows were sometimes sold in the conventional way, then this might increase the likelihood that this was the fate of the second edition of Middleton’s 1613 Show.

In fact, Middleton’s text has a more complex bibliographical history still: it is not simply a matter of the second edition being produced to make corrections to the first. There are a large number of corrections to various copies of Middleton’s 1613 text, the extent of which suggests to me that there may, in fact, have been (at least) three discrete issues, not two. Three copies of the ‘first edition’ (STC 17903) survive. The two copies held at the Guildhall Library and Longleat differ from the British Library copy in quite a few respects. Although all three have been categorised as the first edition, each varies from the others, sometimes including corrections that otherwise appear only in the second edition. Conversely, the Bodleian copy of this second edition (STC 17904) bears a different set of corrections to the first edition from the British Library copy of the ‘same’ edition, resulting in another mixture. All in all, in October 1613 Okes’s workshop seems to have been busy making press corrections and other amendments in a seemingly arbitrary way, resulting in a confusingly large number of variant states of Middleton’s text.

As far as Chruso-thriambos is concerned, Pafford, its editor, has stated that the two editions of Munday’s Show ‘were not of the same impression’ (although he believes that both versions of this work were included in the total of 500 copies which were ordered), and he concurs with Greg that STC 18267.5 ‘was probably in part a corrected reprint’ of STC 18267. Although the final pages appear to be unaltered, there are numerous small differences between the two editions of this work, especially on sheets A–B, which appear to have been completely reset. In the process, a couple of unequivocal errors have been amended, but STC 18267.5’s ‘corrections’ are sometimes less accurate than its probable predecessor, and quite a few seem solely to be what Greg calls ‘indifferent variants’ which may reflect either the compositor’s preferred spelling or that of the author, if the printer was working from an authorial manuscript. It is possible that special care may have been taken over the second attempt at this text because the Goldsmiths were expecting members of the royal family to be present at the Show. In addition, on those regular occasions where the authors were responsible for
co-organising the printing of the Shows, then it would have been more likely that they would have had a role in correcting proofs. Indeed, Munday’s characteristic preference for double vowels has persisted in many of his printed Shows, which, taken with his background as a printer as well as his extensive experience as a jobbing writer by this date, perhaps indicates a close relationship with the printing process.\(^{54}\)

As well as the two works already discussed, some copies of other mayoral Shows also contain considerable differences from each other. A key example is Middleton’s 1622 *Triumphs of honor and vertue*. The corrections to the copy of this work held in the Folger constitute a case that this work exists in variant states, with the BL copy perhaps reflecting an earlier state.\(^{55}\) Although Greg notes only one variant (on the title page) the Folger copy actually shows numerous minor and not so minor press corrections to typographical errors present in the BL copy, as well as other changes in the second half of the work. Amongst other things, the later compositor – or perhaps Middleton himself – seems to have preferred to use capital letters for nouns and adjectives.\(^{56}\) The most significant difference is the insertion of two lines of verse on sig. B3v missing in the BL copy. Heywood’s *Londini artium* is another text where individual copies bear both minor and more substantial corrections. As well as showing quite a few press corrections to typographical errors, one of the two surviving copies has a passage missing from the second dedication (to the Sheriffs) that does appear in the other copy. Part of this passage, it seems, was originally erroneously placed in the first dedication to the Lord Mayor, and, when the mistake was realised, moved to its correct location in the text and printed with amendments. As with other Okes print jobs, however, the (possibly) earlier imprint has fewer typographical errors than the (later?) one with the dedications accurately printed. Perhaps, again, what we have here is two editions of the same work.

There is an important distinction to be drawn between those fairly numerous opportunistic texts produced to cash in on an event of national significance – such as the marriage of the Count Palatine and Princess Elizabeth – and the commissioned Lord Mayors’ Shows texts. For one thing, some of the former texts were printed with noticeably more care and expense than the majority of the Shows, perhaps in the anticipation of financial recompense. Munday’s *Londons loue*, for example, which was printed by Allde, features a great deal of (expensive) white space, devices and a large woodcut
of a ship as a frontispiece. As the cases discussed above indicate, the Shows were often hastily and clumsily printed, although it is, of course, possible that some of the errors may have originated from the manuscript from which the compositors were working. Nicholas Okes appended an address to the reader in Book Four of Munday’s *Amadis de Gaule* (1618), where he (Okes) apologises for ‘such slips and errors’ he had missed in the printing (sig. A2v). This is the same year as Munday’s *Sidero-Thriambos*, also printed by Okes, so it is therefore likely, at that juncture at least, that Okes did not have a dedicated person in place to correct proofs. One can also suppose that a text like a mayoral Show, printed in a short timescale and not, it seems, in any way treated like an elite publication, would have been given only a cursory check-over. Although press corrections were clearly made to mayoral Shows, mistakes did slip through the net. It is certainly the case that some copies of both Nicholas and John Okes’s Shows have numerous uncorrected errors, some quite substantial. At the same time, one has only to compare *The triumphs of truth* and all its variants with, say, those works printed by Purslowe, *Metropolis coronata* and *Chrysanaleia*, to see how well mayoral Shows could be printed. Indeed, some Shows made greater demands on the printers by including musical notation and foreign languages. Heywood makes repeated recourse to Greek and Latin, for instance, in his Shows, and there are speeches in French and Spanish in *The triumphs of honor and industry* and in French in *Britannia’s honor*. Musical notation was printed in two Shows, *The triumphs of truth* and *Tes Irenes Trophaea*.

Although they raise many vexing questions, thanks to the diligent bureaucracy of the livery companies the printed texts of the Lord Mayors’ Shows can be used to throw light in aspects of printing in this period that cannot readily be gleaned in other contexts. As with the commissioning of the Shows, the Companies’ accounts offer information about the cost and size of the print runs. The usual print run appears to be 500 copies (although it was sometimes as few as 200 or 300) and the cost to the Company was between £2 and £4. Owing to some unspecified demand, the Drapers’ records for 1638 indicate an additional print run and subsequent cost; in this instance it appears that the (unnamed) printer, John Okes, was paid direct by the Company, rather than via Heywood or the Christmas brothers as intermediaries as was the usual practice. In the following year, Okes – this time named in the Company records – was again paid a further sum for printing ‘three hundred bookes for the Companie over and above the number they were to have, by
agreement of Mr Christmas’. A total print run of 800 copies, as on this occasion, is large for a mayoral Show, but not an unusual quantity in the general context of early modern printing practices (Blayney cites 800 as the normal print run for a play-text). Taken together with the unusual degree of interest in the printed text evidenced by the Drapers’ accounts (as discussed above), perhaps the Companies were belatedly taking the publication of these works more seriously as the 1630s – and the heyday of the Shows themselves – drew to a close.

The cost of printing was generally paid to the writer and/or the artificer, who would have liaised with the printer, although in some cases (such as 1613 and 1617), there was no such intermediary. Munday was paid an unusually generous £6 by the Merchant Taylors in 1605 for the cost of printing the books, perhaps because Jaggard was more expensive than the likes of Okes. The Drapers appear to have had established some kind of relationship with John Okes, whose name (as we have already seen) is mentioned specifically in their accounts in 1639; as with his father in 1613, he appears to have been paid personally – albeit with the ‘agreement’ of Christmas – rather than via an intermediary. This, however, is an unusual state of affairs: in the majority of cases, the livery company records do not show the name of the printer (nor, frequently, the number of copies ordered). Mayoral shows do not sit comfortably within the category of ‘commercial’ or ‘speculative’ print, for sure. In the case of the Shows the printers were simply responding to a payment to print on command a specific number of copies rather than making any kind of independent decision about their commercial viability.

Indeed, by taking payment for arranging to have the texts of the Shows printed, as was commonly the case with these works, the writer and artificer team (or the artificer alone, in some cases) were effectively acting as the publisher of the work in question, and may have earned money from commercial sales of the works – assuming this took place – in those cases where they were also responsible for distributing the texts. Bald, Bergeron and Munro all assume that the texts were distributed privately and gratis by the Company, which might be the obvious conclusion to come to were it not for the citation of a publisher in three separate mayoral works. There is a reference in the imprint of *Troia-Noua triumphans* to John Wright, a bookseller who was also a publisher of many best-selling books: ‘Printed by Nicholas Okes, and are to be sold by Iohn Wright dwelling at Christ Church-gate’ (sig. A1r).
1621 work *The sunne in Aries* was printed by Edward Allde for ‘H. G.’ (probably Henry Gosson).\(^{67}\) *Descensus astraeae*, an early Show, also cites a bookseller and publisher, William Wright, on its title page (the actual printer is not known).\(^{68}\) That these three texts refer to booksellers makes it less likely that the printer simply used the wrong imprint on either occasion. Perhaps practice differed: from a payment by the Drapers to ‘Mr Mondayes man for bringing the bookes’ in 1623 it is probable on this occasion that they were delivered to the body which had paid for them, suggesting that the Company distributed them as well.\(^{69}\) The texts printed to celebrate royal entries and other such non-civic entertainments appear more regularly, although not invariably, to have publishers (masques, in particular, almost always have both a printer and a publisher).\(^{70}\)

Only rarely were the printed Shows entered in the Stationers’ Register. Indeed, only six were entered in this period: of the surviving works, these were *The triumphs of truth*, *Troia-Noua triumphphans*, *Chrysanaleia* and *The triumphs of fame and honour*, along with two works which are no longer extant (Peele’s 1588 text and the text for 1604).\(^{71}\) Royal entries and other entertainments, in contrast, such as Elizabeth’s entry into Norwich in 1578 and Christian of Denmark’s London entertainment in 1606, appear to have been entered in the Register more consistently. This indicates that such works were treated as more regular kinds of publication (perhaps with sales to the general public) than mayoral Shows.\(^{72}\) Some Shows, such as Middleton’s *Triumphs of truth*, were not entered until after the Show had taken place, suggesting, as Greg notes, that ‘unless entrance [to the Register] was delayed the print cannot have been ready on the Lord Mayor’s oath-day’.\(^{73}\) Others, however, were entered beforehand. For instance, Peele’s 1588 text was entered in the Stationers’ Register by Richard Jones, the printer, on 28 October, i.e. the day before the Show, and ‘uppon Condicon that it maye be lycensed’, which means it had not yet been authorised for publication.\(^{74}\) The Stationers’ proviso is interesting, for it also indicates that the Company thought it not worth the risk of licensing this text *without* the authority of the censors, as, according to Blayney, they were sometimes prepared to do for texts which were unlikely to offend or which were not considered sufficiently important to need licensing.\(^{75}\) Without an extant text, however, it is impossible to ascertain why such a tentative decision was made. Another Stationers’ Register entry for a lost text relates to 1604 (the year in which Jonson was involved in the mayoral inauguration in some capacity), where the printer Felix Kingston entered ‘a
thing touchinge the pagent’ on 29 October, the day of the Show. The word ‘thing’, as opposed to ‘booke’ as with all other entries in the Register, perhaps indicates a very slight publication, more like a broadsheet than a pamphlet. Two works were entered before or at the same time as the Show: Chrysanaleia on the day of the Show, to Purslowe, its printer, and Taylor’s 1634 text on 14 October to Henry Gosson. Allde may have got into trouble for not entering The sunne in Aries. William Jackson speculates that this title may have been one of the four works which been printed ‘without lycense or entrance’, for which offence Allde was reprimanded by the Stationers in early October 1621. We do know that Troia-Noua triumphans was entered in the Stationers’ Register on 21 October, a week before the Show, when, as before, Nicholas Okes was allowed to print the work ‘When yt is further Authorised’. Werner argues on this basis that a manuscript of the text was submitted to Okes for printing by this date, a week or so before the Show. In contrast, The triumphs of truth was not entered until 3 November and there is no stipulation that this text be authorised in the Stationers’ records. Werner’s supposition about the 1612 Show is made more plausible because, as he points out, the printed work shows no awareness that its intended guest, Henry, Prince of Wales, was not able to attend the Show. ‘It is evident therefore’, he writes, ‘that Dekker did not revise the text after 29 October, that it is not a description of the actual event [in this respect], and that it was either already in print, or in the process of being printed, just before or simultaneously with the pageant’. Conversely, since The triumphs of truth was not entered until a week after the Show, this is likely to indicate that the work had not been printed by 29 October and hence may not have been available for distribution on the day.

