"THE WORLD RUNS ON WHEELES": JOHN STOW'S INDESCRIBABLE LONDON

Author(s): BENJAMIN DENEAULT

Source: *ELH*, SUMMER 2011, Vol. 78, No. 2 (SUMMER 2011), pp. 337-358

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/41236547

REFERENCES
Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:
https://www.jstor.org/stable/41236547?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents
You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms

The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *ELH*

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

"THE WORLD RUNS ON WHEELES": JOHN STOW'S INDESCRIBABLE LONDON

BY BENJAMIN DENEAULT

A citizen of early modern London, but one uncommitted to his company, the Merchant Taylors; a historiographer, but one practiced in other (antiquarian) and older (annalistic) methods of time-keeping: John Stow (1524/5–1605) shrugs off an easy epithet. In one quality, however, he appears unalloyed. "He did not like change," as Charles Lethbridge Kingsford flatly determined a century ago.[1] When Stow mustered himself to speak of the present, it was about matters steeped in the past. "New-fangled customs and amusements," for instance, "he did not love," but "the time-honoured wrestling at Bartholomew Fair" interested him, along with other "old games" still being played (*S*, 1:xli). Old games, in fact, seriously interested Stow. His *Survey of London* (1598, revised 1603), a pedestrian, ward-by-ward topography of the city, is "suffused with nostalgia" for the type of ritual—ludic and spatial—he experienced as a child.[2] Surveying old places and practices alongside the emergencies of London, Stow worked to save urban tradition for and from a culture "taking an alien warp," turning toward modernity.[3] Depending on the interpretation, his labor proved ameliorative or (unsuccessfully) fixative.[4] Either way, Stow believed his moment was in need of some re-engineering. Of course. "Old men hate change."[5] This maxim must especially apply to an old man—Stow was 72 or 73 at the *Survey*'s first publication—who leaned on William Fitzstephen's twelfth-century *Descriptio Nobilissimae Civitatis Londoniae*, itself an "unrealistic, rose-tinted picture of London."[6]

By and large, critics see Stow as a Virgilian guide or future-shocked septuagenarian, even when they argue for the portentousness of the *Survey*. Steven Mullaney calls the text a "timely work," one of many "new and unprecedented forms of commentary" necessitated by the advent of modernity.[7] Still, he describes Stow's surveying as reminiscent of an earlier era, a different mentality. Stow's preparatory tour of the city's wards followed the route of Elizabeth I's inaugural procession (1558), and Mullaney reads its textual analogue as a faithful representation of that auspicious time.[8] In the *Survey*, Stow does not walk the city like Michel de Certeau's urbanite; he gazes at a procession.[9] It

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

is not hard to imagine him having reason to do so. Stow had already been approaching middle age in 1558, and had possibly (probably?) witnessed Elizabeth's entrance to the city, the memory of which must have been vivid, enchanting.

And welcome. From the beginning Stow makes clear that his topography is personal, a claim that has affected various readings of the *Survey*. He identifies his duty as one owed to "my native mother and Countrey" (*S*, 1:xcviii). Stow invokes here, as Lawrence Manley has best shown, a long-refined system of description that naturalizes urbanization and, as a result, suppresses history. Harmonizing Aristotelian ideas and Ramist dialectic, this system theorizes the city as organic form perfected, figuring it as a woman who matures but does not age.[10] The *Survey*'s memorializing bears this fable of organicism and continuity, a fable that influences Mullaney. "Where Elizabeth's passage inscribed the common places of the city with meaning, Stow's retrieves and recreates not only the meaning of such events but also the eventfulness of such manifest forms of significance."[11] Elizabeth's coronation passage inscribed a certain snaking segment of the city's common places. That evergreen segment, Mullaney argues, was where Stow could recreate event and retrieve meaning. Time is an idyll, a place of eternal "eventfulness" called London.

The overdetermined image of Stow as a nostalgic, conservative, and (sometimes merely) old operator shapes modern opinion of his surveying, and no doubt a hand in that image making can be assigned to Stow himself.[12] Yet in the *Survey* Stow also exposes, time and again, the limits of his surveying method, and most critics have yet to realize the nature and the consequences of that betrayal. A significant exception is Manley, who argues that Stow flatly acted against familiar principles of topography. In the *Survey*'s represented perambulation of early modern London, "Stow confronted a register of change at odds with the temporal continuities stressed," especially hard, at the beginning and end of his text.[13] Uncovering the irony of Stow's nostalgia, Manley displays how nostalgia in fact pushed Stow to reject, finally, topographical tradition. Stow's longings for the past deepened as he grew older, but only insofar as he recognized that his life had extended through change. A nostalgist, Stow hated change; an experienced surveyor, Stow confronted change daily. As a result, he plotted a new form of urban description, one founded on the personal, not the supra-personal.[14]

I agree with Manley that Stow's nostalgia affected his surveying, but I want to propose that Stow *qua* nostalgist not only recognized the

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

alien reality of his late years but developed as well a representation of that reality through an absolutely taxing employment of the old descriptive method. Stow's nostalgia was largely formal in character. He could not forget his past, in no small part because he could not work without long-refined descriptive categories. And yet he was not so shocked by the changeful present as to confuse it with matters amenable to those same categories.[15] Instead, Stow mourned and noted the intransigence of his present, the many ways it rebuffed the traditions of urban topography to which he was so deeply obliged. Worked through a scheme incapable of its processing, early modern London appears in Stow's text as an almost nothing, as the caustic smoke of malfunction, as the burst marks of description. Stow's too-bustling city was out there, but it registers as such in here, in the incisive failures of his *Survey*. London, its native son shows, has broken its foundations as it has "broken from its foundations."[16] Whereas Manley concludes that Stow forged a new, modern representational plan, I am claiming that Stow displayed an elaborate failure of the old, syncretic representational plan.[17] In Manley's reading, we see the future for prose writers (Defoe in particular) who take on the growing metropolis; in my reading, such a ramification is absent.[18] My reading will take us nearly nowhere, but that obscure place is Stow's representation, and we need to reconsider our use of the *Survey*. Scholars have sometimes used the *Survey* to signal what was early and what was modern about early modern London, but in my view it signals the modern very poorly. All the same, the text offers a powerful and valuable representation of early, inconclusive urbanization. A "commanding view" in title alone, the *Survey* touches the aphasia of Stow's late years, and despite its solipsism, the text relates meaningfully to other surveys of a cityscape no longer medieval.[19]

In what follows I examine the *Survey*'s passage on the intra-city coach—an emergent and especially aggressive presence in Stow's present—in order to conduct a stress test of my primary claim concerning Stow's methodology. In the *Survey*, I argue, the old paradigm of urban topography is repeatedly worked to failure, the points of which indicate the London of Stow's late years. Next, I determine the resonance of Stow's (in)effective method by comparing its fizzled product to other depictions of early modern coaching. Reading across an array of texts, I illustrate that the *Survey* takes part in a conversation about the perceptual difficulties of London's urbanization. Finally, I test my arguments concerning Stow's method of representational failure and its contemporary resonance through a reading of petitions by Black-

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

friars residents against James Burbage's private playhouse (opened, 1597)—another coach-related eruption of the early modern present. The petitioners request help from civic fathers for an environmental crisis, one occurring in their precinct of the city. Stow had already simulated this crisis through his peculiar brand of topography, which locates the novelties of London in a descriptive crux and articulates novel London as at most a somewhere beyond articulation. In so doing, I conclude, Stow's *Survey* makes legible, to the extent possible, urban experience in a state of emergency.

