

Grunwald-Hope, K. (2024) 'Remembering the horsemen of Smithfield: chivalric nostalgia in John Stow's *Survey of London*', *The London Journal*, 49 (1), pp. 1-19.

This is an accepted manuscript of an article first published by Taylor & Francis Group in '*The London Journal*' on 30/5/23 online at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03058034.2023.2205297>

With the permission of the London Journal Trust, this accepted manuscript is made available under the CC BY 4.0 license <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Remembering the Horsemen of Smithfield: Chivalric Nostalgia in John Stow's *A Survey of London*

Kerstin Grunwald-Hope
Bath Spa University, UK

A Survey of London offers readers past and present an unrivalled insight into the history of early modern London. However, it is of hitherto unrecognised significance that the *Survey* draws on a pronounced horse culture and participates in the seventeenth-century revival of chivalric literature as a way of engaging with topographical change in the City. Drawing on early modern nostalgia studies, this article is the first to explore how the depiction of Smithfield's horsemen evokes chivalric nostalgia. With the help of the memory studies concepts of synchronic and diachronic historical consciousness, I show how this chivalric nostalgia functions as a literary device that by harnessing the traditions of chivalric romance offers a way of challenging the impact of urbanisation on readerly memory. This approach reveals the importance of Smithfield's horsemen in London's rich civic history and that nostalgia is a strategy rather than a limiting force in the *Survey*.

Keywords: John Stow; *Survey of London*; Smithfield; chivalric romance; nostalgia; urbanisation; horses

John Stow's chorography *A Survey of London* (1603) breathes life into its textual 'discovery of London' by walking the reader through the City ward by ward.¹ Along the way, the *Survey* looks beneath the urban topography and uncovers associated traditions past and present. Of

particular significance is how the *Survey* engages with horses to explore topographical change: horses pull Londoners' carts and coaches, they serve knights at tournaments and the urban elite at processions, they entice buyers and spectators to the weekly livestock market, and drag condemned criminals to their site of execution. Such is the ubiquity of horses in the *Survey* that we can speak of a distinctive urban 'horse culture'.² Horses were an ever-tangible presence in city life and an early modern reader did not have to own a horse to experience horse-related public customs or to relate to the *Survey*'s textual depictions. Time and again the *Survey* emphasises that as the cityscape changed over time, so did Londoners' horse-related practices. Equine encounters help the *Survey*'s readers superimpose wide-reaching processes of urbanisation onto their everyday experiences, and the nostalgic portrayal of horses and their human counterparts functions as a literary strategy with which the *Survey* makes urbanisation legible.

By bringing the horse into the equation and exploring portrayals of horses in both the 1603 and 1633 editions of the *Survey*, this article shines important new light on the complexity of nostalgia in the *Survey*. I have chosen these editions because they represent their respective editors' most substantial engagement with urban, and therefore also horse-related, customs in the seventeenth century. John Stow revised his original 1598 chorography and the second edition was published in 1603. Humphrey Dyson and his co-editors completed the fourth edition that they had started with Anthony Munday before his death in 1633. As the *Survey* is a work compiled by several editors over four decades, I do not speculate about whether nostalgia featured in the personal psychologies of either Stow or his editorial successors.³ Instead, I focus on the literary and intertextual strategies with which the *Survey* brings its nostalgic horse culture to life and thereby illuminates processes of urbanisation for its readership.

In the *Survey*, Smithfield embodies the horse culture that dominated early modern consciousness because this City location played host to 'markets of horses and cattle ... Military exercises, as J[o]ustings, Turnings, and great triumphes'.⁴ The seventeenth-century revival of chivalric romance influences the literary representations of these horse-related practices in the *Survey* since their portrayal repeatedly foregrounds the chivalric ideal of excellence in horsemanship. Building on the rich field of *Survey* studies that has already explored nostalgic themes in the text, I follow a memory studies approach to explore how the *Survey* conjures nostalgia in the tradition of chivalric romance with its renderings of the Smithfield tournaments and Smithfield horse market. Yet, the *Survey* complicates its nostalgic version of chivalric Smithfield by meaningfully juxtaposing medieval customs with a cartographic eye for how

processes of urbanisation had been obliterating the horse-related topographical features of Smithfield pond and Smithfield elms and with them a cherished horse culture that was heavily organised around chivalric ideals. The tournaments, market, elms, and pond reveal that a distinctive early modern horse culture, the seventeenth-century revival of chivalric literature, and urbanisation are interrelated contexts for the *Survey*'s nostalgic portrayal of Smithfield. Chivalric horsemen act as a nostalgic lens through which the *Survey* traces unprecedented topographical change whilst encouraging early modern readers to invest nostalgically in their increasingly urbanising present-day Smithfield. By conflating the urban environment with its horse culture, the *Survey* participates in the seventeenth-century revival of romance writing with a literary strategy that I define as chivalric nostalgia.

Romanticising Early Modern Horse Culture: Chivalric Nostalgia as Literary Strategy

The early modern horse hides in plain sight. Susanna Forrest writes that 'horses are so common in history that we glance over them without seeing them'.⁵ According to Karen Raber and Treva J. Tucker, the reason for this oversight is that 'whereas in the early modern world horses were truly everywhere, known in some or all aspects to literally everyone, in our postmodern world the horse and its attendant bodies of knowledge are an oddity, uncommon to the extreme'.⁶ As the horse culture we encounter in every *Survey* chapter has received no academic attention to date, my article shines light onto this particular postmodern blindspot in relation to the *Survey*. Regardless of whether the horse culture in the *Survey* portrays the everyday, such as the quotidian activities of coach- and draymen, or the extraordinary, such as the notable exploits of horsemen at tournaments and executions, participation in horsemanship matters equally in the text because the world of chivalry imbues all horse-related practices with larger-than-life significance. The etymology of the word 'chivalry' links 'knighthood' to 'horse-soldiery, cavalry, ... rider [and] horseman' in most European languages.⁷ In a broader sense, chivalry denotes the practices of mounted warriors, a religious order, a social class or a set of principles by which these groups lived.⁸ Despite the wide remit of the term chivalry, classic chivalric values such as 'hardiness and prowess' dominated romance narratives since the heyday of chivalry in the twelfth century because skilled horsemen were crucial to medieval warfare.⁹ Horsemanship such as the *Survey* praises in its portrayal of Smithfield had been an 'intellectual endeavour' since antiquity so that, over the centuries, riding, and the handling of horses more broadly, transformed into an artform.¹⁰ Medieval chivalric romances reflected the artistry and ambition inherent in noble pursuits such as warfare and the hunt by portraying horses and their human counterparts as striving for honour and glory together.¹¹