This raises two questions: who did the distributing of these hundreds of books, and at what point did this take place? It is rather difficult to tell, for we do not know whether the printed texts of Shows were actually sold or simply given away. Only after the Restoration do the texts have prices or other signs of sale on them. The assumptions underpinning scholarship in this area are ripe for full re-examination. A tantalising reference in a work published in a timely fashion in October 1617 suggests that mayoral Shows were to be found on booksellers’ stalls alongside plays, ballads and the like. Henry Fitzgeffrey’s Satyres: and satyricall epigrams cites ‘Sightes, to be read: of my Lo. Maior’s day’s [sic]’ in its list of the ‘rout / Of carelesse fearlesse Pamphlets’ that populated ‘our
The situation becomes clearer after 1660. Settle’s 1698 Show, *Glory’s Resurrection*, appears to have the word ‘price’ printed on the title page underneath the imprint (the ‘e’ of ‘price’, if ‘price’ it was, has been cut away). One copy of Settle’s *The Triumphs of London* (1695) appears to have a price of 3d written in a contemporary hand on its title page, along with the date of the Show, ‘29 Octob.’. Had the earlier texts been sold, their retail price would probably have been analogous to quarto play-texts, which Blayney has calculated to range from around 4d to 10d per copy, partly depending on the number of pages. The automatic assumption on the evidence available would be that these texts were simply commemorative and distributed to a select readership, at least in the first instance. If this is an accurate view of the mayoral Shows, then they were, naturally, most likely to have been given away gratis, although such liberality must be put alongside the fact that the Company members, who may have been those who received the books, had to pay to be part of the procession anyway. In any case, whether the texts were sold or not, as we have seen, the printers would have been under pressure to finish printing the texts as quickly as possible, while the event still had the maximum currency for any potential reader.

Levin argues that ‘a somewhat specialised audience for [the printed Shows] . . . is implied by their tendency to assume a reader’s familiarity with the overall shape and geography of the shows’. Heywood does refer back to a previous Show in *Londini artium* in such a way as to suggest that he is expecting a degree of continuity in his readership. Since the 1632 Show was presented on behalf of the Haberdashers’ Company for the second year running, Heywood once again brings in St Katherine, the company’s patron saint. In the second text he states that there is no need to rehearse ‘the Etymology of her Name, her Royal Birth, her Breeding, the Life and Death [because] in the last yeeres Discourse I gaue a large Charactar’ (sig. B2v). He also signals an expectation of a fairly erudite readership, refraining from explaining the ‘Hystory’ of Perseus and Andromeda, ‘but rather refer[ing] the Reader to Ouid, who hath most elegantly expressed it’: the side-note ‘Meta-’ is obviously a reference to the relevant Ovid work to which the reader is encouraged to refer (*ibid.*, sig. B3v).

Some clues about how these events were translated into print can be gleaned from another one-off text, printed in 1639, *Mars, his triumph*. This was written by William Barriffe to commemorate military exercises by men of the Artillery Garden at Merchant
Taylors’ Hall in October of the previous year and it bears similarities in terms of its context to mayoral Shows, especially in its address to a metropolitan audience. In the dedication Barriffe explains his recourse to print with helpful candour:

the well contriving and exact performance [of the exercises] . . . induced many of the judicious Spectators to desire copies: which through severall transcriptions became so imperfect, that I was requested by many to bring it to the Presse . . . This I was the more willing to suffer, by reason no more were to pass the print, then barely might serve such Gentlemen who were desirous of them, being members of our own Company. As not being willing that so rough and unpolishd a draught should be exposed to the publick view.  

Although his stance of authorial modesty is a commonplace in this period, Barriffe does reveal aspects of the way in which his work made it into print from its initial manuscript circulation. Clearly, although it bore the name of both a printer (‘I. L’) and publisher (Ralph Mab), this text was expressly not intended for a wide audience. Barriffe’s dedication tells us that it was effectively an ‘on demand’ publication, produced after the event, and intended to supplement successive manuscript transcriptions with their inherent instability. Only ‘Spectators’ of ‘our own Company’ are cited as a potential readership. An account of a Jonsonian masque performed at the house of Lord Haye on 22 February 1617 is claimed by Greg to have been ‘apparently printed for private distribution on the occasion of the performance’, although there is nothing specific in the text itself to give this impression apart from the absence of an imprint; unlike Barriffe’s work, there is no explanatory preamble.

The writers of the Shows, unfortunately, tend not to be so expansive. Those texts that do not scrupulously describe all the pageantry (Heywood’s are a case in point) may have been produced as programmes, issued on the day to onlookers with no particular requirement to be comprehensive. In its initial pages John Squire’s Tes Irenes Trophaea quite clearly positions itself as a programme through its use of the present tense and in the way in which it represents the relationship between the book and the event. In the dedication the author expresses the wish that the text will add to the ‘pleasure’ he hopes the Lord Mayor ‘will conceiue at view of those reall Tryumphs’ (sig. A2r). It is as if Francis Jones had been handed a copy before the day’s festivities began, although the main body of this text, oddly, is written in the past tense. The Ironmongers’
Court minutes certainly imply that this Company was responsible for distributing the printed texts to its members and other worthies, for in 1629 Garret Christmas and Dekker were instructed to ‘give’ the Company 500 copies once they were printed, as were Heywood and the Christmas brothers six years later.\(^90\) As we have seen, the onlookers at large were given souvenirs, of a kind, in the form of various items scattered from the pageant cars and tableaux stations, such as coins, spices and in 1610, ‘Tynn Compters [counters] which were throwen out of the Shipp, into the Streetes amongst the people’.\(^91\)

As the uncertainty about their circulation indicates, the printed texts of Lord Mayors’ Shows did not fit altogether neatly into normal commercial publishing practices. In 1611, the books were given to the Goldsmiths’ Company to disseminate, although Robertson and Gordon claim that ‘there is no evidence that [the books] were ever distributed as programmes’.\(^92\) Their theory is that the books were only commemorative and issued after the event, although if this was the case then the ‘explanations’ of the more arcane symbolism that some of the texts contain would have been of no help to the onlookers if they were not available on the day itself; putative readers would have had to rely on their memory. As we will see below, the commonplace use of the present tense also indicates that the texts could, in principle, have been used as guides to the proceedings.\(^93\) Cressy writes that ‘printed programmes’ were sold to spectators of the Gunpowder Plot firework display held in 1647 ‘which explained . . . each tableau’, so it is at least possible that the same arrangement could have taken place for some of the Shows in the years previously.\(^94\) Although very brief, this latter text, \textit{A Modell of the Fire-works to be presented at Lincolnes-Inne Fields on the 5th of November 1647}, certainly follows the ‘description of tableau followed by explanation of its meaning’ format that had become usual practice with printed mayoral Shows by then. This is certainly the approach Middleton takes in \textit{The triumphs of integrity}. Towards the end of the text he pauses to offer his readership some elucidation: ‘I thought fit in this place to giue this [pageant] it’s [sic] full Illustration’, he writes (sig. B4r). It seems, then, most likely that practice simply varied: in some years the books were distributed on the day and in others not.

Unlike mayoral Shows, continental ‘festival books’ were usually composed of both text and image. As Ravelhofer writes, these ‘aimed at a comprehensive account of a courtly spectacle, which at best included full illustrations of the event’.\(^95\) The printed texts
of London mayoral Shows, however, were themselves exclusively textual. As a result, pictorial images relating to the Shows are even rarer than the printed texts, and raise similar questions about form and function. Who created them? What was their purpose? To whom were they given? Are they accurate representations of the pageants produced on the day? Alongside Booth’s sketches (discussed in Chapter 3), the best known, most extensive and as a result the most reproduced illustrations are those associated with the 1616 Show, the originals of which are still in Fishmongers’ Hall, though in poor condition. These images, known as the Fishmongers’ Pageant Roll, mostly bear handwritten captions, written in the past tense. For instance, the picture of the ‘fishing busse’ is captioned ‘This bursse [sic] served on land and so did all the rest of the shewes following’. The use of the past tense might indicate a commemorative function for these images. More evidence for this supposition can be gleaned by the comment ‘This remaineth for an Ornament in Fishmongers Hall’ written above the picture of the King of the Moors; similar notes are appended to a number of the other devices. The writer helpfully adds that one of the pageants was ‘unfit’ to be kept as an ‘ornament’ owing to the large number of children used to ‘beautify’ it, and recommends for future reference that ‘if the house will have a pageant to beautify their hall they must appoint fewer children therein’. The repeated references to the images being displayed at the Company Hall show that, whatever their original purpose, they ended up being used commemoratively, and the latter quotation implies that this may have not been uncommon practice. It is thus possible that similar illustrations were produced for other Shows as part of a team’s ‘project’ but not kept. The survival of these images to this day shows that, unlike the Show books, they were and remain prized by the Fishmongers’ Company.

However, as with the printed works, one should not assume that the pictures necessarily truthfully represent the pageants displayed on the day. On the King of the Moors image the reader is told to ‘note’ that the other Moors, although there depicted on foot, actually ‘ridd on horsebacke’ (as Munday’s text also states). Such discrepancies may have been inevitable, of course, given the different media concerned. The drawing of Walworth in his bower, for instance, is perforce static, whereas the staging of the pageant has Walworth waking from sleep or death, sitting up and speaking (see Figure 17). Indeed, the caption on this particular image states as much, echoing Munday’s text: ‘this was a tombe or monum[en]t placed in Powles Church Yeard whereon ley Sr Wm Walworth who
17 The pageant of Walworth’s bower/tomb from *Chrysanaleia*
risse from the same & made a speech to the Lord Maior & so ridd on horsebacke for that day’. The ‘conceit’ of this pageant was indeed probably impossible to realise in a drawing, for Walworth is described first as ‘a Marble Statue’ who then rises and takes horse (sig. B3r). Furthermore, a degree of artistic licence is in evidence. The pageant chariot of Richard II in the printed text, for example, is described as having wheels by means of which it was moved around, but in the drawing the pageant in its entirety (including the wheels) is shown fixed to a block, with chains suggesting the edifice was drawn along in some unspecified fashion, making the wheels redundant (see Figure 9). As depicted, it is hard to see how the pageant could have been transported, and the presence of a similar block structure on some of the other images suggests that these were drawn for display rather than practical purposes.

It is equally unclear who produced these images and wrote the notes on them. The captions do not seem to be in Munday’s hand, nor are they in the hand of the Fishmongers’ clerk who wrote the Court minutes for 1616. It is possible that they were drawn by ‘Mr Colle a Carver or graver’, whose name appears (albeit in a different hand) on the Walworth bower image, as it seems logical that the artisan who made the pageants would have been best placed to draw them. If this was the case, they could conceivably have been based on working drawings for the pageants, to accompany the writer’s and artificer’s ‘plot’, perhaps with written annotations added with a view to posterity. This is not conclusive, however, for the images also include members of the procession on horseback dressed in the usual attire and it would seem unnecessary for those bidding for the commission to illustrate an aspect of the event which would have been the same as always. As with the use of the past tense, the whole purpose of the illustrations may have been commemorative and their origin retrospective. Perhaps it is understandable that Nichols does not speculate about the timing and function of the images.

‘Fauourable conceit, must needs supply the defect of impossible performance’: text and event

A fundamental question I will now address is the nature of the relationship between the printed text and the event it sought to represent. Palmer reminds us that such a relationship was not necessarily straightforward: ‘the pageant experience is typically converted into an authorised text that claims to simply report the entertainment. In making such a claim, these texts mystify
their own part in a secondary shaping of everyone and everything included in the original performance’. As he notes, ‘scholarship has yet to recognise these kinds of secondary shapings’. Furthermore, as well as being distinct from the performance, as time progressed the printed texts became much more than simply a reproduction of the speeches given on the day. These texts are therefore in the main a complex hybrid of description and interpretation. They are, Hentschell writes, ‘self-consciously textual’, bearing elements such as dedications, prefatory matter, printer’s details and so on, all of which she usefully describes as ‘extra-theatrical, giving the reader more and new information than would have been allowed the spectator’.  

Middleton’s *Tryumphs of honor and industry* is a case in point: unless the printed text did function as a programme, the translations provided in the printed text of the speeches given on the day in French and Spanish are unlikely to have been available to the audience on the day; hence, perhaps, Middleton’s statement that only ‘a small number’ of those present would have understood them (sig. B2r).

The discrepancies between text and performance were not always as well disguised as one might assume. The authors of a number of the printed Shows are surprisingly frank about the logistical and other problems that may have affected their ability to present the entertainment as it had originally been planned. Bergeron offers a neat conceptualisation of the dialectic between text and event, arguing that

as the book seeks to ‘fix’ the event . . . it apparently liberates the dramatist to create materials not represented in the street entertainment . . . [T]hrough this gap he moves with digressions, descriptions and discourses on sometimes arcane topics. That gap may also consist of ellipses – omitted details of the dramatic event. We therefore come to experience the pageant . . . texts as events themselves, resembling but differing from the show.

Even Stephen Harrison’s printed illustrations of the arches he created for James’s coronation entry, which one might assume would be accurate representations, do not provide identical details to the written descriptions given by Jonson, Dekker and Middleton. Gasper has noted that Dekker, in particular, chooses to record ‘not what the King saw and heard, but what Thomas Dekker thought the King ought to have seen and heard’. These texts had their own agendas, and faithful representation of what happened on the day was not necessarily chief among them. After all, it was not
until the seventeenth century that the printed texts attempted to do more than simply publish the speeches. Watanabe-O’Kelly asserts that ‘the official account [of a festivity] sets down and explicates the political programme of the festival as depicted in the official iconography of that festival’. As a result, we should be cautious about how much we credit their representations, for, as she states, such texts tend to ‘narrate what the organisers hoped would happen rather than what did happen’. These texts are, crucially, fashioned and authored, and some, as we will see, are noticeably self-conscious about their literariness: as Bergeron has argued, ‘textual performance here fantasises theatrical performance’. Johnson has pointed out that the texts sometimes ‘read much more like the script of a contemporary play than the account of public experience’. The regular commissioning of playwrights to produce these texts was only ever going to enhance this aspect of them.

Probably the most extreme example of a disparity between the printed text and Show itself occurred in 1605, where the Show was brought to an untimely end by very inclement weather and then repeated a few days later on All Saints’ Day. Indeed, given the timing of the Shows in late October it is quite remarkable that this seems to be the only year when the weather was so bad that the event had to be completely called off, although there are other occasions – 1612, for example, where high winds nearly ruined the water show – when the festivities were to some extent curtailed. The expense and, of course, the underlying importance of the event was such that in most cases those concerned tried to soldier on. The 1605 Show, however, was restaged in its entirety: even the sword-players were re-employed. Munday’s text, however, gives no sign of this eventuality (perhaps it was printed before 29 October), and if it were not for the Merchant Taylors’ accounts recording the loss of the ‘great coste . . . bestowed upon their Pageant and other shewes’ and the additional expenses of ‘repairing’ the ‘shewes’ so that they could be replayed, one would not know that this had taken place.

The case of the 1605 Show, together with other more trivial instances, demonstrates that more uncertainties are introduced if one accepts that the relationship between the event and the printed text is contingent rather than straightforward.

As we have seen in relation to so many facets of the Shows, practice varied. Some, although not many, printed texts made explicit claims to represent the day’s events both fully and faithfully. Troia-Noua triumphans states on its title page that ‘All the Showes, Pageants, Chariots of Triumph, with other Deuices, (both
on the Water and Land) [are] here *fully* expressed’ (sig. A1r; my emphases). Similarly, in *Londons tempe*, Dekker’s title page claims that ‘All the particular Inventions, for the Pageants, Showes of Triumph, both by Water and land [are] here fully set downe’ (sig. A1r). These instances resemble the way in which in this period play-texts were almost invariably printed with some variant of ‘as performed by X company at Y playhouse’ on their title pages: in both cases, a kind of authority is being claimed. However, of the other pageant writers only Taylor takes the same line. He is quite emphatic about the authority of this work, stating on his title page that ‘The particularities of every Invention in all the Pageants, Shewes and Triumphs both by Water and Land, are following fully set downe’ (sig. A2r). More typical is the relationship between the text and the event as outlined in *Tes Irenes Trophaea*, which merely offers on its title page an ‘explication of the seuerall shewes and deuices’, with no definite guarantees that the ‘explication’ did reflect how the ‘shewes and deuices’ materialised. Indeed, this phraseology does not even guarantee that Squire was responsible for *originating*, as well as ‘explicating’, said shows and devices, although at the same time it is unlikely that he would have been asked simply to write them up. The title page of Middleton’s 1613 Show simply says that it contains ‘all the Showes, Pageants, Chariots, Morning, Noone, and Night Triumphes’ (sig. A1r). Munday is more ambiguous in *Sidero-Thriambos*, stating in his dedication to the Ironmongers that ‘the whole scope of the deuices aymed at, and were ordered according to [the Company’s] direction: are briefly set downe in this Booke’ (sig. A3r). Here the ability to present the ‘whole scope’ might be seen as potentially in conflict with Munday’s stated aim to ‘briefly set downe’ the content of the Show.

These texts were indeed composed of different elements, and the writers did not all approach the task in the same way. It is important to keep a distinction in mind between those aspects of the texts which pertain exclusively to print and thus to the reader’s understanding of the work, such as preambles, dedicatory material and comments on the Show in action, and those parts of the texts, such as the speeches, which reflect the viewers’ experience. As Manley comments, the printed Shows were ‘no mere script’.110 Munday’s general practice was to embark on a historical overview of the City, the livery company and/or the Lord Mayor in question, then supply descriptions of the various pageants and devices, and then append the speeches almost as a supplement. Heywood took fewer pains to
be comprehensive; indeed, he is often quite frank about the gaps in his text. Dekker and Middleton, in contrast, habitually switch from prose description to speeches and back again, in an attempt, one imagines, to give a full and authentic account of the day. The joins do sometimes show. The list of royal, ecclesiastical and ducal past members of the Merchant Taylors with which Dekker concludes the book entitled Troia-Noua triumphans clearly belongs only to the printed text rather than to the actual event. The list has no apparent function within the pageantry, and Dekker also explains to Swinnerton that ‘if I should lengthen this number [of names], it were but to trouble you with a large Index of names only, knowing your expectation is to bee otherwise feasted’ (sig. C3r). Dekker’s expectation, it appears (borne out by the way he dedicates the work, discussed below), is that the Lord Mayor is following the text as the day unfolds.

Other texts indicate a more commemorative, or at least a retrospective function by being written or partly written in the past tense, although we must remember that it was quite possible that the past tense may have been used to confer an air of authenticity upon that which was supposed to have happened. Tes Irenes Trophaea, for instance, begins by stating that ‘the first shew, or presentment, on the water, was a Chariot’; thereafter all such descriptions are in the past tense (sig. A3r). In contrast, Heywood refers to ‘the Showes, now in present Agitation’ in Londini sinus salutis (sig. A4v; my emphasis). Chruso-thriambos commences with an account of how ‘First, concerning the services performed on the Water, when [the Lord Mayor] tooke Bardge, with all the other Companes towards Westminster; supposition must needs give some gracefull help to invention’ (sig. A3r–v). The text then rapidly reverts to the present tense, however, suggesting that Munday may have adapted the scenario for publication by ‘topping and tailing’ its various sections to render it suitably retrospective. Even so, the text is so dense with historical and mythical explication that the capaciousness of a printed text must always have been in mind. The first pageant, the ‘Orferie’, is described not simply in terms of the appropriate figures it bears and their significance to goldsmithing, but with, in addition, a lengthy account of the ‘back story’ of Chthoon and her daughters Chrusos and Argurion, and of ‘that greedy and never-satisfied Lydian King’ Midas (sig. B1r). Even the ‘Touch-Stone’ that Chrusos bears on the pageant has its own history, as Munday’s text reveals. Although Leofstane summarises some of this information in his address to the Lord Mayor at St Lawrence Lane, none of this
earlier and wider contextualisation would have been readily available to the onlookers on the day of the inauguration in the absence of a book.

Munday’s *Metropolis coronata* obligingly indicates how events actually unfolded on the day by mentioning measures taken to change the ‘script’ in order to deal with a delay. He writes that ‘because after my Lords landing, protraction necessarily required to be auoyded . . . such speeches as should haue been spoken to him by the way, were referred till his Honours returne to Saint Paules in the afternoone’ (sig. B3r–v). Perhaps it had taken longer to get back down-river than anticipated. Heywood makes the same kind of gesture towards authenticity in *Londini speculum*, where he comments that ‘these few following Lines may . . . be added unto Jupiters message, delivered by Mercury, which though too long for the Bardge, may perhaps not shew lame in the booke, as being lesse troublesome to the Reader than the Rower’ (sig. B4r). In both cases, the writers’ words make it pretty certain that these particular works were not finalised or circulated until after the Shows had taken place. Dekker’s *Britannia’s honor* is an example of what seems to be the opposite case, for he is typically frank about a possible revision to the day’s schedule in such a way as to make it clear that the text was printed before the event took place. As with Queen Anna in 1611 and Prince Henry in 1612, a royal visitor was expected in 1628 – Queen Henrietta Maria. Dekker writes that ‘if her Maiestie be pleased on the Water, or Land, to Honor These Tryumphes with her Presence, This following Speech in French is then deliuered to her’ (sigs A4v–B1r; my emphases). Dekker also discloses that, had the Queen been present, she would have received a copy of ‘a Booke of the Presentatiens’ specifically decorated for its royal recipient, ‘All the Couer, being set thicke with Flowers de Luces in Gold’ (sig. B1r). A speech of welcome is also reproduced in the text, in both French and English. It is not clear whether the ‘Booke’ planned for the Queen was the present one with a fancy cover, or a special copy tailored for its recipient.

The texts’ bearing on the events is therefore often uncertain. The 1590 text states in its final page, as a kind of afterthought following an account of Walworth’s famous deeds, that ‘it is to be understood that Sir William Walworth pointeth wherewith the king did endue [sic] him, which were placed neere about him in the Pageant’ (*The deuice*, sig. A4r). It is unclear if those who are supposed to do the ‘understanding’ are subsequent readers, although this does seem the likeliest interpretation. The text concludes with a brief epilogue:
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Time.
Time servs for all things,
Time runneth fast,
We craue your patience,
For the time is past.

(sig. A4r)

The pronoun ‘we’ perhaps indicates that these final words were spoken on the day and addressed to an audience rather than a readership. Nelson’s text therefore seems to be gesturing towards both. Perhaps because he was new to the genre in 1612, Dekker, despite the claims of accuracy on his title page as cited above, goes further still towards preserving contingency in his text. He writes in *Troia-Noua triumphans* at one point that ‘either during this speech [of Envy], or else when it is done, certaine Rockets flye up into the aire’ (sig. C1r; my emphasis). In contrast, Middleton’s *The tryumphs of honor and industry* is not only written in the present tense but by a complex use of personal pronouns invokes the reader’s – or the viewer’s – attention towards the spectacle before them, thereby exemplifying Palmer’s assertion that ‘commentary frames performance’. Thus Middleton writes that ‘about this Castle of Fame are plast many honorable fi gures . . . If you looke vpon Truth first, you shall fi nde her properly exprest’ (sig. B4v). Here, as Levin comments, Middleton ‘does not merely describe the emblematic participants, he takes us by the hand and points’. Two years later Middleton expressed himself again in a similar fashion: ‘let mee draw your attentions to his Honours entertain-ment vpon the water’, he tells his readers (*The triumphs of loue and antiquity*, sig. A4v). In *Londini emporia* Heywood similarly remarks that ‘the Fabricke it selfe [of the first water pageant] being visible to all needeth not any expression from me’ (sig. A4v). *Sidero-Thriambos*, in contrast, comes across as having been presented to the Ironmongers’ Company after the event, as Munday’s dedication states that ‘what the whole scope of the deuises aymed at, and were ordered according to your direction: are briefl ily set downe in this Booke’ (sig. A3r). The descriptions of the devices themselves, one should note, are expressed in the dominant present tense. Indeed, Munday switches from past to present in the space of two consecutive sentences: ‘Certain gallant Knights in Armour’, he writes, ‘haue the charge or guiding of [a] Cannon . . . This was first imployed on the water, in the mornings seruice, and afterwards helpeth the dayes further Triumph’ (sig. B2v; my emphases). I interpret this passage as having been partly derived from the original explanation of the
devices, as presented to the Company and/or used to construct the pageantry, with a coda to explain what took place on the day added for the occasion of print. In the haste to bring these works to print by, or soon after, the day of the Show it is hardly surprising that one ends up with a composite of various sources, sometimes with the raw edges showing.

Accordingly, like *Sidero-Thriambos*, Munday’s *Metropolis coronata* shows vestiges of the original plot offered to the Drapers in the very same sentence as evidence of how the actual Show turned out. He begins, somewhat incongruously, in a provisional manner (‘as occasion best presenteth it selve’) and then turns to the actuality of the day:

> afterward, as occasion best presenteth it selve, when the heate of all other employments are calmly overpast: Earle Robin Hood, with Fryer Tuck, and his other braue Huntes-men, attending (now at last) to discharge their duty to my Lord, which the busie turmoile of the whole day could not before affoord. (sig. C1v)

In *Londini sinus salutis* Heywood too sometimes describes the pageants in both the past and present tense, such as when he writes that ‘the next Modell by Land, which was onely showne upon the Water, is one of the twelue Celestiall signes’ (sig. A5v). For instance, he writes in the present tense of the firing of ordnance after a speech, but in the same sentence tells his reader ‘now I come to the fi ft and last’. The writers occasionally add interventions in their own voices, so to speak. Towards the very end of *The triumphs of truth* the present tense used to describe the pageantry is mixed with an interpellation of authorial voice, when Middleton, in the middle of his account of the day’s spectacle, thanks Nichols, Grinkin and Munday and then returns to his account as if the interruption had never happened (sigs D2v–D3r). Heywood also at times inserted himself into his text quite overtly, with an oddly defamiliarising effect. In *Londini sinus salutis* he cites only briefly those aspects of the Ironmongers’ history and classical antecedents which he might have discussed at length: ‘Heere I might enter into large discourse, concerning the commodiousnesse of Iron and Steele . . . with other fixions to the like purpose’. However, he tells how he deliberately chose not to serve up pre-used material, for ‘these hauing been exposed to the publick view vpon occasion of the like solemnity, & knowing withall that Cibus bis coctus [twice cooked food], relisheth not the quesie stomackes of these times. I therefore purposly omit them’ (sig. B1r). There is no question that this part of the text is retrospective.
Heywood similarly negotiates – not without awkwardness – the correct path through his material. There is an intervention in *Londini status pacatus* which again is located uncomfortably between the last two speeches of the day, although it might have been better placed in the prefatory section where he introduces the mayor and his Company in the traditional fashion, or alternatively tagged on at the end as an appendix. As it stands, it serves as another example of the fragmented nature of these texts.\(^{114}\) Heywood writes, rather defensively:

> one thing I cannot omit, concerning the Wardens and Committes of this Worshipful Society of the Drapers; that howsoever in all my writing I labour to avoyd what is Abstruse or obsolete: so withall I study not to meddle with what is too frequent and common: yet in all my expressions either of Poeticall fancie, or (more grave History,) their apprehensions went equally along with my reading. (sig. C3v)

Heywood’s practice in this respect differs quite markedly from some of his predecessors, especially Munday, who habitually made a point of giving the reader, if not the viewer, extensive historical contextualisation of the Shows in general, and often of the livery company in question, without any self-consciousness about its appropriateness. The use of personal pronouns is often indicative of the intended audience and/or readership, of course. In the speeches ‘you’ more often than not is directed at the Lord Mayor; in the expository material in prose, however, a readership is implied. ‘I’ and ‘you’, as Bergeron has remarked, ‘imply a dialogue with a reader’, and accordingly Taylor is even more preoccupied with the reader’s experience than Munday tended to be. He concludes *The triumphs of fame and honour* with the explanation that ‘these few expressions I thought fit to set downe here for the illustration of such words and places as may seeme hard and obscure to some meane Readers’ (sig. B6v).\(^ {115}\) Middleton makes a similar point slightly more tactfully in *The triumphs of honor and vertue*, where ‘to adde a little more help to the fainter Apprehensions’ amongst his readership, he explains that ‘the three Merchants . . . haue reference to the Lord Maior and Sheriffes’ (sig. B2v). It seems unlikely that Taylor would address the dignitaries of the Clothworkers’ Company, those whom he elsewhere terms ‘the Noble Fellowship and Brother-hood of Clothworkers’, in such terms, so a wider readership is signalled here. Indeed, Taylor goes to some lengths with his ‘explanations’, which form a series of appendices to the main body of the text. In case they were unaware of European geography,
the reader is informed, for instance, that ‘Po [is] a famous river in Italy [and] Seine a river in France which runs through Paris’; further afield, it is revealed that ‘Ierusalem [is] the chiefe Citie of Iudea’ (sigs B4v and B6v).

In *Troia-Noua triumphans* Dekker appends a note to explain that the water show does not feature in his text, despite the fact that the title page includes it:

> the title page of this Booke makes promise of all the Shewes by water, as of these On the Land; but Apollo hauing no hand in them, I suffer them to dye by that which fed them; that is to say, Powder & Smoke. I had deuiz’d One, altogether Musicall, but Times glasse could spare no Sand, nor lend conuenient Howres for the performance of it. (sig. D1v)

There are two points at issue here. On the one hand, Dekker had ‘deviz’d’ a suitably ‘musicall’ water show for which there was insufficient time, and, on the other hand, those aspects of the water show which were performed on the day – exclusively composed of cannon, it would seem – do not appear to have gained his approbation (perhaps he, as ‘Apollo’, had no hand in them). One gets the impression that Dekker was a bit displeased at how things turned out. This text generally retains so much that is tentative that it seems likely to have been based more on what was *intended* to happen than on the reality. Indeed, throughout Dekker’s mayoral works we find sections that read more like a prospectus or a brief than a retrospective record. Envy’s speech towards the end of this Show was intended either to be accompanied by or followed by gunfire, as Dekker’s text rather awkwardly states: ‘This done, or as it is in doing, those twelue that ride armed discharge their Pistols’ (sig. C4v). Indeed, I would speculate that a large part of Dekker’s printed text for 1612 was imported directly from his original ‘plot’ – with all the provisionality that this implies – with either no cognisance or no concern that the logistical tone throughout might strike the reader oddly. Munday’s account of the making of the 1616 Show also foregrounds the processes that lay behind the production. His use of the word ‘our’ alludes to the teamwork he and Grinkin engaged in, an impression underscored by the text’s seeming use of the original brief in phrases like ‘our first deuice’ and ‘we next present’ (sigs B1r and B2r).

These instances serves as an instructive reminder that the printed work should not readily be assumed to be identical to the day’s performance. The texts related to royal entries and other civic
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entertainments celebrating the monarch and his or her family are, however, more consistently commemorative. Even so, as with his later Show, Dekker’s account of James’s 1604 royal entry includes some speeches that were not heard on the day; the first edition admits that this was the case owing to the possibility of the King being wearied by overlong festivities. Indeed, Dekker is especially likely to preserve contingency in his texts, perhaps because of his abiding interest in theatrical effect. Another of Middleton’s civic texts may offer us some clues as to one of the relationship between printed book and event. In his second year as City Chronologer, 1621, he published Honorable entertainments compos’d de for the service of this noble cittie, quite a long work comprising ten ad hoc entertainments in the form of verse, prose and speeches which took place before civic and Privy Council dignitaries during Easter week 1620. The entertainments were centred on the marriage of Charles Howard, Baron of Effingham, and Mary Cockayne, the eldest daughter of the Lord Mayor for whom Middleton had also written the inaugural Show in 1619, the year before the entertainments in question. The publication date confirms that Middleton’s text is retrospective, and the dedication to Francis Jones, the current Lord Mayor, also establishes the printing of the text as between October 1620 and October 1621, the dates of Jones’s mayoralty. Furthermore, the dedication implies that the dedicatees (the Lord Mayor, aldermen and other civic dignitaries) were present at the entertainments:

Those things that tooke Ioy (at seuerall Feasts)
To giue you Entertainment, as the Guests
They held most truly Worthy, become now
Poore Suiters to be enterlaynde by you,
So were they from the first; their Suite is then,
Once seruing you, to be receiude agen,
And You, to equall Iustice are so true,
You alwaies cherish that, which honors You.

However, for this text to be printed at all indicates that there would have been a wider readership than simply those present at what was, in one case (and despite the presence of important public figures), essentially a private, family event. There must also have been a reason why the accounts of these disparate events were put together into a single work and issued a year or so later, when quite some time had elapsed.
Further ways of conceptualising the relationship between the printed text and the event emanate from the 1629 Show by Dekker and Christmas, which was printed as *Londons tempe*. *Londons tempe* is a unique instance where we have a printed work and an eyewitness account that includes sketches (Abram Booth’s), as well as exceptionally full livery company records. For in this instance, fortuitously, the Ironmongers’ Court minutes for 27 October (two days before the actual Show) contain an entry called ‘The explanacion of the Shewe on the Lord Maiors day’, which details each of the six individual pageants performed during the Show. That it exists at all is notable, for it is very unusual for Company records to preserve this level of detail about the content of the actual pageantry. The only equivalent instances where other Company records provide more than minimal information about the content of the Show were decades earlier, in 1561 and 1568, where the speeches given on the day of the mayoral inauguration were transcribed in the Merchant Taylors’ records. If, as it seems, the Ironmongers’ Company took an especial interest in the content of their Shows it is perhaps not a coincidence that Munday draws attention to his 1618 Show having been ‘ordered according to [the Ironmongers’] direction’ (*Sidero-Thriambos*, sig. A3r). However, there is no explanation for the Ironmongers’ ‘explanacion’ of 1629: it appears at the end of the day’s minutes accompanied by two marginal notes that simply state ‘Pageantes’ (see Figure 18). The descriptions are written in a different hand from the rest of the Company clerk’s minutes, which does not appear to be either Dekker’s or Christmas’s, going by their signatures in these minutes.

The Ironmongers’ descriptions of the pageants, although briefer than those in the printed text, do follow the latter very closely. Their account of the first ‘Scene’ of the Show begins as follows:

The first Scene is a Watterworke presented by Oceanus Kinge of the Sea sitting in the vast shell of a Siluer Scollupp, reyning in the heads of two wild Seahorses their maines falling aboute their neckes shining with curles of gold. On his head is placed a Diadem whose botteme is a conceited corronett of gold.  

*Londons tempe* reads:

The first scene is a Water-worke, presented by Oceanus, King of the Sea . . . He . . . sits Triumphantly in the Vast (but Queint) shell of a siluer Scollop, Reyning in the heads of two wild Seahorses, proportioned to the life, their maynes falling about their neckes, shining with curles of gold. On his head . . . is placed, a Diadem, whose Bottome, is a conceited Coronet of gold.
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The identical use of adjectives (‘vast’, ‘wild’ and ‘conceited’), in particular, is significant and suggests a common source, which might have been authorial and based on Dekker and Christmas’s original brief, backing up the contention I made previously about Dekker’s practice. In 1613 the Grocers recorded that Munday had presented to them a ‘Devise or proiect in wryting sett downe’, which he offered to read to the Company Court. Assuming that this was common practice, it is therefore entirely feasible that the Ironmongers had access to Dekker and Christmas’s plot in written form, making it easier to copy that plot into their minutes. Strangely, two of the passages in these minutes describe the pageants in the past tense (‘The fourth presentation was Lemnions forge’, states one), although the

18 Extract from the Ironmongers’ Company records (1629): ‘the explanacion of the Shewe’
The Show had not yet taken place (see Figure 19). In the printed text they are all referred to in the present tense.

The exceptionality of this instance is demonstrated by juxtaposition with another Dekker production, *Troia-Noua triumphans*, and the livery company documentation associated with it. In their accounts the Merchant Taylors do list the names of the pageants for their 1612 Show, such as ‘Neptunes Throne’, but there is nothing like the congruence between the disparate texts that we saw in the case of the Ironmongers’ Show for 1629. Indeed, the pageant that the Merchant Taylors call ‘Envies Castle’, Dekker calls ‘the Forlorn Castle’, and his fourth device, ‘Fames high Temple’, is not mentioned by the Company at all.122 Similarly, the Company accounts refer to ‘the seaven liberall sciences’ as being part of ‘Neptunes Throne’ when in the printed work they appear within the second device, ‘the Throne of Vertue’.123 Here it is clear that the Merchant Taylors’ list of individual pageants is cited purely and pragmatically in terms of what they are paying for.
In sum, it seems to me most likely that in the majority of cases – particularly with Dekker’s Shows – the main body of the printed works was based, sometimes with very little amendment, on the writer and artificer’s scenario for the Show as commissioned by the livery company in question. Upon printing, the writers sometimes added (often jarring) comments about the vicissitudes of the day. The present-tense descriptions of the pageants, then, may have been a relic of their original address to the Company, and not necessarily directed to the witnesses of the Show on the day, although this may have been the eventual effect. Many of the texts – increasingly so through this period – then had dedications, historical preambles and the like appended to them when the work was prepared for publication, none of which would have had any particular function when the Show was commissioned. Heywood’s recourse to historical and mythical record, in particular, often reads like rehashed classics lessons from his days as a student.\(^{124}\) Middleton simply reproduced the first page of the preamble to *The triumphs of loue and antiquity* in *The triumphs of honor and vertue* three years later; although the texts were commissioned by different Companies, apart from a few words in parentheses, the two works are identical at this point.\(^{125}\) Perhaps he thought no one would notice, or care.

‘Tendred into your hands’: patrons, readers and owners

These texts were produced, at least in principle, for a multiple audience and readership: the Lord Mayor, some of the onlookers and any subsequent readers. Bromham sensibly comments that ‘the deviser of the pageant could assume a third audience, whose experience would have been exclusively verbal . . . [and who] might be capable of picking up verbal details that might or might not have registered in performance’.\(^ {126}\) Heywood evinces just such awareness in *Londini artium*, where he dismisses the third land pageant with considerable lack of tact (rather undermining this part of the Show in the process). Indeed, he labours the point to such an extent he is clearly assuming an educated readership, one which would not be offended by what he says:

This [pageant] is more Mimicall than Materiail [sic], and inserted for the Vulgar, who rather loue to feast their eyes, then to banquet their eares: and therefore though it bee allowed place amongst the rest: (as in all Professions wee see Dunces amongst Doctors, simple amongst subtle, and Fooles intermixt with Wisemen to fill vp number) as
doubting whether it can wel appology for it selfe or no, at this time I affoord it no tongue. (sig. B4r)

True to his word, the pageant is not described and no speeches are reproduced, unlike the other parts of the Show. Apart from the ambivalence towards ‘the vulgar’ manifested here, Heywood’s text makes an explicit division between the taciturnity of the printed text and the actual performance of the Show, where the third land pageant would have taken place.

Some of the Shows and other printed texts of entertainments such as royal entries are more ‘writerly’ than others. In these works one can see many instances of where the writer hoped to supplement performance and to allow the meanings exemplified by the pagentry to come across more fully. Prefatory material in the printed text discussing historical matters pertaining to the Lord Mayor’s Company, as presented by Munday and Taylor in particular, is one thing, and more or less relevant to the matter in hand, but, typically, Jonson’s work is at the far end of this spectrum. To Dekker’s disdain in his parallel text (Jonson’s was published first), his colleague’s part of The magnificent entertainment is stuffed with copious marginal notes, footnotes, Greek and Latin tags and other textual aspects which have little to do with the entertainment witnessed on the streets, and indeed would probably have been extremely distracting for any reader attempting to gain an impression of the day. Genius’s speech of ‘Gratulation’, for instance, is wellnigh drowned out in the printed text by Jonson’s exhaustive (and exhausting) scholarly notes, references and authorial amplifications. Smuts has rightly commented that Jonson’s work ‘demands to be treated as a literary text rather than a record of a public occasion’, and Kiefer argues along the same lines that ‘it was not in [Jonson’s] nature to make things easy for spectators . . . [P]erhaps only the readers of Jonson’s masques find sufficient explanation . . . to comprehend fully what spectators beheld in performance’. Other ‘writerly’ features of such occasional texts include dedications, and it is chiefly in the dedications, for obvious reasons, that one tends to find explicit references to the actual day of triumph itself. Dekker’s Troia-Noua triumphans is typical in this respect. He addresses Swinnerton as follows: ‘Honor (this day) takes you by the Hand and giues you welcomes [sic] into your New-Office of Pretorship . . . I present (Sir) vnto you, these labours of my Pen, as the first and newest Congratulatory Offrings tendred into your hands’ (sig. A2r). As time wore on, it had become more common
for printed Lord Mayors’ Shows to bear dedications to the new Lord Mayor or, occasionally, to his livery company. However, Bergeron is incorrect when he states that mayoral texts ‘cite only one patron: the current Lord Mayor (or occasionally also the sheriff)’. Munday’s dedications never mention the new Lord Mayor, and, where sheriffs are cited by other writers, such as Heywood, it is always the two of them. The convention was to write a dedication to the Lord Mayor – Middleton’s were generally in verse – although Munday, where he dedicated his mayoral texts at all, and he was less likely to do so than most of his contemporaries, chose to address the Master, Wardens and Assistants of the Company in question. Perhaps, knowing the way Munday tended to operate, he did so in the awareness that future commissions of this type were more likely to emanate from those who ran the livery companies than from an individual. He does write in *Sidero-Thriambos* that he chose to dedicate the book to the Ironmongers’ governing body because theirs ‘was the charge’ for the Show (sig. A3r). *The triumphs of the Golden Fleece* is addressed to ‘the Maisters, Wardens Batchelers, and their Assistant Brethren’ of the Drapers, with whom Munday had, as he puts it, ‘runne through the troublesome trauaile of so serious an employment’ (sig. A2r). That said, although many of the writers were otherwise employed as dramatists – indeed, Bergeron has recently argued that ‘playwrights helped shape these [pageant] texts to resemble many other kinds of text’ – such dedications did not really operate in the ways one can identify in other printed works like plays. In the context of a mayoral Show the ‘patronage’ of the writer by the livery company can be taken as read. It did not have to be sought, nor, it seems, did writers require the protection of a patron, as was sometimes the case with other kinds of publication. This points up once again how the printed mayoral Show does not sit unproblematically alongside other works of this period.

However, although the writers may not have needed to seek patronage for their texts, some still used the same terminology as elsewhere in their other works, and indeed in the majority of early modern dedications. Livery company patronage thus underscores the existence of these events, first on the street and then in print. Middleton presents *The triumphs of loue and antiquity* to the Lord Mayor: on ‘this day’, his dedication reads, ‘my Seruice, and the Booke’ are offered to Cockayne (sig. A3r). Dekker is once again gratifyingly open about the processes that lay behind his work. As we have seen, addressing the new mayor in the dedication of
Troia-Noua triumphans directly, he writes ‘I present (Sir) vnto you, these labours of my Pen, as the first and newest Congratulatory Offrings tendred into your hands’. The dedication thus presents the text as being offered to Swinnerton, almost as a physical gift, on the very day of his inauguration: ‘Yesterday [you] were a Brother’, Dekker states, ‘and This Day a Father’ (sig. A2r–v). Altogether, Dekker’s text, written entirely in the present tense, does read as if the work had been handed ceremonially to the new Lord Mayor on the day itself.\textsuperscript{135}

‘These entertainments’, Bergeron comments, ‘by their nature serve and please patrons’, and he notes that no mayoral text has a preface to the reader as such.\textsuperscript{136} In these dedications, as he has argued, we can see the writers ‘struggling to understand and characterise their cultural position . . . [and] what it means to be an author of such texts’.\textsuperscript{137} Munday’s lengthy dedication to the Fishmongers’ Company in Chrysanaleia is a case in point. He here delineates his relationship with the Company (and, by implication, with the City as a whole), claiming that his authorship of the pamphlet derives from a deep-seated and lifelong allegiance. For Munday, as I have established elsewhere, his ‘cultural position’ (in Bergeron’s terms) is inseparable from his personal one. Interestingly, Munday transfers the agency of patronage from the patron (the Company) to himself – it is almost as if he offers them the patronage. His dedication uses the metaphor of a river feeding into, and nourished by, the sea, to express his indebtedness to the Fishmongers. His dedication of the text to them is therefore a ‘iust retribution and dutie’, and their ‘Patronage and protection’ of the writer ‘in right and equity belongs unto you’. The Company is exhorted to ‘welcome’ their patronage of Munday ‘in loue and acceptance’ (sig. A3r–v).\textsuperscript{138}

The printed books of the Shows may, as speculated, have been handed around to various important people on the day. Subsequently, though, many have ended up far and wide from the City. I now move on to explore what can be learned about the ownership and use of these works. As a starting point, the physical form of the texts can tell us something about their genre and possible readership in their own time. Of the printed mayoral works that have survived, after Nelson’s 1590 text, and with the sole exception thereafter of Munday’s 1618 Sidero-Thriambos, part of which is in black letter to demonstrate the ‘archaic’ nature of that section of the text where a venerable Bard speaks, the Shows were uniformly printed in roman type.\textsuperscript{139} This might suggest a certain status in the
eyes of the printers and stationers for those books which might otherwise be seen simply as ‘pamphlets’, for although black letter was still used ubiquitously for proclamations and editions of the Bible, according to Blayney, ‘the book trade [associated] roman type with a higher level of literacy and education than blackletter . . . [and it] did not perceive [books printed in roman type] as belonging to the same market as jestbooks and ballads’.  

Some printed Shows (as with university drama and masques) bore Latin on their title pages. Farmer and Lesser’s interpretation of this phenomenon is that Latin ‘attached itself most commonly to forms of drama that were . . . part of the elaborately classicized and allegorical displays of the court and city’. The use of Latin also seems to be related to the frequency of an authorial attribution: where Latin exists on a title page so, most usually, does an author’s name. *Tes Irenes Trophaea* bears a motto from Virgil, ‘Parua sub ingentimatris se subijcit umbra’, along with the initials ‘I. S’. As noted above, with the minor proviso that the title page of *Campbell* has not survived, none of the mayoral Shows is anonymous. Farmer and Lesser note the ‘remarkably high frequency [of author attribution] on the title pages of Lord Mayor’s shows’, ‘surpass[ing] all other forms of drama’. They also comment that ‘we should probably assume that authors provided these [Latin] tags as part of the copy they gave to their stationers’. This is possible, I suppose, but in the absence of much information about by whose agency the mayoral texts got into print, it remains speculation. Farmer and Lesser also state that ‘the dramatists who most frequently employed Latin were, not coincidentally, the same authors who were attempting to establish their own literary authority’, and they mention Jonson and (with some puzzlement on their part) Heywood in this regard. They do not comment on the fact that two of Dekker’s three Shows, *Londons tempe* and *Britannia’s honor*, also bear Latin mottoes on their title pages: their omission is perhaps because Dekker does not sit at all easily within their category of authors ‘attempting to establish literary authority’. Only nine Shows have Latin on their title pages in any case, and most of these are simply the conventional motto ‘Redeunt spectacula’, although Farmer and Lesser are correct that this trend appears to have accelerated in the 1630s as far as the Shows are concerned. The phrase, which can be translated as ‘the games will return’, is extracted from ‘Nocte pluit tota, redeunt spectacula mane, / Divisum imperium cum Jove Caesar habet’, lines written by Virgil in praise of Emperor Augustus. All bar one of Heywood’s Shows use this motto. Dekker’s *London’s*
tempe has a line from Martial, ‘Quando magis dignos licuit spectare triumphos?’. Dekker clearly favoured Martial, as Britannia’s honor bears another of his epigrams (plus its source reference); Webster too used Martial on Monuments of Honor (an epigram that also appears in the reader’s preface to The White Devil).  

Although this evidence demonstrates that in various ways they appear not to have been categorised as what is often called ‘cheap print’, the Show texts, unlike a number of works commemorating royal entries and the like, were (as we have seen) published without illustrations. Robertson and Gordon suggest that the reason why the mayoral Shows were not illustrated (as they tended to be in continental Europe) was ‘the limited resources of English book production’.  

Astington, in contrast, argues that the difference between English and continental practice has been ‘overstated’: ‘illustration was popular and more widespread than is commonly recognised’. The English book trade was actually quite capable of producing illustrated ‘festival’ texts, even if these tend to relate to royal entertainments: one only has to look at the detailed engraving of ‘the great Pond at Eluetham, and . . . the properties which it containeth’ in The honorable entertainement gieuen to the Queenes Maiestie in progresse, at Eluetham in Hampshire, published in 1591, not to mention Harrison’s Arch’s of triumph.  

It is more likely that Lord Mayors’ Show texts were not illustrated by lavish plates, as on the continent, partly because this was not generally the custom in England, and also because of a lack of time in the print-shop. Indeed, Blayney observes that texts composed of both verse and prose, as is the case for the Shows post-Peele, presented more difficulties for a compositor and printer than a text entirely in verse; to add to the complexity, as we have seen, some Show texts also included musical notation.  

As I discuss in more detail elsewhere in this book, unlike royal triumphs, the mayoral Shows were usually planned in detail only some three weeks before the event, which would not have made it possible for a printer to produce elaborate plates. Other forms of pageantry that took place with a longer run-up could produce illustrations, such as Thomas Lant’s thirty plates for the printed commemoration of Philip Sidney’s 1588 funeral procession, published as Sequitur celebritas.  

As Orgel states, ‘the market for printed masques [and other works of this type] in England . . . was not dependent on the elegance of the book’. In general terms significant differences do exist between the printed texts of Lord Mayor’s Shows and those produced on the continent to commemorate royal
or ducal triumphs. However, it is important to remember that one is not necessarily comparing like with like: as Watanabe-O’Kelly says, ‘which form a festival book takes is largely determined by the traditions of the court or civic or religious body which commissions it’. One major disparity is that instead of being produced in relatively large numbers by professional printers, as in London, those works produced on the continent, in Watanabe-O’Kelly’s words, ‘were often customised for particular patrons by being printed on vellum, hand-coloured or illuminated, so that the line between mass-produced publication and one-off art object can become blurred’.  

Evidence of who owned the printed Shows once they had been distributed is, unfortunately, scant, partly because the rate of attrition of the printed texts was considerable (for instance, of the 500 copies of The sunne in Aries only two have survived, which is not atypical). Book collectors within whose collections mayoral Shows reside include Robert Burton, Brian Twyne, Anthony Wood and Humphrey Dyson. For the most part, these were scholarly men with no apparent London links and their copies were probably gained some time after the actual Show took place. Only Dyson was an immediate contemporary, and he was also the only one with significant civic connections. He signed the title page of a copy of Britannia’s honor which is now bound into a larger volume of related works. Dyson was a citizen of London (a member of the Wax Chandlers’ Company), which might in itself be sufficient cause for ownership of at least one of these texts. His co-editorship of the 1633 edition of Stow’s Suruey (along with Munday and others) also demonstrates his orientation towards the civic domain, not least because Munday, Dyson’s main collaborator and the preceding continuer of Stow’s work, had himself been one of the most successful pageant-writers of the past three decades. Indeed, it is quite likely that Dyson and Munday were already working on their massive expansion of the Suruey when Dekker’s 1628 Show took place; Dyson may even have somehow got hold of a copy of the printed text as part of his researches.

Moreover, what is common to all the surviving copies of mayoral Shows is that, where they exist at all, contemporary marginalia only very rarely extend past the title page of the text; even there handwritten annotation tends to be solely owners’ or readers’ names. One is drawn to the conclusion that it was generally considered more important to own a copy of one of these works than to read it, or at least to read it more than once, quite probably because the
majority of the owners had already seen the Show and so had little cause to want to revisit its content.\textsuperscript{156} There are a few exceptions, however. One of the most heavily annotated books – the Bodleian’s copy of \textit{The triumphes of re-united Britania} – bears on its title page the names of various individuals in apparently contemporary or near-contemporary hands, as well as the strikingly appropriate comment ‘Champion for the Citty or the Citty’s Champion’ next to Munday’s name (although the comment may, of course, refer to the Lord Mayor). The rest of the text, however, is unmarked and indeed very clean. Similarly, one copy of \textit{The triumphs of loue and antiquity} bears the handwritten note ‘Free of the Skynners’ on its title page, alluding to the Lord Mayor’s Company. Generally speaking, although one is likely to find copies with dirty or stained covers, since the works were not originally produced with bindings, the majority of extant Show texts are both in excellent condition and lacking in signs of active use, which suggests they were prized, unread or perhaps both. Indeed, a copy of Heywood’s \textit{Londini status pacatus} was left uncut for a considerable time and thus cannot have been read by its immediate contemporary owner(s). Hardin’s description of the printed Shows as ‘a lasting account of how [the City oligarchy] wished to perceive themselves and the metropolis’ therefore seems accurate only in principle: what is the value of ‘a lasting account’ that no one reads?\textsuperscript{157} The likely ownership of certain copies of the Shows seems to have extended outside of the limited realm of the City companies, in any case. The Thynne family of Longleat, who had strong civic connections, may have owned their copies of \textit{The triumphs of truth}, \textit{Metropolis coronata} and \textit{The triumphs of loue and antiquity} since they were first printed, especially since only a few years separate these works.\textsuperscript{158}

A rare exception to the norm of non-annotation, as far as mayoral Shows go, is the Gough copy of \textit{Londini status pacatus}, where someone has carefully counted the lines of the verses of every substantive speech and written the number at the end of the relevant passage. The title page of this book also bears, in what looks like the same hand, the comment ‘G [i.e. good?] Speeches’, which \textit{may} – exceptionally – indicate a reader’s aesthetic appreciation of the contents: perhaps the reader’s liking for the speeches manifested itself in a desire to count their lines.\textsuperscript{159} The same reader probably marked the number of lines of one speech (and numbered the pages) in a copy of Middleton’s \textit{Triumphs of loue and antiquity} which also forms part of the Gough bequest in the Bodleian. Interestingly, both of these copies bear more signs of use than is the norm.
Given that the usual assumption is that civic dignitaries were the initial recipients of these works, another, rather surprising aspect of the ownership history of these texts is their extreme scarcity in Company Halls. There seems to have been little or no incentive for the livery companies to keep copies of the printed Shows. Even the single copy of *Metropolis coronata* owned by the Drapers – the only contemporary printed Show I have been able to locate in a Company Hall – was probably bought by the Company a considerable time after 1615. The Fishmongers’ Company does have a copy of the lavish 1844 edition of *Chrysantelie*, which was produced on its behalf, but this is an exception. The general view amongst livery company archivists is that such ephemeral texts were not at all prized by the Companies; most of the Companies had very little interest in ‘literature’ generally, even when they had paid for the printing of the works themselves. If this is the case, it, in this context, disproves Heywood’s claim in 1631 that the Companies ‘neglect not the study of arts, and practice of literature’ (*Londons ius honorarium*, sig. C3v).

In contrast, as one would expect, the texts themselves foreground the livery companies in various ways. *Monuments of Honor* is the first printed Show to use the Company’s arms. After 1624 it became common practice to display the arms of the livery company to which the Lord Mayor belonged on the title page of the printed work. This practice, it seems to me, may be connected to the defiant claims one finds *within* these texts too about the importance of the livery companies in the later Jacobean period and onwards, a topic which will explored in the next chapter.

**Notes**

I am particularly indebted to Ian Gadd and Richard Rowland for their comments and advice on this chapter.

1 Michael Burden’s discussion of the post-Restoration Shows is an exception in this respect (see “For the lustre of the subject”).
2 ‘Occasional events’, p. 180; my emphasis. As Watanabe-O’Kelly has cogently argued in relation to continental triumphs, ‘festival books are . . . not simple records of a festival, but another element in it’ (‘Early modern European festivals’, p. 23).
4 There were between twenty-one and twenty-four printing houses in London in this period, and not all of them were prepared to print any text at all, although the Lord Mayor’s Show is unlikely to have been
regarded as controversial (Blayney, ‘The publication of playbooks’, p. 405).

5 See Watanabe-O’Kelly, ‘Early modern European festivals’, p. 23, for a useful summary of the ways in which continental festival books might have been produced and consumed.

6 ‘The publication of playbooks’, p. 384. Fortunately Greg did include the Shows in his bibliographies, although Watanabe-O’Kelly and Simon’s Festivals and Ceremonies: A Bibliography of Works Relating to Court, Civic and Religious Festivals is not complete: it omits all pre-1605 printed Lord Mayors’ Shows and all those written by Heywood, and includes only some of the texts held in the British Library, even those which are bound together in the same volume.

7 Bergeron has written a bibliographical study of one of Heywood’s Shows. Farmer and Lesser do include some of the Shows in their account of the marketing of play-texts: as they state, ‘some of the more interesting results may be found by comparing commercial drama to its university and closet counterparts, to masques, entertainments, and Lord Mayor’s shows’ (‘Vile arts’, p. 111). However, given that they consulted Greg’s Bibliography when compiling their database of ‘all qualifying title pages’ the omission of some ten Shows is puzzling.

8 I am grateful to Ian Gadd for the development of this point.

9 Greg, Bibliography, vol. IV, p. 1682. Munday’s classical scholarship was never all that secure; one cannot imagine Jonson or Heywood making such an error.

10 Farmer and Lesser note that masque texts only infrequently cite an author ‘due to the courtly fiction that the patron of the masque is its true author and due to their coterie audience, assuring that anyone important would know the author of a masque without being told’ (‘Vile arts’, p. 108 n.39).


12 This point can be related to the one made by Peter Berek that generic terms (tragedy, comedy and so on) are more of a preoccupation for the producers of printed works, as marketing devices, than they are for performance (‘Genres, early modern theatrical title pages’, p. 161).

13 See GH MS 34,048/10. This backs up Northway’s argument that the Companies ‘thought about the shows as speeches’ (‘To kindle an industrious desire’, p. 169).

14 From the Stationers’ Register it would appear that Peele’s lost 1588 text was entitled ‘The device of the Pageant borne before the Righte Honorable Martyn Calthrop, Lorde Maiour of the Cytie of London’ (Greg, Bibliography, vol. I, p. 965).

15 The title pages of these later works contained the same information as the earlier texts, largely set out in the same way, using the same kind of terminology: see, for example, the title page of Jordan’s London in
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*Luster* of 1679, with its conventional ‘All set forth at the proper Cost and Charges of the Worshipful Company of Drapers’, and so on.

16 GH MS 11,590, fol. 21; Middleton, *The triumphs of honor and vertue*, sig. B1v.

17 GH MS 11,590, fol. 14.

18 Drapers’ Bachelors Accounts, fols 86 and 99.

19 *Ibid.*, fol. 86. For some reason the name of the printer and the number of extra copies is left blank in the 1638 accounts (perhaps such details were uncertain until a very late stage); Okes is named the following year, when an additional 300 copies were ordered.

20 The earliest surviving printed and illustrated text of a European royal entertainment – in this case, an entry into Bruges – was published in Paris in 1515 (see Kipling, ‘The King’s Advent Transformed’, pp. 92 and 121 n. 4). Prior to that, manuscript accounts of fifteenth-century London pageantry were sometimes compiled (see Barron, ‘Pageantry on London Bridge’, p. 93). Comparative analysis of ‘festival books’ as a genre has been hugely aided by the British Library’s online collection (which does not include mayoral Shows, however): [www.bl.uk/treasures/festivalbooks/homepage.html](http://www.bl.uk/treasures/festivalbooks/homepage.html).

21 Smuts is unusual in the way he foregrounds the issue, asking ‘why did certain ephemeral events – but not others – acquire a second life through the relatively durable medium of print?’ (‘Occasional events’, p. 183). His focus, however, is exclusively on the royal entry and progress rather than the Lord Mayor’s Show.

22 See *ibid.*, pp. 188–94.


25 *Ibid.*, p. 140. There isn’t a single volume which includes copies of all five of these Shows (the Huntington Library holds them all but the provenance varies), so Strype may have referred simply to those individual copies then available to him, or to a volume that has been broken up.

26 He also, more briefly, mentions the titles and authors of the Shows for 1672, 1673, 1677, 1680, 1681 and 1685.

27 One should not understate the commercial imperatives for some of these works: as Hunt points out, Mulcaster’s account of Elizabeth’s coronation was explicitly published to be sold (*The Drama of Coronation*, pp. 159–60).

28 *The Golden Age*, p. 3.

29 GH MS 34,048/9.

30 *Textual Patronage*, p. 49.

31 ‘The masque in/as print’, p. 177.

32 *Guilds, Society*, p. 45. Blayney asserts that to make a profit on a play-text a publisher would have to sell ‘about half the edition’ (‘The publication of playbooks’, p. 389).
33 ‘The King’s Advent Transformed’, p. 92.
34 Norbrook comments of this moment that ‘so great was the interest in the wedding that descriptions of the festivities sold very quickly, and one unscrupulous printer issued an account of the couple’s arrival in Heidelberg eight days before they had left England’ (‘The Masque of Truth’, p. 82).
35 Greg states that a copy of Jonson’s *Masque of Blackness* bears ‘an autograph dedication to Queen Anna signed “Ben: Jonsonius”’ (*Bibliography*, vol. I, p. 403), suggesting that the text was given to her personally, although it is not clear when this happened; one copy of *The Masque of Queenes* has an autograph epistle to the Queen (*ibid.*, p. 416).
36 Robertson and Gordon, *Collections* III, p. 46. Somewhat anachronistically, the Ironmongers use the same phrase in relation to the printing of the 1609 work that became *Camp-bell* (GH MS 16,969/2, fol. 216v).
37 Robertson and Gordon, *Collections* III, p. xxxii.
38 The sole extant copy of *Camp-bell* is missing its first few pages and all remaining copies of Dekker’s Shows for 1628 and 1629 lack an imprint.
39 Amongst other works by Heywood, Raworth printed two plays at around the same time as Heywood’s 1635 Show, *The English traveller* (1633) and *A challenge for beautie* (1636), and a court masque, *Loves maistresse: or, The Queens masque* (1636). The connections may have been generated by the Shows, too, as Okes printed one of Squire’s sermons in 1621, the year after Squire’s sole mayoral Show (going by the ESTC, Okes does not seem to have printed Squire’s works before).
40 Allde, a rather controversial figure, produced over 700 items during his career; however, he mostly acted as a ‘trade printer’, printing material for others.
41 Allde also printed Henry Roberts’s *The King of Denmarkes welcome* (1606), one of a number of texts commemorating the royal visit, a copy of which is in Dyson’s collection. Roberts himself, who had been producing these kinds of occasional texts since the 1580s, was a Stationer.
42 Munday was a neighbour during this period, too (see Hill, *Anthony Munday*, p. 32). (I am grateful to Peter Blayney for his advice on the Okes family.)
43 Watt states that Gosson ‘specialised in the works of [this] one author’. He also appears to have published pamphlets at the more ‘sober’ end of the market (*Cheap Print*, pp. 291 and 359).
44 Okes was a fellow parishioner of John Webster senior in St Sepulchre without Newgate.
45 Heywood, *An apology for actors*, sig. G4r–v. This earlier work, *Troia Britanica*, had been printed by Jaggard in 1609, so Heywood’s
contrasting experiences were the reverse of what one might expect, given Okes’s reputation.

46 Nicholas Okes began his printing business in 1607. *Britannia’s honor* was printed by Okes and Thomas Norton in the first year of their (unauthorised) partnership. Okes had been printing works by both Dekker and Middleton for some years beforehand.

47 There are around ninety extant individual copies of the various Shows, of which I have personally examined eighty-seven.


49 Blayney, *The Texts of King Lear*, pp. 27–9. Okes, it seems, also had a rather cavalier attitude to the various regulations governing printers’ activities.


51 Sullivan is therefore incorrect when she states that this combined text was ‘reprinted two years after’ the Show, in 1615 (‘Summer 1613’, p. 162 n.1; she repeats the claim on p. 164).

52 Greg, *Bibliography*, vol. I, p. 455. This work in its various incarnations illustrates Greg’s comment that ‘the distinction between editions, issues, and variants’ can be ‘occasionally worrying’ (vol. IV, p. xxxii).


54 Bergeron concurs: ‘I think it reasonable to assume that the manuscripts which served as printer’s copy for the pamphlets were probably Munday’s foul papers or fair copies’ (*Pageants and Entertainments*, p. xviii). Jackson argues that ‘the presence of a dedication printed over Webster’s name [in *The Monuments of Honor*] strongly suggests that the printer’s manuscript copy must have derived from the author’ (‘Textual introduction’, p. 251).

55 The Huntington Library copy is identical to the copy in the BL in every respect. Shows which demonstrate fewer and more minor press corrections between different copies include *The triumphs of health and prosperity* and *Londons ius honorarium*.


57 This woodcut appears to have been reused for Taylor’s *Heauens blessing, and earths ioy* of 1613.

58 Bergeron has identified ‘a number of manifest errors’ in Okes’s printing of *Londons ius honorarium* (‘Heywood’s “Londons Ius Honorarium”’, pp. 225–6). There is a reference to ‘faults’ missed by the printer in *’Tis Pity She’s a Whore* (sig. K4r), which was printed by Okes in the same year as *Londini emporia*. *Londons tempe* is also notably badly printed (probably by Okes), often using worn and damaged type.

59 See Middleton, *The triumphs of truth* (STC 17903), sig. C2v, for instance. Not all the ephemeral texts issued from Okes’s workshop were of poor quality, however: Webster’s *Monuments of Honor* is
neatly done and at least one impression of The triumphs of honor and vertue has been carefully corrected.

60 £2 appears to be the going rate that a publisher would pay an author for ‘a small pamphlet’ (Blayney, ‘The publication of playbooks’, p. 396).

61 Drapers’ Company Court of Assistants Minutes. September 1603 to July 1640. MB 13. There were extensive links, if not always amicable ones, between the Drapers and the Stationers in this period (see Johnson, ‘The Stationers versus the Drapers’, passim).

62 Drapers’ Company Court of Assistants Minutes. September 1603 to July 1640. MB 13.

63 ‘The publication of playbooks’, p. 405.

64 ‘Nicholas Okes Stacioner’ was paid £4 direct by the Grocers in 1613 (GH MS 11,590, fol. 6); in 1617 they again paid Okes £4 for printing 500 books (GH MS 11,588/3).

65 Jaggard printed mayoral Shows both before and after he became the Printer to the City of London in 1610.

66 Hardin asserts that the texts were printed ‘for officials of the City and the livery companies’ (‘Conceiving cities’, p. 24); Hentschell, in contrast, assumes that all the texts were sold to the general public (see The Culture of Cloth, p. 177).

67 Gosson (who may have been the nephew of the anti-theatrical polemicist and ex-actor Stephen Gosson) is described by Watt as ‘the largest single producer of ballads’ in this period, publishing ‘over eighty separate ballad titles’ (Cheap Print, pp. 275 and 291). Gosson was responsible for entering Taylor’s 1634 Show in the Stationers’ Register, having had a long association with the writer.

68 For William Wright, see Watt, Cheap Print, p. 277.

69 Drapers’ Bachelors Accounts, fol. 36.

70 One of the editions of Dekker’s Magnificent entertainment, for instance, was printed by Edward Allde for Thomas Man the younger; an account of James’s progress from Scotland to England, published the previous year, was printed by Thomas Creede for Thomas Millington; Munday’s Londons loue was printed by Allde for Nathaniell Fosbrooke; Middleton’s Ciuitatis amor was printed by Okes for Thomas Archer; and the majority of the accounts of Christian IV’s 1606 visit to England had both a printer and publisher.

71 Hentschell is therefore mistaken to claim that the Shows were ‘often’ entered into the Stationers’ Register (The Culture of Cloth, p. 164).

72 The text of the Norwich entry, and Thomas Churchyard’s accounts of the Queen’s entertainments in Norfolk and Suffolk, were licensed to Henry Bynneman; Jonson’s version of the 1604 royal entry was entered to Edward Blount on 19 March of that year (only four days later), and Dekker’s to Thomas Man on 2 April: clearly some controversy resulted (see Greg, Bibliography, vol. I, pp. 19 and 316–18).
Pageantry and power

Allde entered ‘a booke called the Kinge of Denmarke's welcome into England’ on 8 August 1606 (the actual event took place on 18 July); an anonymous text celebrating the Palsgrave marriage on 14 February 1613, *The marriage of the two great princes*, was entered on 18 February of that year (ibid., p. 22).


74 Arber, *Transcript*, vol. II, p. 235. The Stationers’ Register ascribes the 1588 Show to ‘George Peele the Authour’. The Skinners’ Company archives show that Peele won the commission for the 1595 Show too, but again in the absence of any printed text we know little about it; the text may have been printed but has not survived.

75 Blayney, ‘The publication of playbooks’, p. 398. ‘Authority’, he asserts, ‘was officially compulsory, but in practice the [Stationers’] Company officers could decide when it was or was not required’ (p. 404).

76 Arber, *Transcript*, vol. III, p. 115. Felix Kingston printed hundreds of (chiefly religious) works between c.1578 and c.1652; in particular, he printed a number of texts for Thomas Man (the publisher of Dekker’s 1604 *Magnificent entertainment*) in the 1600–5 period, and he also printed another text produced to commemorate the new king’s arrival into London, Michael Drayton’s *A paeon triumphall* (1604).


81 Greg, *Bibliography*, vol. I, p. 28. Unfortunately the Grocers’ records do not say how many copies were printed.


83 Watt cites an instance where a printer got into trouble for trying to sell a text relating to a royal progress for 2d (*Cheap Print*, p. 263). Taylor claims that these works were ‘either given away or sold at a heavily discounted price’, although he does not, unfortunately, provide any evidence for the latter assertion (*Buying Whiteness*, pp. 125 and 410 n. 11).

84 Fitzgeffrey’s text was entered in the Stationers’ Register on 9 October 1617 (Arber, *Transcript*, vol. III, p. 284).

85 This work was printed for R. Barnham in Little Britain, and also features quite lavish engravings (which the title page calls ‘Sculptures’) of the individual pageants. That this work was produced for the open market is also underscored by the advertisement it bears on its last page for another text.

86 ‘The publication of playbooks’, p. 421 n. 61. A handwritten note on one of Munday’s translations, *The true knowledge of a mans owne
selfe, records that its (possibly original) purchaser paid 7d for the book and bought it in London (this copy is in the Folger Shakespeare Library).

87 Middleton: The Collected Works, p. 1257. An alternative explanation, that the printed works were often based in large part on the ‘plot’ presented to the Companies, is further explored elsewhere in this book.

88 Barriffe appears to have specialised in texts about military exercises. See Collections III, p. 182, for a record from the Merchant Taylors relating to this entertainment; see also Ravelhofer, The Early Stuart Masque, for a discussion of Barriffe’s text.


90 See GH MS 16,967/4. The same form of words was used for Munday’s 1609 Show, where again he was required to give the Company 500 copies of the books. Of those 500, only one – incomplete – copy survives.

91 See GH MS 34,048/10. The Company bought 15 lb of these counters, which must have been a considerable number.

92 Robertson and Gordon, Collections III, p. xxxii. Pafford, who edited this Show in 1962, states (unfortunately without giving any concrete evidence) that copies ‘were received by members of the Goldsmiths’ Company in 1611’, to whom the texts were given as free ‘souvenirs’ (Chruso-Thriambos, pp. 7 and 9).

93 A book of speeches was printed to accompany Elizabeth’s civic entertainment at Bristol in 1574, and a copy was apparently given to the Queen to help her follow the proceedings (see McGee, ‘Mysteries, musters and masque’, p. 120 n. 61). Anne Boleyn may also have received a manuscript presentation copy of her 1533 entry into London (see Osberg, ‘Humanist allusions’, p. 31).

94 Cressy, Bonfires and Bells, p. 163. The text is a one-page broadsheet, ascribed to George Browne, gunner.

95 The Early Stuart Masque, p. 84.

96 The images were reproduced, with hand-colouring, by Henry Shaw and published in 1844; it is these versions I have used here although one has to treat them with some caution as the images have been slightly altered to make them fit the Victorian notion of ‘Tudorness’. I am grateful to Stephen Freeth and John Fisher of the Guildhall Library for their advice on these illustrations.

97 Munday ed. Nichols, Chrysanaleia, p. 16.

98 See also Munday, Chrysanaleia, sig. B3r.


100 Hentschell, The Culture of Cloth, pp. 164–5.

101 Bergeron, Textual Patronage, p. 50.

102 McGowan asserts similarly of continental triumphs that ‘the texts which were published to commemorate the celebrations usually
recorded the details of all the edifices in full, and described projected structures as if they had been erected’ (‘The Renaissance triumph’, p. 28).

103 Gasper, *The Dragon and the Dove*, p. 41. Bergeron comments ‘maddeningly, Dekker does not tell us which speeches the performance omitted or cut’ (*Textual Patronage*, p. 56).


108 For the 1612 Show, see Sayle, *Lord Mayors’ Pageants*, p. 98. Thomas Churchyard’s printed account of Elizabeth’s entertainment at Norwich, in contrast, deals unashamedly with the consequences of inclement weather.

109 See GH MS 30,048/9.

110 *Literature and Culture*, p. 276.

111 Palmer points out that it would have taken a while for all the boat-loads of people to disembark (‘Music in the barges’, p. 172).


113 Middleton: *The Collected Works*, p. 1252. This is a useful discussion, although it takes a somewhat text-centric approach: she does not consider that, if it functioned as a programme, the text may be guiding the attention of a viewer as well as, or even rather than, a reader.

114 Middleton interrupts *The triumphs of truth* in a similar fashion: Bergeron comments that this moment ‘suggests Middleton’s having a conversation with himself’ (*Middleton: The Collected Works*, p. 964).


116 Hardin’s sensible suggestion in this regard – ‘it seems reasonable to conjecture that [original plots] contained much of the same material found in the printed accounts’ – has not been pursued by any other commentators (‘Spectacular Constructions’, p. 17).

117 Dekker, *The magnificent entertainment*, sig. I4r. Indeed, the very first substantive page of this work commences with ‘a device (projected downe) . . . that should haue serued at his Majesties first accesse to the Citie’ (sig. A2r).

118 Commemorative texts were sometimes printed or reprinted as parts of larger composite works: as well as *The triumphs of truth*, issued with *The Manner of his Lordships Entertainment*, Jonson’s *A particular Entertainment of the Queene and Prince their Highnesse to Althrope*, was issued with *B. Ion: his part*.

119 Middleton and Rowley dedicated their 1620 masque *The world lost at tennis* to Lord Howard, his wife and her father, William Cockayne.

120 GH MS 16,967/4.

121 Robertson and Gordon *Collections* III, p. 86.
The Show from street to print

122 See GH MS 34,048/10 and Troia-Noua triumphans, sigs B4r and C1v. In 1624 the Company reverted to the usual form by merely referring to ‘all the land and water shewes Pageants, [and] Chariott’ (GH MS 34,048/13).

123 GH MS 34,048/10 and Dekker, Troia-Noua triumphans, sig. B2r.

124 Fairholt comments, with some justice, that many of the speeches Heywood produced for the Shows ‘are rather turgid and bombastic, and . . . remarkably full of pedantic allusions’ (Lord Mayors’ Pageants, vol. II, p. 58).

125 Middleton also reuses here, again with little emendation, his account of previous Grocer mayors which had previously been printed in The triumphs of honor and industry. The title pages of his Shows from 1619 onwards are almost identical, bar (naturally) the name of the Lord Mayor and livery company.

126 ‘Thomas Middleton’s The Triumphs of Truth’, p. 4.

127 See Jonson, B. Ion: his part, sigs B3r and D1v–D2r, for example. Jonson’s text must have presented Valentine Simmes and George Eld, its printers, with considerable challenges. As Dutton comments, ‘Dekker’s account is altogether more relaxed’ (Jacobean Civic Pageants, p. 21). Dekker praised Middleton’s contribution without equivocation.


129 Dekker’s 1612 Show is the earliest extant printed Show to have a dedication: Bergeron regards 1613 as ‘a fault line’ in the history of dedicatory prefaces (Textual Patronage, p. 51).

130 Ibid.

131 In contrast, as well as being dedicated to the Lord Mayor, Harrison’s Arch’s of triumph does have an address to the reader, at the very end of the text. Tatham’s text of the 1660 Show is less equivocal about its status than its predecessors, as it has a preface to the reader.

132 Given his usual practice in the dedications of his other prose works, which are often very effusive, as Bergeron comments, Munday shows an unusual ‘reticence’ here (Textual Patronage, p. 67).

133 Ibid., p. 19.

134 Heywood has been singled out by Cyndia Clegg as a notable writer of prefaces to the reader: this may be the case for his plays, but not for his Shows, which only bear prefatory addresses to civic dignitaries rather than to readers as such (‘Renaissance play-readers’, p. 27).

135 This may be an authorial device, as the text was entered in the Stationers’ Register a week before the Show.

136 Textual Patronage, p. 49.

137 Ibid., p. 51.

138 See also Hill, Anthony Munday, pp. 23–4.

139 1590 is the date cited by Lesser for the establishment of roman type, and he notes that black letter often signalled ‘past-ness’ in early
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printed books (‘Topographic nostalgia’, pp. 101 and 107). The use of black letter in playbooks after 1609 was extremely low at less than 7 per cent (ibid., p. 114), which points up the exceptionality of Sidero-Thriambos in this regard.

142 Ibid., p. 109 n. 45. The list of Shows in this article is incomplete, however (a third of them are missing), and so their figure of 91 per cent for authorial attribution – and indeed their other statistics about the Shows – should be treated with caution.
143 Ibid., p. 99.
144 Ibid. Heywood’s use of Latin is ascribed by Farmer and Lesser to his attempts in the 1630s ‘to put together a collection of his dramatic works’, Latin being part of a strategy ‘to develop literary authority’ (p. 101).
145 Such mottoes were traditionally used in royal and continental triumphs too. Interestingly, Munday, who had two authorial tags for many of his other works, did not use Latin on his Shows (see my Anthony Munday, pp. 49 and 52).
146 Robertson and Gordon, Collections III, p. xxxiii n. 3. See Kipling, ‘The King’s advent transformed’, p. 111, for an example of such a complex engraved printed illustration, in this case from a royal entry that took place in Antwerp in 1582. In some cases, he adds, texts of royal entries circulated in ‘de luxe, hand-coloured versions’ (ibid., p. 122 n. 9).
147 ‘The ages of man’, p. 87.
148 Reproduced in Greg, Bibliography, vol. I, plate XXXI. Harrison’s text is also in folio, unlike the usual quarto format of mayoral Shows.
149 ‘The publication of playbooks’, p. 406. Settle’s 1698 Show, Glory’s Resurrection, has four lavish plates to accompany the text. To demonstrate the continental mode, a Venetian text printed in 1591, Funerale antichi di diversi Popoli et Nationi, has twenty-three plates and a frontispiece (see Society of Antiquaries, A Catalogue, p. 6).
150 This text Goldring calls ‘unprecedented . . . [as] nothing like it had been published in England’ (‘The funeral of Sir Philip Sidney’, p. 210).
152 ‘Early modern European festivals’, p. 22.
153 Ibid.
154 Anthony Wood had a collection of programmes for Encaenia and determination ceremonies at Oxford University, where he often wrote his impressions of the music and speeches that took place at these events (see Kiessling, The Library of Anthony Wood, p. xxx).
155 The sole surviving copy of Munday’s Chruso-thriambos (STC 18265-5) is part of the Puckering bequest in Trinity College, Cambridge. It is just possible that this copy’s provenance can be traced back through
the Puckering family to its date of publication. There is a strong likelihood that members of the royal family attended the Lord Mayor’s Show in 1611, and, given the connection between the royal household and Thomas Puckering, it seems to me at least possible that this copy was actually given to a member of the royal party (perhaps Puckering himself) on the day of the Show. Unfortunately, despite the expert assistance of David McKitterick, I have not been able to authenticate this possibility.

156 I am grateful to Maureen Bell for her elucidation of this point.

157 Hardin, ‘Spectacular Constructions’, p. 17.

158 Christiana, a daughter of Richard Gresham (Lord Mayor in 1537) and sister of Thomas Gresham (the founder of the Royal Exchange) married Sir John Thynne in the sixteenth century (see Blanchard, Oxford DNB, ‘Gresham, Sir Richard’).

159 There are also some marginalia inside the Bodleian’s unique copy of Peele’s 1585 Show; unfortunately, most of them have been covered over by the binding with the result that they are barely legible.

160 The ESTC omits this copy. I am grateful to Penny Fussell for her advice on this work.

161 The first post-Civil War printed mayoral Show, Londons triumph (usually ascribed to John Bulteel) bears the coat of arms of the City Corporation on its title page, rather than the arms of the relevant livery company.