I.

Introduced to England in 1564 as a novelty for Queen Elizabeth, "by little and little" the coach became a usual means of transportation, so that by 1605 it could confidently be called "ordinary," a common feature of the urban street and suburban park.[20] Those familiar with Stow's work will not be surprised to find that he treats the phenomenon dismissively, but the terms of that dismissal deserve careful attention. In the antagonizing zone of the really new, surely, we should discover what, if anything, happens to the old ways of description in Stow's care.

> Of olde time Coatches were not knowne in this Island, but chariots or Whirlicotes, then so called, and they onely used of Princes or great Estates, such as had their footmen about them: and for example to note, I read that *Richard* the second, being threatened by the rebels of Kent, rode from the Tower of London to the Myles end, and with him his mother, because she was sicke and weake in a Wherlicote, the Earles of Buckingham, Kent, Warwicke and Oxford, Sir *Thomas Percie*, Sir *Robert Knowles*, the Mayor of London, Sir *Aubery de Vere* that bare the kinges sword, with other Knights and Esquiers attending on horseback. He followed in the next year the said king *Richard*, who took to wife *Anne* daughter to the king of Boheme, that first brought hether the riding upon side saddles, and so was the riding in Wherlicotes and chariots forsaken, except at Coronatinos and such like spectacles: but now of late yeares the use of coatches brought out of Germanie is taken up, and made so common, as there is neither distinction of time, nor difference of persons observed: for the world runs on wheeles with many, whose parents were glad to goe on foote. (*S*, 1:83–84)

In this passage, Stow determines the coach's position on a timeline, beginning at "olde time" and ending "now of late yeares," and judges accordingly. The things of late years offend Stow in many ways, and the coach is most certainly a latecomer to London.

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

However, this evaluation does not exhaust Stow's treatment of the past or the present. The one, rather, provides a means with which to attempt the construing of the other. Old time is for Stow a preparatory model, structured by an old descriptive pattern, supplied in this case by the *Anonimalle Chronicle* (1381).[21] In comparing the richness of the past to the meagerness of the present, Stow does not signal a desire to ignore the present. Instead he signals the difficulty of representing the London of his late years. Old time and its array of detail must be marshaled to gain a vantage on the living moment, and even then, little of that moment can be seen. What, then, does one learn from the past and the protocols of chronicling? First, coaches were not formerly "knowne in this Island." Only chariots and whirlicotes were available.[22] Use of these vehicles, moreover, was limited to "Princes or great Estates," a fact discernible because "footmen" were about traveling noblemen and, thus, about their vehicles, creating in the process outlines as conspicuous (in pageantry) as they were particular (in hierarchical distinction). This conspicuous particularity allows Stow to "note" past vehicle usage, to "read" from history and bring the vehicles (once more) into distinction. "I read." This brief acknowledgement of source serves, of course, a rhetorical function, in that it establishes the authority of Stow's notation. It also establishes the fact of enduring legibility, guaranteed by an established descriptive system. Chariots and whirlicotes were notable in the past, and thus Stow can and will note them again. The first "example to note" may appear absurd. The monarchic crisis of the Peasants' Revolt (1381) is mined for an anecdote about, of all things, whirlicotes. If we change our focus, however, Stow's position becomes clear. History, properly speaking, lay largely beyond the note, but the note provides the necessary preconditions for time-keeping: what, who, why, when, whence, and how. The note acts as a parable of detail. From the conspicuous particularity of the "Wherlicote" and its passenger(s) arises the possibility of narrative and concept. The second "example to note," about Anne of Bohemia's introduction of the sidesaddle, deepens the lesson of the first by restricting its particular detail, bringing it into tighter focus. After the introduction of "riding upon side saddles," whirlicote travel occurred only during times and in the pathways of coronation, and was enjoyed only by monarchs and such like people.

What is crucial for us to note here is that these readings of the past do not suppress the present and are not themselves jettisoned when Stow turns to the present. They are employed, instead, to prepare the reader to think about the present, and are meant to negotiate that

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

intellectual engagement. After reading Stow's history of whirlicotes and upon turning to his brief comments on "the use of coatches," the reader—tutored here and almost everywhere in a traditional means of description—is asked to see what he or she can make of latter-day London. He or she is asked, that is, to do more than listen to and agree with Stow's grouse against late practices. To be sure, judgment on the coach is rendered in a way that supports the image of Stow as a cranky old man. "Now of late yeares the use of coatches . . . [is] made so common, as [that is, because] there is neither distinction of time, nor difference of persons observed: for the world runs on wheeles with many, whose parents were glad to goe on foote." Translation: kids today refuse to slow down and do things properly. These coaches are so common because so many of this generation want to roam around at all hours and in fancy vehicles, even if their breeding suggests they should be hoofing it. By going so fast, they are missing out on the various orders of the city, which make it great. Boosterism aside, Stow thinks it is a serious problem to ignore order. In a later passage he claims that order can save lives.[23] In this light, the preceding notes on the whirlicote impress upon the reader the inappropriateness of making coach usage "common." They help one see that as whirlicotes were for "Princes or great Estates," coaches should be too, even if coaches are clearly foreign things, "brought out of Germanie." If we read only this far, we merely invert Edward Bonahue, Jr.'s argument that Stow uses the past to make the present less troubling and more familiar.[24] But the turn, from whirlicotes to coaches, demands more from the reader, who has been readied to look for certain details and build out from there. Perversely, though, Stow has prepared his audience for failure. A second parsing of the passage tells as much: "now of late yeares the use of coatches . . . [is] made so common, as [that is, with the result that] there is neither distinction of time, nor difference of persons observed: for the world runs on wheeles with many, whose parents were glad to goe on foote." Second translation: even if people nowadays want to observe distinctions and differences—of degree, for instance—they cannot do it. They cannot observe (conform to, show regard for) distinctions and differences because they cannot observe (see, take note of) distinctions and differences on London's streets. The coach impairs perception.

