Early Theatre
23.2 (2020), 169–82
https://doi.org/10.12745/et.23.2.4387

Emily Mayne

Shows of Joy and Malice: Performance, the Star Chamber, and the Celebration of James I's Coronation in Norwich in 1603

The spread of the plague in Norwich in July 1603 disrupted the city's celebrations of the coronation of King James I, and precipitated a conflict between the city's mayor, Thomas Lane, and the alderman Robert Gibson, which culminated in Gibson taking Lane to the Star Chamber. Drawing on previously unexamined legal and civic documents, this essay reconstructs both Norwich's planned and actual coronation festivities and their role in the dispute in July, including its longer legal aftermath in court. The essay examines the meanings and functions participants attributed to the celebrations in Norwich, and to what extent they can be understood as performances, and, if so, of what.

In November 1604 two prominent aldermen of Norwich, Thomas Lane and Leonard Mapes, received an unwelcome dispatch: copies of a Bill of Complaint submitted that day to the court of Star Chamber by Robert Gibson, another wealthy former citizen and alderman of Norwich.[1] In this bill, Lane, mayor of Norwich in 1603–4, and Mapes, the Norwich corporation's town clerk, would have found themselves charged with an extraordinary array of offences. Lane was accused of infringement of the charter and letters patent of the city during his mayoralty; prohibition of coronation festivities for the new king James I in the city; pursuit of a vendetta against Gibson, including false imprisonment and deprivation of his aldermanic seat and freedom of the city; nonconformity in religion; and, in concert with his wife Mary, the extortion of fines and fees around the regulation of beer-brewing and selling in the city — and more. Mapes was accused of providing malicious legal advice, falsifying city records, and inciting Lane to commit the various acts alleged above.[2] Lane and Mapes both provided answers to Gibson's bill rejecting all the allegations, and a panel of local gentry and officials in Norwich examined them on behalf of the court on 11 January

Emily Mayne (emily.mayne@merton.ox.ac.uk) is a stipendiary lecturer in English literature at Merton College, Oxford.

1605, during which they again denied all of Gibson's allegations. Apparently undeterred, Gibson submitted a replication to the answers of Lane and Mapes to the court on 9 May 1605, in which he in turn rejected their arguments, and their conduct, as 'cautelous' (i.e. deceitful) and requested that the court call witnesses to substantiate his version of events.[3] After this point the documentary trail runs cold: to date I have found no further records of the proceedings in the case, or of its outcome.[4] Only a passing remark by the eighteenth-century Norfolk antiquarian Francis Blomefield — that Gibson was later 'on Submission' restored to his freedom of the city — and Gibson's subsequent death in May 1606, indicate that the saga came to some kind of artificial or natural end within a year of Gibson's final replication.[5]

The alleged events that Gibson's bill describes, and the range and seriousness of its accusations, suggest that the case manifests larger political and confessional tensions among members of Norwich's civic elite, issues beyond the scope of this particular essay.[6] But the case is also a unique resource for exploring festivity and performance in early seventeenth-century Norwich, for its accounts of the city's coronation celebrations are almost entirely unknown from other sources. As such, the case broadens our knowledge of the range of forms that festive culture and civic celebration took in the early seventeenth century, and the ways in which — and why — celebrations could go wrong. This essay first reconstructs the 1603 coronation festivities in Norwich, and the disruptions caused to them by the presence of plague in the city, dissention among its aldermen, and perhaps by the coincidence of the coronation day with local celebrations of the feast of St James the Great on 25 July. Norwich's coronation celebrations took diverse forms, including processions, sermon-attending, bonfires, music, feasting, marching, and public displays of 'loyall & cordiall loue & zeale' and thankfulness.[7] None of these practices is in itself unique, for all appear during other moments of local or national celebration in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the city, though not necessarily all at the same time. This essay uses the broad terms 'celebration' or 'festivity' to reflect the range and variety of activities that the coronation events in Norwich featured, although they also share many of the characteristics of early modern festivals: grounded in the celebration of a particular event or date, diverse in form, and offering opportunities for popular participation.[8]

What about 'performance' in this context, and in these activities? The Norwich coronation festivities described in Gibson vs Lane can certainly be read as a series of sociopolitical performances: of (for instance) loyalty, civic identity, and proper behaviour, as social historians have understood Corpus Christi processions, mayoral inaugurations, and other occasions of public ceremony and celebration.[9]

Gibson's bill is in fact keen to impress upon its readers that all Gibson is guilty of is attempting to express through his actions and words his joy and fidelity to his new monarch. But, as the bill — and no doubt Gibson himself — knew very well, in neither coronation celebrations nor any other kind of festivity is comprehension, or 'correct' interpretation, guaranteed. As David Cressy points out, '[t]he vocabulary of celebration was certainly expressive but, like other forms of communication, it was susceptible to prompts and crossed meanings'.[10] Because it describes a series of often contradictory events alongside its two participants' very different interpretations of their meanings, functions, and significance, Gibson vs Lane is particularly significant for the broader study of early modern festivity and performance. We have comparatively few surviving instances of multiple and distinct interpretations of such shows, and the case as such sheds light not only on the content and structure of the celebrations themselves, but also on what their actors and agents thought they — and others — were doing. Gibson's bill of complaint in particular ably manipulates the various potential significations always extrapolatable from the public actions of others in the service of its accusations against Lane, and combines legal discourse with the festive vocabulary of 'shows' in order to expose Lane's alleged duplicity and malign intentions. In fact, if like Meg Twycross we understand performance as 'sustaining a particular kind of behaviour in public for effect', then Gibson's decision to bring the case to the Star Chamber and to subject Lane and Mapes to public examination in Norwich looks suspiciously like a continuation of his defiant behaviour on and after coronation day.[11] The case is thus both a document of the coronation festivities and conflicts in Norwich, and part of their continuing performance in the world.

What Happened in Norwich in July 1603?

Without Gibson vs Lane the celebration of James's English coronation in Norwich on 25 July appears both smaller in scale and more under the control of the city authorities than it in fact was. Eighteenth-century histories of Norwich suggest that nothing much happened on this particular coronation day in the city. In an unnerving echo of UK government advice in Spring 2020, Francis Blomefield notes that the plague then endemic in London prompted the Crown to order 'that there should be as little Concourse of People as possible on such Occasions, least they should spread the *Infection*, which same wise Course was taken by the Magistrates' in Norwich.[12] In fact the city authorities did pay for the shooting of guns, as well as music and fireworks on 25 July: actions and activities typical of the celebration of coronations and other joyful national events across

early modern England.[13] Norwich's civic accounts show that the coronations of Tudor monarchs were marked by the firing of the city guns, music by the city's liveried musicians, and bonfires, sometimes accompanied by beer and wine. City records tend to describe such events as 'triumphs', which suggests that the activities had a processional element; or, at least, their joyful, public and magnificent nature.[14] Norwich celebrated the coronation of Edward VI on 20 February 1547 with guns, music, and bonfires; the coronation of Mary I on 1 October 1553 was marked with a 'tryvmpe', bonfires at several locations in the city, music, and beer, wine, and bread for the city's poor; and on Elizabeth I's coronation on 15 January 1559 the six 'greate gunes' of the city were shot, and there were bonfires again.[15]

Our Star Chamber case adds considerably, and not very harmoniously, to this picture of public festivity supported by the civic purse. It allows us to also glimpse festivities in Norwich that do not seem to have been funded by the Norwich corporation or directed by its principal representatives: we might term these 'unofficial' festivities, alongside the 'official' celebrations organized by the corporation.[16] The depositions of Gibson and Lane show that coronation celebrations began on Monday 25 July — the day of the coronation itself — and continued until at least Friday 29 July in a range of forms across Norwich.[17] Lane's answer to Gibson's bill begins perhaps unsurprisingly with the city's 'official' coronation festivities, partly familiar to us from the Norwich Chamberlains' accounts. These celebrations began with the mayor, most of the aldermen, and the 'best sort of the citizens' assembling on the coronation day 'at a publike place' in the city,

> being on y*a*t day in their robes of scarlett w*i*th ye shiriff*es* & many of ye said citizens in their best manner went from thence to ye cathedrall church in ye said city there to offer their prayers praise & thankesgiuing to almighty god for his ma*ies*tie … & at ye said Cathedrall church hard diuine seruice & ye sermon there made & coming from thence ye great ordinance of ye City & diu*er*s other shott being shott of by this def*endantes* appointment & all the ensignes & Colours of ye city being shewed & displayed w*i*th musick & other tokens and shewes of ioyfulnes & triumph in ye best maner y*a*t they could deuise & againe in ye afternoone this def*endan*t & many ald*er*men in their said robes & citizens did resort to a publike sermon in an other part of ye City[18]