The early modern period saw a revival of chivalric romance because it fuelled the literary appetite of an increasingly wealthy and educated middle class in Elizabethan England. Romance writers such as the *Survey* editor Munday tailored their translations and texts to this new audience by underpinning chivalric idealism with lessons in morality and utility. The average citizen enjoyed these reimagined stories about mounted warriors because they provided examples of honour, personal achievement, and patriotism that were relatable to bourgeois circumstances.¹² Consequently, Barbara Fuchs rightly identifies how romance as a genre achieves a balancing act by simultaneously ‘harking back to a literary tradition, while also [remaining] highly adaptable to particular historical and ideological contexts’.¹³ Two of Fuchs’s insights about romance are particularly relevant to the *Survey*’s portrayal of chivalric Smithfield. First, since romance transcends literary periodisation, it can function as a textual strategy. That way, any text at any time, including the 1603 and 1633 *Survey* editions, can deploy romance strategically in part, even if their overall objective is not the production of imaginative literature. Second, while the conservative outlook of romance tends to surface in idealisations of the past, such nostalgia ‘can pose a significant challenge to the present’.¹⁴ By evoking nostalgia for numerous ‘great and royall J[o]ustes [that] were there holden in Smithfield’, the *Survey* reminds the reader that this urban space was once the seat of chivalric glory in London.¹⁵ By superimposing knightly adventures onto early modern Smithfield, the *Survey* participates in a seventeenth-century revival of chivalric romance and taps into a substantial cultural phenomenon by attempting to make medieval chivalry present to as many seventeenth-century citizen readers as possible. Moreover, by evoking nostalgia for Smithfield’s horsemen, the *Survey* also challenges the present-day state of the site and raises the alarm over how urbanisation has eroded the very equine topography that made chivalric Smithfield possible. Consequently, the *Survey* deploys chivalric nostalgia to achieve a timely textual memory strategy that halts the erosion of what Gordon calls the ‘customary knowledge [necessary] to inculcate in [*Survey*] readers a sense of their responsibilities as urban residents and members of a commonweal’.¹⁶

We find such horse-related knowledge in a *Survey* chapter dedicated to the customary responsibilities ‘of the Citizens’, for example, in which ‘the good lawes and customes of this Citty’ stipulate that ‘the fore horse of every carriage should bee lead by hand’.¹⁷ However, ‘these good orders are not observed’ and the *Survey* points the finger at specific equine occupations breaking horse-related laws: ‘the Coach man rides behinde the horse tayles, lasheth them, and looketh not behind him: The Draye man sitteth and sleepeth on his Drea, and letteth his horse leade him home’.¹⁸ By not paying attention to their equine counterparts, these stock

characters neglect their customary responsibilities. Moreover, they fail in the basics of horsemanship: principles in which both civic and aristocratic horsemen should be expert. Gervase Markham's *Faithfull Farrier* makes it plain to the reader that it is 'requisite that you acquaint your knowledge well with the complections, qualities, customes and conditions of horses' in general and, even more importantly, that you 'acquaint yourselfe with the complexion of *your* horse ... so you must also have a settled knowledge in his countenance and gestures, ... his actions and motions'.¹⁹ By blindly lashing at the horse on one hand and falling asleep on the other, the coach- and draymen clearly cannot know or understand their animals. Nonetheless, the *Survey* implies that such neglect was not always customary and that there was a time when good orders were observed.

Markham's suggested best-practices for horsemanship and the complaint over the lack thereof in the *Survey* are both in line with understandings of the kind of 'care-filled engagement' that Erica Fudge detects in early modern human-animal relations and which is 'premised on attending to the other partner, watching the steps they make, following their lead, on the understanding that that partner will also attend to you, watch your steps, follow your lead as the situation requires'.²⁰ In the *Survey*, it matters whether early modern Londoners follow what Fudge terms 'choreographies' with their horses, because knightly figures base their chivalric claims on such customary knowledge in early modern romances.²¹ As Munday's 1619 translation of *Amadis de Gaule* reveals when it gushes about 'a Knight of the comlyest grace that ever was seen ... by reason of his bravery in horsman-ship', there is no mistaking that reciprocal choreographies between horse and rider grant honour.²² In this light, the *Survey* turns the coach- and draymen into examples of Londoners and their horses no longer attending to each other with care and thereby eroding the City's cherished horse culture. Consequently, romance as a textual strategy partly grounds the customary rights of both knights and citizens in the responsibilities of watching, understanding, and attending that, according to Fudge, horses brought with them.

The branch of memory studies called nostalgia studies offers a further theoretical framework with which to explore how the portrayal of customary knowledge determines the rights and responsibilities of Smithfield's horsemen in the *Survey*. In peacetime, the tournament was a unique opportunity for a rider to test his proficiency in horsemanship and which, as a sporting contest and entertainment, remained a 'potent ritual that initiate[d] the participants in the rights and responsibilities of their traditional chivalric role' under Elizabethan rule.²³ Furthermore, Caroline Barron considers the sixteenth-century Midsummer Watch as evidence that 'Londoners developed their own brand of chivalric spectacle, [which] while being

influenced by chivalric tournaments and romances, ... had a distinct, possibly bourgeois, character of its own'.²⁴ Indeed, militaristic horsemen at both aristocratic tournaments and civic watches engender chivalric nostalgia in the *Survey*. In his seminal work on how nostalgia influences portrayals of the past, Raymond Williams detects 'not ... historical error, but historical perspective' and the need for 'precise analysis of each kind of retrospect'.²⁵ Nostalgia studies approach nostalgia as a multifaceted and period-specific phenomenon and recognise that, while people have reacted to change with nostalgia through the ages, nostalgia does not function universally across time. Consequently, the romance-related intertextuality of Smithfield's horsemen in the *Survey* calls for our nuanced attention.

Whereas I approach nostalgia as an effective strategy, *Survey* scholarship tends to consider such retrospection as a limiting force. For example, Daniel Woolf, Ian Archer, and Patrick Collinson argue that the *Survey* has fewer positive things to say about the present than the past because Stow was an ageing antiquarian who remembered fondly the London of his Catholic youth. As a result, we need to treat the *Survey*'s portrayal of the City with caution.²⁶ While conceding that Stow idealised the past, Andrew Gordon, Lawrence Manley, and Oliver Harris also contend that nostalgia did not stop Stow from embracing change or from meaningfully engaging with the City throughout his prolific writing career.²⁷ This article builds on these bodies of scholarship that greatly enrich our understanding of nostalgia in the *Survey*; however, by exploring the intertextual literary strategies relating to the horse culture we find in the *Survey*'s portrayal of Smithfield, I necessarily step away from prevailing readings of nostalgia as an impediment to Stow, the individual. Instead, I argue that the *Survey* situates its horse culture within the literary tradition of chivalric romance and deploys romance as a literary strategy that serves a seventeenth-century readership familiar with and appreciative of its conventions.