Stow registers this perceptual failure in his representation by showing how the old mode of description now fails to render almost any detail. Stow turns to the topic of coaching as if in the fashion in which he noted whirlicotes, and his audience is to grasp the inscrutability

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

of London's present insofar as the old descriptive means are quite suddenly attenuated. Consider, in this regard, not only what Stow represents as the two problems of coaching but also how he represents them. First, he says, coaches bar the observance of the "distinction of time." In simple terms, this must mean that coaches run at inopportune times and announce that fact across the cityscape. Exceedingly noisy, as we shall see, the coach highlights the bad example of the nocturnal traveler or Sunday pleasure-seeker, and disturbs the established circadian rhythms of the city. A city that never sleeps is a city that cannot sleep. Time in a coach-filled city is always twilight. With the second problem, regarding the "difference of persons," Stow claims that widespread access to coach transportation negates the vehicle's ability to mark social status rightly. If coach travel properly belongs to princely figures, its common usage threatens the fulfillment of the vehicle's status-marking duty. A coach running through the streets may transport a Lord; then again, it may carry anyone with loose change—from a merchant to a common bawd. Coaches create communal lacunae in London's built environment.

We may extend Stow's analysis further by thinking of the parents of the "many," those who "were glad to goe on foote." Stow had a natural affinity for such folk. According to Edmund Howes (flourished, 1602–1631), abridger of Stow's *Annales*, Stow "could never ride [due to financial hardship], but traveled on foot unto divers chief places of the land to search records."[25] And, as we know, the bulk of the *Survey* is structured as a walking tour. With this in mind, we may classify Stow as a representative of the parents of the many. He identifies with the man on the street, and it is there, on the street, that he thinks the work of observing differences is done. When the "world runs on wheeles," this work is impaired, and the extent of this impairment can be registered by taking into account that the *Survey*'s coaching note proceeds directly from a discussion of purprestures, "enchrochmentes on the Highwayes, lanes, and common groundes, in and about this cittie" (*S*, 1:83). Coaching and purprestures naturally interrelate in that they both cause problems for the person on the street. Purprestures make street navigation difficult; coaches make it dangerous. Yet the connection goes deeper than this. According to Manley, purprestures represented a growing problem in the late Elizabethan period.[26] As the city grew, landlords extended their buildings onto traditional public spaces. As Stow notes, the streets of the city were especially hard hit by the buildup and expansion of tenements. Purprestures materially reinforced a period-specific "pattern of introversion . . . which en-

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

couraged the replacement of outdoor, public recreation with indoor, commercialized leisure."[27] In other words, purprestures effectively privatized and, in some cases, monetized public space. The coach, for Stow, is a running purpresture. It crowds out the communal space of the street with another, private and impersonal space—that of the coach's boot (carriage). In doing so, the coach obscures the significant peculiarities of London for those on foot, and prevents, or frees, the "many" from undertaking the needful task of relating to their tradition-encrusted environs.

All of this, of course, is speculation concerning the diminishment of temporal markers and interpersonal differences caused by coaches. Stow merely says that time and people are no longer distinctive. Yet Stow's curtness is to the point. From his description of the antique whirlicote, the reader receives multiple, if brief, notations of time and status, which gesture in concert to a narrative regarding Richard II's monarchical crisis. Upon turning to coaches, the reader can no longer find these brief but networked notations, and thus experiences a textual simulation of what Stow judges to occur on the city's streets. Here the reader is essential to Stow's simulation. He or she is taught to look for particular distinctions, and then frustrated. The whirlicote references prepare him or her to observe . . . nothing much. What has become the model for representation fails, and in the concomitant cessation of description, the reader learns Stow's truth about early modern London: there is not enough there there.[28]

II.

In *Cultural Capitals* Karen Newman reads an account by Paul Fréart, Seigneur de Chantelou, of Gian Lorenzo Bernini's 1665 trip to Paris. Having been called to the metropolis by Louis XIV (reigned, 1643–1715), the renowned architect and sculptor (1598–1680) moved through the city "comfortably ensconced in a coach," "the coach of the king" at that.[29] From the "safety and comfort of the coach," Bernini passed judgment on a view from the Pont Rouge that was "framed by the coach window" (*C*, 33). Newman uses this vignette to characterize generally the experience of coaching in early modern Paris and London. "From a coach window, riders saw a moving picture, a framed series of images, a refigured perception of the urban cityscape quite different from that of the pedestrian" (*C*, 74). Coaching offered its practitioners—the "coach set," as Newman calls them—the cityscape as movie (*C*, 69). Pedestrians, in contrast, were in the picture and thus

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

unable to observe from a cool distance their urban environment. The act of coaching afforded a privileged sort of viewing; the coach itself made visible this and other privileges. According to Newman, the coach "needs to be understood in part as a means of reestablishing the social distinctions put in jeopardy by the 'promiscuous sociability' of the newly congested, burgeoning urban environment of the street" (*C*, 73). Picture-makers and pedestrians were easy to tell apart.

I think Newman is probably right about Bernini. He was a visionary, after all. But Newman is wrong to make Bernini's experience typical: the king's coach was not every coach; the Pont Rouge (and Paris!), not everywhere; and Bernini, not everyone. If it did exist, the "coach set," as antecedent to the jet set of the 1950s, was not rendering the city cinematically. The historical evidence, from London at least, suggests otherwise. With the material and social properties of coaching, moreover, we find English writers creating stories about the failing forward of civic distinction. Like Stow, these writers eye a wheeling urban scene.

Newman's argument that coaching promoted social distinctions is secured first by the idea that the "coach set" physically experienced travel as did the jet set—those lucky few who flew, say, the Concorde. But, as Joan Parkes has detailed, the first English coaches were decidedly low-tech contraptions, unfit for moving picture productions. Square and heavy-bodied, typical English coaches were covered in tough black leather, studded with broad-headed brass nails, and drawn by four or more horses. Fast but unwieldy, these vehicles added bruising congestion to the list of hazards—fogs, flash floods, open cellars, dunghills, shop bulks, and stone washing-stools—counted on London's streets. Naturally, this admixture gave rise to a number of bloody moving violations. Protected only by leather flaps or fabric curtains, coach passengers were prone to tumbling or, worse, ejection—due in large part to the vehicle's primitive suspension and London's uneven streets. Pedestrians often fared as ill as the coached. Forced to give the wall at the coach's approach, bystanders might receive a splatter of dirt or a glancing blow from the passing vehicle.[30] Not surprisingly, getting "coached" quickly became synonymous with the receipt of any violent motion.[31]

Again, Newman's assumption of physical settlement within the coach leads to an assumption of social settlement without, on the streets. But the vehicle clanged as it jarred.[32] Prone to running at all hours and on every day, coaches noised repeatedly but not necessarily regularly, disturbing the tranquility of homes and churches located near

