

ANNE LANCASHIRE

Dekker's Accession Pageant for James I

In 1603, as all scholars of the period know, a planned traditional July coronation entry through London for the new monarch James I, who had succeeded Elizabeth I at her death on 24 March, was postponed because of the plague then rampant in the city. A substituted post-coronation entry — much of it according to the 1603 plans and preparations¹ — took place in March 1604. The details of the 1604 event are recorded in a number of extant primary documents, including texts and descriptions of the various pageants located along the king's processional route,² and have been discussed in numerous accounts of James's reign and in articles and books on London theatre and pageantry in the early seventeenth century.³ This spectacular 1604 royal entry was the first such entry through London since the coronation entry of Elizabeth I in 1559. It featured seven triumphal arches; professional playwrights wrote the city's pageant speeches; lavish display was the norm; and the city's water conduits ran with wine.

In his printed account — *The Magnificent Entertainment* — of the 1604 entry, Thomas Dekker, who wrote several of the entry pageants, includes the text of a pageant he wrote for James's welcoming that was in the end apparently not performed but, as Dekker tells us, 'layd by' (257). Consisting of a meeting in amity together ('hand in hand' [254]) of an armed St Andrew and St George with a (female) Genius of the City, with the Genius inviting the king to enter London, the pageant was clearly intended as an initial/opening presentation to James, and may have influenced Ben Jonson's focus on a (male) Genius of the City in his two pageants, the first and the last, written for and performed in the 1604 entry. Jonson's — and the entry's — first pageant, in which the Genius welcomes the king to the city, was located in Fenchurch Street, which James, coming up Mark Lane from the Tower of London at the beginning of his entry, would have processed along to Gracechurch Street (and from there on through the city).⁴ Discussions today of Dekker's 'layd by' pageant assume that it was written to be performed as the opening pageant in

the planned 1603 coronation entry and/or in the substituted 1604 entry, but that in 1604 Jonson's Fenchurch pageant was used instead, either because of a change in the originally planned route of the entry (Dekker tells us that his pageant was to have been performed at Bishopsgate [254] but that the king did not make his entrance as expected [257]) and/or because Jonson's pageant was preferred.⁵

The details supplied by Dekker himself, however, accompanying his printed text of the pageant, indicate that his Genius pageant was written not for the 1603 coronation entry, or for the 1604 substitute coronation entry, but rather for James's May 1603 accession entry into London. Theatre historians previously have not much discussed accession entries (or even used that name for them).⁶ Both of James's immediate royal predecessors on the English throne, however, in following the usual pattern of new English monarchs succeeding to the throne, moved to occupy the Tower of London (royal territory although within London's walls) immediately upon their accession, and made a formal processional entry into London on their way to the Tower. Both Mary and Elizabeth were outside London/Westminster at the time of their accessions (Elizabeth in Hertfordshire, north of London; Mary in Norfolk and Suffolk, to the east); and both made formal accession entries involving ceremonial speeches, musicians, and cheering crowds.

Mary came into the city from the east, at Aldgate, and processed from Aldgate west along to Leadenhall, down Gracechurch Street to Fenchurch Street, east along Fenchurch Street, and down Mark Lane to Tower Street and the Tower.⁷ Elizabeth came down from the north and, after a short stay at the Charterhouse just north of Aldersgate, outside the walls on the north-west side of the city, entered the city at Cripplegate and moved east along London's wall to Bishopsgate, and from there processed down to Leadenhall and, like Mary, down Gracechurch Street, along Fenchurch Street, and down Mark Lane to the Tower.⁸ In neither case is there any record of a pageant; but the occasions were formal, planned and staged by the city. London's Court of Aldermen on 2 August 1553 set out in detail the route and the proceedings for welcoming Mary.

At this Corte it is agreed that my Lorde Mayer and his brethern shall to morowe in the after none ryde to mete the Quenes maiestie at the barres *withowte* Algate and there takynge their places by the appoyntement of the harrold of armes to ryde furthe before her hyghenes as farr as the harrold shall appoynte them

Item the *parishe Clerkes* and the wardens of the *mynstrelles* were *commaunded* to be in a redynes *with* singinge men / for the Receyving of the Quenes grace and they to *consult* *with* their companie therefore / by the wey from Algate to Leaden hall gracious strete ffanchurche strete marte Lane and Towerstrete at suche places as they shall think mete and ... my Lorde mayer and *certayne* of my *Mastres* thaldermen did agre to vyewe the same places theym selves this after none

Item all the companies of *Craftes* to *prepayre* Reyllles for their standinges and they to stande in their *lyueries* to Receyve her grace... .

Item ... thaldermen ... shall geve warnynge to thin*habitauntes* of the ... wardes to hange oute all suche ryche clothes of Aras clothe of Sylver and of goold as they haue or *canne* geate oute at their wyndowes and *stalles* at the Quenes highenes *commynge* hether to morowe to the Tower

...

Item it was agreed that my Lorde Mayer Mr Bowes Mr Iudde Mr wodrof Mr Ofeley and Mr wyther shall this after none appoynte the places and stages betweyne Algate and the Tower where the *mynstrelles* and *parishe clerkes* shall stonde at the Quenes highenes *commynge* thether⁹

Charles Wriothsley in his chronicle of the period provides more details: the mayor, aldermen, and recorder met the queen with ceremony and speeches at the bars beyond Aldgate (ie, at the boundary of the city east of Aldgate); the children of Christ's Hospital sat on a stage at St Botolph's Church, where one made a Latin oration; the city waits played in the battlements of Aldgate itself; and four stages with clerks and musicians, singing and playing, were positioned between Aldgate and the Tower.¹⁰

A record from the 19 November 1558 Court of Aldermen on preparations for Elizabeth's accession arrival (on 28 November) is much less detailed than for Mary's welcoming; it mentions only clerks and minstrels to be ready to serve in appointed places at the queen's coming (and the sheriffs are to receive the queen at the outer part of Middlesex);¹¹ but other accounts describe the route, the liveried members of the London companies standing at their rails along the streets, and some other celebratory details.¹² Wriothsley, for example, tells us that Bishopsgate was 'richlye hanged, and [was] where the waytes of the Cittie played, &c' — just as, we might note, the waits played at Aldgate for Mary — and John Hayward in his *Annals* mentions a Latin speech by a scholar from Paul's School.

James I, in making his slow progress from Scotland to London, came down to the city from the north. He could have entered the city through London's wall at Bishopsgate; but, as court letters of the period indicate had been planned for some time, instead on 7 May he arrived, like Elizabeth before him, to stay initially at the Charterhouse, outside the city's wall at Aldersgate.¹³ Elizabeth had then moved east from the Charterhouse, entering the city at Cripplegate and moving over to Bishopsgate, then processing on to the Tower (as outlined above); but while James had been moving south towards London, the plague had been growing in the city, and once he had reached the Charterhouse James did not follow Elizabeth's route, or any other, through the city to the Tower, as would surely have been originally expected. Instead, after four days, the king on 11 May travelled quietly southwest to Whitehall, and then went by water from Whitehall to the Tower.¹⁴ He had at least already been greeted by the mayor and aldermen at Stamford Hill, north of London, on his way to the Charterhouse;¹⁵ and the boys of Christ's Hospital, just outside the Charterhouse at his arrival there, had attempted to sing for him (though they were disrupted by the crowds);¹⁶ but he did not satisfy what must have been the original expectation of a formal procession — such as those made by Mary and by Elizabeth — to the Tower through the main streets of the city. The plague may not have been the only cause of the route change (if the change had not been planned before 7 May); the unruly crowds outside the Charterhouse must have been anathema to a king who disliked public appearances;¹⁷ and unruliness of crowds of course also increased the risk of contagion.

Everything Dekker tells us about his 'layd by' pageant in his account of the 1604 substitute coronation entry indicates that it was written to be performed at James's accession entry into London. First, Dekker begins his *Magnificent Entertainment* not in March 1604 but with a description of the city's expectation in 1603 of the newly-proclaimed king's arrival from the north, 'to be conducted through some vtter part of this his Citie, to his royal Castle the *Tower*' (253), which 'in the age of a man (till this very minute) had not bene acquainted nor borne the name of a Kings Court' (253–4). Dekker could not have made this last comment about the Tower after May 1603, since James occupied the Tower at his arrival in London then. Dekker states that his pageant was 'suddenly made vp' for this 'first accesse' of the king to London, because the citizens 'would giue a taste of their dutie and affection' as 'the first seruice, to a more royall and serious ensuing Entertainment' (253–4). That is, the pageant was quickly prepared for James's initial arrival at London in 1603. The more

royal and serious entertainment to follow would have been the usual royal entry through London preceding a monarch's coronation: planned for James's coronation in July 1603 but, as we have seen, then postponed to 1604, because of plague.

Second, Dekker states that his 'layd by' pageant 'should haue bene performed about the Barres beyond Bishops-gate' (254); that is, just to the north of Bishopsgate. This location is significant. The formal two-day coronation entry route for English monarchs had for centuries been a first-day procession to the Tower, by land across London Bridge (with pageantry at the Bridge) or by water on the Thames (with processional water display), and then a second-day procession (though not usually, by the sixteenth century, on the day following the first) from the Tower through the heart of the city: up Gracechurch Street to the Standard, and west along Cornhill, Poultry, and Cheapside to St Paul's, and on from there out of the city again and to Westminster. Non-coronation royal entries had traditionally been a one-day event: reaching the standard route through the city, from Gracechurch Street on, via a procession across London Bridge and from there up to Gracechurch Street. (The Tower was not involved.)¹⁸ Bishopsgate, well to the north of Cornhill, was never a part of either traditional royal entry route. But Bishopsgate — a logical entry point to the city for anyone coming from the north — had been part of the route for Elizabeth's accession entry: the accession entry, 45 years earlier, immediately preceding James's. Elizabeth, it is true, had not entered London through Bishopsgate; but she had arrived there after having entered the city through Cripplegate, and the city had positioned a part of the formal accession welcoming there. Perhaps Dekker, naming the bars to the north of Bishopsgate as the intended location for his pageant, had misunderstood the specific Bishopsgate location intended; or perhaps the city had not originally been told that James — like Elizabeth — would stop first at the Charterhouse, and had expected him, coming from the north, to enter through Bishopsgate; or perhaps it had indeed been planned that James, unlike Elizabeth, would go outside London's walls from the Charterhouse to Bishopsgate, and formally enter the city there.¹⁹ Whichever the case, Bishopsgate would have been a logical place for an accession entry pageant for James, but not for any coronation or substituted post-coronation royal entry pageantry.

Third, Dekker states that his Genius pageant 'should haue benee the first Offring of the Citties Loue' but was 'layd by' because the king did not make 'his *Entrance* (according to expectation)' (257). Out of context, Dekker's statement could be taken to apply to the postponement of the 1603 corona-

tion entry, or — a stretch, and ignoring the use of a parenthesis — to the omission in 1604 of many of the speeches written for the substituted post-coronation entry;²⁰ but given Dekker's other statements about his pageant (as cited above), and the location of Bishopsgate well off the traditional royal entry routes through London, the statement only appropriately applies to James's accession arrival at London in May 1603.

E.K. Chambers in 1923 was largely or entirely right (depending on what the original accession entry route plans had been). Chambers wrote, 'When James first came to London on 7 May 1603, Dekker had prepared a show of the Genius Loci and Saints George and Andrew for performance at the Bars beyond Bishopsgate, which he afterwards printed; but James entered by another route, direct from Stamford Hill to the Charterhouse.'²¹ Chambers was clearly correct about the occasion for which Dekker's pageant was written, although the route change he indicates is, as we have seen, only one of several possibilities. But Chambers' statement has been lost sight of over the past 86 years: doubtless because a pageant for an accession entry is otherwise unknown in the theatre history of the period. With the passage of 44 years, however, since the city of London, at the coronation of Elizabeth I in 1559, had had the opportunity to stage pageants for a royal entry, the city was doubtless eager for a pageant display as soon as possible; and/or James's slow journey from Scotland provided pageant preparation time that normally did not exist at an accession, since a new monarch usually went to the Tower as quickly as possible — within days — after succeeding to the throne. Elizabeth, for example, was proclaimed queen on 17 November 1558, proceeded from Hatfield House — where she was staying at the time — to the Charterhouse on 23 November, and processed from the Charterhouse to the Tower on 28 November.²² Mary was proclaimed queen in London on 19 July (after a brief period of Jane as queen) and entered London (after considerable turmoil in the city) on 3 August²³ James not only had been far from London at his accession but also had deliberately planned a slow progress from the north so as not to enter the city before Elizabeth's funeral (on 29 April).²⁴ Leaving Edinburgh on 5 April, James had finally reached London (and the Charterhouse) on 7 May, over six weeks after he had been proclaimed king.