Writing at the forefront of early modern nostalgia studies, Kristine Johanson stipulates that nostalgia is always tied to the present because the person who nostalgically engages with the past does so through the prism of the social and cultural realities of their day.²⁸ In the case of the *Survey*, early modern urbanisation and the revival of chivalric literature created intersecting socio-cultural dynamics. While aristocratic in origin, chivalric rights and responsibilities became attainable and even aspirational for many more Londoners in the early modern period. However, chivalric customs required physical space in the City. Rachel Ramsay makes the important point that the abundant criticism of building development in the *Survey* pinpoints processes of urbanisation that benefitted private individuals rather than the community and therefore seemed to transform London 'never [for] the better'.²⁹ In the

following readings, the memory studies concepts of synchronic and diachronic historical consciousness allow me to show how the *Survey* turns chivalric Smithfield into a powerful warning of how urbanisation has eroded Londoners' customary rights and responsibilities. Memory studies define synchronic historical consciousness as the ways in which medieval and early modern Europeans still tended to think analogically about the past and drew parallels across time without accounting for differences in historical conditions between the past and the present. Modern diachronic temporal awareness differs from such older synchronic thinking because nowadays we tend to consider history as linear rather than repeatable.³⁰ I show how the *Survey* blends synchronic and diachronic historical consciousness to evoke chivalric nostalgia with its intertextual portrayal of Smithfield's horsemen: a technique that in turn serves a complex memory strategy. To unpack this strategy, I draw on the work of William Keith Hall, who approaches the *Survey* as 'linguistic cartography' with pronounced literary qualities.³¹ The first part of my discussion expands on Hall's pioneering work and considers how the *Survey* deploys the literary strategies of telescoping, omission, and digression to transport the reader into the medieval glory days of chivalric Smithfield. The second part explores how the *Survey* historicises chivalric nostalgia by diachronically tracing the impact of early modern urbanisation on Smithfield's horse-related topography. As the recollections captured in the *Survey* are meant to 'bestow upon the politike body & members of the same: what London hath beene of auncient time', such a memory strategy keeps the rich chivalric horse culture of the City alive in a rapidly urbanising cityscape.³²

‘A notable Shew of Horses’: Following the Steps of Smithfield’s Chivalric Horsemen

The *Survey* brings the chivalric horse culture of Smithfield to life with mention of twelve tournaments in the chapter 'The warde of Faringdon extra, or without'. These examples evoke nostalgia in line with synchronic thinking because the *Survey* does not systematically trace how such equine spectacles developed over time. Instead, all twelve date from 1357 to 1467. In the *Survey*, a short 110-year-period in the later Middle Ages thus represents all of Smithfield's tournament-related history and thereby implies that such equine customs had since remained unchanged. Yet, early modern Smithfield did not host aristocratic tournaments. Such spectacles tended to take place away from the City in the 'tiltyards of Greenwich, Westminster Palace and Whitehall'.³³ Although the 1603 edition refers to all these locations at some point on its textual perambulation, reference to a 'large Tilt yard [in Westminster] for Noblemen and other to exercise themselves in J[o]usting, Turneyng, and fighting at Barryers' is the only elaboration of tournament-related horsemanship outside the City proper.³⁴ Moreover, while the 1633

Survey updates the earlier editions in many other respects, we find no examples of sixteenth- or early seventeenth-century tournaments taking place within or outside the City in the text. In light of this, we could easily allege that the *Survey* freezes equine Smithfield in time to evade diachronic questions of whether tournaments continued to ennoble this particular City location with the sights and sound of chivalric spectacle; however, persistent editorial omission of present-day equivalents of medieval tournaments points to a kind of telescoping.³⁵ In the case of Smithfield, the *Survey* purposefully transports the reader back in time by claiming that just twelve examples ‘may suffice for J[o]ustes’ at this site.³⁶ While ceremonial aspects such as displays of courtly love started to dominate tiltyards from the thirteenth century onwards, the *Survey*’s attention remains on manifestations of martial rather than amorous honour in a medieval City location.³⁷ Consequently, the telescoped tournaments reveal themselves as a strategic digression with which to champion a literary version of Smithfield that still resonates strongly with the praise of horsemanship in both medieval and early modern chivalric romance.³⁸

The location, as presented by the *Survey*, thus holds together traces of horse-related practice, both past and present. To celebrate the non-fictional, everyday, horsemen of Smithfield as martial heroes, like those of chivalric romance, the *Survey*’s recalling of the medieval tournaments repeatedly links the fates of warriors and their warhorses as they struggle together for glory at the site:

Lord Scales horse ha[d] on his Chafron a long speare pike of steele, and as the two Champions coaped together, the same horse thrust his pike into the nostrilles of the Bastards horse, so that for very payne he mounted so high that he fell on the one side.³⁹

A shaffron was a metal covering for the horse’s head and was often ornately embossed.⁴⁰ Hence, the detailed description of the protective headgear of Lord Scales’s horse with its ‘long speare pike of steele’ not only dramatises proceedings aesthetically but also emphasises the genuine risks that horses faced at the Smithfield tournaments.⁴¹ The *Survey* makes the danger for the horses’ human counterparts equally tangible as one tournament was abandoned after ‘five courses’ because one opponent ‘was borne over horse and man’.⁴² In 1393, a joust even proved fatal in that the ‘Earle of Mare was cast both horse and man, and two of his ribbes broken with the fall, so that he was convaied out of Smithfield ... but dyed by the way at Yorke’.⁴³ Consequently, the *Survey* conjures an image of chivalric horsemanship in which the quest for honour at the Smithfield tournaments comes at a real cost to both animal and human participants. While Fudge warns that we must be careful not to ‘force an alien concept on to

[the early modern] world that has no parallel' and we cannot find animal welfare concerns in the *Survey*, its chivalric presentation of Smithfield nonetheless pays careful, and therefore potentially care-filled, attention to not only men facing injury and death but also horses experiencing 'paine'.⁴⁴

Early modern tournaments became less dangerous for horse and man.⁴⁵ Innovations such as '[r]ebated weapons', 'the introduction of the tilt barrier', 'adoption of plate armour' and 'points [being] deducted for ... striking an opponent's horse' all meant that even though aristocrats and their horses continued to prove themselves chivalrously in the tiltyards of Greenwich, Westminster, and Whitehall, their participation no longer prepared them for war in any practical way.⁴⁶ Without its military impetus, the tournament became a vehicle of courtiers' 'self-promotion' with which to negotiate their relationships with reigning monarchs who continued to attend tiltyard entertainments regularly in the early modern period.⁴⁷ Whereas the *Survey* remains silent about the less-than-chivalric repurposing of horse-related gestures, we can turn to the drama of the period for evidence that seventeenth-century audiences were keenly aware of how the motives and agendas underpinning tournaments gradually changed. For example, the 1605 city comedy *Eastward Ho* registers increasing scepticism surrounding chivalric claims by ridiculing the so-called 'thirty-pound knights' of early modern London who bought their title for a relatively small sum of money rather than earning their honour on the battlefield:

Thou art a fool, Sin. The knighthood nowadays are nothing like the knighthood of old time. They rid a-horse-back; ours go afoot. ... They were still prest to engage their honour; ours still ready to pawn their clothes. They would gallop on at sight of a monster; ours run away at sight of a sergeant. They would help poor ladies, ours make poor ladies.⁴⁸

The character Gertrude here inverts every positive quality associated with chivalry when her husband Sir Petronel Flash turns out to be a penniless fraud instead of the upstanding aristocrat he claims to be. Twice the 'knighthood of old time' is defined in relation to horses: first, as warriors 'on horse-back' and, second, as riding towards danger.⁴⁹ In *Eastward Ho*, present-day chivalry no longer upholds any such honourable deeds and becomes a world of thinly veiled self-interest. We find no such diachronic cynicism in either *Survey* edition's examples of medieval knightly behaviour. Instead, jousting opponents 'fought valiantly' in 1409 and, in 1467, two knights 'departed with equall honour'.⁵⁰ Consequently, synchronic thinking in the *Survey* directs the reader's gaze to a time when knights still filled Smithfield with commendable horsemanship and their chivalric ideals could not be called into question.