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

prominent thoroughfares. The writer and illustrator Henry Peacham (1578–1644) relates that a friend "can neither sleepe or studie for the clattering of Coaches" near his house in the Strand.[33] The disruption of church services seems to have been particularly egregious. In their protestations to various government bodies, the leading inhabitants and officers of the Blackfriars charge that the confluence of coaches to their precinct, caused by the opening of Burbage's playhouse, has disturbed rites of baptism and prayers for the dead.[34] Perhaps Ben Jonson's Morose is a reasonable character after all. Supersensitive to noise, "hee hath chosen a street to lie [live] in, so narrow at both ends, that it will receive no coaches, nor carts, nor any of these common noises."[35]

It was not only the coach's ride, sound, or timing that was represented as disruptive. The statement made by a passing coach and its passengers often confused the semantics of the streets. Consider, as an example, John Taylor (1578–1653). Newman writes, "John Taylor writes of being overcome with 'a Timpany of pride' while riding in a coach looking down on the hoi polloi: 'In what state I would leane over the boote and looke and pry if I saw any of my acquaintance'" (*C*, 74).[36] Newman thus identifies Taylor as a "privileged occupant [who] was safely segregated from the hurly-burly of the street" (*C*, 74). But Newman fails to point out that Taylor recounts here a trip taken in "my Maister Sir William [Waad's] Coach."[37] Waad (1546–1623) was a high-ranking diplomat and bureaucrat, a certified grandee. Taylor, on the other hand, was the famous "Water Poet," a ferryman and professional writer—two professions that were less than exalted in early modern London. Waad's coach, then, did not offer the "kind of class-determined" experience that Newman attributes to it (*C*, 75). While riding, Taylor may have felt "a Timpany of pride," but that feeling largely derived from transgressing the bounds of social order. In truth, Taylor must have stuck his head out of the flap of the boot in order to look for and be looked at by acquaintances, people who would recognize him and would, more importantly, recognize that the Water Poet was riding around in someone else's fancy vehicle. Such a transgression, adding to the hurly-burly of the streets, was perhaps not all that uncommon.

It is true that the nobility often owned their own coaches and distinguished them by means of embossed heraldic badges, which presumably would have allowed the commoner to distinguish elite vehicles from their for-hire (hackney) brethren.[38] Indeed, Gertrude Touchstone, the newly made Lady Flash of *Eastward Ho*, assumes

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

such distinctions can be readily made and smugly asserts the privilege of visible distinction to her city mother.[39] But, as with so many things, Gertrude seems to be mistaken. Badges were not so simple to read. In a comic catalogue of "Sir Coach's" apparel, Peacham intimates that the personified vehicle's "Atcheivement of sundry Coats" has most likely "beene stollen, from over some Monument, where they had long living in a Church."[40] Of course, this claim is dubious, but Peacham pursues the idea of coach-enabled identity theft. An empty private coach may simply await the return of its noble passenger(s), or it may signal an opportunity, a chance for others to enter its hold and employ the prestige of its "dead painted Coate and Crest, as Lion, Elephant, &c."[41] Whether Taylor's carnivalesque coaching experience was exceptional is difficult to determine, but the perceived potential of coaches, especially badged coaches, to facilitate social climbing is not.

Throughout his dramatic oeuvre, Jonson parades his would-be courtiers and newly made ladies through the streets of London in private coaches, believed by such characters to represent, literally, vehicles for social power. Fastidius Brisk, "a good property to perfume the boot of a coach," attests to his high standing in court by recounting that "[a countess] yesternight sent her coach twise to my lodging, to intreat mee accompany her, and my sweet mistris, with some two, or three nameless ladies more."[42] Epicene calculates the rate of her / his ascendancy to the "ladies collegiate" according to the time it will take her/him to acquire "a coach, and horses."[43] Lady Flash "longs to ride in her new Coache" because it will afford her the admiration of commoners, represented street-side by the witless Mistresses Fond and Gazer.[44] Finally, the haughty city wife Chloe "most vehemently" desires to ride privately because the act will realize (she hopes) her passage to high society.[45] When had, such experiences never ensure the social elevation of Jonson's poseurs. Lady Flash and her two waiting women, penurious by the play's end, are forced to live in a coach "like three Snailes in a shell."[46] Yet, considered together, Jonson's comedies suggest how coach usage could facilitate a certain slippage of social cues and damage the stable articulation of degree on the streets. It is hard work to recognize the "difference of persons" while moving through the city if marks of distinction can be "stollen," emptied, or commandeered and if this potential for fraud is suspected, if not always known, to be at play. How can anyone rightly identify the quality of coach passengers or resist their claims? Fond and Gazer, although supremely silly, figure the problem of attempting to apply certain rules of discernment to an uncertain order of people and things on the street.[47]

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

III.

In Jonson's plays, Stow's type of surveying becomes mere gazing. The transmutation suggests something other than sympathy between Stow's project and Jonson's city comedy.[48] Angela Stock argues that London playwrights in general were interested in Stow only because he was a handy figure of fun.[49] Stow's *Survey*, as Stock notes, has little to nothing to say about London's theaters, making it a somewhat curious target for any playwright imagining early modern London (*St*, 97–98). Only a few words are paid to the professional theater in the *Survey*'s first edition (1598), and even less is said in the enlarged second edition (1603). Stock finds this state of affairs odd "since to an unbiased surveyer, London's playhouses would have warranted attention—and rather more in 1603 than [in 1598]" (*St*, 89). Stock's explanation for this lack of comment hinges on Stow's nostalgia. Devoted to an ideal of Londoners being "conscious of their civic heritage and of ancient rights as well as responsibilities, but also conscious of the nature of their collective relationships," Stow rejects the commercial stage, Stock argues, because "it represented, rather than was, a saturnalian experience" (*St*, 91). As such, "the professional theatre has virtually no part in [Stow's] scenario of communal activities" and, thus, no part in his nostalgia-suffused *Survey* (*St*, 91).

But the theater has a part to play in the *Survey*, and Stow is alive to the moment he shares with London's first professional playwrights. Like coaching, the theater serves Stow as an example of the present at its bleeding edge. Stow's paucity of reference to playhouses, a paucity that is made more pronounced in the *Survey*'s second edition, represents the fact that playhouses, like coaches, corrode their zones of activity; this lesson is imparted only if the reader places, as Stow designs, such scant references in context and processes them, wrenchingly, through old descriptive means. One's conclusion, having read the *Survey* at length, should be that the stage, imaginable as an anywhere, is in fact a near nowhere. The place of the stage refuses determinations because it is overflowing with them. An "antitheatrical prejudice" was commonly held in Stow's late years, of course, but more than anyone else Stow practiced that prejudice as a form of eco-criticism.[50] Stow has been called a "historical ecologist," a writer of "all the old open spaces."[51] This statement is almost right. Stow was a writer of all the old open spaces, now polluted to the point of nullification by playhouses, coaches, and so forth. He represented the theater as a threat to homely space, and this representation touched a form of antitheatricalism—environmental in concern—very much

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

alive in early modern London but largely unavailable to us. I need now to detail this prejudice in order to prove the *Survey*'s timeliness, its ability to provoke in 1598 and rather more in 1603.[52] To so detail, I will now read petitions lodged by the leading inhabitants of the Blackfriars against Burbage's in-precinct theater and its coach traffic.

