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Introduction: Cuckoldry and Popular Culture

This chapter draws on historical and cultural sources to examine the skimmington or riding, an English variant of the European charivari. It interrogates the specifics of this social shaming ritual and its impact on print culture. Its primary focus is the lengthiest skimmington account, in the “authorized” second part of Samuel Butler's three-part burlesque poem *Hudibras*, first published in 1664. The central pair of this mock-heroic Augustan poem are the Presbyterian antihero Sir Hudibras and his Sectarian Independent squire Ralpho (or Ralph), a humble tailor whose occult medical skills enabled him to diagnose magical impotence and other causes of cuckoldry. So obsessed was the early modern period with cuckoldry that, according to Douglas Bruster, “it is difficult to overestimate the predominance of cuckoldry in the popular drama of the period.” No level of society was exempt, and increasingly, parallels were drawn between cheating and betrayal in the private marital sphere and public political arena, especially in the aftermath of the Civil War, when Butler confronts England's monarch with his court's incontinence:

Cuckolds so cow'rdly and so base,
Lascivious wives so void of grace.
[...] Such stars could surely never shine,
O Charles! round any throne but thine;
Thy great example prompts each spouse
To make a jest of marriage-vows.

Skimmingtons target marital transgression, especially cuckoldry. Their performative highpoint is a proxy couple (or, more rarely, a single stand-in), chosen from among the shamed couple's nearest male neighbors, to enact the transgressing pair. Their aggressively theatrical neighborly contribution is,
I here suggest, informed by responses to perceived mismatches between canon law, civil legislation and peasant traditions relating to marital infertility and paternity issues. English common law protected the paternity and birthright of children born to husbands abroad; requiring husbands to prove themselves legal cuckolds in courts of law before being permitted to disinherit children born within wedlock. Butler’s contribution to the controversy surrounding this legislation is typically sharp:

To give the cheats the eldest hand  
In foul play, by the laws o’ th’ land;  
For which so many a legal cuckold  
Has been run down in courts, and truckled.  
[...] ‘Tis we [wives] that can dispose alone,  
Whether your heirs shall be your own,  
To whose integrity you must,  
In spite of all your caution, trust;  
And, ’less you fly beyond the seas,  
Can fit you with what heirs we please;  
And force you t’own ’em, though begotten  
By French valets, or Irish footmen.⁶

Brazenly turning common law to his advantage and proclaiming “Ile teach a Cuckold how to hide his horns,” the pragmatic sailor hero of John Webster and William Rowley’s early 17th-century play, A cure for a cuckold (first published only in 1661), successfully sues a wealthy childless merchant and his barren wife to win back custody of his wife’s baby son, born shortly before his return from several years at sea.⁷

Potent husbands in childless marriages had the legal right to divorce their barren spouse, a right extended by canon law to the fertile wives of impotent men.⁸ The previously unrecognized relevance of certain ancient regulations and traditional rules, governing the rights and duties of members of peasant groups, is also significant in the context of the skimmington. The authoritative legal historian (and collector of folk and fairy tales) Jacob Grimm published several volumes of “wisdoms” transcribed from 17th- and 18th-century vernacular German dialect manuscripts, whose references to outmoded weaponry and concepts such as longbows and spears, or crop damage by bears, suggest much earlier origins. The extent, if any, of their legal status or use in early modern law courts, is unclear.⁹ Perhaps they are akin to the complex punishment rituals and other traditions practiced by early modern occupational groups such as game-keepers, miners or freemasons.¹⁰

Grimm’s publications include four “wisdoms” exhorting impotent husbands to embrace the status of wittol, or compliant cuckold, and ensure an heir by requesting male neighbors to stand in for their marital duty. All elaborate on an impotent peasant farmer’s right or duty to “call on his neighbors to help him with his wife’s mortal peril” (Hattinger landfeste), “take her to his neighbor” (Bockumer landrecht), “deliver his wife to someone capable of taking care of her needs” (Wendhager bauernrecht) or “ask his nearest neighbor to help his wife” (Benker heidenrecht).¹¹ If that doesn’t work,
some advise the peasant to dress her in best or new clothes, fill her moneybag and send her to the nearest annual fair to sort out the problem herself, and, if that still doesn’t solve it, to let her go to the devil, or even a thousand devils. Garbled overlaps between these ritualized stipulations suggest venerable oral transmission. Most instruct the impotent peasant to convey his wife, on his back, across his own boundary fence onto a neighbor's land, and exhort him to treat her gently, or not to be rough with her or hurt her in any way. According to the Benker heidenrecht, he must also carry her back home and provide her with a roast chicken and a jug of wine after her ordeal. Some authorities agree with Grimm in accepting these four “wisdoms” as a legitimate way of providing for an heir, others classify them as ritual rape. Although practice of this very public custom is known to Grimm only from legend and fable, there is evidence of some early modern childless couples' more discreet involvement of male neighbors in their attempts to secure heirs, a practice supported by Martin Luther. From the 12th century onwards, canon law attempted to clarify the conundrum of whether binding marriage was established by consensual contract (the exchange of vows), or by a point of law (sexual consummation), and whether couples prevented by impotence from consummating their marriage could be regarded as legally married. Concerned to minimize divorce, and apparently attempting to replace both Catholic canon law and peasant “wisdoms,” Luther’s anti-Papist sermon of 1522 directly addresses the fertile wife of an impotent husband. Informing her that unconsummated childless marriages are not recognized by God, he advises her to seek her husband’s explicit permission to provide him with an heir, by agreeing to be cheated by her “secret marriage” with his brother or closest relative.