To a romance-appreciating citizen reader, medieval Smithfield offered further significant nostalgic attractions: a strong heritage of both aristocratic and civic horse-related customs in the shape of not only elite tournaments, but also a commonly accessible livestock market and public executions. While tournaments might have already belonged to the past of early modern Smithfield, the resident market ‘for the sale of live animals, whether horses for riding, or beef, sheep and pigs for eating’ was still taking place twice a week at the seventeenth-century site.⁵¹ In the *Survey*’s version of Smithfield market, horses take centre-stage: ‘every fryday ... a notable shew’ of horses takes place while ‘swine, milch kine, sheepe and oxen’ receive considerably less attention and are set aside as ‘other cattell’.⁵² Importantly, the *Survey* bases its seventeenth-century portrayal on a single medieval source: William Fitzstephen’s 1174 rendering of the market as an equine spectacle in which racing ‘horses stretch[ed] out their bodies and [ran] speedily away, [with] the Riders spurring them on’t’.⁵³ Fitzstephen wrote evocatively about the noteworthy horsemanship on display in Smithfield in the very century in which the world of chivalry enjoyed its heyday.⁵⁴ However, Fitzstephen’s martially inspired vision of medieval Smithfield was not itself written as part of a chivalric romance or indeed, even a chorography. Instead, the above quotation features in the introductory survey of the City found in his biography of Thomas Becket. Since Fitzstephen’s own portrayal of Smithfield’s horsemen nonetheless offers chivalric role models with which to populate an idealised version of the site, the *Survey* can thus be seen to draw on the precedent it sets as a non-fiction text deploying romance modes in part as a literary strategy. This temporal and intertextual manipulation signifies a kind of synchronic historical awareness that purposefully omits centuries of change to frame the weekly event within a specifically medieval consciousness.

As in the case of the Smithfield tournaments, synchronic historical consciousness circumvents diachronic questions of whether the people associated with horse-related practices in the seventeenth-century Smithfield market were still, in the words of the *Survey*, ‘notable’.⁵⁵ Judging by the popular opinion of Smithfield’s horse traders, called horse coursers in early modern culture, the likelihood of notoriety was far higher than that of renown. The *Survey* only mentions horse coursers by name once and neutrally remarks that ‘horse coursers ... remaine in their olde Market of Smithfield’.⁵⁶ However, just as in the case of the early modern knights, seventeenth-century drama had much more to say about this particular equine occupation. *Bartholomew Fair* (1614), for instance, offers evidence that the portrayal of Smithfield and its horse coursers in the *Survey* did not reflect contemporary attitudes to goings-on at the site. Instead, Jonson’s play paints Smithfield as an entertaining but dangerous marketplace in which rogue traders preyed on naive visitors. The real-life Bartholomew Fair on which the play was

based took place every August in addition to the weekly livestock market. Importantly, it is the character of the horse courser ‘Dan Knockhum’ who as a dubious ‘knight of the knife’ or, in other words, a thief by many names such as ‘child of the horne-thumb, a babe of booty, boy; a cutpurse’, personifies the immoral qualities of the fair.⁵⁷ The play here explicitly connects horse coursers to the world of knighthood but inverts chivalric honour to make a satirical judgement about horse coursers as disreputable horsemen. Even writers of non-dramatic literature, such as social observers and authorities on horsemanship, voiced scandalised opinions about the practitioners of this trade. For example, the 1616 posthumous edition of Thomas Overbury’s *A Wife*, to which numerous character sketches were appended, dedicates a whole section to ‘The Arrant Horse-Courser’ and singles out Smithfield’s horses as bearing the brunt of the horse courser’s ‘knavery’ in that ‘[h]is Stable is fill’d with so many Diseases, one would thinke most part about Smithfield were an Hospitall for Horses, or a slaughter-house for the common hunt’.⁵⁸ Markham alleges similar malpractices in his *Arte of Horse-manship* since ‘if the horse have ... paines, scratches, splents, or anye eie-sore about the neather joynt, then the first thing the Horse corser doeth; is to ride his horse into the durt, and by dawbing his legs to hide his faultes’.⁵⁹ In both characterisations, the horse courser deceives prospective buyers and wilfully neglects his horses. By refusing to pay care-filled attention to his horses, the horse courser of early modern culture raises questions about the veracity of the valiant Smithfield horsemen we find in the *Survey*.

We can attribute such persistent vilification to the fact that horse coursers were essential but mistrusted middlemen in the mercantile world of early modern London. As the market for horsepower expanded, specialist horse traders dedicated themselves to cater for the countrywide demand for horses. Peter Edwards writes while ‘many of the dealers were undoubtedly reputable ... a host of small-time ... dealers had few scruples and often possessed openly criminal proclivities. Unfortunately, the population at large associated the horse trade with such dubious characters and this affected the reputation of honest traders’.⁶⁰ Such misgivings about Smithfield’s horse coursers were part of a wider resistance to a gradual dissolving of direct producer-customer relationships in the late Elizabethan and early Stuart City. As a result, even though middlemen were an increasingly common sight in London’s marketplaces, ‘their presence was contested’.⁶¹ Since the reputation of early modern horse coursers was morally ambiguous at best, the *Survey* could not deploy their horsemanship nostalgically to imbue seventeenth-century Smithfield with chivalric honour. Due to the cultural vilification of horse coursers, any rendering of Smithfield as a marketplace had to step

away from the debauchery brought to life in *Bartholomew Fair* and required a more concerted effort to engender chivalric nostalgia synchronically.

Yet, the horsemanship on display in Fitzstephen's description of Smithfield market works on a nostalgic level because medieval horse coursers were still indisputably 'expert in governing their horses'.⁶² By textually reviving Fitzstephen's version of the weekly event over four centuries later, the *Survey* telescopes the market into the twelfth century in which horse coursers and their horses act out chivalric pageantry:

There may you of pleasure see ambler pacing it delicately: there may you see trotters fit for men of armes, sitting more hardly: there may you have ... wel limmed geldings, whom the buiers do especially regard for pace, and swiftnes: the boyes which ride these horses, sometime two, sometime three, doe runne races for wagers, with a desire of praise, or hope of victorie.⁶³

Since the *Survey* refers to Smithfield market as a 'notable shew', these horse coursers appear to be performing, like the knights at the Smithfield tournaments, for the 'pleasure' of an appreciative crowd.⁶⁴ At Smithfield market, equine pageantry is described as consisting of horse coursers parading ambler and trotter as well as racing geldings. The emphasis on how ambler and trotter move is noteworthy because their gaits require different levels of training. Whilst all horses trotted, the amble is a four-beat gait and had to be taught.⁶⁵ The 1633 *Survey* edition elaborates on the complexity of the 'ambling pace' as the horse's 'feet [going] on either side up and downe together by turnes, or else crossing'. A trot, on the other hand, is a simpler two-beat gait since trotters 'lite up and set downe together the contrary feet on either side'.⁶⁶ Seeing as the 1603 and 1633 editions both praise the ambling on show at Smithfield market as delicate, it can be construed that the horse coursers display considerable horsemanship in performing this difficult gait. Whilst the trot comes easier to horse and rider, the allusion to 'men of armes' nonetheless evokes mounted warriors such as the chivalric knights who tested their skill and mettle at the Smithfield tournaments.⁶⁷ Smithfield's horse coursers thus effectively mimic chivalric warfare by having their horses trot. The 'races for wagers' at Smithfield market might be less dangerous than the Smithfield tournaments; however, the horse coursers' 'desire of praise, or hope of victorie' echo the knightly ambitions of valour and honour we have already encountered.⁶⁸ To paint Smithfield's horse coursers in chivalric light, the 1633 edition even draws careful attention to 'the very beasts [of the horse coursers that], after their fashion, doe not cease to strive, while their joynts tremble, and impatient of delay, endure not standing still in a place'.⁶⁹ The foregrounding of the horse coursers' equine

counterparts here goes beyond a reciprocal care-filled engagement by explicitly investing the horses with the human emotion of impatience and portraying them as matching their riders' eagerness for the race. Since such anthropomorphising of horses is characteristic of the portrayal of horses as intelligent agents in romance, there is no mistaking the chivalric horsemanship that the *Survey* asks the reader to perceive in Smithfield market.⁷⁰

The *Survey* thus suppresses early modern views on horse coursers as vilified tricksters and purposefully reinstates them as capable horsemen of the chivalric era who together with their horses strive for martial and commercial glory in Smithfield. Synchronic renderings of the medieval tournaments and market remind the *Survey* reader that care-filled relations between horse and man can bestow manifold aristocratic and civic prestige onto London past and present. However, for such a portrayal of riders and their horses to evoke a profound nostalgia, the *Survey* must allow for diachronic change and acknowledge that the chivalric glory days of Smithfield have been and gone. Since knights and horse coursers allow the *Survey* to portray Smithfield in the tradition of chivalric romance, these horsemen cannot be implicated in a critical appraisal of a much-diminished space. In what follows below I thus explore how the *Survey* nonetheless achieves a careful vigil for the disappearance of horse-related topography in seventeenth-century Smithfield and, in fact, relies on cartographic observations that only serve to strengthen the chivalric nostalgia initiated by the descriptions of medieval horsemen at the site.

'Horsepoole ... now much decayed': Attending to the Urbanisation of Early Modern Smithfield

We encounter a keen eye for how urbanisation altered the cityscape from its medieval past to its early modern present-day throughout the *Survey* and the aforementioned bodies of *Survey* scholarship have extensively explored the many facets of Stow's engagement with urban change.⁷¹ However, my readings of Smithfield raise questions about the significance of chivalric romance to how the *Survey* attends to topographical changes at the site. Even though the tournaments and market regularly transformed Smithfield into the equine heart of the City over many centuries, associated structures such as tiltyards and animal pens were nonetheless temporary and could be removed after each respective event. Smithfield pond and the Smithfield elms, however, were permanent features that provided customary resources and landmarks for horse-related practices and thereby made the chivalric horse culture at this particular City location possible in the first place:

Then is Smithfield pond, which of olde time in Records was called Horse-poole, for that men watered horses there, and was a great water. In the sixt of Henrie the fift, a new building was made in this west part of Smithfield betwixt the said Poole and the Riuer of the Wels, or Turnemill brooke, in a place then called the Elmes, for that there grew many Elme trees, and this had beene the place of execution for Offendors: since the which time the building there hath beene so encreased, that now remaineth not one tree growing.⁷²

Whereas the reader needs to rely on their imagination to picture the layout of the site in the nostalgic renderings of the tournaments and the market, the *Survey* relates the Smithfield elms to Smithfield pond with cartographic precision to put both under the tangible threat of urbanisation. In terms of Smithfield pond, overuse and pollution are the processes of urbanisation that break the toponymic link between the body of water and its traditional use for the watering of horses:

Horsepoole in Westsmithfield, was sometime a great water, and because the inhabitants in that part of the Citie did there water their Horses, the same was in olde Records called Horspoole: it is now much decayed, the springs being stopped up, and the land water falling into the small bottome, remayning inclosed with Bricke, is called Smithfield pond.⁷³

As the emphasis lies on the ‘olde Records’ that trace the antiquity of the pool, the *Survey* reminds the reader in line with diachronic historical consciousness that horse-related heritage has been lost in Smithfield.⁷⁴ This literary strategy draws on the material realities of the ‘much decayed’, as in ‘physically wasted or ... ruined’, water source.⁷⁵ Indeed, the City Lands Grant Book 1589–1616 describes how the St Sepulchre parishioners had to ‘first cleanse the pond in good sort at their own charge’ in 1601 to deal with water pollution and then ‘appointed ... to deal with one Wright ... concerning the bringing water into the same pond’ in 1602 to address the low water table.⁷⁶ Consequently, the *Survey* textually urbanises Smithfield pond, as a part of the City that ‘now every man doth beholde’, and by doing so nostalgically raises the alarm over the disappearance of horse-related topography at a site once renowned for chivalric activities.⁷⁷

The *Survey* is the earliest extant seventeenth-century source that mentions Horse pool in Smithfield. In terms of medieval references, a single text from 1249, namely a *Special Inquest into Purprestures*, ‘ordered that the mayor and sheriffs shall cause the tumbrel which stands inside Newgate to be removed to Horsepool at Smithfield before Mid-Lent’ and thereby

reveals that Horse pool was known not only as a place for watering horses but also as one that played host to judicial practices.⁷⁸ A tumbril was used as ‘an instrument of punishment’ from the thirteenth century onwards and, according to the inquest, this particular object belonged not only to Smithfield but specifically to its body of water.⁷⁹ Consequently, portraying Horse pool as a once ‘great water’ recalls a medieval past when Smithfield was a hive of chivalric and judicial activity.⁸⁰ Early modern Smithfield pond, on the other hand, by ‘remayning inclosed with Bricke’, would have faded from view and from memory if the *Survey* had not commemorated it as a once-noteworthy topographical feature.⁸¹

The Smithfield elms also evoke both chivalric and judicial memories. Again, the *Survey* puts these trees under the concrete threat of urbanisation: this time by holding building development responsible for swallowing the open space in ‘this west part of Smithfield betwixt the said Poole and the River of the Wels, or Turnemill brooke’ where the trees once stood.⁸² The *Records of St. Bartholomew’s* confirm that the elms were ‘on the other side of Smithfield by the then Horse-pool, due west from’ the church.⁸³ The precise location of the elms in relation to the pond matters because it allows the *Survey* to tie this topographical feature to the linear place history of Smithfield. Whereas synchronic thinking might suggest that the trees can be planted again, the diachronic message is stark. As there ‘now remaineth not one tree growing’, it is made clear that these elms were irrevocably lost to the building encroachment.⁸⁴ Importantly, the *Survey* describes the ‘place then called the Elmes’ as a ‘place of execution for Offendors’ and thereby links Smithfield’s trees to the capital punishments that had been taking place at the site over many centuries.⁸⁵ We cannot say for certain whether convicted individuals were hanged from actual elms or whether man-made gibbets, named after the nearby trees, were used from the start. Alfred Marks suggests that the Normans started to build gallows near elms, which they considered as ‘the tree of justice’, and this potent symbolism was the reason that the Tyburn Tree gibbet was initially called ‘The Elms’, the same as the gallows in Smithfield.⁸⁶

Despite the remaining toponymic uncertainty, it is beyond question that horsepower was central to judicial proceedings at the Smithfield elms since horses dragged individuals convicted to be ‘drawne, hanged and quartered’ from prison to the site of execution ‘bound and laid on their back’.⁸⁷ Along the way, displays of capital punishment set a ‘scene of terror’, in Michel Foucault’s words, and were disciplinary occasions on which spectators gathered to be ‘made ... afraid’.⁸⁸ Yet, the powerful message of such spectacles played not only on the threat of a violent death but also on symbolic gestures borrowed from the world of chivalry. The chivalric horsemanship on display at the Smithfield tournaments is at the heart of the judicial

authority that the elms hold in the *Survey* because martial prowess is rewarded repeatedly with justice and mercy: virtues which from the very first medieval romances glorified the chivalric endeavours of aristocratic horsemen.⁸⁹ For example, at a tournament in 1409 mounted warriors ‘fought valiantly but the King tooke up the quarrell into his hands, and pardoned them both’.⁹⁰ In 1430, when the knights ‘had fought long, the King tooke up the matter and forgave both the parties’.⁹¹ In 1467, the ‘king gave judgement’.⁹² In all cases, riders and their horses were judged to perform honourably in the tiltyard and were therefore spared from further harm or injury.

Practices located by the Smithfield elms flip this judicial process on its head since they invert the positioning of the chivalric rider atop his horse for symbolic effect. Janette Dillon rightly recognises Smithfield as a ‘place with both formalized conflict (tournaments) and execution’.⁹³ However, we must note that both formalisations are engaged with notions of chivalric horsemanship. Andrew G. Miller writes that medieval knights used horses symbolically to call each other’s honour and reputation into question and ‘shamed ... vanquished opponent[s] by displaying [the other’s] armour, reversed, at [their] horse's tail or by hanging [their] opponent's heraldry emblem there’.⁹⁴ Importantly, ‘dragging anything, for that matter, at a horse’s tail in the Middle Ages—in the way that criminals were dragged on their way to execution—was considered highly debasing, especially for a knight’.⁹⁵ Miller here brings to the forefront the connection between the judicial practices that the *Survey* references in relation to the resident elms and the *Survey*’s romance-inspired portrayal of chivalric tournaments at the site. By being prevented from riding on horseback on their final journey and instead having horses drag them, the sentenced individuals in question are situated as symbolically unhorsed riders and face the ultimate chivalric humiliation before they are executed. Consequently, the reference to the Smithfield elms in the *Survey* is a less obvious but equally important participation in the strategic deployment of chivalric practice.

Yet, in the same way that tournaments no longer graced early modern Smithfield, the gallows had long been relocated from the site to St Giles’s ‘at some time before 1413’.⁹⁶ While most hangings took place elsewhere from the fifteenth century onwards, Smithfield gained renewed notoriety as a site for the burning of heretics.⁹⁷ However, such spectacles of justice are noticeably absent in the *Survey* because evidence of confessional divides would have detracted from the unifying quality of chivalric nostalgia that encourages *Survey* readers to remember Smithfield primarily in the idealising traditions of romance. Since building development and changes in capital punishments had eroded the judicial heritage of Smithfield, the *Survey* turns to chivalric nostalgia to reclaim the vanished elms as an intrinsic aspect of the longstanding and multifaceted horse culture of the site. For example, the *Survey* claims that in

1196 ‘William Fitz Osbert, a seditious traitor ... was ... by the heeles drawn thence to the Elmes in Smithfield and there hanged’.⁹⁸ Moreover, in 1330, ‘Roger Mortimer Earle of March’ was apparently ‘taken and brought to the Tower, from whence hee was drawne to the Elmes, and there hanged’.⁹⁹ Fitz Osbert and Mortimer both were chivalric figures because the former harboured ambitions of becoming a citizen crusader and the latter came from a long line of knights. However, each was charged with committing an offence against chivalric ideals by becoming an ‘opponent of authority’ and an ‘opponent of the king’ respectively instead of accepting the judgement of their superiors like the knights at the Smithfield tournaments.¹⁰⁰

Seeing as the *Survey* does not locate elms in any other intra- or extramural place of execution, the reader is led to believe that these offenders against chivalry met their end in Smithfield. Yet, neither man died at the Smithfield gallows. Instead, both were executed at Tyburn.¹⁰¹ While we could dismiss these accounts as the result of poor research or even wilful falsification on behalf of the *Survey* editors, it is much more fascinating and productive to heed Hall’s advice and bear in mind that in the *Survey* the reader’s ‘view of London is at all times controlled and mediated’.¹⁰² From a literary perspective, the textual relocation of these executions from Tyburn to Smithfield exemplifies the ‘imagination and artifice’ that Hall detects throughout the *Survey* and the strategy of fictionalising Fitz Osbert’s and Mortimer’s fates draws repeated attention to the Smithfield elms as a site of chivalric importance.¹⁰³ That way, the *Survey* codes the potential for chivalric romance into every aspect of horse-related practice and topography in Smithfield, even if they do not appear to be under the influence of chivalry at first glance. By diachronically tracking the transformation of Horse pool and the disappearance of the Smithfield elms, the *Survey* warns the early modern reader that urbanisation erodes the manifold justice that chivalric Smithfield had been bestowing onto the City for many centuries.

Conclusion

The *Survey* displays chivalric figures attaining martial glory but also sees them fall from grace in its nostalgic rendering of Smithfield. However, it is ultimately the precarious state of the present-day site that the *Survey* challenges with the help of chivalric nostalgia. For this reason, the *Survey* also holds processes of urbanisation directly responsible for the erosion of the chivalric heritage of equine Smithfield:

For encroachments and inclosure of this Smithfield ... remaineth but a small portion for the old uses, to wit, for markets of horses and cattle, neither for Military exercises, as

J[o]ustings, Turnings, and great triumphes which have been there performed before the princes and nobility both of this Realm and forraigne countries.¹⁰⁴

As in the portrayals of Smithfield pond and the Smithfield elms, the *Survey* reinstates horse-related knowledge and historicises how chivalric pageantry has fallen victim to building encroachment and the enclosing of previously open land. At first glance, such ever advancing processes of urbanisation raise the question of whether Smithfield can ever be chivalric again. However, the *Survey*'s attention to urban change at the site propels chivalric nostalgia into the present-day and makes horsemen's customary right to participate in spectacles of any kind dependent on taking care-filled responsibility for the topographical features that make equine Smithfield possible. That way the bygone glory days projected in chivalric romance collide with the problems that processes of urbanisation brought with them in early modern London. In this light, the *Survey* imbues nostalgic concerns for the practices of Smithfield's horsemen with critical immediacy by confronting its readership with the most current threats to the site. Such retrospection allows it to perform, in Philip Schwyzer's words, 'the work of the present ... to grasp and *respond* to what has been lost'.¹⁰⁵ Consequently, it is the legacy of chivalric nostalgia in the *Survey* that readers past and present can reimagine and reinvest in today's fully urbanised Smithfield as the once equine heart of the City.

Acknowledgements: My thanks to Professor Tracey Hill, Dr Tamsin Badcoe, and Professor Ian Gadd for their encouragement and invaluable help in preparing this article.

Funding: This work was supported by the Arts & Humanities Research Council (grant number AH/R012776/1) through the South, West, and Wales Doctorial Training Partnership.

Notes on Contributor: Kerstin Grunwald-Hope is a PhD candidate at Bath Spa University and the University of Bristol. Her research investigates nostalgia for horse-related practices such as tournaments, executions, and Smithfield horse market in John Stow's *A Survey of London* as an important historical and socio-cultural engagement with the Reformation and early modern urbanisation. Her thesis is funded through the Arts & Humanities Research Council and is titled "'A notable Shew of Horses': Equine Encounters in *A Survey of London*".

¹ John Stow, 'Epistle Dedicatory', in *A Survey of London: Reprinted From the Text of 1603*, ed. C. L. Kingsford (Oxford: Clarendon, 1908), xcvi–xcviii, in *British History Online* <<https://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/survey-of-london-stow/1603>> [accessed 28 December 2022].

² Karen Raber and Treva J. Tucker, 'Introduction', in *The Culture of the Horse: Status, Discipline, and Identity in the Early Modern World*, ed. Karen Raber and Treva J. Tucker (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 4.

³ Ian Archer detects Stow's nostalgia for his pre-Reformation youth in the privileging of bygone Catholic communality over Protestant charity and piety. 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 University Press, 1995), 17–35. Julia Merritt argues that misgivings about the Reformation did not lead Stow to turn a blind eye to Protestant achievements across the board. Nonetheless, she regards the *Survey* as an example of 'nostalgic antiquarianism' due to the Catholic leanings of Stow's materials. J. F. Merritt, 'The Reshaping of Stow's *Survey*: Munday, Strype, and the Protestant City', in *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stow to Strype, 1598–1720*, ed. J. F. Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 52–88.

⁴ *Survey* (1603), 20–52.

⁵ Susanna Forrest, *The Age of the Horse: An Equine Journey through Human History* (London: Atlantic Books, 2016), 10.

⁶ Raber and Tucker, 'Introduction', 2.

⁷ 'chivalry', in *Oxford English Dictionary* (2022).

⁸ Maurice Keen, *Chivalry* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 2.

⁹ Keen, *Chivalry*, 7.

¹⁰ Forrest, *Age of the Horse*, 88.

¹¹ Keen, *Chivalry*, 115; Andrew G. Miller, "'Tails" of Masculinity: Knights, Clerics and the Mutilation of Horses in Medieval England', *Speculum*, 88.4 (2013), 961.

¹² Louis B. Wright names Munday, Richard Johnson, and Samuel Rowlands among others as examples of writers who adapted medieval romance to suit the tastes and preoccupations of their citizen readers. Since Wright's seminal work, William Hunt, Susan Harlan, and Harriet Phillips have all noted that chivalric literature enjoyed a new lease of life in early modern culture by broadening its appeal to a widening range of social groups. Louis B. Wright, *Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935); William Hunt, 'Civic Chivalry and the English Civil War', in *The Transmission of Culture in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Anthony Grafton and Ann Blair (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 204–237; Susan Harlan, *Memories of War in Early Modern England: Armor and Militant Nostalgia in Marlowe, Sidney, and Shakespeare* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016); Harriet Phillips, *Nostalgia in Print and Performance, 1510–1613: Merry Worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019).

¹³ Barbara Fuchs, *Romance* (London: Routledge, 2004), 8.

¹⁴ Fuchs, *Romance*, 7.

¹⁵ *Survey* (1603), 20–52.

¹⁶ Andrew Gordon, *Writing Early Modern London: Memory, Text and Community* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 133.

¹⁷ *Survey* (1603), 79–91.

¹⁸ *Survey* (1603), 79–91.

¹⁹ Gervase Markham, *Markhams Faithfull Farrier* (London, 1631), 15–16. My emphasis.

-
- ²⁰ Erica Fudge, 'Farmyard Choreographies', in *Renaissance Posthumanism*, ed. Joseph Campana and Scott Maisano (New York: Fordham University Press, 2016), 147.
- ²¹ Fudge, 'Farmyard Choreographies', 147.
- ²² Anthony Munday, *The First Book of Amadis of Gaule* (London, [1590]), 39.
- ²³ Richard C. McCoy, *The Rites of Knighthood: The Literature and Politics of Elizabethan Chivalry* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 26.
- ²⁴ Caroline M. Barron, 'Chivalry, Pageantry and Merchant Culture in Medieval London', in *Medieval London: Collected Papers by Caroline M. Barron*, ed. Martha Carlin and Joel T. Rosenthal (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, 2017), 489.
- ²⁵ Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), 12.
- ²⁶ Daniel Woolf, *The Social Circulation of the Past: English Historical Culture, 1500–1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); 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 University Press, 2001), 27–51; Archer, 'The Nostalgia of John Stow', 17–35.
- ²⁷ Lawrence Manley, 'Of Sites and Rites', in *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre and Politics in London, 1576–1649*, ed. David L. Smith, Richard Strier, and David Bevington (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 35–54; Gordon, *Writing Early Modern London*; Oliver Harris, 'Stow and the Contemporary Antiquarian Network', in *John Stow (1525–1605) and the Making of the English Past*, ed. Ian Gadd and Alexandra Gillespie (London: The British Library, 2004), 27–35.
- ²⁸ Kristine Johanson, 'On the Possibility of Early Modern Nostalgias', *Parergon*, 33.2 (2016), 4.
- ²⁹ Rachel Ramsay, 'The Language of Urbanization in John Stow's *Survey of London*', *Philological Quarterly*, 85.3–4 (2006), 260; *Survey* (1603), 19–20.
- ³⁰ Judith Pollmann, *Memory in Early Modern Europe, 1500–1800* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 73.
- ³¹ William K. Hall, 'A Topography of Time: Historical Narration in John Stow's *Survey of London*', *Studies in Philology*, 86.1 (1991), 4.
- ³² *Survey* (1603), xcvi–xcviii.
- ³³ Alan Young, *Tudor and Jacobean Tournaments* (London: Philip George, 1987), 32.
- ³⁴ *Survey* (1603), 97–124.
- ³⁵ Hall, 'A Topography of Time', 5.
- ³⁶ *Survey* (1603), 20–52.
- ³⁷ Young, *Tudor and Jacobean Tournaments*, 18.
- ³⁸ Keen writes that Arthurian romances offered the 'first heroes of the Middle Ages to be renowned specifically as horsemen, as model cavaliers'. Keen, *Chivalry*, 41. For the centrality of the rider-horse relationship to early modern chivalric literature, see the chapter on Lodovico Ariostos's *Orlando Furioso* (1516) in Bruce Thomas Boehrer, *Animal Characters: Nonhuman Beings in Early Modern Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), 28–73.
- ³⁹ *Survey* (1603), 20–52.
- ⁴⁰ Marina Viallon, 'An Autopsy of Renaissance Equestrianism: The Materials, Making and Use of a ca. 1535 War Saddle from the Musée des Beaux Arts of Rennes', in *The Horse in Premodern European Culture*, ed. Anastasija Ropa and Timothy Dawson (Berlin: Medieval Institute Publications/De Gruyter, 2020), 193.
- ⁴¹ *Survey* (1603), 20–52.
- ⁴² *Survey* (1603), 20–52.
- ⁴³ *Survey* (1603), 20–52.

-
- ⁴⁴ Fudge, 'Farmyard Choreographies', 147; *Survey* (1603), 20–52.
- ⁴⁵ Keen, *Chivalry*, 205; Gabriel Heaton, *Writing and Reading Royal Entertainments: From George Gascoigne to Ben Jonson* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 49.
- ⁴⁶ Young, *Tudor and Jacobean Tournaments*, 14–15.
- ⁴⁷ Heaton, *Writing and Reading Royal Entertainments*, 57.
- ⁴⁸ George Chapman, Ben Jonson, John Marston, *Eastward Ho*, ed. Richard W. Van Fossen (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990), 5.1.36–47.
- ⁴⁹ Chapman, Jonson, Marston, *Eastward Ho*, 5.1.36–47.
- ⁵⁰ *Survey* (1603), 20–52.
- ⁵¹ *Hugh Alley's Caveat: Markets of London in 1598*, ed. Ian Archer, Caroline M. Barron, and Vanessa Harding (London: London Topographical Society, 1988), 6, 94.
- ⁵² *Survey* (1603), 79–91.
- ⁵³ John Stow, *The Survey of London containing the Original, Increase, Modern Estate and Government of that City*, ed. Anthony Munday, Humphrey Dyson and others (London, 1633), 712.
- ⁵⁴ Keen, *Chivalry*, 25.
- ⁵⁵ *Survey* (1603), 79–91.
- ⁵⁶ *Survey* (1603), 79–91.
- ⁵⁷ Ben Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair*, ed. Carroll Storrs Alden (New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1904), 2.3.8–12.
- ⁵⁸ Thomas Overbury, 'An arrant Horse-Courser', in *Sir Thomas Overburie his Wife with new Elegies upon his (now knowne) untimely Death* (London, 1616).
- ⁵⁹ Gervase Markham, *Cavelarice, or The English Horseman contayning all the Arte of Horsemanship* (London, 1607), 9.
- ⁶⁰ Peter Edwards, *Horse and Man in Early Modern England* (London: Continuum Books, 2007), 15.
- ⁶¹ Charlie Taverner, 'Moral Marketplaces: Regulating the Food Markets of Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart London', *Urban History*, 48.4 (2021), 611.
- ⁶² *Survey* (1633), 711.
- ⁶³ *Survey* (1603), 79–91.
- ⁶⁴ *Survey* (1603), 79–91.
- ⁶⁵ Edwards, *Horse and Man*, 49.
- ⁶⁶ *Survey* (1633), 711.
- ⁶⁷ *Survey* (1603), 79–91.
- ⁶⁸ *Survey* (1603), 79–91.
- ⁶⁹ *Survey* (1633), 711–712.
- ⁷⁰ See: Boehrer's 'Horse-Sense and Chivalry', 30–41.
- ⁷¹ See: Gordon, *Writing Early Modern London*, on the treatment of water pollution in the *Survey*; and Ramsay, 'The Language of Urbanization', on violations of building regulations. For overpopulation and housing problems, see: Vanessa Harding, 'City, Capital and Metropolis: The Changing Shape of Seventeenth-Century London', in *Imagining Early Modern London: Perceptions and Portrayals of the City from Stow to Strype, 1598–1720*, ed. J. F. Merritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 117–143.
- ⁷² *Survey* (1603), 20–52.
- ⁷³ *Survey* (1603), 11–19.
- ⁷⁴ *Survey* (1603), 11–19.
- ⁷⁵ *Survey* (1603), 11–19; 'decayed', in *Oxford English Dictionary* (2022).
- ⁷⁶ London Metropolitan Archives, City Lands Estates, Smithfield Pond 1601/ 2 Jan 29, CLA/008/EM/02/01/001/055r/06; Smithfield Pond 1602 Jun 18, CLA/008/EM/02/01/001/060v/05.

-
- ⁷⁷ *Survey* (1603), xcvi–xcviii.
- ⁷⁸ ‘Special Inquest into Purprestures: January 1246 (nos 348–486)’, in *The London Eyre of 1244*, ed. Helena M. Chew and Martin Weinbaum (London: 1970), 136–153, <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/london-record-soc/vol6/pp136-153>> [accessed 18 January 2023].
- ⁷⁹ ‘tumbriel’, in *Oxford English Dictionary* (2022).
- ⁸⁰ *Survey* (1603), 11–19.
- ⁸¹ *Survey* (1603), 11–19.
- ⁸² *Survey* (1603), 20–52.
- ⁸³ E. A. Webb, ‘The Founder: To 1123’, in *The Records of St. Bartholomew’s Priory and St. Bartholomew the Great, West Smithfield: Volume 1* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1921), 37–55, <<http://www.british-history.ac.uk/st-barts-records/vol1/pp37-55>> [accessed 16 October 2022].
- ⁸⁴ *Survey* (1603), 20–52.
- ⁸⁵ *Survey* (1603), 20–52.
- ⁸⁶ Alfred Marks, *Tyburn Tree: Its History and Annals* (Glasgow: Good Press, 2019), 38.
- ⁸⁷ *Survey* (1603), 69–91; Una McIlvenna, ‘The Power of Music: The Significance of Contrafactum in Execution Ballads’, *Past and Present*, 229 (2015), 57; Marks, *Tyburn Tree*, 7.
- ⁸⁸ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (London: Penguin Books, 2020), 58.
- ⁸⁹ Keen, *Chivalry*, 98.
- ⁹⁰ *Survey* (1603), 20–52.
- ⁹¹ *Survey* (1603), 20–52.
- ⁹² *Survey* (1603), 20–52.
- ⁹³ Janette Dillon, ‘Clerkenwell and Smithfield as a Neglected Home of London Theater’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 71.1 (2008), 125.
- ⁹⁴ Miller, ‘“Tails” of Masculinity’, 980.
- ⁹⁵ Miller, ‘“Tails” of Masculinity’, 980.
- ⁹⁶ Marks, *Tyburn Tree*, 30.
- ⁹⁷ Marks, *Tyburn Tree*, 31; Dillon, ‘Clerkenwell and Smithfield’, 122.
- ⁹⁸ *Survey* (1603), 250–258.
- ⁹⁹ *Survey* (1603), 44–71.
- ¹⁰⁰ Derek Keene, ‘William fitz Osbert (d. 1196)’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/9621; R. R. Davies, ‘Mortimer, Roger, first earl of March (1287–1330), regent, soldier, and magnate’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/19354.
- ¹⁰¹ Keene, ‘William fitz Osbert’; Davies, ‘Mortimer, Roger’.
- ¹⁰² Hall, ‘A Topography of Time’, 2.
- ¹⁰³ Hall, ‘A Topography of Time’, 12.
- ¹⁰⁴ *Survey* (1603), 20–52.
- ¹⁰⁵ Philip Schwyzer, ‘“Late” Losses and the Temporality of Early Modern Nostalgia’, *Parergon*, 33.2 (2016), 98. My emphasis.