In their first, preemptive petition, the Blackfriars' inhabitants predict that Burbage's theater "will grow to be a very great annoyance and trouble," one caused by a "great resort and gathering together of all manner of vagrant and lewd persons that, under color of resorting to the plays, will come thither and work all manner of mischief."[53] The vague anxiety here is much the same as that evinced by the modern phenomenon of white flight. The petitioners worry that the playhouse will bring in the wrong sort of people who will do the wrong sort of things, yet they cannot identify exactly who these people will be or what crimes they will commit. Vagueness has its advantages. It is in the petitioners' best interest to make the outline of the coming playgoing menace as large as possible. But from the petitioners' perspective the playgoers will truly be "vagrant[s]," moving hither and thither in the precinct without a legitimate purpose. The petitioners, in short, apply a local rubric of identification to the playgoers, and when it fails, the visitors are classed as an unknown population, whose undetermined values may obscure the implicit order of the precinct.

The petitioners' perceived (self-)alienation stems in large part from the relative exclusivity of their neighborhood. It is true that the Blackfriars, like most places in early modern London, housed persons across the social scale.[54] Yet certain built-in features made the precinct particularly attractive to such high-toned persons as Lady Elizabeth Russell (1528–1609). The vacated buildings of the dissolved Dominican friary, with their ample rooms and stately adornments, enabled the creation of something like apartment mansions. The tenth Baron Cobham, William Brooke (1527–1597), for instance, converted the second floor of the old porter's lodge into his primary residence, and hosted Queen Elizabeth there on at least one occasion.[55] Moreover, the precinct's location in the "bosom of the City" proved appealing to movers and shakers.[56] In short, while the Blackfriars was until 1608 among the liberties of London, its reputation was far better than that of, say, the Clink in Southwark.

With this sense of place, the petitioners characterize the emergent problem of playgoing vagrancy as a "great pestering and filling up of the same precinct, if it should please God to send any visitation of sickness as heretofore hath been, for that the same precinct is already

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

grown very populous."[57] Again, the indeterminacy of the playgoers incites a claim of mischief, here registered as a fear of "pestering and filling up." Like its cause, the duration of this effected demographic shift remains ambiguous. The playgoers might come and then stay, and if they stay, an already "very populous" precinct will be permanently "filled up" with people. Alternatively, the playgoers might come and go repeatedly, causing momentary imbalances that nonetheless create some sort of damage. As a tourist population, the playgoers would resemble the "sickness" they might spark. Like sickness, they could appear as an unannounced "visitation" upon the precinct. It is hard to say which form of overpopulation, occasional or permanent, causes more worry for the petitioners. In some respects, the condition of occasional overpopulation must seem worse. If the playgoers remained permanently on site, the petitioners could start the heavy work of social incorporation or, what is more likely, seize the impetus to become (momentarily) transient themselves, that is, to fly to a better clime.

Although this petition, the first of many, worries over the playhouse menace exclusively, its basic concerns are recycled in other complaints that consider the effects of coach traffic in the precinct. These later petitions see the playhouse as the occasion of the petitioners' woes, but pin the exacerbation of those woes on coach usage. A complaint to the Lord Mayor issued by the City in 1619 argues that, because of the playhouse,

> there is daily so great resort of people [to the precinct], and so great multitude of coaches, whereof many are hackney coaches bringing people of all sorts, that sometimes all their streets cannot contain them, that they endanger one the other, break down stalls, throw down men's goods from their shops, hinder the passage of the inhabitants there to and from their houses, let the bringing in of their necessary provisions, that the tradesmen and shopkeepers cannot utter their wares, nor the passengers go to the common water stairs without danger of their lives and limbs.[58]

Again, precinct visitors are classed as an amorphous mass, the "great resort of people" mentioned in the original petition of 1596. The difference here relates to the presence of coaches in and about the precinct. Their intrusion realizes concretely the dissolution of propriety first threatened with Burbage's plans for a private theater. In practical terms, coaches take up more space than do people on foot. Their presence thus constitutes a more aggressively physical filling up of the precinct. As the petitioners' catalogue of abuses makes evident,

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

the "great multitude of coaches" so clogs up the precinct's streets that inhabitants' economic, social, and religious activities cannot be concluded without the threat of loss. In this litany, the petitioners clearly stress their collective sense of entitlement. Tradesmen, shopkeepers, worshippers, and other inhabitants have a right to use the precinct's streets without molestation. Coach traffic fundamentally negates this right by throwing all—playgoers and inhabitants alike—into dangerous congestion. As a result, Blackfriars inhabitants become strangers, contending among strangers, in the precinct. This state of anonymous contestation realizes a deconstruction of the neighborhood, "a known area of social space in which, to a greater or lesser degree, one knows himself or herself to be recognized . . . [an] area of public space in general (anonymous, for everyone) in which little by little a private, particularized space insinuates itself as a result of the practical, everyday use of this space."[59] Local community, in other words, obtains only when its constituents can conceptualize their place within its loose structure. This personal space is not private in the fullest sense of the word because its main function is to disambiguate constituents and locate them in precise relation to everyone else. In short, there is nothing anonymous or general about the communal experience, since its formation results from the marking out of personal differences. With its introduction to the precinct, coach traffic has erased the petitioners' accumulated "private, particularized space" and with it, their ability to recognize each other as neighbors. The precinct, in short, has reverted back to a zone of "public space in general," where all are anonymous and without privilege.

In sum, the Blackfriars petitioners suffer a notational failure. They can observe intently but not finely the effect of the theater and its traffic on their precinct. Within the coach's enclosure, passengers have privacy, yet this privacy is never related, finally, back to people on the streets. Coaches do not make public space communal in any sense; they merely break it down into smaller spaces that hold no sure relation to each other. It is for this reason that the petitioners classify in-precinct coaches so vaguely. They are simply a "great multitude of coaches," irreducible to particularization and irreconcilable to the precinct's unspoken proprieties. As I have argued, Stow's discussion of coaching denotes, as it models, the petitioners' type of environmental failure. Though without their urgency, he unhappily notes that he too cannot record adequately what coaching does to the civic landscape. Through the manufacture of descriptive failure, moreover, he reproduces for the reader the topographical aphasia felt by the petitioners: their in-

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

ability to coordinate activity, person, place and time and their resulting sense that space has become increasingly anonymous and undefined.