A Swiss visitor to London in 1599, the physician Thomas Platter the Younger, records the performative heart of the English skimmington not as the shamed couple, but their nearest neighbors:

In England … women have much more freedom than in other places, and also know well how to make good use of it. They often go for walks or coach-rides extremely impressively dressed, and their husbands just have to put up with this, and are not permitted to punish them for it. Instead, wives often beat their husbands, and when one hears about this, the very nearest of their neighbors is placed on a cart and paraded around the whole town in order to make fun of the beaten man, while proclaiming that this is his punishment for not having come to the aid of his neighbor while his wife was beating him.

This practice was also confirmed by a Frenchman living in London:

I have sometimes met in the Streets of London a Woman carrying a Figure of Straw representing a Man, crown’d with very ample Horns, preceded by a Drum, and follow’d by a Mob, making a most grating Noise with Tongs, Grid-irons, Frying-pans, and Saucepans: I ask’d what was the Meaning of all this; they told me, that a Woman had given her Husband a sound beating, for accusing her of making him a Cuckold, and that upon such Occasions some kind Neighbour of the poor innocent injur’d Creature generally perform’d this Ceremony.
This account highlights the centrality to the skimmington of horns, the ancient symbol of cuckoldry, of discordant noise and of mockery targeting the couple as a whole: in this case, the virago wife no less than her cuckolded husband.

Since Violet Alford’s ground breaking article of 1959 on “Rough music or charivari,” anthropologists and social historians such as Natalie Zemon Davis, Martin Ingram, EP Thompson and David Underdown have contributed greatly to our understanding of street theatre intended to shame couples who transgress sexual and social mores. They examine the mythic origins and history of European charivaris and English skimmingtons, their relationship to regional variants such as “riding the stang,” wheel-barrowing, hussitting, ritual hunts or the Welsh ceffyl pren, and overlaps with diverse rituals and “rough music” at official civic punishments, unofficial land closure and other occasions for public riots. Some skimmingtons involved little more than the public taunting of quarrelling couples, as in the case of Mary Hall of Cameley. In 1616, when neighbors learned that she had beaten their blacksmith (her husband John), on the back with a frying pan, they “had one to Ryde upon mens shoulders by the name of Skymerton without any hurt don or misdemeanours otherwise at all.” Although primarily, skimmingtons publicly shamed cuckolds or bawds, some mocked other types of antisocial transgressors. In 1691, one hundred Warwickshire villagers, led by a cross-dressed smith and a farmer crowned with a pair of horns, marched to the house of a local couple. Maligning them as a “cuckoldy dog” and a stealing “whore,” they loudly broadcast the details of their petty thieving of timber and chickens. Other skimmingtons, such as those staged as enclosure protests, targeted social rather than individual transgressions.

_Hudibras_

Interpretation of the domestic and political dimensions of Butler’s skimmington account is necessarily informed by the convoluted book history of _Hudibras_. Dated 1663, the anonymously published first edition of Part I was an immediate bestseller. It was in the bookshops by December 26, 1662, when Samuel Pepys, hearing about “a new book of drollery in use, called _Hudebras_,” rushed to buy it at the Temple. Pronouncing it “so silly … that I am ashamed of it,” he sold it on to a friend that same evening. However, determined to give this fashionable publication another go, he rebought it in February: “it being certainly some ill humour to be so against that which all the world cries up to be the example of wit; for which I am resolved once more to read him, and see whether I can find it or no.” Within a year, Part I was anonymously re-issued in five authorized and four pirated editions. Multiple editions of an “unauthorized” Part II (1663) were followed by an entirely differently worded anonymous “authorized” Part II (1664), authenticated as Butler’s by its later incorporation into all combined editions. Part III, also anonymous, followed in 1674. Pepys borrowed Part II in November 1663: “to see if it be as good as the first, which the world cry so mightily up, though it hath not a
good liking in me, though I had tried by twice or three times reading to bring myself to think it witty.” A fortnight later, he bought: “Hudibras, both parts, the book now in greatest fashion for drollery, though I cannot, I confess, see enough where the wit lies”; this even though Pepys’s colleague Sir William Petty reckoned Hudibras among the “three books ... most esteemed and generally cried up for wit in the world,” and the staunch “Parliament-man” Mr. Seymour quoted it “in a serious discourse.” 27 By 1668, when Pepys and his wife invited Samuel Butler to dine at their house with the portraitist Samuel Cooper and others, they appreciated the company of the writer they now knew to be the author of Hudibras.28 In August 1683, three years after Butler’s death, and having finally been won over by his poem, Pepys “read over the first two books of Hudibras” while voyaging to Tangier on Navy business.29

Although critics dismiss the 1663 “unauthorized” Part II as a derivative work of little literary merit by some unidentifiable hack, Butler’s authorial involvement cannot be excluded. Passages openly attacking religious and political belief systems with powerful supporters would have discouraged any writer with pretensions to court patronage from admitting to its authorship during the 1660s. Published barely a year after the anonymous Part I, the unauthorized Part II refers knowingly to “Butlero,”30 and matches some of Butler’s innovative literary quirks in ways that go beyond mere derivation or parody. Perhaps not coincidentally, Hudibras followed Don Quixote in inspiring an unauthorized sequel that both promoted and profited from the original work’s commercial success.31

Magical Impotence

One pervasive leitmotif of Hudibras is the principle protagonist’s virility. Although Sir Hudibras is a bachelor, his fear of impotence and cuckoldry is reflected in constant references to horns and tails (or lack thereof). The plot tracks his rambling quest to prove himself “no Gelding” in order to avoid the professed cure for folly and impotence (also featured in Don Quixote): being whipped with the dried penis of a bull.32 Impotence was closely associated with cuckoldry; the occult practice of magical impotence, thought to render a bridegroom impotent with his new wife but not with other women, was regarded as a major cause of cuckoldry. Magical impotence thus threatened newlyweds with childlessness, and other couples with cuckoldry’s complex legal, moral and economic dangers. Its roots are ancient and transnational. On mainland Europe, magical impotence rituals were integral to a continuous tradition of domestic witchcraft.33 In early modern England, by contrast, their popular practice was all but obsolete.

Magical impotence rituals entered Jacobean theatre culture through the influence of practices owing less to indigenous traditions than to classically inspired necromancy of the type then flourishing at European courts. This revival of interest was fueled by a high-profile court scandal surrounding
Frances Howard, daughter of Thomas Howard, Earl of Suffolk. In 1606, 13-year-old Frances married 14-year-old Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex; in 1613, she filed for annulment of her marriage. Her successful case rested on proving her virginity and Essex's magically-induced impotence to an ecclesiastical commission chaired by George Abbott, Archbishop of Canterbury, whose vehement rejection of witchcraft as a cause of impotence was overruled by King James I.34 Howard’s case greatly influenced plays such as Thomas Middleton’s The Witch (c. 1616), in which the garrulous chief witch Hecate renders clients’ unwanted lovers magically impotent by dispensing knotted charms.35 Similar magical knots feature in the anti-masque of Ben Jonson’s Masque of Queenes, performed at court in 1609. Referencing demonological tracts, classical authors and dictionaries, Jonson notes of his witches that “the vntying of their knots is, when they are going to some fatall businesse.”36

Magical impotence rituals involving knots were an ongoing occult practice in many European regions. Thomas Platter’s account of them in Languedoc in 1598 is the earliest known detailed record of the performative sequence whereby occult practitioners enacted magical impotence rituals during the actual marriage ceremony of their intended victims. It notes that they involved knotting a point (a reinforced leather lace of the type used to lace up codpieces), during a specific part of the wedding ceremony itself.37 Although central to European magical impotence, knots had evidently fallen into disuse in 17th-century England. While Jonson’s chief witch alludes to knots on stage, her fellow witches pierce effigies, proclaiming: “With pictures full, of waxe, and of wooll / Their liuers I sticke, with needles quicke.”38 Jacobean occult practitioners and dramatists, evidently unfamiliar with continental magical impotence rituals, seem to have pieced together their details from classical literary sources and European demonological tracts.

Alluded to in Masque of Queenes and The Witch, magical impotence is central to Thomas Heywood and Richard Brome’s play Late Lancashire Witches (1634), featuring a simple country couple. Before their wedding ceremony, a jealous local witch (and former lover of the bridegroom) presents him with a knotted codpiece point. This renders him impotent with his new wife. Eventually, after much grief, including their public shaming in a skimmington, the newlyweds realize that the knotted point is a bewitched “charme.”39 Only by burning this “Inchauntment” does the couple finally restore the husband’s potency and their marital harmony. While Late Lancashire Witches could still serve up a plot dependent on codpiece points as late as 1634, such magic charms are noticeably absent from Thomas Shadwell’s radically updated version of Heywood and Brome’s play, Lancashire-Witches (1682).40 Magical impotence is fleetingly alluded to, but there is no hint of the actual rituals to bring it about, either in the playtext itself, or even in Shadwell’s copious learned references drawn from classical sources, Jacobean drama, and demonological tracts. English witches, it appears, dispensed with magical knots long before their continental counterparts.
Samuel Butler’s description of the judiciary astrologer Sidrophel the Rosicrucian, who was consulted by Sir Hudibras concerning his impotence, represents one of the fullest literary accounts of early modern expectations of the professional practice of occult healers, which accorded a prominent role to the diagnosis and treatment of impotence and other infertility problems. In Canto II of the unauthorized Part II, this medical specialism is aggressively marketed by a flamboyant Catholic mountebank from Paris. Mounting his outdoor fairground stage, Monsieur Quack promotes the resurrective powers of his patent cure for impotence in comical broken English, drawing on a venerable literary tradition. Bawdily assisted by his mixed-gender troupe, Quack continues to vaunt his ability to cure—and cause—impotence even after his brutal arrest and capture by the outraged Sir Hudibras and Ralpo:

So on they amble to the place,
Where Monsieur spake with a boon grace;
Begar ["by God"] me kill you all, an den
Fresan make you alive agen;
Wi dis me do all de gran Cure,
De Pock, de Scab. de Ca lenture;
Me make de Man strong, pour de Wench.
(Then riseth Capon from the Bench)
Look you me now, do you no see
Dead yesterday, now live day be,
Four boon, dey leap, dey dance, dey sing,
May foy, an de toder ting:
Begar good Medicine do all dis.
Capon makes legs, and Wench doth kiss,
Take hands, and throw their legs about.
 [...] Me be de Frenchman, profess Phissick,
Me cure de Pock, de Cough, de Tissick,
De Ish, de Gout, the Ash in bones,
And me begar can cut your Stones [i.e. castrate you].

Rehearsing key themes played out over the poem’s three official Parts, the unauthorized Part II anticipates, as well as draws on, Butler’s relentless satirical pitting of his Reform protagonists Hudibras and Ralpo against traditional customs such as the skimmington. Performative ceremonies of this type were reviled by hard-line Parliamentarians concerned to repress popular culture with perceived Papist roots.

Butler’s Skimmington: Rough Music, Bad Smells and Cuckolds’ Horns

In place of the quack troupe of the 1663 unauthorized version, the 1664 authorized edition of Hudibras Part II features a colorfully theatrical skimmington that made the poem’s title into a byword. A Charing Cross wedding of 1737, for example, was disrupted by what the London press gleefully labelled a “Grand Hudibrastick Skimmington.” Involving numerous
“Chairmen [drivers], and others of that Class,” it greatly disturbed the mismatched 70-plus-year-old groom and his teenage bride. Literary precedents for the Hudibras skimmington can be found in plays such as The Knave in Graine (1640, attributed by some to John Day), or Heywood and Brome’s The Late Lancashire Witches (1634), while it in turn directly inspired writers such as Andrew Marvell, Walter Scott and Edward William Davies, whose detailed fictional skimmington account is previously uncited in this context. The practice was considered stageworthy well into the 18th century, as indicated by works such as The Country-Wedding and Skimmington (1729), a comic libretto attributed to Essex Hawker.

Like the charivari, the skimmington was habitually accompanied by a terrifying din and heavy-handed allusions to cuckoldry and impotence through the blowing, brandishing, or wearing of horns. The cacophony incorporated mocking laughter, the raucous human voice and “rough music” which, like the demonic music of medieval stage devils, involved martial and rustic instruments such as horns, drums or bagpipes, and noisy makeshift use of women’s kitchen implements, such as skimming ladles and pots, pans or griddles. Infernal din contributes materially to the performative impact of stage skimmingtons. In Beaumont and Fletcher’s dramatic sequel to Shakespeare's Taming of the Shrew, such din is created by a band of noisy women led by the widowed Petruchio’s new wife Maria. Rejecting female submission, they “flying main Potlids / like massie rocks, dart ladles, tossing Irons / and tongs like Thunderbolts.” Other stage skimmingtons are announced by “a great Hubub and noise, a ringing of basons, a great many Boyes before,” or by an onlooker enquiring: “Whats the matter now, is Hell broke loose?” The arrival of the Hudibras skimmington too, is heralded by the fear its commotion instils into Butler’s cowardly Sir Hudibras and Ralpho:

When both were parted on the sudden,  
With hideous Clamour, and a loud one,  
As if all sorts of Noise had been  
Contracted into one loud Din:  
Or that some Member [of Parliament] to be chosen [i.e. elected],  
Had got the Odds above a Thousand;  
And by the Greatness of his Noise,  
Prov’d fittest for his Country’s Choice.  
This strange surprisal put the Knight,  
And wrathful Squire into a Fright.

Sir Hudibras and Ralpho’s fears were fully justified; but although some charivaris and skimmingtons had been known to lead to serious injury or death, no attempt at regulation had managed to stop this ancient custom. William Prynne’s Puritan anti-theatrical treatise of 1633 traces it back to at least 1404, the date of a canon law warning clergy to “be not present at, nor yet play in the play that is called Charevari, in which they use vizards in the shape of divels, and horrible things are there committed: which Play
wee prohibit not onely Clergy men, but generally all our subjects under paine of excommunication.”53 Two centuries after this prohibition, Thomas Platter documented unruly French “chalifary” groups of rowdy young bachelors, also disguised in devil masks. They continued to meet nightly to disturb the immediate neighborhood of newlywed couples of unequal age with intolerable smells and unsocial noises, disbanding only on receipt of a handsome bribe from the shamed couple:

each with his own instrument: one has an old kettle, another a pan, the third a drum, the fourth pipes, the fifth a spoon in a salt vat, the sixth a cowhorn and so on … They start playing their instruments at around midnight, and each tries to shout, sing or play more horribly than the rest. This releases such a frightening noise and screaming, that no neighbors within twelve houses’ distance are able to get any peace at all.54

Platter’s description recalls the noisy, smelly, riotous chaos graphically evoked by Butler, as do the historical records relating to a skimmington for the self-proclaimed married couple William and Margaret Cripple. Having set up house together in Burton-on-Trent in 1618, they were soon suspected of being unmarried, even brother and sister. In March 1618, around four hundred locals, many armed or disguised, dragged the newcomers out of their house and through the town to the stocks, “with greate noyce and with ringing of cow bells, basons, candlesticks, fryingpannes and with the sounde of a drumme,” shouting “a whore and a knave, a whore, a whore.”55

William Hogarth’s heroic print *Hudibras encounters the skimmington*56 heightens the rustic riot’s burlesque effect by innovatively borrowing the monumental scale traditionally reserved for the most respected category of art: history painting.57 Directly travestying the musical retinues of classical triumphs, its corpulent central hornblower’s58 massive musical horn draws attention both to the martial din and the motivating cuckoldry of Butler’s skimmington, ruled over by the cuckold’s horns:

And now the Cause of all their Fear,
By slow Degrees approach’d so near,
They might distinguish diff’rent Noise
Of Horns, and Pans, and Dogs, and Boys,
And Kettle-Drums, whose sullen Dub
Sounds like the hooping of a Tub.59

Having likened the conventions of his skimmington to some corrupt local political election, Butler goes on to develop satirical parallels to Roman Triumphs:

But when the Sight appear’d in View,
They found it was an Antique Show,
A Triumph, that for Pomp and State,
Did proudest Romans emulate:
[… ] Being mounted in their best Array,
Upon a Carre, and who but they?
And follow’d with a World of Tall-Lads,
That merry Ditties troll’d, and Ballads;
Did ride with many a Good-morrow,
Crying, Hey for our Town, through the Burrough.60

These allusions to the important role of the raucous human voice (laughing, shouting, yelling or singing generic doggerel or scurrilous rhymes written for the occasion), are followed by further evocations of rough music:61

Next Pan, and Kettles of all Keys,
From Trebles down to double Base.
And after them, upon a Nag,
That might pass for a forehand Stag,
A Cornet rode, and on his Staff,
A Smock display’d, did proudly wave:
Then Bagpipes of the lowdest Drones,
With snuffling broken winded tones.62

This horned horse alludes to the rundown jade or nag ridden by the theatrical focal point of the skimmington’s enactment of the battle of the sexes, the central proxy pair to whom attention is drawn by riotous cacophony.

Within and outside the context of rough music, horns habitually feature in documented skimmingtons. In that held in Quemerford near Calne in 1618, the mob that gathered to shame the local cutler Thomas Mills and his wife Agnes sounded “pipes & horns ... & rames horns & buckes horns carried upon forkes were then and there lifted up andshown.” On the morning of May 27, 1618, some dozen rowdy boys and men had been turned away from Quemerford by its womenfolk, who “understanding yt ye drumer & his company came thither for a Skimmington, they made towards the drumr & cutt a pt of his drum, whereupon he and his company departed towards Callne.” At noon, a group of three or four hundred men from Calne, some armed, arrived with their proxy cuckold, identifiable by his characteristic night-shirt and horns: “a man riding upon a horse, haveing a white night cap upon his head, two shininge horns hanging by his eares, & counterfayte beard upon his chine made of a deares tayle, a smocke upon the top of his garments.”63 Accusations of cuckoldry and aggressive allusions to horns cut deep. Horning was “an insult that could draw blood.”64 In August 1532, when around 80 rowdy men nightly roamed central Oxford, causing terror by randomly attacking pedestrians with stones or daggers and breaking into houses, but also by threatening them with cuckoldry: “if any one speaks to them out of the windows, they bid him go to bed, cuckold knave, or else come down, and his horns shall be knocked in again.”65
Butler’s Skimmington: Pelting, Riding and the Battle of the Sexes

Another ritual integral to skimmingtons is mutual pelting. Sir Hudibras faces a barrage of eggs wielded by the Hudibras mob. Julio, the cheating Knave in graine, is pelted with “Pippings, Carrets, or Turneps,” while the mashed or spent brewers’ grains traditionally used as pig feed or compost referred to in this play’s title is confirmed as skimmington ammunition by Marvell. Hudibras specifies a less salubrious mixture:

Next, one upon a Pair of Panniers,  
Full fraught with that, which for good Manners  
Shall here be nameless, mixt with Grains,  
Which he dispenc’d among the Swains,  
And busily upon the Crowd,  
At Random round about bestow’d.

John Locke identifies the unnamed ingredient in an aside directly following a reference to “the bespatterings of Mr Edward’s Dunghil,” noting that “Skimmington Rides in Triumph, driving all before him by the Ordures that he bestows on those that come in his way.”

The previously cited skimmington records of 1618 also mention various ritual uses of dung and grain. In Burton-on-Trent, locals cast the “dourte and mier of the streets” on William and Margaret Cripple while dragging them from their own house to the market place and then on to the stocks, where they “did in moste indecent and shamfull mannor cast durte upon […] them] and pissed on their heads,” before dragging them back into town “by the feete, their heads lying upon the grownde, through the dutry channells of the said streets.” As in Butler’s literary account, the paraded proxy horseman of the 1618 Quemerford skimmington pelted the mob with grain: “he rode upon a red horse wth a paire of potts under him & in them some quantitye of bruinge graines, wch he used to cast upon ye presse of people, rushing over thicke upon him in ye way as he passed.” Specialists, who sometimes view this grain as a malevolent inversion of the benign sprinkling of rice or confetti on newlyweds, rarely comment on a second use of grain in skimmingtons, occurring, for example, after the armed Quemerford crowd forcibly dragged Agnes Mills from the upper floor of her home. They flung her into her “wett hole”.

trod upon hir & beried her filthily wth durt, & did beate hir blacke & blewe in many places with an intent … to have had hir, viz, Agnes, out of their howse to ye horseman & to have set hir up behind him to carry hir to Callne & there washe hir in the cukinge stoole, & if she would not be still & sitt quietly, then to stuffe hir mouth wth greines.

The dual role of brewers’ grains as both ammunition and force-fed fodder is confirmed in a highly politicized account of a riding allegedly staged at Smithfield Bar (a fortified border then controlling those entering the City of London from the East London district of Smithfield), in January 1650:
Where one that acted Sir Thomas a horse-back, with a Ladle in his hand, two Baskets of Prides Graines before him, and his Doxie riding with her face to the horse tayle behind; one of them flung a Ladle of Graines in our Commanders face: which he took to be a great affront to a Souldier ... which a Butchers Boy perceiving, presently ... made him swallow his Graines and be thankfull.75

At their most typical, skimmingtons unite punishment and festival. Public processional street theatre mocking dominant wives and henpecked or cuckolded husbands enlisted a shamed couple’s closest neighbors to reenact their transgressions with a satirical use of transvestite clothing and gendered household items. Some neighbors enthusiastically volunteered to play the role of proxy, with the aim of extracting maximum shame from the couple (and a generous tip or formal payment for their trouble), while others required coercion or refused to participate.76 Late Lancashire Witches describes rowdy street theatre disrupted by the newlywed couple themselves, the bride Parnell and Lawrence, her bewitched and impotent husband. Far from allowing themselves to be drummed out, they unseat the proxy couple and proceed to beat the unfortunate pair with their own mock weapons.77

Satirizing the political impotence of English foreign policy, the brief skimmington account in Andrew Marvell’s poem “The last instructions to a painter,” notes that when a London neighborhood learns of a local husband-beater: “the just Street does the next House invade / Mounting the Neighbour Couple on lean Jade.”78 In a diary entry of 22 February 1563, another Londoner, Henry Machyn, confirms those paraded as the nearest neighbors, not the shamed couple:

The xxij day of Feybruary, was Shroyff-monday, at Charyngcrosse ther was a man cared of iiij men, and a-for hym a bagpype playng, a shame [=shawm] and a drum playhyng, and a xx lynkes bornyng a-bowtt hym, because ys next neybor(‘s) wyff ded bett [=beat] here hosband; ther-for yt (is) ordered that ys next naybor shall ryd a-bowtt the plase.79

Margaret Cavendish argues for abolishing London’s “Foolish ... Unjust and Unhandsome Custom” of the skimmington, which shames an “Innocent Person”, ... “the next Neighbour ” rather than the “Foolish Husband,” who should be forced to “Ride in Disgrace, Scorn, and Pain” for allowing his wife to usurp his “Masculine Authority.”80 Knowingly or not, Cavendish betrays no awareness that near neighbors might enjoy heightened opportunities as cuckolders. One such is Julio, the eponymous hero of The Knave in Graine. He smugly endures being paraded in a skimmington cart as the proxy of an elderly neighbor who bitterly hints that Julio cuckolded him: “Well he stands heare but for a shew, and I am sure I suffered for it really and indeed.”81

More often than being paraded in carts, single skimmington proxies were mounted on a horse backwards,82 or back to back if a couple, as in the Smithfield Bar account of 1650, featuring the couple’s two nearest male neighbors raucously enacting the delinquents. One was cross-dressed as a virago, the other wore night clothes and carried domestic items (such as a
distaff or spinning wheel), thereby identifying him as an effeminate husband. In *Hudibras*, the proxy playing the henpecked husband is perched backwards, behind his domineering wife:

Then mounted on a Horned *Horse*,
One bore a *Gauntlet* and *Gilt Spurs*,
[...] Next after, on a raw-bon’d *Steed*,
The Conqueror’s *Standard-bearer* rid,
And bore aloft before the *Champion*
A *Petticoat* display’d, and rampant;
Near whom the *Amazon* triumphant,
Bestrid her *Beast*, and on the *Rump* on’t
Sat Face to *Tail*, and *Bum* to *Bum*,
The *Warrior* whilom overcome;
Arm’d with a *Spindle* and a *Distaff*,
Which as he rode, she made him twist off.83

The backward ride was practiced from the 8th century onwards as a geographically widespread shaming ritual meted out legally as well as informally to those facing sentences for crimes ranging from capital offences to petty social delinquencies.84 A youthful eye-witness recollection of John Stow (c. 1525–1605) records both carting and backward riding as judicial punishments for cuckolders, in this case the Parish priest of St Michael’s Church in Cornhill, London. Having been caught *in flagrante* by John Atwod, the local draper, with his wife:

the Priest being apprehended and committed, I saw his punishment to be thus: He was on three Market dayes conveyed thorow the high street and Markets of the Citie, with a paper on his head, wherein was written his trespasse. The first day hee rode in a Carry; the second, on a horse, his face to the horse taile; the third, led betwixt twaine, and every day rung with Basons, and proclamations made of his fact at every turning of the streets, and also before John Atwods Stall, and the Church doore of his Service, where hee lost his Chauntre of twenty Nobles the yeere, and was banished the Citie for ever.85

*Hudibras* too, alludes to such judicial punishments, as when describing the ignominious journey to the stocks endured by Hudibras and Ralpho “mounted both upon their Horses / But with their *Faces* to the *Arses*,” Butler compares backward riders to the spoils of Roman triumphs.86

Such triumphs are again evoked when Sir Hudibras labels the skimmington a “prophane ... Show ... a *Paganish* Invention”; only to endure correction by his squire:

Quoth *Ralpho*, You mistake the matter;
For, all th’ *Antiquity* you smatter
Is but a *Riding*, us’d of course,
When the *Grey Mare’s* the better *Horse*.
When o’er the Breeches greedy *Women*
Fight, to extend their vast *Dominion*.87
Here Butler refers to “the battle for the breeches,” waged for household dominance by some marital couples, as depicted in popular prints such as one of 1628 showing a skimmington and a proxy “wife” wearing breeches. Butler continues to subvert well-worn cultural references to the gender power struggle to his own purpose:

And in the Cause Impatient Grizel
Has drubb’d her Husband, with Bull’s Pizzle,
And brought him under Covert Baron,
To turn her Vassal with a Marrain;
When Wives their Sexes shift, like Hares
And ride their Husbands, like Night-Mares,
And they in mortal Battle vanquish’d,
Are of their Charter dis-enfranchis’d,
And by the right of War, like Gills,
Condemn’d to Distaff, Horns, and Wheels;
For when Men by their Wives are cow’d,
Their Horns of course are understood.

A less rowdy 18th-century stage skimmington features women celebrating their neighbor’s victory in a domestic argument over her husband. As they process through the village, they too, sing a ballad referring to “the battle for the breeches”:

Good wives, pray learn
Your Husbands Rage to quell:
And follow this Example,
Whenever they rebel.
This man-like buxom Dame,
The Breeches long has worn;
Henceforth no more be tame,
But valiant in your Turn.

The currency of such gender reversals is confirmed by historical accounts. On June 18, 1607, within the framework of other protesting demonstrations, outraged men and women of Wells used the ritual framework of the typical skimmington ritual to ridicule unpopular city leaders. Their procession included the displaying of gendered items of clothing as triumphal trophies, a cross-dressed man with a spinning wheel and distaff, a man with a skimming ladle, and two men mounted on one horse throwing handfuls of grain from a basket. Recognizing the power of performance and ceremony to build and bind communities and forge perceptions of norms, the early modern Church, the royal court, and city authorities all competed for their control. English religious reform, before and during the Commonwealth, had largely dismantled the Christian festive year that supported the fabric of Catholic European society, although historians such as Underdown caution against interpreting events such as the Wells disorders of 1607 as a straightforward clash between traditionalists and a Puritan minority determined to suppress
their May Games. Sir Hudibras and Ralpho’s clashes with traditionalist revelers are similarly deserving of nuanced interpretation.

Sir Hudibras roundly condemns the horrors of the traditional English village skimmington as an anti-feminist, Papist, “Dev’l’s Procession”:

’Tis Ethnique and Idolatrous,
From Heathenism deriv’d to us.
Does not the Whore of Babylon ride
Upon her horned Beast astride
[…] It is an Antichristian Opera,
Much us’d in Midnight times of Popery;
[…] To scandalize that Sex, for scolding,
To whom the Saints are so beholding.

His rousing oration in defense of “Women, who were our first Apostles” is rudely halted in mid-sentence by a volley of eggs and blows. Demonstrating yet again his cowardice and moral impotence, his face and beard “besmear’d with Orange-tawny Slime,” and accompanied by Ralpho “smother’d with the Stink” of dung and grain, Hudibras beats “a brave Retreat” from the skimmington mob.

James Stokes identifies the early 17th century as a watershed “moment of great cultural change in which efforts to suppress most festive and performative elements of traditional culture coincided with an end to the acceptance of women in performance.” According to Stokes, the skimmington’s turning of “punishment of women into a comic performance” parodies the medieval festive elevation of women to central performative roles, as May queens, processional leaders or suchlike. This important insight should not, however, obscure the fact that skimmingtons publicly humiliate weak husbands no less than dominant wives. They reflect gendered anxieties of a transitional period, when radically changing expectations of marriage and its duration (not least due to medical advances in childbed survival rates), increasingly undermined conventional views valuing the public duty of procreation above the private pleasures of companionship.

Conclusion

This essay focuses on Butler’s Hudibras in the light of evolving cultural reflections of impotence, cuckoldry and the skimmington, with reference to legal and historical records, and literary and factual accounts by diarists and others, both domestic and foreign. The poem’s skimmington account unites punitive and festive elements, including rough music, bad smells, cuckold’s horns and pelting with missiles such as eggs, grain and dung, to frame its central performative ritual, the cross-dressed theatrical reenactment of gender conflicts by two back-to-back, mounted proxy actors played by the couple’s nearest male neighbors. Through this use of neighbors—innocent or not—as proxies for a transgressing couple, the skimmington lent itself to
Butler’s favored themes of individual and collective social responsibility. As literary creation rather than sociological record, his *Hudibras* skimmington contributes to our understanding of the development of persistent cultural conventions and of the opaque relationship between literary texts and historical accounts. Creatively, and with varying degrees of accuracy in reflecting actual practice, Butler draws on and reinforces current cultural conventions. He brings together and illuminates numerous features typical of individual skimmingtons, including the subversion of judicial punishment, and the mockery of political festival, from Roman triumphs to 17th-century election celebrations.

By 1664, when the *Hudibras* skimmington was first published, witchcraft was no longer viewed as the primary cause of impotence, and traditional peasant “wisdoms,” encouraging impotent husbands to cuckold themselves by attaining fatherhood through the help of their nearest neighbor, had been largely forgotten. However, such obsolete belief systems indelibly mark the performative practices of the European charivari and related marital shaming rituals. Dramatists and writers viewed magical impotence and skimmingtons as attractive vehicles for introducing into their works erotic energy, combining “the celebratory and the violent” and colorful, exotic elements of occult ritual involving female characters, and systematically utilized them as vehicles for pointed social and political commentary. Although skimmingtons involving marital shaming are rare after 1800, they are historically documented until at least 1930, and feature strikingly in 19th-century novels by Walter Scott, Edward William Davies and Thomas Hardy.

In *Hudibras*, Butler created a vehicle for political satire with much slippery layering of meaning. Although social historians recognize the documentary value of his skimmington account, they have not systematically contextualized it within changing cultural conventions. Suffused with references to the cuckold’s horns, it directly develops questions of truth and justice within the context of Butler’s sustained social critique. Butler’s primary motivation was political rather than domestic; he targeted the private battle between the sexes, but even more the political humiliations of Commonwealth and post-Commonwealth England, and the public hypocrisies of those who imposed them. With numerous knowing nods to popular forms of contemporary print culture such as picaresque fiction, the mountebank’s quack bill and the ballad sheet or jest book, *Hudibras* subverts classical texts and chivalric romances. Its skimmington account tellingly combines *Hudibras*’s three mocking strands: style, subject and satire; heroicizing traditional, officially discouraged, “anti-processional” festival practices parodying self-promoting, self-serving Establishment ceremonial culture typified by the Roman triumph. Through his cowardly, hypocritical Hudibras and Ralph, his cheating charlatans, and the shaming rituals of his skimmington mob, Butler satirizes and criticizes Puritans, Catholics, royal and political elites, and the social folly and political impotence of post-Commonwealth England. His bleak pessimism infects all his targets. He satirizes the dishonest dealings of *Hudibras*’s occult
protagonists, quacks and central pair, the private cheating of adulterers and their complicit cuckolds, and even more the shameless public cheating of the 17th-century "quacks of government," the political and religious leaders who, in betraying and politically "cuckolding" those on both sides of the Civil War, attracted Butler's sharpest ridicule. Hudibras marks a clear watershed in cultural representations of skimingtons. After 1664, the description and depiction of skimingtons in art or literature owe as much to Butler as to any folkloric authenticity.
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