Dekker's accession entry pageant — like other royal entry pageants — would have been commissioned by the city, which would therefore probably have owned it, making easy Jonson's access to it, as a potential source, in his preparation of his 1604 'Genius' Fenchurch pageant. And an adaptation of Dekker's pageant was apparently also performed, along with Jonson's Genius

pageant, in Fenchurch Street in 1604: Gilbert Dugdale in his printed eyewitness account of the 1604 entry, *The Time Triumphant*, describes a performance there involving an armed St George and St Andrew engaged in a combat (rather than initially united, as in Dekker's pageant), but then joined 'hand in hand' by an elderly hermit.²⁵ Dugdale's 'hermit' was probably the male Genius of Jonson's Fenchurch pageant, or a duplicate of him, given Jonson's description of his Genius as 'a person attyr'd rich, reuerend and antique: his haire long and white, crowned with a wreathe of Plane tree, ... in one hand a goblet, in the other a branch full of little twigs'.²⁶ There would seem no reason for Dugdale to have reported this performance if it had not taken place; and such a performance further explains Dekker's inclusion of the original form of this entertainment — his own original text, in the context of the original plans for it — in *The Magnificent Entertainment*. Dekker's pageant had indeed been, as he states, 'not vtterly throwne from the Alter' (257) but temporarily 'layd by' in 1603; it was made use of after all, though in adapted form, in 1604.²⁷

Who — assuming that Dugdale correctly reported the (adapted) performance of a combat — would have prepared the 1604 adaptation? Perhaps Dekker himself prepared it, still preferring his original (though it had been intended for a different kind of occasion), and resenting having to change his female Genius to a male to conform to Jonson's Genius in his Fenchurch pageant. Dekker pointedly comments, in his printed pageant description and text, on his own (original) Genius as female ('contrary to the opinion of all the Doctors' [255]), and indirectly disparages Jonson's Fenchurch pageant text, with its learned details, in noting that he — Dekker — will not 'keepe a tyrannicall coyle, in Anatomizing *Genius* from head to foote, (only to shew how nimbly we can carue vp the whole messe of the Poets)' (254). Perhaps Jonson prepared it, at the city's request, but then did not include it in his printed text of his own entry pageants because of its source and/or because it was insufficiently learned for his tastes. Perhaps simply the performers or an entry organizer made the adaptation. However the changes originated (but especially if Jonson made them or caused them to be made), the tension between the two authors in relation to the 1604 entry — apparent in Dekker's explanatory text to his Genius pageant (254–5) — may be at least partly explained by what apparently happened in 1604 in Fenchurch Street to Dekker's original 1603 accession pageant.²⁸

The tension between Dekker and Jonson over their parts in the 1604 royal entry was mirrored in a conflict between the 1604 publisher of Jonson's

pageant texts, Edward Blount, and the 1604 publisher of Dekker's account of the entire 1604 royal entry, Thomas Man Jr. As Herford and Simpson pointed out in 1941, despite Blount's careful registering of Jonson's pageant texts in the Stationers' Register (19 March 1604) as a part, only, of James's entry, and Man's registration some two weeks later (2 April 1604) of Dekker's full account (which for Jonson's pageants gives descriptions but not the texts), there was evidently a dispute between the two publishers over rights to the materials, as a Stationers' Company ruling of 14 May 1604 (our only indication today of the dispute) awarded Blount's then-remaining stock of 400 copies of Jonson's texts to Man, although the latter was to pay six shillings a ream for them.²⁹ Dekker's *Genius* pageant seems unlikely, however, to have directly contributed to the publishers' dispute, since it played no part in the Jonson/Blount publication. Peter Blayney has suggested that at this time the publisher of a licensed work had the right to a fair chance to recover his publication costs, and could seek the protection of the Stationers' Company if any other publication threatened that chance;³⁰ perhaps Blount's publication was deemed to be a threat to Man's — although, oddly for such an argument to be made in this case, Blount's quarto had been licensed before Man's. Perhaps Dekker and Man had special authorization or weight from the city in publishing an account of the full royal entry, and the Stationers' Company therefore forced Blount to an arrangement with Man.

Notes

- 1 See, for example, for the 1604 continuation of 1603 preparations, *Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts ... Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice*, vol. 10 (1603–1607), ed. H.F. Brown (London, 1900), 63–4, and Dekker, 302. All citations of Dekker are of his *The Magnificent Entertainment* (1604), ed. Fredson Bowers in *The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1955), 229–309; page numbers are given parenthetically within the body of the article.
- 2 See, for example, C.E. McGee and John C. Meagher, 'Preliminary Checklist of Tudor and Stuart Entertainments: 1603–1613', *Research Opportunities in Renaissance Drama* 27 (1984), 57–61. The three major accounts, all printed in 1604, are those by Ben Jonson, *His Part of King James His Royal and Magnificent Entertainment* (Jonson's own two pageants, with full texts), Thomas Dekker, *The Magnificent Entertainment Given to King James* (all the pageants described, but without the texts of those written by Jonson), and Stephen Harrison, *The Arches of Triumph* (some descriptions, speeches,

and engravings of seven pageant arches). A second edition of Dekker's account, *The Whole Magnificent Entertainment* (1604), with a translation of Latin speeches, was also published.

- 3 Two modern editions of a combination of Dekker's and Jonson's 1604 texts of the entry are: Thomas Dekker and Ben Jonson, 'The Magnificent Entertainment', in Richard Dutton (ed.), *Jacobean Civic Pageants* (Staffordshire, 1995), 19–115, and 'The Whole Royal and Magnificent Entertainment', ed. R. Malcolm Smuts, in Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (gen. eds), *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works* (Oxford, 2007), 219–79. Smuts (219) calls his edition, which also includes additional entry materials, 'an ideal reconstruction' (as opposed to 'an account of what anyone [individually] saw or heard').
- 4 For useful maps of the city around this time, showing the main streets and other locations discussed here and below, see Lawrence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge, 1995), 226–7, and *The A to Z of Elizabethan London*, compiled by Adrian Prockter and Robert Taylor (Lympne Castle, Kent, in association with Guildhall Library, London, 1979), 7–14, 25–8.
- 5 Richard Dutton, *Jacobean Civic Pageants*, for example, places Dekker's composition of his Genius pageant for Bishopsgate in 1603, as part of elaborate coronation pageant preparations when 'an early coronation was expected' (19), and notes that by 1604 matters had changed and the first entry entertainment was by Jonson. Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*, suggests (253) that Jonson and Dekker designed 'alternative preliminary pageants' (for the 1604 entry, it is implied) and that Dekker's Bishopsgate pageant was not used because of 'the King's adherence to a route and program that honored Jonson's Fenchurch arch as the first in the entry series'. Similarly Smuts (in *Thomas Middleton*, 222) calls Dekker's work 'an initial pageant 'layd by' because James did not enter London in the expected place' (that is, in 1604). C.H. Herford and P. and E. Simpson, in their edition of *Ben Jonson*, vol. 7 (Oxford, 1941) had suggested that 'Dekker ... had written a pageant for a first triumphal arch, which was not erected, at Bishopsgate', and that Jonson perhaps had 'supplant[ed]' Dekker in the first pageant (78). Cyrus Hoy, in his *Introductions, Notes, and Commentaries to texts in 'The Dramatic Works of Thomas Dekker' edited by Fredson Bowers*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, 1980), 131, cited Herford and Simpson. Graham Parry, in *The Golden Age Restor'd* (Manchester, 1981), had a different suggestion: that Dekker's pageant was a 'little prelude' to the 1604 entry, to surprise the king as he approached the city, but which was not performed 'because of confused circumstances' (3). Dekker's and Jonson's pageants were quite different in form and in style. Dekker's was peripatetic (all three characters rode on horses) and comparatively straight forward, with one speech (as Manley has noted, 253–4) echoing John of Gaunt's eulogy to

England in Shakespeare's *Richard II*; Jonson's was static (focused on a triumphal arch) and learnedly allusive. Each pageant was also associated with a different professional acting company: Dekker's indirectly with the King's Men, through the *Richard II* echo; Jonson's with Prince Henry's Men, since professional actor Edward Alleyn, of that company, played Jonson's Genius (Dekker, 260). I am grateful to Scott Schofield for the Parry reference, and also for the Loewenstein reference in note 29 below.

- 6 For a brief discussion of accession entries, see Anne Lancashire, *London Civic Theatre: City Drama and Pageantry from Roman Times to 1558* (Cambridge, 2002), 137–8.
- 7 For Mary's route, see Corporation of London MS Repertory 13 (1) [COL/CA/01/01/014], f. 70v, Charles Wriothesley, *A Chronicle of England during the Reigns of the Tudors*, ed. William Douglas Hamilton, vol. 2 (Camden Society, N.S. 20, 1877), 93–4, and *The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Taylor of London from A.D. 1550 to A.D. 1563*, ed. John Gough Nichols (Camden Society, 42, 1848), 38–9.
- 8 For Elizabeth's route, see Raphael Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, vol. 4 [ed. Henry Ellis] (London, 1808), 156, John Hayward, *Annals of the First Four Years of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. John Bruce (Camden Society, 46, 1840), 10, and Machyn's *Diary*, 180.
- 9 MS Repertory 13(1), f. 70v.
- 10 Wriothesley, *A Chronicle of England*, 93–5; see also Machyn's *Diary*, 38.
- 11 Corporation of London MS Repertory 14 [COL/CA/01/01/016], ff. 90v–1.
- 12 See, for example, Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles*, 156, Wriothesley, *A Chronicle of England*, 142, Hayward, *Annals of the First Four Years*, 10, Machyn's *Diary*, 180.
- 13 See John Chamberlain to Dudley Carleton, 12 April 1603, in John Nichols, *The Processes, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities of King James the First*, vol. 1 (London, 1828), 52, and also Robert Cecil to Thomas Parry, 27 April 1603, in Nichols, 145. For the 7 May date, see Nichols, 113. One of the sheriffs (the other was ill) met the king in Middlesex (Nichols, 113), just as both sheriffs met Elizabeth in 1558.
14. Nichols, *The Processes*, 114 and 118. Aldersgate was decorated for the occasion. The 1607 edition of John Stow's *Abridgment or Summarie of the English Chronicle* (London, 1607), 551, says the king went 'priuately from the Charterhouse to Whitehall' and from there by water to the Tower.
- 15 Nichols, *The Processes*, 113.
- 16 Ibid, 140.
- 17 See, for example, on James's dislike of public appearances, Arthur Wilson's 1653 biography of the king as quoted in Dutton, *Jacobean Civic Pageants*, 22.
- 18 For these traditional ceremonial routes, see Lancashire, *London Civic Theatre*, 46–7 and 131–3, and Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*, 223–9 (including map).

- 19 It is unlikely — though not impossible — that plans would have been made for James formally to enter the city at Bishopsgate, then immediately to move outside the walls again (via another northern gate) to the Charterhouse for his stay there. Uncertainties as to James's route did exist in some quarters; John Savile, in his 1603 printed account of James's progress, notes (Nichols, *The Processes*, 139–40) the uncertainty of the people flocking to see James, as he approached London, as to what route he would take at Islington on his way to the Charterhouse. This particular reported uncertainty, however, at least indicates general knowledge, by the time of the king's arrival at London, that James was coming through Islington to the Charterhouse and not (at least at this point) through Bishopsgate.
- 20 Dekker notes the 1604 omissions, 303.
- 21 E.K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1923), 1.134; see also 4.69–70. Chambers also noted that Elizabeth had been formally greeted in November 1558 when she came to the Tower at her accession.
- 22 For the dates of 23 and 28 November, see Holinshed, *Holinshed's Chronicles*, 156, and Hayward, *Annals of the First Four Years*, 9.
- 23 See Wriothesley, *A Chronicle of England*, 88–93. The shortness of preparation time for Mary's accession entry is specifically commented on in the court minutes of the Armourers and Brasiers' Company (one of London's livery companies), Guildhall Library (London) MS 12071/1, 364.
- 24 See G.P.V. Akrigg, *Jacobean Pageant* (Cambridge, MA, 1962), 18.
- 25 Dugdale, *The Time Triumphant* (London, 1604), sig. B2v. (A note containing Dugdale's account of this performance is included in Malcolm Smuts's edition of the 1604 entry in Taylor's and Lavagnino's *Thomas Middleton*, 233, n. to line 453.) David Bergeron noted in 1983, in his 'Gilbert Dugdale and the royal entry of James I (1604)', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 13 (1983), 117–18, the resemblances between Dekker's 'layd by' pageant and Dugdale's description of the Fenchurch Street pageant of St Andrew, St George, and the Genius, and suggested that Dekker's pageant had been 'picked up and used in conjunction with the Fenchurch arch'. Malcom Smuts suggested in 2000, in 'Occasional Events, Literary Texts and Historical Interpretations', in Robin Headlam Wells, Glenn Burgess, and Rowland Wymer (eds), *Neohistoricism: Studies in Renaissance Literature, History, and Politics* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, and Rochester, NY, 2000), 197, that Dugdale, in seeing Dekker's pageant performed, misinterpreted it, although Smuts also noted (197, n. 69) that Dekker's pageant text might have been modified, and in his edition of the 1604 entry (in *Thomas Middleton*) notes that Dugdale 'appears to be describing a version of the pageant originally planned for Bishopsgate, which had perhaps been transferred to a site between the Tower and Fenchurch' (233, n. to line 453).

- 26 Nichols, *The Processes*, 85. Dekker's female Genius was 'Antique, and reuerend both in yeares and habit: a Chaplet of mingled flowres, (Inter-wouen with branches of the Plane Tree) crowning her Temples: her haire long and white: her Vesture a loose roabe, Changeable and powdred with Starres' (255). Dugdale's 'hermit' could therefore possibly have been Dugdale's misinterpretation of Dekker's Genius (as Smuts believes: in his *Thomas Middleton* edition of the 1604 entry, 233, n. to line 453); but Geniuses of different sexes in consecutive pageants in Fenchurch Street seems unlikely.
- 27 The king, Dekker tells us in *Magnificent Entertainment* (303), was not fond of 'teadious speeches', and significantly the adaptation of Dekker's pageant, if Dugdale has reported it correctly, was focused on action (a combat). Pageantry texts of the period often represent original intentions rather than actual performances; and Dekker's *Magnificent Entertainment* is no exception, as Dekker makes clear at the end of his entry account (303), commenting on the non-performance of many of the speeches included in his text.
- 28 For the animosity in general between Dekker and Jonson at this time, see Dutton, *Jacobean Civic Pageants*, 20.
- 29 See Herford and Simpson, *Ben Jonson*, 67 and 77–9, who also note that Man's father became master of the Stationers' Company in 1604. Joseph Loewenstein, *Ben Jonson and Possesive Authorship* (Cambridge, 2002), also comments (170–1) on this publishers' conflict, as does Malcolm Smuts in Gary Taylor and John Lavagnino (gen. eds), *Thomas Middleton and Early Modern Textual Culture: A Companion to the Collected Works* (Oxford, 2007), 498.
- 30 Peter W.M. Blayney, 'The Publication of Playbooks', in John D. Cox and David Scott Kastan (eds), *A New History of Early English Drama* (NY, 1997), 399.