Like the petitioners, Stow does not separate the environmental effect of coaching from that of the professional theater. The difference between Stow and the petitioners is largely one of scale. Stow's silence on the theater takes part in a survey of early modern London as a whole, as a catastrophic biosphere. To see how Stow's silence does so, we must now qualify it. Stock states that the professional theater references "were cut in the revised and otherwise extended edition of [the *Survey* in] 1603" (*St*, 89). But that is not quite the case. Manley, with somewhat greater precision, says that Stow exhibits "relative silence on London's new commercial theatres."[60] Stow's "relative silence," however, is relative only to our desire for him to speak longer and more explicitly about what interests us. In the 1603 edition of the *Survey*, a 1598 mention of the Curtain theater has indeed been removed from a discussion of the dissolution of the Priory of St John the Baptist (*S*, 2:69). But another 1598 reference to the public theaters, in a section entitled "Sports and pastimes of old time used in this Citie," remains in 1603, if in mutilated form. In the 1598 edition of the *Survey* this passage reads: "Of late time in place of those Stage playes, hath beene used Comedies, Tragedies, Enterludes, and Histories, both true and fayned: For the acting whereof certaine publike places *as the Theater, the Curtine, &c.* have beene erected" (*S*, 1:93, emphasis added). In the 1603 edition of the *Survey*, the words I have emphasized are removed. However, in both editions there appears a marginal note of "Theater and Curten for Comedies & other shewes." So the professional theater remains in the 1603 edition of the *Survey*, even if its place-names have been marginalized. Dramatic works have lately been acted out in "certain publike places," places that have been "erected" especially for performance: public places, purpose-built. A preceding anecdote highlights these identifying (non-)particulars. Speaking of a stage play in 1391 that lasted, astonishingly, three days, Stow points out not only its amateur actors, "parish Clearkes of London," but also its natural locale, "the Skinners well besides Smithfield" (*S*, 1:93).

Kingsford conjectures that the emendation to the Priory discussion may be explained by the fact that the Curtain was torn down in 1600, but he does not attempt to account for the excision of the reference to the Theater and the Curtain in "Sports and pastimes" (*S*, 2:368). As Stock points out, there were plenty of other public theater place-names that could have filled the spots of the Curtain and the Theater, which was dismantled and repurposed in 1597 (*St*, 89–90). Sloppy editing?

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Perhaps. Stow may have forgotten to add current place-names to the text proper and may have forgotten as well to correct the marginal note, or he may have simply failed to remove the marginal note. Stock suggests the latter (*St*, 89n4). Still, she and many others have registered in Stow's partial, reductive emendations the intention to right the realities of London according to his nostalgic vision. While I agree that something more than sloppiness is at play in the emendations of 1603, I dispute that the professional theater is met with "silence" by Stow. Stow, rather, mutters on the matter. He addresses the existence of commercial theaters, but does so with as few words as possible.

To what end, then, does Stow mutter? Context, once more, proves crucially informative. The *Survey*'s brief notice of the theater comes amid much longer and more cheerily delivered descriptions concerning "Sports and pastimes of old time used in this Citie" (*S*, 1:91–99). For Stock, the implicit opposition between new stage business and old pastimes is simply that, oppositional. The representation of saturnalia opposes the saturnalian experience of mumming, May Day games, and so forth, and thus the professional theater is judged accordingly, with silence (*St*, 90–91). But Stock does not take into account that the ludic memories surrounding the theater reference define the present. Consider Stow's treatment of London's bygone winter sports, coming only lines before the lone 1603 theater reference. These sports are first precisely located. Quoting from Fitzstephen's twelfth-century description of London, Stow notes, "When the great fenne or Moore, which watereth the wals of the Citie on the North side, is frozen, many yong men play upon the yce" (*S*, 1:93). In the margin Stow adds, "The Moore-field when there was no ditch by the wall of the Citie." Place (Moor Fields on the north side of London), time (in winter and before the existence of a city-wall ditch), and people ("yong men") are all counted, after which the various sports, fun but dangerous, are detailed.

> [S]ome [young men] . . . doe slide swiftly: others make themselves seates of yce, as great as Milstones: one sits downe, many hand in hand do draw him, and one slipping on a sudden, all fall together: some tie bones to their feete, and under their heeles, and shoving themselves by a little picked Staffe, do slide as swiftly as a bird flieth in the ayre, or an arrow out of a Crossebow. Sometime two runne together with Poles, and hitting one the other, either one or both doe fall, not without hurt: some breake their arms, some their legges, but youth desirous of glorie in this sort exerciseth it selfe against the time of warre. (*S*, 1:93)

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

The details here are delightful. (Who knew that bones were precursors to ice skates?) Fitzstephen and Stow both seem to revel in the exuberance of youth—sliding, running, hitting—even as they flinch at its recklessness—slipping, breaking bones. Detail is available in such richness precisely because it can be multiply located. The rapport between Fitzstephen and Stow exists not only because the two are deeply nostalgic but also because they share a sense of the primal import of environment to narrative.

It is with this deep reverence for environment that Stow passes critical judgment, not only moral judgment, on the professional theater. While Stow strips place names from the *Survey*'s theater reference, relegates them to the margin, and leaves them there in all their obsolescence, he does not do so in the service of silence. After the establishment of locational fixity and fullness elsewhere in the text, such editorial actions mean instead to force upon the reader an understanding about the (almost) nowhere that is the place of the stage. The Globe can, of course, be found in 1603. Just pay John Taylor to ferry you across the Thames to Southwark. Once there, however, you will contend, as a stranger among strangers, in a space without proper historical, symbolic, temporal, or spatial signposts. Play spaces are defined as "certaine publike places": the phrasing is both definite and indefinite. These are fixed locales, but only in the most meager of terms. Meager places sponsor meager detail, a flat enumeration—"Comedies, Tragedies, Enterludes, and Histories." The note in the margin, "Theater and Curten for Comedies & other shewes," only adds to the reduction. "While marginalia sometimes help to locate text," as William Slights notes, "at other times they dislocate it."[61] In our instance, the margin locates the text to harm the text's representation of space. Seeming holders of place, "Theater and Curten" upon inspection prove wills o' the wisp, names for transferred, transformed, or vanished spaces. In sum, Stow simulates for the reader the Blackfriars petitioners' environmental nightmare, the flickering out of their precinct as it was quickly becoming one of many "certaine publike places."

University of Colorado, Boulder

NOTES

Many thanks to Katherine Eggert, David Glimp, and Marjorie McIntosh, as well as audiences at the University of Colorado, Boulder.