As mayor, Lane emphasizes both his individual and corporate role in organizing these events, and claims that the entire spectacle was devised 'acording to his best vnderstanding & as in his duty to the king*es* ma*ies*tie he ought to doe', in agreement 'w*i*th other of his brethren Ald*er*men'.[19] As we might expect, these

processions and 'shewes of ioyfulnes & triumph' had an audience, for Lane notes that care was taken '*ya*t resort of people from p*artes* of ye city then visited w*i*th ye plague might be restreined', suggesting by implication that inhabitants from other, non-infected areas of the city were able to congregate and attend the celebrations.[20]

But guns, music, and fireworks, and the procession of Norwich's premier citizens to sermons, were not the only ways in which James's coronation was commemorated in the city. Lane takes care to say that no citizen *not* 'suspected for the sicknes' was 'restrained from making any triumph or from any shew of ioyfulnes & gladnes w*hi*ch themselues did or Could deuise or p*er*forme'. As a result,

> ye people continued all that day & *ya*t day being ended ye people ye next day being Tuesday of themselues continued in diu*er*se p*artes* of the City shewes of ioy & gladnes assembling themselues together making bonfires & feasting in ye street*es* hanging out their best thing*es* w*i*th diu*er*s other shewes of ioyfulnes & thankfulnes as they thought good & likewise continued on ye wednesday & so on ye Thursday then following or ye most p*ar*t of th*at* ~~day~~ daye ⌜& p*ar*t of the night*es* of the same dayes⌝[21]

Lane's insistence that all non-quarantined citizens were free to devise, perform, and/or attend coronation-related celebratory events and activities comes in response to Gibson's claim that the Norwich corporation, and Lane in particular, 'maliciouslye perposedly & vndutifully' opposed and interrupted citizens' festival activities both on coronation day itself and over the following week.[22]

Gibson's bill makes no mention of the procession of the city's 'best sort' which features so centrally in Lane's description of his efforts to commemorate the coronation, although as an alderman Gibson himself would presumably have been expected or invited to participate. Instead, Gibson's bill claims that celebrations began in the parish of St James with Pockthorpe, in Norwich's great ward of 'Over the Water'. There the inhabitants

> did … beginne the solemnization of yo*u*r highnes Coronac*i*on w*i*th ioye feastinge shewes & triumphe and the yonge lustie youthes of the s*ai*d cittie gatheringe themselves to gither into one companie & addressinge & furnishinge themselves w*i*th ~~flade~~ flagges ensignes muskett*es* & culevers <…> pikes and other artilery of shewe & triumphe and p*er*forminge a service of Ioye and braverie in the s*ai*d cittye to theire abillitie befittinge ye occasion accordinge to theire abilltie and apprehention & for the closinge vpp thereof the same day did march in orderly & semely arraye to the

> dwellinge of ye s*ai*d Thomas Lane yo*u*r Ma*ies*tie Lieuetenant <…> did dischardge some volues of shott & did make some other shewes & triumphes vnto him before his dwellinge as vnto yo*u*r highnes Lievetenant in honor of his place & office[23]

Given the military nature of these 'shewes & triumphes', we might forgive Lane for having misgivings about the intentions of the participants when they turned up in front of his house, but Gibson's bill claims that Lane was far more than displeased:

> for the service and trivumphes of the s*ai*d youthes he sayd w*i*th dispight & disdayne hee liked not theare fooleries & toyes nor did take noe pleasue to heare or see them & s*ai*d they might dep*ar*te & begonne & did not soe much as com<….> for them out of his howse or cause to bee given them or any of them so much as a Cuppe or bowle of wine or beare to refreshe theire heate & labours[24]

In response to this alleged slight, the bill relates that some of the youths tied a rope between the doorposts of Lane's house, and attached a halter to the rope, as, the bill claims, 'an ensigne of his defect', or, more threateningly, in a second copy of the bill, 'an ensigne of his deserte': a gesture of extreme disrespect about which Gibson's bill has tellingly little to say.[25] Although Lane does not mention this incident in his initial answer to Gibson's bill, at least some parts of the confrontation do seem to have taken place. In his subsequent examination for the suit in January 1605 Lane disputed the bill's account of his response to the procession, claiming that he had in fact provided 'beere ~~enoughe~~ at large to the yonge people & others that did make shew of tryvmphe that daye', and 'many of them did supp that night at his howse, & that daye he did not vse any such reproving speeche'.[26]

Whatever their exact nature, the shows and triumphs at Lane's door did not mark the conclusion of coronation-related festivities. For the next three days (26–28 July), Gibson's bill claims, people in other areas of Norwich continued to celebrate the coronation, and Lane made further efforts to suppress and subvert the festivities. On the fourth day (29 July) Gibson himself joined in with the celebratory activities described above by Lane, taking to the streets in west Norwich — probably in the parish of St Lawrence — and

> did … hange & adorne the stret*es* w*i*th clothes of tapestry and pictures, sh<..>inge fourth his inwarde hartie ioye w*i*th such outward signes and tokens as hee could But the s*ai*d Thomas Lane beinge taynted & deeply corrupted w*i*th priuat inueterat malice longe before agaynst yo*u*r s*ai*d subject … as also for dislike of the said

> solemnization did, maliciouslie, dispitefully, ~~& wrongfully~~ and wrongfully in his owne p*er*son, & <…> his owne hands rente & teare downe the said tapestrie hangings and pictures of yo*u*r said subiect & threw them in the grounde[27]

Gibson, unsurprisingly 'grieued there with', 'affirm[ed] that he was your Ma*iest*ie ^⌜subiect⌝, & therefore was bounde to make all shewe of his ioyes'.[28] To this Lane allegedly retorted that Gibson was not a subject but a 'sub Iacke' — 'vnfitt wordes to bee vsed to an alderman of yo*u*r s*ai*d cittie', and 'comaund[ed] yo*u*r subiect*es* to take downe theire solemnities deriding scorninge & openly findinge faulte the<…>th'.[29]

To these allegations Lane answered that while he had indeed visited the parish of St James on Friday 29 July, he had acted only 'w*i*th gentlenes to entreat & p*er*swade ye people to desist & giue ouer those shews & occasions of those concourses & meeting*es*'.[30] He did so, he claimed, in response to the recent rapid increase in plague in Norwich, for, like many modern governments, the authorities understood that 'ye continuance of those meeting*es* & concourses of ye people in ye said city might be a meanes to encrease or spredd y*a*t contagious sicknes of ye plague'.[31] In Lane's account only Gibson himself would not comply. In a flagrant seventeenth-century breach of social distancing guidelines, Gibson had not only decorated his own house with 'hanging*es* Cou*er*ing*es* & pictures', and 'also a tenant*es* house of his out of w*hi*ch had dyed not long before one of ye plague & another out of his owne house of ye same sicknes', but he refused 'very spightfully & scornfully' to comply with Lane's requests.[32] Lane admits that he, 'taking it very ill y*a*t ye compl*ainan*t so litle regarded his place', did pull down one of Gibson's hangings, prompting Gibson to utter 'word*es* & speeches of disdaine & reproch', and to try to incite a riot.[33] Subsequent hostile incidents between Lane and Gibson occurred after the conclusion of the coronation celebrations, including Gibson's interruption of a mayoral procession on 30 July, and his circulation of libels and rumours about Lane and his family, culminating on 9 August with the Norwich corporation's ejection of Gibson from his aldermanic seat and the freedom of the city.[34]

Making Sense of the Case

The cascade of events and counter-events alleged and described in Gibson vs Lane allows us to build a fuller picture of the range and extent of the ways in which James I's coronation was celebrated in Norwich, and of what the celebrants thought they were doing. It also helps us identify the implications that these activities, actions,

and beliefs have for early modern performance and festivity more broadly. We already knew that the mayor of Norwich and his brethren organized and oversaw the celebration of the king's coronation in a manner consistent with the celebration of the coronations of previous monarchs, as the payments from the city's own coffers for guns, faggots for bonfires, beverages, the services of the city's musicians, and so on indicate. Gibson vs Lane, however, shows that 'unofficial' festivities also took place in the city. The relationship of these events to the festival activities recorded in Norwich's civic accounts is not clear: were, for instance, the 'shewes & triumphes' of the youths outside Lane's house akin to the 'Tryumphs' with guns, banners, and processions used to mark events of national significance in the city's civic accounts, or were they imitations — or parodies — of them?[35] Were there routinely 'unofficial' festivities in the city when significant occasions were celebrated, that usually leave no trace in the Norwich corporation's records? In this particular case the celebrations came into collision with both the 1603 plague and dissension within the aldermanic community itself — which is why we know about them at all.

That people both participated in and created festivity in early modern Norwich is not especially surprising: bonfires, feasting, decorating the outside of one's house, and so on all formed part of what David Cressy has called early modern England's 'vocabulary of celebration'.[36] The inhabitants of Norwich might indeed have had special cause for celebrating the accession of a king with three living children in 1603. Gibson's bill of complaint even intimates that the prospect of a male monarch was particularly exciting after 'so many yeares regiment by two Quenes Imperiall although they were of famous memorie'.[37] The bill's claim that the festivities began in the parish of St James suggests that the coronation celebrations were particularly intensive because they coincided with the feast day of St James the Great. St James's Day — a major fair day in England — may also have been a focus for festive activity in Norwich: it certainly was in the 1540s, when civic accounts regularly record payments for the shooting of guns, construction of booths and viewing areas for wrestling, processions of the city's aldermen, music by the city waits, and banners.[38] One of the broader festive implications here is the possibility that there was more continuity in Norwich's 'unofficial' festive traditions from the mid-Tudor period to the end of the century than we might otherwise assume.

Yet we ought not to read Gibson vs Lane's account of Norwich's coronation celebrations uncritically. In its desire to demonstrate Lane's 'lewde wicked & malicious disposicion' Gibson's suit has a strong interest in presenting the 'unofficial' celebrations as a spontaneous outpouring of the citizens' love and joy for their

new monarch: thus the youths, the bill tells us, 'gather[ed] *themselves* to gither'.[39] It is also possible, of course, that the 'unofficial' celebrations were sanctioned or possibly even directed by members of the aldermanic community such as Gibson who were dissatisfied with Lane's magistracy, and saw an opportunity to make trouble for the mayor: Lane after all claims at another point in the saga that Gibson was able to easily incite a riot in St James's parish after their encounter.[40]

The designs that Gibson's bill has on its legal hearers bring us back to the question of performance, for, like any legal argument worth its salt, it is preoccupied by its need to provide, in its words, 'probable testimonies' of Lane's guilt.[41] The bill's depiction of the festivities in Norwich, and Lane's alleged responses to them, are crucial to its portrayal of Lane's delinquency: to use its terms, 'shewes' lead to 'shewes' of Lane's malign intentions and inner corruption. Lane's alleged 'continuall mvrmvringe' against the coronation festivities, and attempts to shut them down are, according to the bill, the 'testimonies' that make up 'the shewe as may bee thought of a wicked & rebellious hart'; Gibson's decision to decorate his house and street are a 'shewinge forth' of 'his inwarde hartye ioye with such outwarde signes & tokens as hee could'; the citizens of Norwich, meanwhile, are described as keen to put on triumphs as 'ensignes & shewes' of their 'loyall & cordiall loue & zeale' towards their new king.[42] In Gibson's bill, the proliferation of 'shows', as both noun and verb, stages a kind of anagnorisis or recognition for all the participants in these events, in which their celebratory (or not) actions are correspondent to their inner beliefs and intentions as regards the new king and his regime.[43]

The bill's argumentative choices here are not novel: the language of display or revelation — or, to use the bill's own favoured word, 'discovery' — was an important part of legal narrative, as Laura Gowing demonstrated in relation to church court cases some time ago.[44] More notably, however, the bill presents the Norwich 'shows' as the means of the revelation of Lane's inner, malevolent character. The coronation celebrations in Norwich may be forms of drama, and/or opportunities for the performance of civic and social values, but Gibson's bill concerns itself with the way in which the festivities reveal something not about their nature or function, but about Lane's guilt. Considerable scholarship treats the ways in which early modern legal theory and practice shaped early modern drama on the commercial stage; Gibson vs Lane may show an instance of the process working the other way around: a legal argument which plays on the ambiguity between the terminology of legal discourse and performance.[45] Moreover, prosecution of the suit allowed Gibson to publicly interact with his enemies by subjecting them to examination in Norwich before a panel of Norfolk officials and gentry. By offering Gibson the opportunity to undertake a legal 're-staging' of

the conflict, the case finally reveals itself to also be a type of performance: another public intervention in the struggle for the meaning of the events of July 1603.

Notes

In this essay I draw on research conducted for the revised Records of Early English Drama (REED) collection for Norwich (1540–1642). I would like to acknowledge the central contribution to the project made by my co-editor Professor Matthew Woodcock. I am also grateful to the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council for funding this project, and to the staff of the National Archives for their assistance with Star Chamber (STAC) records.

1 Dates in this essay are given in New Style.

2 Bill of Complaint of Robert Gibson, London, National Archives (NA) STAC 8/153/27, mbs 3r, 9r (two copies of the bill are included in the bundle). Subsequent quotations from the bill are to mb 3r, collated to mb 9r.

3 Replication of Robert Gibson, NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 2r.

4 The lack of verdict in the case is not unusual: most STAC cases lack judgements, due to the loss of the court's order and decree books: see J.A. Guy, *The Court of Star Chamber to the Reign of Elizabeth I* (London, 1985), 19–35.

5 Francis Blomefield, *The History of the City and County of Norwich* (Norwich, 1745), 253. Gibson was buried in St Lawrence's Church, Norwich on 13 May 1606: Norfolk Record Office (NRO) PD 58/1, f [36]v.

6 The case is the ongoing subject of a longer study by the present author.

7 NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 3r.

8 See Tracey Hill, 'Festivals', in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Popular Culture in Early Modern England*, ed. Andrew Hadfield, Matthew Dimmock, and Abigail Shinn (Farnham, 2014), 43–57, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315613420; J.R. Mulryne, 'Introduction', in *Court Festivals of the European Renaissance*, ed. Mulryne and Elizabeth Goldring (Aldershot, 2002), 1–14, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315259086-1.

9 On Corpus Christi, see for example Mervyn James, 'Ritual, Drama and the Social Body in the Late Medieval English Town', *Past & Present* 98.1 (1983), 3–29, https://doi.org/10.1093/past/98.1.3; Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late-Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1991), 213–87. On post-Reformation adaptations of celebrations for the performance of civic identity and unity in Norwich, see Muriel McClendon, *The Quiet Reformation: Magistrates and the Emergence of Protestantism in Tudor Norwich* (Stanford, 1999), 94–110.

10 David Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells: National Memory and the Protestant Calendar in Elizabethan and Stuart England* (Sutton, 2004), 68.
11 Meg Twycross, 'Some Approaches to Dramatic Festivity, especially Processions', in *Festive Drama*, ed. Meg Twycross (Cambridge, 1996), 7.
12 Blomefield, *Norwich*, 253. See also Philip Browne, *The History of Norwich* (Norwich, 1814), np.
13 Norwich Chamberlains' Accounts, 1602–25, NRO NCR 18a/12, f 16r. I'm grateful to my co-editor Matthew Woodcock for his exemplary work on the Chamberlains' records, and I draw on his transcriptions throughout this essay. On coronation celebrations in general, see Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells*, 67–92.
14 Compare the quotations in *Oxford English Dictionary Online* (*OED*), s.v. 'triumph, n.', esp. 3. and 4.
15 Norwich Chamberlains' Accounts, 1541–50, NRO NCR 18a/7, ff 249r-250r; Norwich Chamberlains' Accounts, 1551–67, NRO NCR 18a/8, ff 57r, 155r.
16 I have not phrased this difference as 'elite' versus 'popular' celebrations because in my view this is not an accurate lens through which to view these events. The central involvement of Gibson, a wealthy alderman, in 'unofficial' celebrations, suggests that the events of late July 1603 have more to do with disputes between powerful members of Norwich's civic elite than between those of different ranks in the city. For brief comments on 'authorised' and 'unauthorised' festivity, see Hill, 'Festivals', 6; on popular culture, see Peter Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe*, 3rd edn (Farnham, 2009), https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315246420.
17 Gibson claims that 25 July was a Tuesday: it was, in fact, as Lane points out, a Monday. Cf. NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 3r; Answer of Thomas Lane, NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 4r.
18 NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 4r. Transcriptions of the relevant sections of the entire STAC case will appear in the second edition of *REED: Norwich*, ed. Emily Mayne and Matthew Woodcock.
19 NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 4r.
20 Ibid.
21 Ibid.
22 NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 3r.
23 Ibid. The two illegible sections in the quotation are visible as 'with shotte', and '& ther' in NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 9r.
24 NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 3r. 'com<….>' is legible as 'com*m*aunde' in NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 9r.

25 NA STAC 8/153/27, mbs 9r, 3r. The variant readings may be due to the scribe misreading the word in his source copy ('defect' and 'desert' do resemble each other in secretary hand).
26 Examination of Thomas Lane, 11 January 1605, NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 7r.
27 NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 3r. In NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 9r 'sh<..>inge' is legible as 'shewinge', and the wholly illegible word as 'with'. Gibson's principal residence was in St Lawrence's: Will of Robert Gibson, 24 June 1606: NA PROB 11/107/527.
28 NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 9r. I have quoted this sentence from the second copy of the Bill due to illegibility in NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 3r.
29 NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 3r. NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 9r records the variant 'vnfittinge' for 'vnfitt', and 'the<…>th' is legible as 'therewith'. The insult 'sub-jack' seems to be based on a play on words between 'subject' and 'sub-jack', with a 'sub-jack' being (unlike a subject) insubordinate: see *OED*, s.v. 'sub-jack, n.'
30 NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 4r.
31 Ibid. As Lane notes, the Norwich authorities were also motivated by the Crown's July proclamations about the avoiding of crowds: see for example nos 19 (6 July), 21 (11 July), and 23 (29 July) in *Royal Proclamations of King James I, 1603–1625*, in *Stuart Royal Proclamations*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1973–), 2.37–8, 40–1, 44–5.
32 NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 4r.
33 Ibid.
34 See NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 4r; Norwich Assembly Book, 1585–1613, NRO NCR 16c/5, ff 258v–259v.
35 'Tryumphs' from David Galloway, ed., *REED: Norwich, 1540–1642* (Toronto, 1984), 84. The youths' triumph may have been a type of mock muster, which subverted the forms and practices of musters for the purposes of insult and/or protest. See James Stokes with Robert J. Alexander, eds., *Records of Early English Drama: Somerset*, 2 vols (Toronto, 1996), 2.477, 492, for a comparable example.
36 Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells*, 67 and passim. For similar practices, see for example the hanging of houses and railings with cloths along the route of Elizabeth's coronation: *The Passage of … Quene Elyzabeth through the citie of London* (London, 1559; STC: 7590), C2v–C3r; for bonfires and outdoor feasts, see Cressy, *Bonfires and Bells*, 80–7.
37 NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 9r. This sentence is partly illegible in NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 3r.
38 Using a 1661 catalogue, Cressy counts 56 towns holding fairs on St James's Day: *Bonfires and Bells*, 16. For Norwich festivities see Norwich Chamberlains' Accounts, 1541–49/50, NRO NCR 18a/7, f 72r; Norwich Chamberlains' Accounts, 1537–46, NRO NCR 18a/6, ff 65r, 88r, 114v, 115r; NRO NCR 18a/7, ff 37r, 72r–v. Wrestling

was also a St James's Day activity in early sixteenth-century Bristol: see James Pilkington, ed., *Records of Early English Drama: Bristol* (Toronto, 1997), 26–31, 33, 41, 46. There were bonfires on St James's Day in Long Melford, Suffolk, before the Reformations: see Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England, 1400–1580*, 2nd edn (New Haven, 2005), 60.

39 NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 3r (my emphasis).

40 Lane alleges that on 29 July he was followed by 'a great number of people … p*ro*cured as this def*endan*t verily suspecteth by the said compl*ainan*t [Gibson] to doe to this def*endan*t some violence': NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 4r.

41 NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 3r.

42 NA STAC 8/153/27, mb 9r ('shewinge forth … as hee could'); mb 3r (all other quotations). I have quoted from the second copy in the first instance due to illegibility.

43 Among the nine documents which constitute Gibson vs Lane, Gibson's bill of complaint is the only one which uses 'show' repeatedly as a verb as well as a noun.

44 Laura Gowing, *Domestic Dangers: Women, Words and Sex in Early Modern London* (Oxford, 1996), esp. 232–61, https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198207634.001.0001.

45 See for example Subha Mukherji, *Law and Representation in Early Modern Drama* (Cambridge, 2006), https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511483813; Lorna Hutson, *The Invention of Suspicion: Law and Mimesis in Shakespeare and Renaissance Drama* (Oxford, 2007), https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199212439.001.0001. For a discussion of the field, see Subha Mukherji, '"Understood Relations": Law and Literature in Early Modern Studies', *Literature Compass* 6.3 (2009), 706–25, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-4113.2009.00628.x.