[1] John Stow, *A Survey of London*, ed. Charles Lethbridge Kingsford, 2 vol. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1908), 1:xi. Kingsford's edition is still authoritative; his text is a facsimile of the 1603 edition. Hereafter abbreviated *S* and cited parenthetically by volume and page number.

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

[2] Ian Archer, "The Nostalgia of John Stow," in *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre and Politics in London, 1576–1649*, ed. David L. Smith, Richard Strier and David Bevington (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995), 21. For a concise history of nostalgia, see Jean Starobinski, "The Idea of Nostalgia," trans. William S. Kemp, *Diogenes* 14 (1966): 81–103.

[3] Steven Mullaney, *The Place of the Stage: License, Play, and Power in Renaissance England* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1988), 19.

[4] On the ameliorative work of the *Survey*, see especially Edward T. Bonahue, Jr., "Citizen History: Stow's *Survey of London*," *Studies in English Literature 1500–1900* 38 (1998): 61–85. On the *Survey*'s design to fix London, see especially Archer.

[5] Patrick Collinson, "John Stow and Nostalgic Antiquarianism," in *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stow to Strype, 1598–1720*, ed. J. F. Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2001), 34.

[6] Collinson, 29. Fitzstephen's description of London, prefacing recension 1 of *Vita sancti Thome* (c.1173–74), was first printed as the final appendix to the *Survey* (1598). For a modern English translation, see H. E. Butler, trans., "A Description of London," in *Norman London*, ed. Frank Stenton (New York: Italica Press, 1990), 47–60.

[7] Mullaney, 14–15.

[8] Mullaney, 15–16.

[9] See Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, trans. Steven Rendall (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1984), 91–100.

[10] See Lawrence Manley, *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995), 125–58.

[11] Mullaney, 16.

[12] Consider, in a modern instance of this image-making, how Katherine Duncan-Jones distinguishes the effigies of Stow and William Shakespeare in "Afterword: Stow's Remains," in *John Stow (1525–1605) and the Making of the English Past*, ed. Ian Gadd and Alexandra Gillespie (London: The British Library, 2004), 157–64.

[13] Manley, *Literature and Culture*, 162.

[14] See Manley, *Literature and Culture*, 158–163.

[15] Compare Andrew Gordon, "Overseeing and Overlooking: John Stow and the Surveying of the City," in *John Stow (1525–1605), 81–88.*

[16] Manley, *Literature and Culture*, 163.

[17] There can be no doubt that the *Survey* proved amenable material to later generations. For various reasons, Anthony Munday revised and enlarged the text twice (1618 and 1633), and John Strype, once (1720). James Howell, less studious than Munday and Strype, lifted large chunks of Stow's text for his *Londinopolis* (1657). On revision of the *Survey*, see especially J. F. Merritt, "The Reshaping of Stow's *Survey*: Munday, Strype, and the Protestant City," in *Imagining Early Modern London*, 52–88; and Helen Moore, "Succeeding Stow: Anthony Munday and the 1618 *Survey of London*," in *John Stow (1525–1605)*, 99–108. On marginalia in one copy of the *Survey*, see the brief discussion in D. R. Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000), 88–90. The *Survey* may have been used in a variety of ways, but it intends to exercise its readers to conceptual failure concerning the early modern present, and, thus, it does not aspire to be a blueprint for later Londons. Although he bequeathed his work to Munday, Stow did not, from what we can tell, ask him to change or enlarge observations of the present moment. Instead, Stow seems to have asked Munday only to correct the *Survey* according to "[the surveyor's] good mind" and "his best collections" (quoted in Merritt, 55). The contents of Stow's good

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

mind, when he was near death, are impossible to determine. The contents of his collections, however, are partially listed, and of that part, none is exactly topical. See Stow, 1:lxxxvi–xciii.

[18] Manley, *Literature and Culture*, 164–67.

[19] Oxford English Dictionary, 2nd ed., *s. v.* "survey."

[20] Edmund Howes, *Annales, or, A generall chronicle of England . . .* (London, 1631), 867. Quoted in Stow, 1:282n84. Kingsford conjectures that Howes' addition came from Stow's collection of materials. Stow ambiguously identifies two origination dates for the English coach. He initially claims that Walter Rippon built the first coach for the second Earl of Rutland, Henry Manners, in 1555. Later, he writes that Rippon built the first "hollow [covered] turning [with a pivoting front axle] coche" for Elizabeth I in 1564. Stuart Piggott clears this confusion by identifying the 1555 "coach" as, in fact, a Luttrell-type (fixed-track, five-horse) covered wagon. See his *Wagon, Chariot and Carriage* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1992), 151.

[21] By and large, scholarly discussions of the *Anonimalle Chronicle* focus on its treatment of the Peasants' Revolt. For a colossal reading of chronicling, see Annabel Patterson's *Reading Holinshed's Chronicles* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1994).

[22] The whirlicote was also known as the English long wagon, "a cot or bed upon wheels" (George Athelstane Thrupp, *The History of Coaches* [London: Kerby & Endean, 1877], 27). An artist's rendering of a whirlicote can be seen in Edwin Tunis, *Wheels: A Pictorial History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2002), 27.

[23] Stow's proof for the life-saving capacity of social order comes as a gloss on Fitzstephen's recollection of the great number of soldiers the city could muster during the tumultuous reign of King Stephen. See Stow, 1:84–85.

[24] Bonahue, 62.

[25] Quoted in Stow, 1:xxiv.

[26] Manley, "Of Sites and Rites," in *The Theatrical City*, 50–51.

[27] Manley, "Of Sites and Rites," 51.

[28] Echoing here, of course, Gertrude Stein, *Everybody's Autobiography* (New York: Random House, 1937), 289.

[29] Karen Newman, *Cultural Capitals: Early Modern London and Paris* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 2007), 17, 33. Hereafter abbreviated *C* and cited parenthetically by page number.

[30] Joan Parkes, *Travel in England in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1925), 19–20. For further description of the early English coach, see Norman G. Brett-James, *The Growth of Stuart London* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd, 1935), 429–432; and Walter Besant, *London in the Time of the Tudors* (London: A. & C. Black, 1904), 338–343. Newman does not provide any details on Louis XIV's coach, but it must have been a unique luxury vehicle. Equivalents, belonging to Elizabeth I, may be viewed in Tunis, 30–31. Another equivalent, given by James I to Tsar Boris Godunov in 1604, is in the Kremlin's Amory Museum, and contains in its carriage an exhibit of "high-relief painted carvings depicting hunting scenes and battles between Christians and Moslems." http://english.ruvr.ru/radio_broadcast/2248864/2316487/index.html. Compare the humble sight of an English for-hire (hackney) coach, rendered in Tunis, 32. For a historiography of hackney coaching in the long eighteenth century, see Mark Jenner, "Circulation and Disorder: London Streets and Hackney Coaches, c. 1640–1740," in *The Streets of London: from the Great Fire to the Great Stink*, ed. Tim Hitchcock and Heather Shore (London: Rivers Oram Press, 2003), 40–53.

[31] Parkes, 65.

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

[32] A final point here about the coach's usually jarring ride: it proved great material for innuendo. Here is one of many examples. In his mock eulogy for Thomas Hobson (died, 1631), who drove the weekly coach between London and Cambridge, an anonymous poet claims that unlike other coaches, Hobson's was "no bawdy house of leather . . . that jumble[s] altogether" ("On Hobson the Carrier," in G. Blakemore Evans, "Milton and the Hobson Poems," *MLQ* 4 [September, 1943]: 286–88).

[33] Peacham, *Coach and Sedan Pleasantly Disputing for Place and Precedence: The Brewers-Cart Being Moderator* (London, 1636), A3r.

[34] John Bruce, William Douglas Hamilton, and Sophia Crawford Lomas, ed., *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic series, of the reign of Charles I* . . . , 23 vol. (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, 1858–97), 5:220.

[35] Ben Jonson, *Epicene*, in *Ben Jonson*, ed. C. H. Herford, Percy Simpson, and Evelyn Simpson, 11 vol. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925–52), volume 5, act 1, scene 1, lines 167–69.

[36] Newman quotes from Parkes, 67. Parkes, in turn, directly quotes from Taylor, *The World Runnes on Wheeles, or, Oddes Between Cartes and Coaches* (London, 1623), B4r–v.

[37] Taylor, B4r–v.

[38] Poet and playwright John Marston (1576–1634) sneers at the conspicuousness of elite coach passengers, barbing one who rides a badged coach in his "Satire VIII: A Cynicke Satyre," in *The Scourge of Villanie* (London, 1598), E3r.

[39] Jonson, *Eastward Ho*, in *Ben Jonson*, 1.2.112–13.

[40] Peacham, B1v.

[41] Peacham, B3v.

[42] Jonson, *Every Man Out of His Humour*, in *Ben Jonson*, "Characters," 41; 2.4.21–23.

[43] Jonson, *Epicene*, 4.6.18.

[44] Jonson, *Eastward Ho*, 2.2.280; 3.2.

[45] Jonson, *Poetaster*, in *Ben Jonson*, 4.2.18.

[46] Jonson, *Eastward Ho*, 4.2.21.

[47] I have the space to trace out only a few main lines of inquiry concerning the coach. Much work remains to be done, especially in regard to the connection between coaching and the movement of women around London. As my brief overview of Jonson's work suggests, city comedies frequently use the coach as a means with which to characterize the troublingly irregular circulation of city wives, ladies, and so on. For a historiographical reading of women's movement (*sans* coach) within the early modern capital, see Laura Gowing, "'The freedom of the streets': Women and Social Space, 1560–1640," in *Londinopolis: Essays in the Cultural and Social History of Early Modern London*, ed. Paul Griffiths and Mark S. R. Jenner (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 2000), 130–153.

[48] Peacham and Taylor as well are out for targeted laughs. Each personifies the coach, and pits it against another animate vehicle "for place and precedence."

[49] Angela Stock, "Stow's *Survey* and the London Playwrights," in *John Stow (1525–1605)*, 89–98. Hereafter abbreviated *St* and cited parenthetically by page number.

[50] Jonas Barish, *The Antitheatrical Prejudice* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1981). The "greening" of Stow studies is in order, though such a critical turn should entail a healthy interrogation of what "green" means.

[51] Collinson, 34.

[52] The *Survey* should provoke us as well. Recent criticism argues that the social spaces of early modern London lost demarcation, and as a result, London's subjects became

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

more modern and less early; playing spaces in London grew fixed, and as a result, the theater's ability to teach emerging urbanites—about themselves, their physical and cultural landscape, and so on—increased. The ordered subject went missing in the streets as the individual was found viewing some (ideologically-conditioned) semblance of his self or her self on stage. The *Survey* flatly denies that such a rescue occurred. Compare Douglas Bruster, *Drama and the Market in the Age of Shakespeare* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1992); Helen Ostovich, "'To Behold the Scene Full': Seeing and Judging in *Every Man Out of His Humour*," in *Re-Presenting Ben Jonson: Text, History, Performance*, ed. Martin Butler (New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1999), 76–92; Ostovich, ed., *Every Man Out of His Humour* (New York: Palgrave, 2001); Andrew Hiscock, *The Uses of this World: Thinking Space in Shakespeare, Marlowe, Cary and Jonson* (Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press, 2004); Henry S. Turner, *The English Renaissance Stage: Geometry, Poetics, and the Practical Spatial Arts 1580–1630* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2006); Jean Howard, *Theater of a City: The Places of London Comedy, 1598–1642* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2007); Mary Bly, "Playing the Tourist in Early Modern London: Selling the Liberties Onstage," *PMLA* 122 (2007): 61–71; and James D. Mardock, *Our Scene is London: Ben Jonson's City and the Space of the Author* (New York: Routledge, 2008).

[53] Quoted in Irwin Smith, *Shakespeare's Blackfriars Playhouse: Its History and Its Design* (New York: New York Univ. Press, 1964), 480.

[54] A "treue certificat of the nombre names and trade of lyvinge of all Straingers" residing in the Blackfriars (1583) lists roughly 64 artisan families in its rolls. See Richard Arthur Roberts, Edward Salisbury, and Montague Spencer Giuseppi, ed., *Calendar of the manuscripts of the Most Honorable the Marquis of Salisbury* . . . 15 vol., Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts (London: HMSO, 1971), 13:219–227.

[55] Henry Benjamin Wheatley, *London, Past and Present: Its History, Associations, and Traditions* . . . 2 vol. (London: J. Murray, 1891), 1:196–97.

[56] Corporation of London, *Analytical Index to the Series of Records Known as the Remembrancia* . . . , 9 vol. (London: E. J. Francis & Company, Took's Court and Wine Office Court, E.C., 1828), 1:355–57.

[57] Corporation of London, 1:355–57.

[58] Robert Lemon and Mary Anne Everett Green, ed., *Calendar of state papers, Domestic series, of the reigns of Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, and James I, 1547–1625* . . . 12 vol. (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, 1856–72), 10:28.

[59] de Certeau, Luce Girard, and Pierre Mayol, *Practice of Everyday Life. Volume 2: Cooking and Living*, trans. Timothy J. Tomasik (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1998), 9.

[60] Manley, "Of Sites and Rites," 50.

[61] William Slights, *Managing Readers: Printed Marginalia in English Renaissance Books* (Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 2001), 8.

This content downloaded from
101.230.229.1 on Fri, 30 Jul 2021 04:52:07 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms