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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the social politics of literary production at London's Inns of Court from 1572 to 1634. Pierre Bourdieu's concepts of cultural production are widened beyond his own French academic context so that the Inns may be located as institutions central to the formation of literary and, in particular, dramatic culture in early modern London.

A significant part of Bourdieu's research has concerned the establishment of a foundation for a sociological analysis of literary works. The literary field, Bourdieu argues, is but one of many possible fields of cultural production—social networks of struggle over valued economic, cultural, scientific, or religious resources. As a historically constituted arena of activity with its own specific institutions, rules, and capital, the juridical field of early modern London was a competitive market in which legal agents struggled for the power to determine the law. Within this field, the Inns of Court served as unchartered law schools in which the valuable cultural currency of the common law was transmitted to the resident students, whose association with this currency was crucial for their pursuit of social prestige.

Focusing on the four Inns of Court as central institutions in the juridical field and their relationship with the larger political and economic forces of London, that is, the field of power, the thesis demonstrates how the literary art associated with these institutions relates to the students' struggle for social legitimation, particularly in their interaction with the City and the Crown. By demonstrating how the structures of literary texts reflect the structures of the relationship between the Inns and other centers of urban power, this analysis examines the pivotal role(s) played by law students in the development of London's literary culture.
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PREFACE

I was aware from the outset that my task involved not simply telling the truth of this world, as can be uncovered by objectivist methods of observation, but also showing that this world is the site of an ongoing struggle to tell the truth of this world.

—Pierre Bourdieu, In Other Words, 35.

When John Donne was admitted to Lincoln's Inn on 6 May 1592, he was twenty years old. For around two-and-a-half years, he studied the common law, then left his legal studies for voyages to Italy and Spain. While he was at the Inns, Donne apparently wrote his five Satires, each of which targets a particular object of his contempt. In Satire II, Donne concentrates on the people he encounters in his legal community. The worst of these, he claims, are lawyers who believe their poetry is original:

... hee is worst, who (beggarly) doth chaw
Other wits fruits, and in his ravenous maw
Rankly digested, doth those things out-spue,
As his owne things; and they are his owne, 'tis true,
For if one eate my meate, though it be knowne
The meate was mine, th'excrement is his owne. (1.25-30)

Donne isolates one lawyer in particular, Coscus, and castigates his new habit of using the power of the law for seductive purposes, a habit that Donne believes is a shameful crime:

... the insolence
Of Coscus onely breeds my just offence,
Whom time (which rots all, and makes botches poxe,
And plodding on, must make a calfe an oxe)
Hath made a Lawyer, which was (alas) of late
But scarce a Poët; jollier of this state,
Donne is irritated that lawyers such as Coscus pretentiously use their association with the Inns (and the prestige of the common law) to fashion themselves as members of the cultural elite when in fact, "men which chuse / Law practice for meere gaine . . . repute / Worse then imbrothel'd strumpets prostitute" (I.62-64). Donne maintains that while lawyers like Coscus rely on the culture of the Inns as the source of personal prestige, "amateur gentlemen" at the Inns (like himself) seek connections with the court and are offended by the successful "self-interested diligence" of their professional colleagues (Corthell 28).2

1 Geoffrey Bullough suggests that Satire II mocks the anonymous author of Zepheria (1594), a lyric sequence consisting of forty canzons (61). Margaret R. Christian of Pennsylvania State University, Lehigh Valley, is completing an edition of Zepheria in which she elucidates the poems' use of legal imagery as a poetic device that draws attention to the self-deceptive nature of romantic love. In the sequence, the lover Amphion fantasizes about the various illegal maneuvers whereby he could violate the letter of human legal codes that would govern his pursuit of Zepheria.

2 Ronald Corthell observes that while Donne resided at Lincoln's Inn, legal and courtly studies were "causing an increasingly sharp division between the serious law students, on the one hand, and the students of civility, . . . the 'gentlemen' [who] were especially anxious to cultivate courtly postures and activities that would set them apart from the lawyers and law students with whom they were associated and whose social status was not high. As a coterie of wits Donne and his circle were defining themselves by opposition to a professional group which, as 'Satire II' makes clear, Donne regarded as a threat to himself and to the traditional order of society" (25).

In Donne's eyes, this order consisted of the men with whom Donne was competing for the attention of the court; the "extravagant wit and manners" exhibited by Donne's circle were "manipulations of the courtly codes, linguistic and behavioral, which they would have to master in order to enter the Elizabethan system of preferment and privilege" (Corthell 26). The prospect of gaining the attention of the court was an extremely competitive one, and Donne's Satires illustrates the simultaneous impulses of devotion and disdain that he felt towards a desirable institution whose rules of entry were inexplicit and largely based on one's social connections. "Except for the select few with influential relatives," R. Malcolm Smuts observes, "entry into the court almost always required a long and expensive apprenticeship, spent cultivating the favor of the great and haunting the antechambers of Whitehall, with no guarantee of ultimate success" (56). Alfred Harbage claims that one cannot read the Satires without sensing that Donne is "tasting the society and perhaps the pleasures of
After his journeys on the Continent and his ordination, Donne returned to Lincoln's Inn in October 1616 as its divinity reader, a post he filled until he was appointed dean of St. Paul's Cathedral in February 1621. Both as reader and dean, Donne finally acquired a position and language of authority, which allowed him to acknowledge the power of the common law and its role in his establishment of a successful career in the church.

Geoffrey Bullough observes that the "twenty-five surviving sermons which we know or suppose were given at Lincoln's Inn show Donne's awareness of that particular congregation. His prodigal youth was well known there, so he occasionally refers to it, as when he declares that 'their sin, that shall sinne by occasion of any wanton writings of mine, will be my sin, though they come after'" (qtd. in Bullough 76). Donne's Lincoln's Inn sermons offer carefully constructed antidotes to the subversive writings of his youth, when his "hat[red]" for "all this towne" (Satire II, 1.1-2) masked his real envy of Coscus's unapologetic ability to play the "game of advancement" according to the clear rules of professional success rather than the mysterious rules of courtship (Corthell 29). Donne uses the authority of his position as a preacher in the Temple Church in order to encourage the law students' professional ambitions, citing the law as a worthwhile, demanding pursuit. The ability to make this judgment about the legal profession—to have the authority to claim what is worthwhile and to have this authority respected—appears to have been a significant goal throughout his life. As a law student of the lowest rank, he was frustrated that his "words none drawes / Within the vast reach of th'huge statute lawes" (Satire II, 1.111-12). As a successful churchman, his words finally carry the power he desires.

[London's leisure class] with a consequent revulsion of feeling. An audience of Donne might seem good enough for anyone, but we may guess that in and about the Inns of Court were many who shared Donne's mood" (53-54).
This brief assessment of Donne, his institutional affiliations, and the different kinds of authority associated with the various positions he held is inspired by Pierre Bourdieu's interpretive model for understanding the correlation between culture and social class. According to Bourdieu, cultural "resources"—such as "verbal facility, general cultural awareness, aesthetic preferences, scientific knowledge, and educational credentials" (Swartz 43)—serve as "markers of underlying class distinctions" (143). As a court-aspiring law student, for example, Donne was keenly aware of how his accumulating knowledge of 'high' court culture should set him apart from Coscus's 'lower' pursuit of credentially-based prestige. "When cultural producers pursue their own specific interests in fields," as David Swartz explains in his book on Bourdieu, "they unwittingly produce homologous effects in the social class structure" (134). Bourdieu's model of this relationship is based on the idea that social space contains a field of power composed of institutions and agents that indirectly exert political and economic forces on fields of cultural production, which are relatively independent social networks that operate according to their own rules and value-systems. Each of these fields (literary,  

---

3 Swartz observes that this view distinguishes Bourdieu from "many contemporary postmodern voices who stress the uncertain, contingent, and socially diverse character of cultural life" (143).

4 Bourdieu's science is composed of individual fields—each distinct yet linked to one another, and each corresponding to a specific level of social reality: the field of cultural production, the field of power, and the field of social space. A field, as Bourdieu uses the term, is "a separate social universe having its own laws of functioning" (1993: 162-63). "Laws of functioning" are rules or value systems that are unique to specific institutions, disciplines, or art forms. An academic department, for example, regards itself as having a special knowledge about how its discipline should be taught and arranged. The art of writing has its own rules, which one must follow in order to succeed as a writer. In a field, artists of all kinds compete for the ability to determine the rules of cultural production. Bourdieu's concept of field "reflects the metatheoretical dimension of [his] thought. Bourdieu sees it as an 'open concept' designed to counteract the various forms of subjectivism and objectivism he criticizes in other prevailing ways of conceptualizing the relationship between social and cultural structures and practices" (Swartz 119).

There can be many kinds of cultural fields, including those of philosophical, scientific, literary, and juridical production. These distinct fields exist as the direct result of "the
juridical, scientific, religious, civic, among others) has its own properties and its own object of interest (capital) for which its members compete, such as literary prestige, the authority to interpret the law, a reputation as an expert scientist, and the power to determine public policy. Like any other institution in a cultural field, the Inns gain in their capacity to manage the progressive invention of a particular social game" that governs each field; the invention of this game is inseparable from the invention of the artist or scientist and is entirely dependent on the relative autonomy of the field (measured by the exclusivity of its rules and terms of entry) within the field of power. Fields of economic and political power are commodity markets formed through "relations of force between agents or between institutions [governments, patrons, kings] having in common the possession of the capital necessary to occupy the dominant positions in different fields (notably economic or cultural)" (1992: 215). The rules that direct the field of power are political and economic. These rules affect those that operate in the field of cultural production, so the autonomy of cultural fields is only relative—it is never absolute:

In spite of its autonomy, the realm of culture remains subordinate to the economy. Bourdieu considers that 'economic capital is at the root of all the other types of capital,' such as cultural capital, social capital, and symbolic capital, and that there are in fact 'transformed, disguised forms of economic capital.' It is after all economic capital that makes possible the investment in cultural capital by making possible the investment in time needed to accumulate cultural capital. Economic structures shape decisively cultural arenas though Bourdieu seldom sees that causal connection as direct. (Swartz 80)

Bourdieu emphasizes that "to think in terms of field is to think relationally" (Swartz 119); "as a spatial metaphor," Swartz explains, the concept of a field "suggests rank and hierarchy as well as exchange relations between buyers and sellers. Interactions among actors within fields are shaped by their relative location in the hierarchy of positions" (120). A field is simultaneously a site of resistance and domination, "one being relationally linked to the other" (121).

5 Swartz describes fields as "arenas of struggle for control over valued resources" (122). These resources exist as "particular forms of capital: economic, cultural, scientific, or religious. . . There are . . . as many fields as there are forms of capital" (122-23). Economic capital, of course, pertains to money. Cultural capital can be embodied (as a sensitivity to cultural distinctions one accumulates through the "pedagogical action" of one's family), objectified (books, works of art, and scientific instruments that require specialized cultural abilities to use), or institutionalized (the educational credential system) (76). Social capital refers to one's social rank. Cultural and social capital are forms of symbolic capital, which is defined by social prestige and recognition.

Bourdieu recognizes a "broader range of types of labor . . . that constitute power resources" than Marx acknowledges in his "dynamic of primitive accumulation" (Swartz 75). Bourdieu's significant contribution beyond Marx is his notion that "culture (in the broadest sense of the term) can become a power resource," and with varying degrees of difficulty, and "under certain conditions and at certain times" (75), it is possible to convert one form of capital into another. Craig Calhoun observes that "[i]t is this notion of multiform, convertible capital that underpins [Bourdieu's] richly nuanced account of class relations in France" (69). This idea of the convertibility of kinds of capital also shaped both the struggle of London's law students to locate and advance their social rank, and the literary production that this struggle inspired.
distribution of their prized capital as a valuable cultural resource, and thereby to legitimate existing social arrangements, as a result of their increasing independence from more powerful political and economic forces. Donne's discerning sense of institutional arrangements enables him to understand how the growing autonomy of the Inns enables upstarts like Coscus to mistake professional success for cultural fluency.\(^6\)

According to Bourdieu, the fields that constitute the social world are "structured spaces of dominant and subordinate positions based on types and amounts of capital" (Swartz 123). In his *Satires*, Donne recognizes London's legal community as such a structured space (similar to Bourdieu's *juridical* field), and the focus of his concern is the contingency of advancement through and beyond this and other cultural communities on the legitimate accumulation of cultural capital. The positions that individuals and groups struggle to occupy in a given field are determined by the distribution of capital; it is the unequal distribution of this capital (objectified and institutionalized) across social classes that is the root of social inequality (77).

Within this hierarchically structured social space, agents struggle to maintain or enhance their relative positions within their fields through the acquisition (or conversion) of capital (123, 145). What frustrates Donne as a law student is his growing understanding that the rules for succeeding at the Inns are determined by senior barristers, whose strategy of conserving the systems of advancement through the ranks of the legal profession privileges new entrants who proceed according to the established routines. The young Donne

\(^6\) Swartz explains that the "purely economic cannot express itself autonomously but must be converted into symbolic form. There is, therefore, 'symbolic power: as well as material or economic power. Individuals and groups who are able to benefit from the transformation of self-interest into disinterest obtain what Bourdieu calls 'symbolic capital.' Symbolic capital is 'denied capital'; it disguises the underlying interested relations as disinterested pursuits" (90).
prefers his success to be determined not by his ability to conform to newly developing professional codes but by his cultural fluency—an attribute that the legal profession (as a profession) only nominally valued. The *Satires* exhibit Donne's strategy of subversion, whereby he challenges the legitimacy of lawyers like Coscus to use their legal authority as a basis for making aesthetic judgments. His complaint is that *legal capital*, or the cultural capital acquired through one's association with the Inns, cannot get him where he wants to go (the court), and Coscus's use of this capital to exhibit courtly airs irritates Donne even more.

The Bourdieusian concepts that help us to understand Donne's relationship to the Inns and its legal culture (and the place of his *Satires* in this relationship) can also help us to understand, on a larger scale, the role of the Inns in the formation of London's literary culture. This role is defined by the law students' struggle for social legitimation through their association with the Inns, and Bourdieu's "theory of the social uses of culture" (Swartz 250), rather than a theory of culture *per se*, aids this investigation because it embraces sociology and history in a way that invites critics to expose "through research arbitrary mechanisms that maintain power relations" in societies past and present (261). The organization of this thesis is based on Bourdieu's

---

7 Bourdieu identifies three kinds of field strategies: *conservation, succession*, and *subversion*: Conservation strategies tend to be pursued by those who hold dominant positions and enjoy seniority in the field. Strategies of succession are attempts to gain access to dominant positions in a field and are generally pursued by the new entrants. Finally, strategies of subversion are pursued by those who expect to gain little from the dominant groups. These strategies take the form of a more or less radical rupture with the dominant group by challenging its legitimacy to define the standards of the field. (Swartz 125)

8 Bourdieu claims that "all sociology should be historical and all history sociological. In point of fact, one of the functions of the theory of fields that I propose is to make the opposition between reproduction and transformation, statics and dynamics, or structure and history, vanish" (Wacquant 37; this quotation from Bourdieu is from his 1989 interview with Loic Wacquant). Bourdieu's position runs counter to the "dialogue of the deaf" that Peter Burke claims plagues the relationship between sociologists, who "have long viewed historians as amateurish, myopic fact-collectors without system or method," and historians, who regard
concepts of field relations and the convertibility of cultural capital. I identify
the City of London (the office of the Lord Mayor and its subordinate
constituencies) and the Crown as the primary institutions that possessed the
economic and symbolic forms of capital necessary to occupy dominant
positions in the field of power. The Inns of Court were primary institutions
in the field of juridical production, institutions in which the symbolic capital
of the common law was transmitted to students in a relatively "closed"
system devoted to the reproduction of its own capital.

As the example of Donne suggests, literature was a very uncertain
investment for students; at the same time, it was part of a more open field
than that of the law, a field that provided some students somewhat easier
access to the kind of prestige they desired than the kind offered by the
common law. Conveniently close to London and its material and cultural
markets—markets that were quickly becoming more complex—the Inns'_students became increasingly aware of the interconvertibility of cultural
(specifically legal) and economic capital. Literary and dramatic activity
expanded the opportunities for the students both to gain and use this
awareness to their social advantage. Literature was both an educational tool
for understanding the social utility of the law-as-prestige and a form of
cultural capital the students could try to use as an alternative (however risky)
source of prestige.

The specific concept of capital that Bourdieu has derived from his
sociological research does not recognize the distinction between capitalist and
noncapitalist social relations (Swartz 80); in Bourdieu's world, "all are capital

sociologists as "people who state the obvious in a barbarous and abstract jargon, lack any
sense of place and time, squeeze individuals without mercy into rigid categories and . . .
describe these activities as 'scientific'" (3).
holders and investors seeking profits" (82) in a complex system wherein the "transmutation of the different kinds of capital into symbolic capital" produces symbolic power (93). According to Bourdieu, culture is a "freely available and all-purpose knowledge that you acquire in general at an age when you don't yet have any questions to ask. You can spend your life increasing it, cultivating it for its own sake. Or else, you can use it as a sort of more or less inexhaustible toolbox" (Bourdieu 1990: 29).

Movements between cultural fields necessitate the interconvertibility of kinds of capital, and this thesis explores this phenomenon through a series of sociological analyses of Inns-related texts produced during the reigns of Elizabeth I, James I, and Charles I. Some of these texts relate to specific places of performance while others are connected to political circumstances involving several institutions. It is within these institutional settings and contexts that specific kinds of symbolic capital are made, identified, and exchanged. By focusing each chapter on a specific institution (or kind of institution), my effort is to provide clear, localized examples of how the dramaturgical culture of the Inns—a culture that I reimagine through the examination of literary and non-literary texts associated with these societies—was driven by the circulation of cultural capital between the juridical field and the field of power. I have limited the scope of this thesis to the period between 1572, when the (in)famous barrister Edward Coke entered the Inner Temple as a student, and 1634, when the Inns of Court staged two performances of James Shirley's *Triumph of Peace*.

The structure of the cultural field's relation to the field of power (and to other fields of production), Bourdieu maintains, is homologously related to the structure of relationships among cultural works produced within the field. Accordingly, a work of literature, for example, "supplies all the tools
necessary for its own sociological analysis," but to make these links between text and context, the analyst must acquire a thorough knowledge of the socio-political conditions in which the work was produced. Drawing from Inns-of-Court records, engravings, maps, and the research of legal historians, I construct in the first chapter a new social topography of London's juridical field. By explaining the relationships between the Inns, the Crown, and the City of London, this topography serves as a contextual field structure for the analyses in the last three chapters.

I introduce the broad institutional landscape that this thesis covers by first outlining the competing institutions that constitute the juridical field (focusing on the Inns' place within it) and then by assessing how this field was situated within the field of power of early modern London. I next concentrate on the Inns by explaining the varieties of rules that members had to follow in order to ensure their ability to make the most of their time at the Inns. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the various dispositions and values that new law students acquired through their experiences at home and school/university, and explains how the

---

9 Toril Moi observes that "Bourdieu grounds any literary analysis on an immense mass of social and cultural data." By investigating, for instance, the way people chew their food, look at photographs, and by assessing their musical, literary, and cinematic preferences, he is able to compile a set of data that permits him to make the "thick" phenomenological and sociological descriptions that Bourdieu[s]ian sociology promises literary criticism" (505). The concepts that derive from Bourdieu's program of research are part of an intellectual tradition composed of other twentieth-century thinkers who share his "painstaking attentiveness to the particular case, a wish to take the concrete manifestations of human behavior as the starting point for thought" (498). These thinkers include Freud, Heidegger, Sartre, Beauvoir, Merleau-Ponty, J. L. Austin, and Wittgenstein—all "philosophers of subjectivity, understood as an embodied locus of action and choice." Moi explains that a "literary theory based on their insights will have to take the form of a concrete, historically grounded speech-act theory" (504).

Bourdieu's requirement for amassing cultural data, Moi argues, "causes huge problems for critics studying American or British literature" because "[t]here is no existing body of Bourdieu[s]ian analyses of the relevant fields or institutions. Only the most intensive research can rectify this situation" (505). The first chapter of this thesis is a synthesis of the research necessary for the Bourdieusian readings of Inns-related literature that follow in the subsequent three chapters.
institutional culture of legal commons influenced these dispositions and values.

In light of the first chapter's revised perspective of the place of law students in London, chapter two concentrates on four Inns-of-Court texts: a legal lecture by Edward Coke, Francis Beaumont's *Grammar Lecture*, William Browne's masque of *Ulysses and Circe*, and *Gesta Grayorum*. Except for Browne's masque, these texts are Elizabethan, and they demonstrate in different ways the lawyers' recognition of the convertibility of legal capital at a time when the common law was quickly becoming more complex in order to meet the demands of a more prosperous and litigious society. I explain how the transformation of the Inns' halls from places of formal legal exercises into places of revels enabled law students to understand the social magic of legal capital and to recognize its convertibility.

In chapter three, I examine how this recognition operates in an institution that is intimately tied to the market. Here I discuss playgoing at the Blackfriars playhouse by relating the social competition among the members of the audience to the conversion of capital that is staged in plays that were performed there. Three Jacobean city comedies are the subject of this analysis: George Chapman, Ben Jonson, and John Marston's *Eastward Ho* (1605), Thomas Middleton's *A Trick to Catch the Old One* (1604-6?), and Francis Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (c.1607).

In the final chapter, I study the circumstances surrounding the publication of William Prynne's *Histriomastix* (1633) and the performance of James Shirley's *The Triumph of Peace* (1634)—situations in which the interconvertibility of various kinds of capital had real political consequences for the Crown, the Inns, and the City. Here I suggest that Charles I's downfall
can be explained in part by conditions in which symbolic and economic capital were too closely interconnected.

Up to this point, studies of the relationship between law and literature in early modern England have typically focused on illuminating the cross-over between legal and literary discourses in specific legal and literary texts. By exploring the close relationship between the conflicting social forces at work among the Inns, the City, and the Crown and the manifestation of these conflicting forces in a variety of Inns-of-Court texts, this project examines how the movements of lawyers (law students especially) through London's institutions enabled literary and legal discourses to converge. In *Ambition and Privilege*, Frank Whigham uses such an sociological approach in order to question the status of Renaissance courtesy literature as a subjugated or marginal body of knowledge in studies of early modern culture. Historians, he claims, have dismissed it as frivolous, while literary scholars have habitually reduced it to "the poetry of conduct," erasing the traces of struggle by a familiar reification of the poetic" (4). Whigham claims that what this body of texts needs is "a sociological criticism that assembles and codifies the lore of courtesy as a repertoire of strategies, tools for such tasks as 'selecting enemies and allies, for socializing losses, for warding off the evil eye, for purification, propitiation, and desanctification, consolation and vengeance, admonition and exhortation, implicit commands or instructions'" (4). This kind of criticism Whigham calls for would help us to explain the importance of much Inns-of-Court literature that is routinely ignored by literary critics and historians alike, perhaps because this literature is often regarded as doggerel by the former, historically insignificant by the latter.
CHAPTER 1

A New Social Topography of London's Juridical Field

We must repel any unilateral, unidimensional, and monomaniacal definition of sociological practice, and resist all attempts to impose one.
—Pierre Bourdieu, *In Other Words*, 54.

A detail from an engraving published in the 1622 edition of Michael Drayton's *Poly-Olbion* (see figure 1) depicts feminine personifications of Westminster and the City of London. London embraces the spires of St. Paul’s Cathedral in the City's west and St. Peter's Church in the City's east. London, majestic and statuesque, significantly overshadows her western counterpart, a disparity that underlines the City's topographical dominance over Westminster, where the Parliament was held at Westminster Hall and where the more studious law students at the Inns went to hear fully practicing barristers argue their cases. It is interesting to note the engraving's imposition of a narrow blank space between London and Westminster. This void sharpens the distinction between these separate cities. The Inns of Court were the primary institutions that occupied the fissure between Westminster and London, and their absence in the map illustrates the somewhat anomalous qualities of their existence.10

Neither belonging to the City of London nor to Westminster, the Inns, and the legal quarter of which they were a part, nevertheless had strong ties to

---

10 David Evans observes that the "history of London is in many ways the story of these two cities, a tale inscribed in the border between the Strand and Fleet Street," a threshold that "serves to emphasize the relationship between the autonomous commercial affairs of the City of London and the wider authority represented by Westminster, Parliament, and the sovereign." "The Inns of Court," Evans concludes, "occupy, if not define, the meeting of these two realms" (153).
both.\textsuperscript{11} By presenting a new social topography of London's legal quarter, this chapter, in a manner of speaking, attempts to fill the gap in the engraving. The first section assumes a broad view of London's legal community (and the Inns' place within it) and the relation of this community to the larger political and economic communities that, to an extent, dominated it. The last two sections focus on the legal culture of the Inns, its (re)production of symbolic (legal) capital, and the backgrounds of those who came to the Inns in order to benefit from this circulation of prestige.

The juridical field, its agents and capital, and the field of power

England's juridical field was a site of struggle for the right to determine the law. The Crown, the various courts of the common law, and the Parliament confronted one another over who had the authority to determine

\textsuperscript{11} The early modern Inns were situated just outside the western perimeter of the City limits in what were known as the "liberties," or those areas lying outside the City walls. The legal quarter (see figure 2) was located between London and Westminster in "a thriving and expanding legal community very conscious of its independent life and pride" (Lehmann 33). The western portion of the City wall separated London from the legal quarter—southward from Greyfriars to Blackfriars, then westward from Ludgate to Fleet Bridge. The quarter (see figure 3) was roughly confined to a narrow cross-section bordered to the south by the Thames and to the north by Gray's Inn. Gray's Inn Lane, Chancery Lane, and Temple Bar roughly delineated the western border. The eastern side of the district was bordered by a stream called the "Holeborn," which was known as the "Fleet" as it neared the Thames. Bridewell Palace, built by the Normans and rebuilt by Henry VIII, marked the south-east corner of the district. Lincoln's Inn was centrally positioned west of Chancery Lane, while the Inner and Middle Temples were located at the southern end of the quarter close to the Thames. Westminster (see figure 4) was the home of Whitehall and the Star Chamber.

The region had once been the home of the Knights Templar, a powerful religious order that occupied the area between Chancery Lane and the River Fleet until its fall at the end of the thirteenth century. The maps of the legal quarter from 1563 and 1570 illustrate the gradual development of what had once been a monastic region into a legal precinct. A matrix of intersecting pathways and boundaries gradually imposes a geometrical structure upon a generally pastoral environment. Mostly parallel east- and west-bound pathways linking the City and Westminster (Holborn Road and Fleet Street) are crossed by narrower meandering north- and southbound pathways (Water Lane, Fetter Lane, Chancery Lane, Gray's Inn Lane) that partition the region between these major thoroughfares into smaller exclusive properties.
a legitimate vision of the social world. The Inns of Court were part of the juridical field, but they were neither courts nor institutional extensions of the Crown. They were prestigious legal institutions where learned barristers reformulated the common law and where typically well-to-do sons of English gentry observed and associated with this interpretive process. They were also places where these young men, as students, could associate themselves with the prestige of the Inns in an attempt to advance into London's more exclusive cultural circles.

In order to acquire the skills necessary to "find" the law, a student had to learn the *culture* of his Inn rather than a legal *text*. His ability to access the prestige of the common law, in other words, was determined more by his extended affiliation with the routines of commons than his demonstration of legal knowledge per se. The common law itself was a unique system of jurisprudence in early modern Europe primarily because it was built upon unwritten concepts derived from a continuous, fluid process of judicial decision-making rather than a Corpus Iuris, or a single written text (Rodgers 154). The procedure for learning the law was envisioned as a kind of art. In *The Lawyers Light* (1629), Dodderidge contends that the lawyer is

---

12 The law student who desired to proceed to the bar was expected to participate in commons for seven years and undertake a termly routine of legal exercises that involved readings, moots, bolts, and commonplacing. Readings consisted of a series of lectures based on an eight to ten year sequence of royal statutes; the sequence was designed, at least in theory, to offer "every student a comprehensive review of all the important statutes during his period of study at the Inn." Moots were formal "oral pleading exercises" whereby the inner- and utter-barristers applied their learning to questions set by the benchers by pleading opposing sides of the question in law French (Baker 1990: 13). Benchers judged the exercises and commented on them in English. In bolts, the inner barristers would independently participate in informal conversational arguments, which were more elementary kinds of moots held in private (e.g. not before the whole society). During the terms in which law court was held at Westminster Hall, students were also expected to record their observations of the cases argued there in commonplace books.
most beholding to Inference and Application, wherewith hee is
instructed and taught, that Cases different in circumstance, may be
neverthelasse compared each to other in equalitie of Reason; so that of
like Reason, like law might be framed. And by how much Application
and inference doth more depend upon wit and Art, th[a]n the
producing the expresse Authoritie; by so much the more it excelleth
the same. (93)

According to Dodderidge, the essential tools in law-making—"wit and Art"—enable the lawyer to employ his legal capital in an instant of given circumstances determined by the mood of the auditors, the time of day, and current political and social events.

Bourdieu observes that "customary law always seems to pass from particular case to particular case, from the specific misdeed to the specific sanction, never expressly formulating the fundamental principles which 'rational' law spells out explicitly" (1977: 16). Students and non-students alike perceived the common law as a practice devoid of a clear principle or theory; it often appeared "archaic in substance," "cumbersome in procedure," "chaotic and arcane," as well as "disorderly and unmethodical" (Hall 13; Simpson 14). Lawyers and their critics were fully aware of this perception of the common law, despite Sir Edward Coke's contention that it was "the bedrock of liberty and the perfection of reason" (Hall 14).

---

13 In 1622, three years into his period of legal study, Simonds D'Ewes still found the study of law "difficult and unpleasant." In his essay Of Judicature, Francis Bacon admits that "there is no worse torture than the torture of laws."

14 The only son of Robert Coke, a prosperous and respectable barrister of Lincoln's Inn, Edward entered Clifford's Inn (an Inn of Chancery attached to the Inner Temple) in 1571 after leaving Trinity College, Cambridge, without a degree. The following year, on 24 April, he progressed to the Inner Temple at the age of twenty, when he began to attend the courts at Westminster and record the cases and decisions he heard there in scrupulous detail. These transcripts of cases gradually amounted to a wealth of case-notes, reports, and commentaries. The thoroughness of Coke's recordings reveal his "relentless appetite for common law learning" (Keeton 44) and his "outstanding jurisprudential talents" (Prest 1972: 62), both of which led him to be called to the Inner Temple bar on 20 April, 1578, after only six years as a
of the law's logic underlines the exclusive and rigorous nature of its transmission, for "in so far as the law essentially was embodied in oral tradition preserved and transmitted by those who practiced in Westminster Hall, only long years of direct involvement could produce the belief that the system really was rationally coherent" (Simpson 14). Literature provided an alternative field of competition and mastery for students who were frustrated by the slow process of cultivation they encountered in commons. The social trajectory offered by the Inns was largely professional; the literary field (although a more anomalous construction, lacking at this time an institutional structure as complex as that which constituted the juridical field), however, was perceived as an easier means of gaining the court's attention, primarily because literature offered the kinds of elite expressions that students could master in shorter time.

---

15 For the uninitiated, however, the law remained largely confounding, and few students seem to have shared the patience with which Edward Coke learned the law, despite the efforts of learned lawyers, such as Francis Bacon, to organize, codify, redefine, and consolidate the statutes and their accompanying laws in order to make the law as certain as possible. William Bouwsma observes that England's "rapid social and institutional change and the accompanying growth in legal business" compelled certain members of the legal profession "to take a fresh look at the common law, to adapt a legal system based on the needs of an older agrarian society to new social and political uses, and to reduce that legal system to some kind of order" (317). In The Elements of the Common Lawes (1630), Bacon offers "expositions" of the common law that are designed to show the law student the middle way between arguing the law "upon generall grounds" and putting cases "without laying any foundation." In A Summary of the Common Law of England . . . digested into certain Tablets for the help and delight of such Students, as affect Method (published in 1654), Sir Henry Finch (d. 1625) attempts to overcome the seeming impossibility of reducing the "abstruse and intricate" common law to a straightforward method. In Law, or a Discourse Thereof (originally published in law-French in 1613 and translated in 1627), Finch provides more than five hundred pages of definitions, rules, and statute references for the student's review.

16 The interpretive skills a student acquired in commons could in fact aid his creative endeavors: he might apply his techniques of assessing the details of a legal case toward his role in a play (a more "fun" medium than the law), which is a kind of case study of how people act under given conditions.
Whether or not their students vied for success in the literary field, the Inns were entirely structured around the transmission of legal knowledge; the students' aspirations depended, to some degree, on the common law's reputation, which was not necessarily stable. The Inns were but one of several interpretive communities competing for the authority to determine the law. The division of labor within the juridical field is determined, without any conscious planning, through the "structurally organized competition" between the institutions that constitute the field (Bourdieu 1987: 818). In early modern England, these institutions were the prerogative courts (whose judges were appointed by the monarch) and the common law courts (including the House of Commons), each of which vied for the authority to determine the law. Prerogative courts were separate from the common law and were not bound by precedent; lawyers who enjoyed the favor of the monarch—both the chief executive and the "fount of justice"—were appointed to the King's Bench, the Court of Common Pleas, the Privy Council, the Court of Chancery, and the Star Chamber.17 These courts

17 The King’s Bench and the Court of Common Pleas were the "two greatest courts"; their task was to maintain some sense of order and coherence in the legal system by determining the jurisdiction of England's numerous courts (Lockyer 53). The Crown's routine administration was carried out by the Privy Council, which fulfilled a similar function as the cabinet of the American Presidency (257). The Court of Chancery was the "dispenser of the King's Conscience" (I. Smith 214)—a court of equity composed of university-trained civil lawyers who mixed mercy with justice by tempering the strict rules of law in cases where judicial rigor might undo a subject (Fortier 1278). Roger Lockyer notes that common lawyers often "distrusted Chancery as a threat to the autonomy of their own system, and although the Lord Chancellor who headed the court was usually chosen from among their ranks he suffered from being too closely identified with its operations" (57).

The most formidable and popular prerogative court was the Star Chamber, in which the monarch often sat as "judge over all his judges" (Fortier 1276). The jurisdiction of Star Chamber judges was a "national equivalent to that exercised locally by the justices of the peace"; many of the judges were not professional lawyers, and the procedures they used to decide cases were "less technical than those of the common-law courts" (Prest 1972: 131), mostly because these procedures were based on "common sense" rather than the precedents of commonlaw. The Star Chamber typically heard the most intrinsically interesting cases of the day—cases brought mostly by private individuals, cases surrounding events that
ensured that the border between the government and the judicature remained fluid to a certain degree; one consequence of this overlapping institutional power was that judges in non-prerogative courts (the common-law judges) also served as administrative agents of the crown (Lockyer 260).

The House of Commons was a fashionable venue for lawyers trained in the common law; this is where the precedents and technicalities that determined English property law were assessed and debated (Prest 1972: 131). Membership in Parliament was based on one's affiliation with the Inns—the primary institution in which one could compete for the "monopoly of pleading in the High Court and, by association with that institution, of places on the bench (i.e. judges)" (Macdonald 76). The careers of students aspiring to become lawyers of the common law depended entirely on the students' ability to cultivate the spirit of independence inspired by a model of jurisprudence that was defined in relation (and often opposition) to the relatively extemporaneous character of royal prerogative.

At the forefront of political controversy during the reigns of Elizabeth I, James I, and Charles I was the complex relationship between English common law and the authority of the Crown. During this period, the common lawyers began to recognize that the jurisprudence of the increasingly important mercantile legal system offered the best protection to property owners. "The Crown's difficulty with this conception of the common law," Stephen Cohen explains, "was that the very same principles which facilitated the new economic activity could also be—and increasingly were—employed to protect the profits of that activity from royal exploitation" (38). As the growing organization and jurisdiction of the prerogative courts threatened state security, and cases regarding the enforcement of royal proclamations (Prest 1972: 64; Lockyer 259-60).
threatened the integrity of the common law system (Bromham 336), the lawyers at the Inns became increasingly vital agents in resolving this controversy while still upholding the strength and growth of the common law.

During her reign, Elizabeth struggled to redefine a dominant constitutional theory for England "based on principles enshrined in the law of God, nature, and reason, however these might be defined," that safeguarded certain inalienable rights possessed by both the Crown and its subjects (A. Smith 164). Yet the common law, as the nominal means of ensuring these rights, could not guarantee protection against the Crown's encroachments on a subject's property rights or always successfully negotiate between a disputing monarch and Parliament; it was often, in practice, merely a political tool that could be "used for whatever advantage it might give by whoever could exploit it" (Prest 1972: 229-30). While James nominally abided by the English constitution he had inherited (though never completely understood), his self-perception as a divinely appointed king, sharing in the power of God's law over the law of human creation, significantly complicated his dealings with the common law courts.18

James's theoretical beliefs were somewhat mediated by the practical demands of his role in England's political scene as the reigning monarch (Fortier 1275), and he made great effort to "maintain the balance between the powers of the crown and the rights of individual subjects that was the defining characteristic of the English system of government"; in 1610, he claimed that he had "least cause of any man to dislike the common law, for no law can be more favourable and advantageous for a king and extendeth further his prerogative than it doth. And for a King of England to despise the common law, it is to neglect his own crown" (qtd. in Lockyer 59). At the same time, James was bewildered by the complexity of the juridical field, and in 1610 he exclaimed to the members of Parliament that he had "often wished that every court had its own true limit and jurisdiction clearly set down and certainly known . . ." (qtd. in Lockyer 55).

---

18 Before he became King of England in 1603, James wrote his *True Law of Free Monarchies* (1598), in which he bases his personal claim to absolute monarchy on Biblical representations of kingly power; James's preference for the civil law, which honored royal prerogative over judicial law, also informed his political disposition. In James's eyes, Christian kings need answer to no one but God, and the institution of monarchy in the Bible is the only just pattern for kingly authority over the people (Fortier 1268).
James resisted attempts to define the scope of his authority too specifically, for his primary aim was to "retain in widest possible measure his freedom of action" (Lockyer 60). For members of the Inns who were noblemen or gentrymen, like Francis Bacon, this flexibility was a good thing, for they had "a vested interest in upholding the royal authority since it was the linchpin of the social order from which they benefited. They also gained both profit and prestige from their share of royal patronage" (253). Other lawyers at the Inns insisted on the primacy and antiquity of the common law and challenged royal prerogative at every turn (42). As the chief spokesman for the common law, Edward Coke maintained that the monarch should not interfere with jurisprudence and that judges, "by virtue of their training and years of experience of legal practice, were more qualified than the king to decide matters of law" (Bromham 337-38).

Coke's considerable power and persistence caused him to become a thorn in the Crown's side that neither James nor Charles was able or willing to tolerate indefinitely (Lockyer 51). Upon hearing in 1631 that a legal treatise by Coke was about to be published, Charles ordered that it be suppressed: "The king fears," wrote Lord Holland to Secretary Dorchester, that Coke "is held too

During his reign, however, James's sympathies for divine authority at times took center stage; in his speech in 1607 to Parliament, he declared that the king was virtually law itself: "Rex est Index, for he is Lex loquens, and is to supply the Law, where the Law wants" (qtd. in Bromham 337). In 1616, he made a controversial move by intimidating the common law judges and "coercing them into agreeing to consult him individually before rendering judgment in any case involving his prerogative" (Fortier 1256). But despite these and other "rhetorical flourishes," Lockyer argues, James "held the monarchy to the course prescribed by common law" (217).

19 Francis Bacon imagines the writing (or rewriting) of the law as belonging essentially to the monarch, whose prerogative is law, and who is also above the law, holding, at least from Bacon's perspective, the right to consult with the judges of the Star Chamber about any case before it came to trial (Helgerson 1990: 231; Bromham 337; Lockyer 65).

According to Coke and his followers at the Inns, England's monarch is limited by the common law; while not subservient to any person, he or she is subject to the authority of God and the law (Bromham 337). Moreover, Coke argues, the monarch can neither make law nor interpret or apply it. In the preface to his Fourth Reports, Coke claims that the "law makes the king .. . Where will and not law doth sway, there is no king."
great an oracle amongst the people, and they may be misled by anything that carries such an authority as all things that he either speaks or writes” (qtd. in Helgerson 1990: 237). Only a few days before Coke’s death in 1634, Charles arranged for Coke’s manuscripts to be seized. Despite the Crown’s fervent attempts to keep Coke under its thumb, however, it was not able to hinder the growing strength of the common law to which Coke had devoted his professional career. This strength was due in no small part to the institutional culture of the Inns of Court—a culture which had its own obscure relationship to royal authority, characterized by a delicate, ever-shifting balance between resilient independence and cowering subservience.

Like the theatres on the South Bank, the Inns were self-governing institutions whose geographical location outside the City limits and lack of a royal charter had helped to cultivate their collective intellectual freedom, a history of relative independence from external power, and a deep-rooted "professional and personal comradeship” (Cowper 55-56).21 At the same time,

21 There were no professional teachers or fellows as such at the Inns; rather the system of tutelage resembled more of an apprentice-practitioner arrangement. Yet this system operated within buildings that resembled the opulence of Oxford and Cambridge colleges that attracted men keen to associate themselves with the prestige of the Inns. The notion of the Inns as a kind of collective university was not new to their Tudor and early Stuart residents, for in the fifteenth century Sir John Fortescue, in De Laudibus Legum Angliae (c1470), had first imagined the Inns as a legal academy. But Fortescue's vision of a unified university of legal studies failed to materialize, for "there never was any general cooperation among the Inns for governmental purposes as in a University . . . Each Inn had its own founder or founders, generally an administrator, a Judge or other legal official, who provided houses for students of their following” (Williams 28). J. H. Baker argues that this lawyers' university or studium publicum was "unusual, if not unique, in having virtually no existence as a [unified] body. Its constituent colleges were autonomous and formed a university only in the sense that they performed similar functions, in close geographical proximity, under the general supervision of the king's council or the judges” (1986: 45).

While many of London's livery companies since the mid-fifteenth century clarified their institutional status by incorporating themselves under royal charter, thereby confirming their "powers of self-regulation and their monopolistic control" of particular trades and trade regulations (Baker 1986: 47, 54-55), the Inns never sought royal incorporation. If incorporated, the Inns would not have been able to acquire land without license from the Crown. The onerous process of seeking exemptions from royal legislation was prohibitive, and corporate bodies were forever rigidly tied to their inaugural constitutions (54-55). The Inns already had the privileges they required, which mainly concerned their
these societies had always been subject to mandates from the Crown, so their flexibility as unchartered societies beyond the immediate scope of City authority was under constant royal check, particularly concerning religious matters. The Inns were unswervingly loyal to Elizabeth, for example, except on a few occasions. The propensity for popish priests to seek refuge in the legal houses was naturally a cause for Elizabeth's concern. John Hambley was executed in 1587 for violating a statute making it "treason for a priest ordained by the authority of the See of Rome to be within the Queen's dominions and felony to help such a one." In 1591, Edmund Genings was executed in Gray's Inn Fields, along with his gentleman protector Swithin Wells, for "saying Mass in the house of his host in Gray's Inn Lane" (Cowper 57-58). In 1559, Elizabeth ensured that the Inns' chaplaincies were "financed by the Crown from the exchequer," thereby preserving the "medieval continuity of the mastership" and the Crown's right to appoint clergy (R. M. Fisher 71-73). Such an imposition by the sovereign inspired the Inns' governing benchers—determined "to control their own property and personnel"—to request Elizabeth to give up her control of the chaplaincies "for the master's allowance in return." R. M. Fisher notes that "even when

professional freedom to teach law and to control the membership of the bar with minimal disturbance from the outside (Baker 1986: 59). The fluidity of the common law—perpetually defined and redefined—required the institutions of legal education to be flexible as well. Baker argues that the Inns' constitutional flexibility "illustrates one of the main advantages of avoiding incorporation, and contrasts strikingly with the position of Oxford and Cambridge colleges, whose constitutional wrangles were constantly being taken to court" (70).

22 "In relation to external control," W. C. Richardson explains, "the Inns of Court were zealous guardians of their virtual autonomy and, though orders of [royally appointed] judges or council regularly suggested changes or improvements in procedure, they were usually in the form of recommendations. Seldom established without Inns' approval, outside regulations were enforced only if it suited the interest of the houses to do so; superficial compliance seems to have been all that was expected" (280).
the societies finally gained their property by charter in 1608, the mastership
and rectory were emphatically withheld by the Crown" (73).^{23}

Between 1617 and 1640, the Inns encountered further impositions from
the Crown concerning religion. In 1633, William Laud was appointed
Archbishop of Canterbury. A letter dated 16 December 1633 from Laud to the
benchers urges that "because verie many of the gentrie spend some part of
their time in one or other of the Innes of Court, and afterwards returning to
live and governe as Justices of Peace or otherwise in their severall countries,"
the maintenance of church and kingdom would depend on having preachers
at the Inns who were "conformable" (Black Books, vol 2, 317-18). Wilfrid Prest
argues that Laud's intervention "was part of a movement throughout the
1630s towards closer control and supervision of the [I]nns by the state" (1972:
204). More broadly, this act conveys the Church of England's desire to
maintain some degree of control over English society by more closely
supervising the religious life of the Inns—_institutions that housed many of
the nation's future lawyers and judges. The means by which Laud could
ensure the peace and unity he desired for the Church and the people of
England rested in his "support for royal proclamations forbidding disputes"
that might isolate people from the Church of England. As a training ground
for the country's future lawyers and governors, and as a kind of finishing
school for the sons of country nobility, the Inns, in Laud's eyes, served as
important institutions in which to inculcate the church's authority over
England. Laud's insistence on "conformable" preachers at the Inns exhibits

---

^{23} Even today, the Temple Church is a "royal peculiar," an institution "exempt from the
jurisdiction of all except the monarch as Head of the Church of England" (Evans 155).
his strategy of reinforcing the bonds and rituals of community and national integrity at the institutional level.\(^{24}\)

The Crown was also concerned about London's rapid population growth, which was significantly affecting the legal quarter. Numerous pamphlets and royal proclamations identified the legal quarter as a site of social, economic, and legal contestation resulting from the socio-demographic effects of the westward expansion of London's population beyond the City walls. This literature establishes a direct correspondence between the increasing numbers of law students and landed gentry who were moving into this fashionable area and the increasing numbers of vagrants—"the very scumme of England, and the sinke of iniquitie" as Lord Chief Baron William Periam of the Middle Temple called them (Manningham 113)—that reputedly shared this once-isolated sector of the western liberties.\(^{25}\) The rapid growth of London was closely related to the strong temptation of the country gentry and the wealthier London merchants to own land in and around the City in order to build a family residence. However, while such land investments likely elevated a family's social status, they did not generate the kind of business that would employ the City's laborers (F. J. Fisher 1968: 78).

The Crown was concerned that real estate development of this kind further stratified the social space of the City and its liberties primarily because this

\(^{24}\) Since June 1557, Crown-appointed judges had also been regularly imposing restrictions on the kind of apparel that students at the Inns of Court (and Chancery) should wear. In 1559, 1614, 1627, and 1630, Judges' Orders ruled on student dress and fashions; students, for example, were not supposed to wear study-gowns in the City or velvet caps, shoes, double cuffs, feathers, "great hose," and ribbons at any time. Swords, bucklers, and like weapons were also never to be donned. Specific fines were supposedly imposed for violations of these codes (Richardson 483), but they apparently did not stop law students from wearing luxurious clothing. The uniformity of attire demanded by the regulations was designed to enforce discipline.

\(^{25}\) Roger Lockyer observes that "from the mid-sixteenth century onwards there was a pronounced drift from the poorer uplands of the north and west to the more urban areas of southern England," especially the suburbs of London, which "attracted some 7,000 migrants annually... Speculative landholders took advantage of population pressure to jerry-build new houses and fill existing ones to bursting point..." (273).
"progress" gathered together wealthy families into small exclusive communities from which the poor were excluded, thereby creating a situation in which "the country's elite lived in close proximity to humble folk" (Supple 134; Power 180-82).

The legal quarter, which was quickly becoming a fashionable neighborhood for England's elite, exhibits this intimate convergence of property owners and vagrants. On the banks of the Fleet and Thames, the "majority of the country gentry were spending the most impressionable years of their lives . . . tasting the pleasures of both the City and the Court" and enjoying the close proximity of the Strand, "one of the grandest [streets] in the capital" (F. J. Fisher 1948: 42; Power 172). Further north was High Holborn, a broad handsome street bordered by the salubrious Great Queen Street and Lincoln's Inn Fields. Yet these streets were immediately adjacent to much humbler residences in Newton Street and Little Turnstile—indicating the extent to which the legal quarter contained radically distinct social environments (Power 174, 182). As the undeveloped areas of the legal quarter were purchased and partitioned, they became topographical marks of social exclusivity, and the problematic manner in which the corresponding elite spaces closely overlapped with the spaces of the economically disadvantaged aroused the attention of Elizabeth, James, and Charles, each of whom encouraged the country gentry to stay out of the City environs by enacting a series of proclamations prohibiting the further construction of buildings in and around the City.26 Related proclamations also demanded London's

26 James I's 1615 "Proclamation for Buildings," one of a steady stream of proclamations against the continued construction of new buildings under his reign, pleadingly resolves that since "Our Citie of London is become the greatest, or next the greatest Citi of the Christian world, it is more then time that there bee an utter cessation of further New-buildings, lest the surcharge and overflow of people doe bring upon our said Citie infinite inconveniences, Which have bene so often mentioned" (Proclamations 345-46).
landed gentry to leave the City during certain periods of the year. In February 1633 alone, 248 men and women were subpoenaed for remaining in London, though their cases were never heard in court (Heal 222). For the legal quarter, the implications of these royal concerns about the growth of London's population were significant. James's and Charles's efforts to preserve parcels of land (such as Lincoln's Inn Fields) against development were designed to discourage "covetous and greedy" opportunists from building "squalid tenements" near newly-built manor houses in the area (Brett-James 151-54, 109-14).27

The Crown was not the only dominating force that challenged the autonomy of the Inns; the City's commodity and entertainment markets—the theatres, shops, and bear-baiting pits, for example—also encroached upon legal commons.28 The benchers of the early seventeenth-century Inns, who

---

Both James I (on 29 May 1603) and Charles I (on 20 June 1632) issued proclamations that sought to curtail the great numbers of gentlemen from the counties who were flocking to London, building houses, and, as the proclamations suggest, contributing to the hardship of the country's poor. James's proclamation, published in the first year of his reign in anticipation of his coronation, calls this hardship a breeding "sicknesse," which was spreading toward the City and threatening to mar the solemnity of the upcoming royal event. Charles's proclamation reminds the gentry of its obligations regarding the hospitality of the country's poor, as previous royal decrees had done, but it more boldly enumerates the urban problems generated by the growing numbers of country gentry who were residing in the City, namely that "the city was becoming difficult to govern, was increasingly vulnerable to dearth and disease, and was intolerably burdened by the cost of maintaining the poor, including those who followed the rich into town" (Heal 211).

27 Resistance to the development of the area around Lincoln's Inn came from within the Inns as well. In 1604 there was a Chancery suit regarding the nuisances associated with building construction near the Inn. This suit served as a precedent for Clement's Inn v. Ford (1632), resulting in a writ to prohibit building near an Inn of Chancery "if it would happen that the students of the inn, incumbent in the same in the study of our laws, would be so much disturbed with the clamours and noise of men resorting to that place that they could not follow their studies" (qtd. in Manley 1995: 61).

28 "With theatres on both sides of the river, [and] Alsatia, Ram Alley and the Savoy on their door steps," Prest observes, "young men at the [I]nns, often with money in their purses and swords by their sides for the first time in their lives" were easily lured away from the regimen of legal study (1972: 141). Francis Lenton, in The Young Gallant's Whirligigg (1629), provides an interesting snapshot of the wayward young law student:

His Tutor was the man that kept him in,
That hee ran not into excess of Sinne.
His literature fill'd his Parents hearts
were in control of the law students under their jurisdiction, were constantly faced with the disciplinary problems involving the increasing numbers of "disobedient ambitious gentlemen" who were flocking to the Inns as part of what Mark Curtis has called a London-bound migration of "alienated intellectuals" from Oxford and Cambridge (Curtis 25). The dialogue between Westminster and London in Thomas Dekker's pamphlet *The Dead Tearme* (1608) illustrates the problems that the legal profession, represented by Westminster, encountered as a result of London's alluring luxury market. Westminster laments how the attractions of the City entice the gatherings of lawyers away from the court of law and toward the haunts of drunkenness,

---

With joy, and comfort, hoping his deserts
Might purchase credit and a good report,
And therefore send him to the *Innes of Court*,
To study Lawes, and never so surcease,
Till he be made a Justice for the peace.
Now here the ruine of the Youth begins,
For when the Country cannot finde out sinnes
To fit his humour, *London* doth invent
Millions of vices, that are incident
To his aspiring minde; for now one yeare
Doth elevate him to a higher sphere;
And makes him thinke he hath atchieved more,
Then all his fathers auncesters before.

Just one year of a gentleman's exposure to the City's corrupting influences while he was at the Inns was enough, according to this and other accounts, to undermine the natural course of his professional success. Sir John Davies, an established barrister at the Middle Temple, tells the story (in his forty-third epigram, entitled "In Publium") of the law student who prefers to spend his time at the bear-baiting pits across the Thames than at his desk:

Publius student at the common law,
Oft leaves his bookes, and for his recreation:
To Paris Garden doth himselfe Withdrawe,
Where he is ravisht with such delectation
As downe amongst the dogges and beares he goes,
Where whilst he skipping cries *To head, To head,*
His satten doublet and his velvet hose,
Are all with spittle from above be-spread.
Then he is like his Fathers cuntrey hall,
Stinking with dogges, and muted all with haukes.
And rightly too on him this filth doth fall,
Which for such filthie sports his bookes forsakes,
Leave olde Ployden, Dier and Brooke alone,
To see olde Harry Hunkes and Sacarson.
quarreling, and pride across the Fleet during the "dead terme[s]"—the four "mean vacations" that separated term time and the learning vacations. Westminster yearns for the abolition of these vacations, which disturb the smooth course of the law:

When thou (O thou beautiful, but bewitching city) by the Wantonness of thine eye, and the Musicke of thy voyce allurest people from all the corners of the Land, to throng in heaps, at thy Fayres and thy Theatres: Then, (even then) sit I like a widdow in the midst of my mourning. . . Yea, in the open streets is such walking, such talking, such running, such riding, such clapping of windows, such rapping of chamber doores, such crying out for drink, such buying up of weate, and such calling uppon shottes, that at every such time, I verily believe I dwell in Towne of Warre.

London's matronly response to her upstart sister's complaint is that "deade" terms supply a necessary release from the arduous labors of the English common law—necessary for the manner in which they enable the law to operate in a harmonious relationship with the market. London understands how the rhythms of law and the marketplace, represented by Westminster and London respectively, have, over time, caused the two jurisdictions to resemble each other so closely that they have become indistinguishable.

The Inns were the institutional links between these two harmonizing sisters. As such, they offered places in which students could learn the rules of

---

29 "Mean vacations" were periods when the law court at Westminster was held. "Learning vacations" were two twenty-four-day-long periods in the spring and autumn when readings took place in the Inns' halls.

30 London argues that if "foure Tearmes should be without tearme and never come to an end, those feastes which they incite thee to, would be their incurable surfeits, and so consequently thy destruction. If the sounde of Lawyer's tongues were but one whole twelve month in thin earse, then thy selfe wouldst even loath it, tho it were unto the never so delicate sicke."
the law and the market simultaneously. A student could learn the common law only by participating in commons because it was the one system that could bestow this capital. When residing at his Inn, however, the student was also exposed to London's luxury market, an infamous source of distraction from study. It is interesting that a student's ultimate success in the legal profession—devoted as it was to the (re)formation of codes that governed primarily civic relationships concerning property—was determined largely by his ability to disassociate himself from the City's markets, which, as a future barrister, he might eventually have to interrogate. Even while, as Dekker's London claims, the law and the market were closely integrated in practice, legal theory stressed their independence, an emphasis that had everything to do with maintaining the integrity of the Inns.

J. H. Baker's work on the legal culture of early modern England supports a configuration of the Inns' relationship to London in terms of relative autonomy: "Law schools," Baker argues, "are not indifferent to real life; but they do give law an intellectual life of its own, and their logic is sometimes stronger than pressures from the changing world outside" (1986: 465). The strength with which the Inns maintained their intellectual life against the pressures of the City and Crown depended entirely on the extent

---

31 A variety of books written by barristers advised students on ways to steer clear of distracting activities associated with the City so they could more effectively immerse themselves in commons culture. In his Direction or Preparative to the Study of the Lawe (1600)—a guidebook for the law student written at Gray's Inn in 1599—William Fulbecke stipulates that "the will, counsel, and decree of the citie is contained in the lawes, as the bodie can doe nothing without the soule: so a citie without Law cannot use her actions, power, or authority" (9). Fulbecke is certainly aware of the apparent tedium of legal study that propelled many young termers to urban distractions and away from their law books, yet his insistence that "surely there is nothing of weight or woorth, which may be compassed without paine and travaile" indicates the urgent need to address openly the challenges that the termers faced in their long journey to the bar.

The copy of Fulbecke's book in the British Library (shelf-mark 1130.b.14) was once owned by one George Chalmers, who dutifully underlined Fulbecke's pronouncements as if he were memorizing facts from a textbook.
to which they could claim sole authority over the internal logic of the English common law and the manner in which this logic was taught in the hierarchical social structure of legal commons. This hierarchy was recognizable in every aspect of the Inns' organization and daily life, including their ranking system, routines of training, and rituals of commons.

The rules of the game

There were multiple reasons for going to the Inns. One could learn the art of legal disputation and proceed to the bar, take advantage of London's cultural opportunities, or engage in a mixture of these pursuits. The primary attraction seems to have been their prestige, which had everything to do with the social magic of the common law, even if only some of the students managed to take the time to learn the tricks of the profession. The Inns retained this magic through institutional practices that were designed at every stage to compel students to respect the authority of the practicing barrister. This authority was manifested in every aspect of the Inns' organization—from the clothes worn by its residents to the nomenclature, physical setting, seating arrangements, and social formalities that regulated daily behavior in commons.

Commons was centered in each of the four Inns' halls, and the material arrangement of the hall's furnishings reflected and confirmed each society's hierarchical social structure. In each hall, the inner- and utter-barristers sat in rows at the back of the hall. A central fireplace separated the students from the ancients and governing benchers, who sat at the high table on a dais located at the upper end of the hall (see figure 5). On the wall above the dais of the Inner Temple was a large window filled with coats of arms—of
William Herbert, Henry Carey, Queen Elizabeth, King James, as well as Lord Chancellors, Earls, Dukes, and Barons (Hart 17). It was in this formal, aristocratically-inspired environment that students took notes from readings of statutes given by practicing barristers, engaged in the Inn's legal exercises, and ate meals together.32

New students entered the Inns as "clerks" or "punies"; they wore plain, sleeveless black gowns with a flap collar, topped by a round black cloth cap.33 During meals they all had to sit apart from the rest of the membership at tables marked "Clerks' Commons." After two years, each member could proceed to the "Masters' Commons," which were also divided into sections for inner-barristers, outer (or "utter") barristers, and benchers. Stipulated among thirty-two rules governing commons at Gray's Inn (listed at the end of

32 W. C. Richardson observes that
since the Halls at the Inns of Court were used for the legal exercises of mooting and bolting they were arranged as closely as possible to resemble a courtroom, which always contained a physical barrier, called the Bar, separating the judges from the attorneys, court officials, and general public. Although originally there may have been an actual barricade at the Inns, it came to be replaced by an imaginary or symbolic "Bar," represented by . . . an oblong table . . . [that] divided the membership of the society between Benchers and [student] barristers, the latter as pleaders standing outside the Bar.

Institutional rank was physically delineated by the placement of the tables, chairs, and other furnishings; the intimate arrangement of the furnishings was also designed to encourage students to discuss legal problems with colleagues of the same rank.

In The First Part of the Institute of the Lawes of England (1628), Coke states that
"conference with others . . . is the life of studie" (qtd. in Prest 1972: 117). In "Eating Law: Commons, Common Land, Common Law" (1991), Peter Goodrich discusses the relationship between the monastic routine of commons and the exclusivity of the common law. By imposing hierarchical seating arrangements, mirroring collegiate dining halls, and surrounding its inhabitants with visual reminders of the Inns' royal connections through coats-of-arms, the Inns of Court hall contains and regulates the transmission of this tacit knowledge by structuring the social order through which these feats of meaning are circulated.

33 In The Rules of Art, Bourdieu speaks of the value of court dress (in this sense, an aristocratic court) in terms of its ultimate dependence on the self-perpetuation of the court and its associated habitus; the "court cloak," in other words, is "valid only for a court which, in producing itself and in reproducing itself as such, reproduces . . . the whole system of agents and institutions charged with producing and reproducing the habitus and the 'habits' of the court." It is the court's process of (re)producing both itself and its habitus that both satisfies and generates a "desire" for a court cloak (172).
*Gesta Grayorum, 351-52* is the strict order of seating arrangements in the hall and the chapel during term. Alongside rules pertaining to the fortnightly installments of fees, terms of actual residence, and notices of absence were regulations disallowing "Fellows of the Society, under degree of a Barrister, [to] sit at the Barr table in Term time," forbidding anyone to "stand with his back to the fire," and designating the placement of non-barristers among chapel congregations to seats well away from the most senior members of the society. Rules such as these were designed to enforce the Inns' hierarchical system at every level of daily practice.

The inner barristers were still regarded as students and not as full barristers, but their continuous attendance at commons for two years warranted them some degree of privilege, though not much. The majority of the Inns' membership from 1590-1640 fits this status; inner barristers often greatly outnumbered the utter barristers, since only about one in six students was called to the bar (Baker 1986: 136). A student who had made it this far had devoted around seven years to the diligent study of the common law, and thereby had been recommended by the governing benchers of his Inn to be called to its bar, an event that was "judicially recognized as a mark of [his] legal training" and that signified his status as a barrister and thus a fully practicing member of his Inn. A student's call to the bar signified his ability to speak the law with authority—to discern from the amorphous background of the English common law a clear logic that he could convincingly articulate in court. Prest notes that a barrister's full membership in his Inn did not

34 Only members of the Inns could be admitted to the bar, and only those who were admitted to the bar could eventually advocate the law in Parliament. Prest observes that by 1590, "the four Inns had each laid down a broadly similar set of qualifications for call to the bar. The main academic elements were attendance at either four or six learning vacations immediately before call and participation in a given number of moots both abroad at the Inns of Chancery and within the parent house of court" (1972: 54).
necessarily mean he had more *material* privileges than the students; his privileges seemed to be symbolic (seating and clothing). Although the barristers sat at separate tables in hall (wearing long black grogam robes with two velvet welts on the long hanging sleeves), they "ate the same food, paid for their wine (which the benchers received free) and took no part in the government of the house except during vacations, when they ruled as delegates of the bench" (1972: 48).

Every four or five years, and in order of seniority, a group of barristers was elected to serve on the Grand Company of Ancients. It was from among the Company that benchers appointed readers, who were charged with leading the Inn's instruction of law during term. A reader normally undertook fourteen or fifteen years of training before he was assigned his first reading in the autumn vacation, after which he was likely appointed as a bencher, and thus charged with the duty to serve in the Inn's parliament, which handled the society's governance (Richardson 105). Members of the Company wore knee-length gowns tufted with silk and velvet; these conspicuous signs of authority were meant to inspire the civility and respect of all members.

By restricting mobility and by delineating the various ranks of membership, the material furnishings in the Inns' halls physically manifested the ways in which the societies produced and reproduced their systems of social rank. The intimate relationship between physical space and

---

35 When an Inn's parliament needed new members, the benchers selected "'the chieftest and best learned' of the senior barristers, basing their choice upon standing and qualifications. Consequently, since the Inns tended to be socially exclusive, it is not surprising that the selection was frequently from a rather restricted group of distinguished families. This feature was particularly noticeable in the Inner Temple where candidates for a call to the Bench were required to prove their 'gentle blood' for at least three generations. As a result, Bench vacancies there were commonly filled from a few prominent Inner Temple families" (Richardson 476). The Treasurer was an Inn's highest administrative office, equivalent to a Master of a college at Oxford and Cambridge (Elliott 198).
power was manifested in every aspect of commons, primarily because legal learning was determined more by community involvement than anything else. William Fulbecke, in his *Direction or Preparative to the Study of the Law* (1600), noted above, teaches the law student how best to thrive in commons. He informs the student that he must restrain his "minde from all voluptuousness and lust," maintain a healthy diet, and study in the morning rather than late into the evening, for

> the bodie in the night time wareth more dulle, so that the minde cannot use it as a convenient instrument. For when the stomacke is full and stuffed with meate, the thicke aire being round about us, stopping the poores, the great store and abundance of humors is carried, as Aristotle saith to the head, where it stricketh for a time, and layeth as it were a lumpe of leade upon the braine, which maketh us drowsie and proane to sleepe. (13-19)

Fulbecke's concern for the health of law students at the Inns suggests that, in his eyes, the healthy state of the common law depends upon the healthy state of the lawyer's own body as much as a disciplined commons. Having mastered the legal word within the hall of his Inn, this body would have to speak and represent the law.

The rules that directed the space of commons were conceived as a manifestation of the allegedly systematic order of the common law—an order that was difficult for many to discern. As perpetuators of this order, the students were the tangible link between the order of commons and the order of the law, for the law's logic could not be made apparent but through the art

---

36 Richardson observes that "student life in commons conformed to a general pattern, with minor differences in each society. When living in, students normally shared quarters, two to a chamber, Benchers only being privileged to have rooms to themselves. Each day at the sound of the horn members regularly assembled in Hall for the two main meals, dinner and supper, around which the major activities of the house were centered" (481).
of oral interpretation. Thus the rules of commons focused on the appearance and health of the student's body; the success of the law depended in part on the able bodies of its practitioners.\textsuperscript{37} The degree to which a student could \textit{master} these rules was greatly determined by the social acculturation that his family and educational background afforded him.

\textbf{The habitus of a law student}

Bourdieu contends that the "embodied cultural capital of the previous generations" of a privileged family transmits to the family's offspring a model for making cultural preferences in such an "unconscious and impalpable way" that it functions as an advance, head-start, or credit for their acquisition of "legitimate" culture (1984: 70-71).\textsuperscript{38} He argues that educational institutions are the primary places of cultural transmission and that one's "success" in these institutions "is better explained by the amount and type of cultural capital inherited from the family milieu than by measures of individual talent or achievement" (Swartz 76).

Students at the Inns in this period included gentry and those who were seeking membership in the elite. The Inns offered different kinds of cultural currency to each of these categories of students. Many of them (Edward Coke

\textsuperscript{37} I am grateful to Dr. Patricia Badir for her help with this analysis and for her specific attention to similar discussions of material and conceptual space that are central to my arguments in the second chapter.

\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Habitus} refers to a set of deeply-ingrained rules, acquired dispositions, and patterned ways of understanding, perceiving, and acting that arise from an individual's position in a cultural field and the particular social trajectory that has led this individual to occupy this position. The concept "implies a 'sense of one's place' but also a 'sense of the place of others'" (Bourdieu 1989: 19)—a "sense of place and out-of-place in a stratified social world" (Swartz 106). David Swartz defines this concept as "a deep-structuring cultural matrix that generates self-fulfilling prophecies according to different class opportunities" (104). These opportunities create an agent's disposition that predisposes him/her to "select forms of conduct that are most likely to succeed according to anticipated consequences" (106)—to "behave in a certain way in certain circumstances" (Bourdieu 1990: 77).
is an extreme example) wanted to transform legal capital into economic or social capital. Other students, like John Donne, regarded the Inns' prestige as a means to position themselves strategically in cultural fields beyond London's legal domain. The dispositions that distinguished Coke and Donne's rank in the juridical field were greatly informed by the different social trajectories that directed them to the Inns in the first place. Coke was the son of a prominent barrister, while Donne, born into a Catholic family, was the son of a prosperous London citizen who was the Warden of the Company of Ironmongers. The variety of family and institutional backgrounds that students like Coke and Donne brought to commons culture had much to do with the markedly different ways of perceiving the social utility of the common law and the Inns.

39 Bourdieu argues that, in contemporary societies, individuals and groups use cultural resources "to perpetuate their positions of privilege and power" (Swartz 190). To a great extent, he maintains, the educational system reproduces social class relations by reinforcing and protecting, rather than redistributing, cultural capital (191). By "reproducing the hierarchies of the social world in a transformed form," educational institutions "inculcate the dominant systems of classification through which symbolic capital is expressed" (203; 189). Bourdieu's assessment of the academy's situation with respect to the field of power illuminates how the Inns offered an institutional setting for the production of symbolic capital in the form of legal art. The barrister, as the maker of the common law through his specialized language, very much recognized the power of his craft and how his legal training at the Inns set him apart from the public.

At the Inns, the legal art occupied a position in the field of power governed by Bourdieu's principle of internal hierarchization; lawyers spoke to lawyers and gained their power from the system of legal commons. The Inns' educational system perpetuated the "insular traditions of the common law" (Rodgers 143) by creating what Bourdieu calls an antimimetic market, a place where "symbolic capital refuses to be assessed in economic terms." Ideally, legal commons was designed to present the common law as a discipline removed from economic concerns. Between this cultural market and the commodity market (e.g. the field of power), "a long and complex game is played ... in which the tactic of delaying convertibility may yield the best profits in the end" (386). Fulbecke shares this vision in his argument that the law student should focus his energy on his studies, not on his other desires.

In close dialogue with the Inns' antimimetic market was its mimetic market, in which "there is no attempt to conceal the mutual convertibility of cultural and material capital; on the contrary, agents are deliberately and even enthusiastically interested in reconstructing cultural spheres as practices of rational accumulation and assured convertibility" (Guillory 388). Plays, revels, and masques were the forms that these reconstructions assumed at the Inns, whereby their participants thought through their relationship to commons and the common law, and considered the extent to which they could profit from this relationship.
The conditions for entering an Inn were nominally determined by one's family background. Even though the membership did not actually share a homogeneous social background, the imposing façade of the Inns' gates, walls, and crest-decorated halls gave the appearance of containing an exclusive class of future statesmen. The students' need to appear to possess the qualities associated with an aristocratic background is underlined by the frequency with which new entrants to the Inns seem to have misrepresented their family's status upon matriculation. C. W. Brooks explains that the large numbers of students who identified themselves as gentlemen upon their admission in fact were of "bourgeois or plebeian stock" (1981: 56). While students entering a college at Oxford or Cambridge often understated their position in order to pay lower fees, some of the Inns' entrants "styled themselves as gentlemen" in order to meet the expected status category and then felt privileged to spend beyond their means and to behave in ways that were perceived as unbefitting the dignity of their professional calling (Stone

---

40 Demographic studies of the Inns' students suggest that the balance between gentry and non-gentry shifts over time, perhaps because of the different reasons for going to the Inns. Entry to an Inn, at least theoretically, was reserved largely for the eldest sons of gentlemen who had "enjoyed the ministrations of private tutors at home, followed by the Grand Tour and attendance at one of the French academies" (Stone 1964: 58). Wilfrid Prest's research into the social origins of students who were actually called to the bar from 1590 and 1639, however, shows that only half of these students came from "substantial landed families of gentry rank or higher." The rest, Prest observes, consisted of "at best bourgeois or professional 'pseudo-gentry'" (1981: 81). Combined, this evidence suggests that, at least from 1631 to 1635, around half of the Inns' students were not gentrymen, and half of these did not stand to inherit their family fortunes. The acquisition of legal capital was therefore the primary means of assuring their own financial prosperity.

41 The aspiring entrant to an Inn might have perceived a need to appear as a qualified member of what Bourdieu calls an objective class:

a set of agents who are placed in homogeneous conditions of existence imposing homogeneous conditionings and producing homogeneous systems of dispositions capable of generating similar practices; and who possess a set of common properties, objectified properties, sometimes legally guaranteed (as possession of goods and power) or properties embodied as class habitus (and, in particular, systems of classificatory schemes). (1984: 101)
Francis Lenton's description of "A young Barrester" in his *Characterismi* (1631) stereotypes this tendency:

... His very calling writes him Esquire, though his Scutchion sometimes cannot speak him Gentleman, except by way of admittance. Hee is very openhanded till his fee hath clutcht it, and then he's open mouth'd, and will be sure to speake more than toth' purpose, whilst his silly Client rejoyceth as much in the very tone of his tongue, as the substance of his talke, being both coequall to his capacity.

The pressure to conform to the standards of expenditure set by the wealthier residents created financial problems for many of the Inns' newest members. Prest notes that the "accepted minimum cost of maintaining a student at the [I]nns was about £40" a year during our period, compared to a minimum of around £10 to £15 at the universities (1972: 28). The social pressure to spend extravagant amounts of money on fashionable clothes, dinners and suppers in town, lessons at dancing and fencing academies, and miscellaneous expenses for gaming, drinking, plays, and a personal servant exacerbated the financial problems of the new termers. These ostentatious.

---

42 "With no scholarships and no opportunities for service," Ann Cook observes, "anyone who entered the Inns, either directly or following a university stint, simply had to have money.... A stay at the Inns of Court not only led to the most lucrative of all the professions but also carried such immense social prestige that it became the natural choice for those who could afford to educate their sons alongside nobles' and gentlemens' sons. The number of such rich aspirants was small—certainly no more than a quarter and perhaps fewer than a tenth of the total membership" (38-39). Though their number was apparently small, their impact on the Inns' culture of conspicuous consumption was significant, as Cook describes:

Letters home constantly requested money, no matter what the size of their allowances. Thomas Archer begged funds for clothes, 'for what I have is almost past wearinge.' Some notion of the sort of expense he had in mind was revealed by the £24 Edward Heath's father laid out in 1630 for a new cloak and suit, in addition to £13 for a length of green velvet. Rooms cost money too. After several weeks of temporary lodging, George Radcliffe wrote, 'If you can provide me 20 pounde I can buy a fair chamber therewith, together with what my good friends will lend me.' A month later, he reported, 'I am now about a chamber: it is a faire chamber, butt will coste me much. Send me worde when I shall have money towards it, and how much you can well provide. I have already taken uppe of my quarteradge 9 pounde, and I shall neede more this quarter 3 pounde.'
displays were part of a larger culture at the Inns that was centered on the appearance of having the cultural advances associated with an aristocratic upbringing. W. C. Richardson notes that "special banquets and suppers at mooting time at Gray's Inn had grown so excessive [and costly] by 1613 that they were prohibited altogether; almost simultaneously Lincoln's Inn took similar action, though the order was not strictly enforced" (485). "Frequently," Richardson observes, "those of less able circumstances took rooms in town to avoid social competition with the more fortunate" (487).

Some members of the profession eventually became exhausted by this culture of excess. "Good God, what a world is this? What an age doe wee now lyve in?," exclaims Abraham Fraunce to his fellow "learned lawyers" at Gray's Inn in The Lawyer's Logicke (1588). A Cambridge rhetorician, poet, and

43 In The Mastive, or Young-Whelpe of the Olde Dogge (1615), Henry Parrot provides a characterization of a law student who sneaks his way from the Inns to Westminster Hall along the Thames in order to avoid his creditors on the Strand:

Tassus from Temple Stayres by water goes
To Westminster, and back to Temple rowes:
Belike he loves not trot too much the streete,
Or surbait on the stones his tender feete:
Tut come, there's something in't must not be knowne:
But Sir, beleev't, The debt is not his owne.

Francis Cowper remarks on the "small wonder that some did shrink from the ordeal" of residency at the Inns, for the "sustained intellectual effort of subtlety in disputation before an audience which spent all its time sharpening its wits in the same sort of argumentation, was matched by the financial strain of a munificent hospitality which all the official discouragement in the world could not keep within bounds, when sociable impulses and gargantuan appetites set the standards for the public opinion of the table" (29).

In his Alarum Against Usurers (1584), a work of prose fiction addressed to his "courteous friends, the gentlemen of the Inns of Court," Thomas Lodge tells the story of a prodigal son—stereotypically "a university man with a considerable inheritance, who is connected with the Inns of Court, whose loving mother has died, whose father's patience wears thin, and who serves a term in prison" (Helgerson 1976: 108)—who in the end succumbs to the forces of usury that have corrupted him. Even as his protagonist becomes a maker of prodigals, Lodge warns his readers against following the hero's example. He laments the perpetual indebtedness arising from a young termer's unscrupulous living once he leaves home and arrives at the Inns:

Lorde what rioutousnesse passeth in apparell, what lavishnesse in banketting, what looseness in living, and in verie short space, our youth . . . comes to his ungratious Broker, whom with faire tearmes he desireth, and with humble suites more earnestly beseecheth to further his credite in what he may. (3)
logician, Fraunce went to Lincoln's Inn in the 1580s; by attempting to link law to scholastic knowledge, he hoped to undermine the use of the common law's mystique as a tool for social superiority. In *Logicke*, he laments the antics of "newfangled, youngeheaded, hairebrayne boyes," who "will needes be Maysters that never were Schollers; prate of Methode, who never knew order; rayle against Aristotle as soon as they are crept out of a shell." Fraunce also condemns the continual development of a tenacious arrogance among the younger law students, who, having secured a place at the Inns, thought themselves worthy of the title "Gentlemen." Londoners both inside and outside the legal quarter saw the ill effects of the Inns' preoccupation with social status on the impressionable termer. Fraunce insists that if "lawyers [were] to become better schollers, . . . there would not bee so many upstart *Rabulae Forenses*, which under a praetence of Lawe, become altogetheher lawlesse, to the continuall molestation of ignoraunt men, and generall overcharging of the countrey." According to Fraunce, arrogance was the worst quality that students cultivated at the Inns.

Many entrants worked their way to the Inns from humble backgrounds, and embarked upon successful legal careers; even so, their success at the Inns was dependent to a degree on their ability to demonstrate the kind of advances associated with their more socially privileged peers. In

44 Anton-Hermann Chroust suggests that
[i]t was at the Inns that young men became permeated with a sense of the greatness of their calling. This mode of training, acquired in close association with people of identical pursuits and ideals, fostered a high sense of professional honour and professional competence. The control over legal education no less than over the practice of the English Common Law was entrusted to the Inns of Court. By the manner in which they taught the law of the Realm they cast themselves in the immortal role of guardians of the Common Law.

45 In 1598, Francis Crawley, the son of a maltster, went to Gray's Inn from Bedfordshire, and became the Justice of the Common Pleas in 1632:
His career, together with that of two other local men who rose from yeomen origins to become Benchers of the Inn, is a useful corrective to the usual stereotype of the profession three or four hundred years ago. What were these factors in Crawley's case?
Roome for a Gentleman (1609), the soldier Barnabe Riche criticizes the "general controversie" among "the inferior sort of those that would faine be reputed to be Gentlemen, but likewise amongst the better sort of those that be knowne to be Gentlemen by birth, and others by their places and professions are gentelized, and worthy to be esteemed" (2-3). For Riche, becoming a professional is the best means of "gentelization," and he distinguishes "professional" gentlemen from those who attain this status merely through the "enjoying of wealth & riches." Riche, however, adds that it "skills not what their Fathers were, whether Farmers, Shoomakers, Taylers or Tinkers, if their names be inrolled in any Inne of Court, they are all Gentlemen" (12-13). This caveat highlights the consciousness of rank that was so much a part of commons culture; aristocrats, who went to the Inns for fashion's sake, were in close quarters with students who depended on professional development as a means to elevate their standing in English society. For Riche, the student who diligently prepared for his calling to the bar was a gentleman, for he acquired his status through worthy actions.\footnote{Riche condemns students who} Clearly innate ability must come first, to which can be added family prosperity, based on his father's occupation, which would have enabled him to send his son to Cambridge and the Inns of Court. Marriage too may have been of assistance and influenced his choice of Inn, since Crawley's wife was the daughter of Sir John Rotheram of Luton, who entered his son there. (Lee 41) Crawley's successful rise from humble origins into a "gentlemanly pattern of life" was likely a crucial decision for his family. Hugh Kearney suggests that "[f]or those in the half world of yeoman, agriculture, and trade, the decision whether to become a gentleman or not was one which affected the future life-chances of a family. At issue was a question of status rather than power, though of course an acceptable social status did mean the general opening of possibilities in politics and elsewhere" (26).

\footnote{John Tonge, son of William Tonge of Bredgar, Kent, exemplifies this kind of gentleman. The Tonge family was part of the minor landed gentry—people with "more education than the yeoman and thought of by themselves and their neighbours as gentlemen" but who did not have familial ties to the aristocracy:}

William Tonge was a well educated man who treasured his books which he left to John his eldest son. He had bought more land to provide for the education and schooling of all his children. He wished John to be a lawyer and from 16 to 24 years there was £20 a year to support him at the Inns of Court 'which is my desyre if it please god to blesse him.' (Allinson 47-48)
went to a particular Inn perhaps because it was convenient to London, or because as inheritors of estates they were expected to know something about the law, or just because their peers did the same.\textsuperscript{47}

Bourdieu suggests that whereas in the literary field the "rules of the game" are themselves at stake (these rules being the determining factors for one's "success" as a writer), in non-literary fields (like the juridical field) the rules of the game are largely based on social class and wealth—the advances afforded by one's habitus. In other words, the struggle to become a writer is open to a more diverse array of players than struggles associated with more institutionalized arenas of cultural expertise. Success at the Inns, for instance, appears to have been largely based on the appearance of possessing the social advantages of an aristocrat. Like all educational institutions devoted to the transmission of knowledge, the Inns tacitly perpetuated this system of class hierarchies in the way they implemented—through their rules and ranking systems—socially constituted taxonomies, which are in general the

William's emphasis on education and the law as the key to his son's professional success suggests that, if indeed John went to the Inns, he would have been prepared for the rigors of the common law; his yearly bursary, however, would not have matched even the minimum financial expectations of his Inn, much less those of his more wealthy peers.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{47} Louis Knafla comments on the growing tendency for London-bound men in particular geographical regions to recognize a specific Inn as their society of choice (244). Ross Lee observes that in August 1620, "no fewer than seventeen men of Bedfordshire origin were admitted to Gray's Inn. Most were the sons of local gentry. . ." (39). Lee notes the tendency for the "binding texture" of intermarried families to compel their male offspring to head for the same Inn. He also observes that of the seventeen who joined the Inn that August, only two are known to have become practicing lawyers (40). Most returned to Bedfordshire, it seems. Gray's Inn was traditionally regarded as the most prestigious of the Inns, so it is likely that these entrants were attracted more to the possibility of associating with an Inn's commons culture than the prospect of actually engaging in its professional regimen of legal study. This culture was a desirable environment for gaining upward social mobility, for courtiers often "paused briefly at one of the Inns before their translation to higher realms." The Inns were eager to admit such gentlemen as honorary members because the coats of arms that they placed in their Inn's hall served as "visible evidence of the society's honourable connections" (Prest 1972: 224-25).
interiorization of jurisdictional oppositions existing in the juridical and social fields (Bourdieu 1990: 16).48

It was not unusual for Inns' entrants to have left one of the universities without a degree. For those who desired to practice the common law at Westminster, Oxford and Cambridge had nothing to offer in terms of practical training, despite Dodderidge and Fraunce's insistence on a symbiotic relationship between the arts and sciences and the logic of the common law, with the light of reason as their common source. Civil and canon law were taught at the universities but, at the same time, a student's previous attendance at Oxford or Cambridge did not necessarily assist him at the Inns. The wide variance between the skills that a university education offered its students and the professional skills the Inns demanded of these students generated many complaints by barristers regarding the pedagogical deficiencies of university learning. Many of these barristers were also concerned that the status of the common law was being undermined by the glorification of the arts and sciences at the universities.

Lisa Jardine argues that while the art of dialectic in Tudor Cambridge was "the universal, indispensable basis for training in all professional fields,"

48 Based on his studies of how individuals and groups use cultural resources—"especially educational credentials, selection mechanisms, and cognitive classifications"—to "perpetuate their positions of privilege and power" (Swartz 190), Bourdieu concludes that educational systems reinforce (rather than redistribute) the "unequal distribution of cultural capital" across a society (191). Institutions of learning reproduce and retransmit this inequality through the imposition of a "curriculum content and style [that offers] advantages to those who possess the 'educationally profitable linguistic capital' of 'bourgeois language.'" The tendency of this language toward "'abstraction, formalism, intellectualism, and euphemistic moderation' reflects a literary and cultured disposition that is found most often among the dominant classes" (199).

Bourdieu's assessment is based on his studies of the modern academy in France, but his conclusion also helps to explain the way in which the Inns attracted a class of students for whom the study of the common law, at least in theory if not in practice, was perceived as a fashionable pursuit, principally because of the social prestige of the Inns—a prestige that was especially attractive to a family that recognized the advantages of having their sons at least appear to possess some knowledge of the common law because of the social 'magic' and power that this knowledge represented.
it was at the same time "purged of its more specialist aspects" in the universities, especially in the early seventeenth century, when the preoccupations of intellectuals generally veered away from "the quibblings of formal logic" in favor of "the felicities of Latin and vernacular style" and the "problems of the foundations of natural knowledge" (31-62). While these "felicities" cultivated a core of scholars gifted with rhetorical figures at ready hand, they did not serve the specific kind of legal rhetoric that the Inns demanded of the successful barrister.

In a letter regarding one of his students who is making his way from Cambridge to Lincoln's Inn, a Cambridge don admits that he does "not remember to have heard any man in [his] life, discourse more substantially, indifferently [impartially], and with less passion, more love and fidelity, then [he has] heard him: Which was the cause that he tooke singular delight to be in his company, and refused no occasion to enjoy the same" (Leycester's Commonwealth). Such a student would have likely found that his university-cultivated eloquence would not have impressed a barrister as much as it had his teacher; mooting exercises demanded the very "quibblings of formal logic" to which Jardine refers. These were the tools by which the lawyer gained his power to interpret and clarify the complexities of royal statutes in light of precedents established through the common law tradition. Instead of meticulous logicians, the universities seem to have been producing a steady stream of Inns-bound aesthetes whose "high" tastes in arts and letters were often perceived at the Inns as dilettantish, especially by the barristers, who generally deemed the language of humanism and scholasticism to be incompatible with the language and logic of the common law.49 This attitude

49 Many students who left Oxford and Cambridge, such as Simonds D'Ewes, saw their arrival at the Inns as a prime opportunity to develop further the humanist education they had already begun. A study of D'Ewes's library has led Andrew Watson to conclude that
typified the general animosity among students perceived as yearning professionals and those associated with letters. This arrogance, based on the perceived value of legal and intellectual capital, afflicted the entire culture of the Inns.

Peter Goodrich observes that the lawyers regarded the university men with disdain, and they "explicitly denied that a good scholar could ever make a good lawyer or, even more irrationally, that an historian could ever understand the history of the law or that a philologist could lay bare its languages" (1990: 22). The character of "A Fantastic Inns of Court Man" in Sir Thomas Overbury's *New and Choice Characters* (1615) expresses this sentiment:

He is distinguished from a scholar by a pair of silk stockings and a beaver hat, which makes him contemn a scholar as much as a scholar doth a schoolmaster. By that [because] he hath heard one mooting and seen two plays, he thinks as basely of the university as a young

---

D'Ewes's "period of study at the [Middle] Temple saw the beginning of his . . . first large-scale acquisition of books" (4). During his residency, D'Ewes acquired more than two hundred printed books; contemporary history (and not just English history) and political theory "held the place of honour," but heraldry books, classics, two dozen Bibles, works by Erasmus, sermons by Lancelot Andrewes, and some poetry (Barclay, Tasso, Drayton, Sidney) also shared the shelves with his legal materials.

William Smith, the eldest son and heir of an East Anglian landed family, was admitted to Gray's Inn from Cambridge in June 1608. Upon his death the following year, he left at Gray's Inn works by Catullus, Cicero (*De Oratione*), Livy, Plutarch (*The Lives*), Seneca (*Flores*), Suetonius and Tacitus; he also possessed a copy of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, and Gerard Mercator's *Atlas*. The sixth son of a Dorset squire, William Freke entered the Middle Temple from Oxford in 1622 and immediately began to amass a large library, which included such works as Christopher Sutton's *Godly Meditations upon the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* (1601), Robert Record's *The Ground of Artes* (1542), Thomas Hill's *The Art of Vulgar Arithmetick* (1600), Lodge's *Rosalynde*, Samuel Daniel's *The Collection of the Historie of England* (1612-17), a French bible, Shakespeare's *Othello*, and Thomas Thomkims's academic play, *Lingua or the Combat of the Tongues* (Prest 1972: 160-61). The breadth of scope exhibited by the book collections of D'Ewes, Smith, and Freke illustrates not only the possibilities that the Inns offered (as post-Oxbridge academies of social fashion) to men of financial means who could patronize the booksellers that lined Fleet Street, but also the extent to which their newfound proximity to the City of London—with its multi-faceted cultures, its social variety—perhaps stimulated their desire to acquire a greater scope of reading materials than university culture probably encouraged.
sophister doth of a grammar school. He talks of the university with that state as if he were her chancellor; finds fault with alterations and the fall of discipline with an 'It was not so when I was a student,' although that was within this half-year . . .

Some university-educated students (like Donne, who studied at both Oxford and Cambridge before he entered Lincoln's Inn) regarded the professionalism of their peers with equal contempt, having "imbibed the prejudices of clerical, classicist, dons," who predisposed their students to view the common law as "harsh and barbarous." From Oxford and then Cambridge, Richard Brathwaite entered Gray's Inn in 1609, having been urged by his parents to pursue a more practical course of study than the "sweet academical exercises" he enjoyed while at university. Brathwaite, however, found the "thorny plashes and places of the law" to be thoroughly distasteful after "the fresh fragrant flowers of divine poesie and morall philosophy." He apparently was among many who shared his ambivalence: "Nor was I the only one . . . who ran deeply into areers with time and gulled the eyes of opinion with a law-gowne. For I found many in my case who could not recompense their parents many years charge with one book-case" (qtd in Prest 1972: 142).

Such distaste for legal study seems to have increased the value of literature at the Inns, yet this value, for most students, was closely determined by its relation to the prestige of the law. Law and literature were part of the same community. As a more open means of expression than the discourse of common law, literary "performance" served both as a tool and product of the students' collaborative effort to recognize the law as a convertible form of powerful capital (chapter 2), to observe how this capital functioned when staged (chapter 3), and to use it as a political tool (chapter 4).
CHAPTER 2

Recognizing the Convertibility of Legal Capital

But now our Principality is determined, which although it shined very bright in ours and others' darkness, yet, at the Royal Presence of her Majesty, it appeared as an obscured shadow . . .

—Gesta Grayorum, 320.

Standing near the mouth of an open grave, compelled to know what secrets it might contain, Hamlet beholds a skull filled with dirt (5.1). He imagines that the skull once belonged to a lawyer, and marvels that the tricks that had served the lawyer when he lived can now do nothing to defend himself against the careless actions of the gravedigger—the "rude knave" who "knock[s] him about the sconce with a dirty shovel." Hamlet contemplates the ironic fate of this battered skull: its owner once controlled the transaction of property, including land, and now it is full of earth.

We need not look very far in the popular literature of the period to find similar attacks against lawyers. In his unexpected encounter with Lussurioso in 4.2 of Thomas Middleton's The Revenger's Tragedy (1607), the revenger Vindici, rather than revealing to his enemy the real source of his visible discontent, identifies twenty-one years of legal study as the source of his melancholy—an experience of toil that has made him privy to the demise of "too many old, rich men" who have died "poisoned with the affectation of law words" and obsessed by the dispossession of their property, even on their deathbeds (see figure 6). John Day's comic play, Law Tricks (1608), parodies the bewildering qualities of legal discourse through the conniving character of Lurdo, a malicious lawyer who perverts the law and its language in order to
manipulate his fellow characters in his quest to rule Genoa. At the beginning of the play, Lurdo claims that "knowledge i' the law" brings "[p]ublique applause" and also enables one to profit from the manipulative use of legal language—"to speake in distance." Polymetes, the Duke of Genoa's financially careless son, claims that the lawyer's "vultur Avarice / Devours men liuing: they of all the rest, Deale most with Angells, & yet prove least blest."

Many pamphleteers also criticized the legal profession (and the Inns in particular) for its "vested interest in complex and obscure law and legal proceedings" (Macdonald 74). They warned the public of the dire financial ramifications of resorting to the lawyer's verbal machinery as a source of justice. In Roome for a Gentleman (1609), Barnabe Riche advises wise men to avoid lawyers at all costs. Should there "bee no remedy" outside the law, however, the wayward litigant should arm himself with patience and store his purse with crowns, "for the Lawyer . . . sels wind" (25). In The Curtaine-Drawer of the World (1612), W. Parkes advises the lay person not to be deceived by the lawyer's "gravity" nor his "lookes of authority" that together, under the "pretence of law and equity," make him to "bee reputed an honest man, a profitable member to the common-wealth." "Under the Curtains of this grave and honest seeming," Parkes warns, "may bee piled up much deceit and wrong," for which he will suffer at the time of his own "inditement."

The most obvious reason for this popular resentment of lawyers is the perception that the legal profession authorizes a certain privileged few to feed on human misery. Outside the legal quarter, the law was seen as a mysterious system of deception in which words of dubious etymological origin functioned as costly traps to ensnare those who turned to the law in search of justice. While the legal profession was recognized as an institution that could
somehow stabilize society's chaotic change, its methods of doing so were
nevertheless mysterious.

A more complex reason for the popular hostility towards lawyers lies
in the Inns' forward-looking and pragmatic institutional culture, which is
what made the legal profession so successful. Located within the general
domain of London, but at the same time not wholly part of it, the Inns
enjoyed the benefits of their simultaneous (and relative) freedom from and
close proximity to the centers of England's power, and this condition enabled
the younger members of these societies to look at power ironically. Their
ability to do so was largely determined by their awareness of how the public
perceived the prestige they were accumulating at the Inns. The strength of the
collegial loyalty exhibited by the Inns' residents was maintained largely
because this loyalty was regarded with such skepticism by laypeople. This
allegiance depended on the preservation of the Inns' identity as houses
"entrusted with the sacred duty of preserving the special coinage of law" by
"keeping [this coinage] within the legal institution and subject to the singular
techniques of its interpretive tradition," such as the transcription of cases and
moots in Latin and Law-French (Goodrich 1990: 66, 88).  

50 Legal professionals make the public depend on their services by translating the language
used to explain conflicts and transactions between agents into legal code. Legal institutions
"produce their own problems and their own solutions according to a hermetic logic
unavailable to laypeople" (Bourdieu 1987: 834). Like any cultural field, the juridical field's
relative autonomy is determined by "the rise of a corps of specialists who are progressively
able to develop their own organizations and professional interests, which may deviate
significantly from external interests. With growing autonomy comes the capacity to
retranslate and reinterpret external demands" (Swartz 127). This process "often runs contrary
to the simple counsels of common sense" and renders the non-specialists' sense of fairness and
his/her "view of the case" as immaterial (Bourdieu 1987: 828). Even King James, in 1610,
wished that the common law "were written in our vulgar language; for now it is in an old,
mixt and corrupt language [i.e. "law-French"], only understood by lawyers, whereas every
subject ought to understand the law under which he lives ..." (qtd. in Lockyer 62).

The "official language" of a professional field enables its members to sanction and
impose the concepts it regards as worthwhile, "thereby contributing towards the
maintenance of the symbolic order from which it draws its authority" (Bourdieu 1977: 21-
22). According to Bourdieu, law is the "quintessential form of the symbolic power of naming
Hamlet acknowledges that the supposed lawyer whose skull he holds was powerful in his day; yet from the heights of a successful professional life, the lawyer has come to dust just like everyone else. This chapter examines the spatial and discursive practices by which the Inns invited their newer members both to reach such heights and to understand the contingencies of their position. Commons culture enabled the creation of fictions that helped law students understand the systems of domination that determined their subservient position both within and outside the legal quarter. These fictions were constructed as occasional entertainments (or revels), whereby lawyers articulated a certain self-awareness by manipulating and burlesquing the power structure of commons in a manner that stressed the relationship of this structure to London's more powerful political field and commodity markets. These festive rituals were more than a manifestation of the social cachet associated with professional self-ridicule; they were a form of reflexive social criticism whereby the students' seemingly playful rendering of the entire legal enterprise as an object of critical investigation supported a more complex project of recognizing their own collective investment in the authority of the common law.51

that creates the things named, and creates social groups in particular" (1987: 838-39). As long as the Inns could "maintain the mentality and closure of an esoteric guild whose mysteries were to remain hidden in a foreign language, whose concepts were to continue to be insular and defined in artistic terms, and whose method was to remain inaccessible to the order of reason" (Goodrich 1990: 47), its members could enjoy the ability to convert their legal capital into money.

51 "For Bourdieu," David Swartz maintains, "reflexivity means subjecting the position of the observer to the same critical analysis applied to the object of sociological investigation" (276). Reflexivity also "means developing a critical awareness of the class lens through which one views the social world" (272).
Transforming the (common)place

The structure of power relations in commons was designed to channel the transmission of knowledge from an authoritative speaker to subordinated auditors. The hall (as the central place of commons, the place of legal commonplacing) was arranged to reflect this power relationship. The speaker's authority was enforced not only by the hall's arrangement but also by the mystery behind his legal knowledge and discourse, derived as it was from "time immemorial." The dynamic imposed by these relationships structured the meaning of all formal verbal exchanges or performances that took place in the hall both in and out of term. Much of the literature directly associated with the Inns demonstrates that the barristers and students alike were keenly aware of how this dynamic constructed and transmitted legal authority.

Edward Coke's reading on fines

The increasing complexity of English society—its rapid growth in population, its flourishing wealth, and London's accompanying role in this development as the center of land transfer—caused London's legal community to become a vital resource for the elite (Cook 61). The legal profession was well aware of its newfound importance, and the career of Edward Coke exemplifies this awareness. For Coke, an insular approach to the common law was an "ideological necessity," and his "self-presentational strategy" was designed to uphold his considerable authority over the law at every turn (Helgerson 1990: 229). Part of this strategy was to associate himself with the ancient legal thinkers and their English descendants. William Fulbecke claims that Littleton's Tenures (which Littleton based on Justinian's
Institutes) is "of such singularitie, that Littleton is not now the name of a lawyer, but of the law itself" (Direction 71). Coke modeled his First Institute on Littleton's Tenures, and his commentary on Littleton came to be regarded as the law, just as Justinian's Institutes had once been regarded as the law (Helgerson 1990: 237-38). In turn, Coke included himself among the venerable lawyers who were, by virtue of their legal texts, regarded as personifications of the law. Another part of this strategy was to use his position at the Inns in order to construct a particular reading of legal history, one that would reinforce his own authority and the mystique of his profession.

William Hawkins's Three Law Tracts (1764) is an odd edition of three legal texts by Coke. It includes an undated tract entitled "Lord Coke's Reading on 27 Ed. I. called the statute of Finibus levatis." It is interesting to consider why—out of all Coke's readings—Hawkins chose this particular one to include in his printed edition. On the whole, the reading is a routine expostulation of the procedures by which a court can levy a fine for the settlement of land titles. What is noteworthy, however, is the way Coke

---

52 I would date this reading to the early part of Coke's career when he was a reader at Lyon's Inn (1578 to possibly around 1589) because it concerns a legal procedure normally undertaken by "common attorneys," who were not barristers but rather served as officers of the courts with chiefly clerical duties, which they performed as agents or representatives of persons who had legal business in the King's Courts of the Common Law. Attorneys did not "enjoy the right of audience [in the Courts], but they were competent to take all steps in such business prior to the exchange of pleadings" in court (Keeton 8). At the Inns of Chancery, such as Lyon's Inn, student-attorneys learned the less glamorous mechanics of the law—procedures, fees, writs, rules, and the like. Students copied writs of the Clerks of Chancery, listened to readers sent over by their corresponding Inn of Court to give lectures, and undertook rudimentary legal exercises (Gayley 30). "Recognized as separate professional groups distinct from the barristers," attorneys were disparagingly regarded as careless profit-seekers who resided their entire careers on the ability to transfer rapidly the cultural capital of the common law into economic capital. Such a sentiment is evident in William Dugdale's characterization of attorneys as students who, "lacking other means of support, looked pragmatically to lucrative practice rather than to the pursuit of legal competence" (Richardson 300-1).

Attorneys were in charge of preparing the documents that recorded fines and recoveries, or Finalis Concordia, "which were, in essence, fictitious records of actions compromised (that is, ended by a "fine") or prosecuted to judgment, which were long used as devices for the transfer of land" (Keeton 9). In 1581, Parliament passed an act that "provided for
expands the reading's formal structure to include a digression on how the words of the law are bound to a distinctively English authorial tradition uncorrupted by the "barbaric inferiority" (Helgerson 1992: 101) commonly associated with the country's ancient past. In the first lecture in this reading on fines, Coke explains his central faith in the common law of England as a body of *immemorial custom* ("custom," in this sense, refers to the idea of an unchanging law being beyond the limitations of history and customized to fit the demands of specific cases, each of which serves as a precedent for the next). The lawyer's job is to access immemorial antiquity in order to discover the law in each particular case. Thus the law itself never really changes, only its application in court.

To remedy the paradox between the common law as ever-changing-with-each-application and as a stable jurisprudential code, Coke designates the source of law as part of an exclusively English—almost divine—secular tradition. The common-law method of making history serves to demonstrate that the ancient leaders of England, as far back as Arthur and Brutus, were, when giving legal judgments, "merely giving expression to already existing laws"—there was no original mortal legislator, yet all legislators and rulers of England have benefited from the same source of legal knowledge (Rodgers 138). Coke's argument was part of his larger project to maintain both the

---

53 Upon offering for discussion difficult cases deriving from a legal text—cases that would often stray some distance from the text (Baker 1986: 33)—the reader's eloquence might well have taken flight, especially in cases involving vexatious questions regarding the Crown and the Church (Knafla 252-53).

54 C. P. Rodgers argues that in *The Law of the Britons*, Coke "was not seeking to derive the law from some mythical founder" (138), only to derive the authority of the law as it has been manifested in the ancient past in such documents as the *Domesday Book* and the *Magna Carta*, and in the writings of Bracton, Britton, and Fleta (Helgerson 1990: 242-43). Anthony A. Bromham observes that "Coke drew his precedents from very old sources, as he believed
insularity of the common law as English and its autonomy within the juridical field. He saw his role in jurisprudence as that of upholding the legal institution—and not the king—as the proper voice of English law. In *Forms of Nationhood*, Richard Helgerson explains that in order for Coke to ground his case, he had to assert the national importance of his project into every aspect of his legal practice. Thus what begins in Coke's first lecture as a discussion of the antiquity of fines quickly develops into an extended digression on the ancient *Englishness* of the common law.55

Coke begins by referring to a commentary in which Edmund Plowden reports an argument that one "lord Catlyn" made in "Stowell's case." Catlyn's argument apparently included citations of "many fines of antiquity; some touching the abbot of Crowland before the conquest." This case evidence leads Coke to conclude that "the Common laws of England at this day . . . were not brought in and established by William the Conqueror, as many do affirm, and one hath lately committed to writing, but were long time, no man knows how long time before" (223). To discredit further the claim "that the Conqueror brought in Common law," Coke maintains the following:

> For if the Normans have any laws that do resemble the laws of England, out of doubt, when the Conqueror had subdued the kingdom, perceiving the equity and excellency of the laws of England, never attempted to alter or change the same; but to the end that his own country-men, the Normans, might know the laws of England, under which from thenceforth he resolved they should live. And therefore for their benefit and safety, he caused some of the laws and ordinances

---

that the oldest [English] sources revealed the purest laws" (336). According to Coke, Arthur and Brutus were part of the same custom in which Coke and his contemporary lawyers were engaged. By including mythic figures such as these in the common law tradition, Coke and his contemporary antiquarians "clung to [an] . . . historically inaccurate version of the history of English law in order to bolster [their] profession's position" (Rodgers 140).  

55 Rodgers contends that the "eyes of the common lawyers were turned inwards on their own nation, which had made its own law in a process with no identifiable beginning" (138).
of England to be written in the Norman tongue. And afterwards seeing and well perceiving the happy success, where such laws were observed, abolished his old laws out of Normandy, and established part of our English laws there. And it cannot be truly said, that the English laws are in the Norman tongue; for the laws of England are unwritten laws, but divinely cast into the hearts of men, and built upon the irremovable rock of reason.

All of this in a lecture about fines. Coke's digression demonstrates the common lawyer's dependence on legal texts as the only reliable sources of evidence for the writing of English history. According to C. P. Rodgers, this is because the common law tradition was not interested in resorting to historical research to interpret the past; Coke's approach to history instead served to "find authority for views already held . . . it was not a theory of history so much as an extension of the lawyer's technique of seeking precedents and authority" through the creation of a fictional case-history of the common law that resorted entirely to its own carefully selected materials for its corroborating evidence (139, 145-46).

In his digression, Coke uses the power of his position as lecturer/reader to construct a version of legal authority that legitimates his association with a higher, national (though not fully accessible) power.56 The position Coke holds in the juridical field affords him the capacity to gain an audience—to make people listen to him. At the same time, his language is a means of producing a form of power, which depends for its efficacy on the dynamic of commons within the hall. His discourse also serves a legitimating function by using the art of recording history or precedent as a means to inscribe his own

56 In the second chapter of Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England, Richard Helgerson provides a thorough account of Coke's project of "writing against writing" in order to preserve his vision of the English constitution.
identity politics into the hallowed forum of English jurisprudence. Coke's power is not derived from his words per se but is dependent on the students' belief in the legitimacy of the words and of Coke himself. Symbolic power, Bourdieu explains, "resides not in the force of ideas but in their relation to social structure"—in the "determinate relationship between those who exercise this power and those who undergo it" (Swartz 88).

The force of Coke's ideas derives as well from their relation, in his eyes, to a broader nationalist sentiment (Helgerson 1992: 101), which is at once legitimizing of the Inns and legitimized by them because of the way people like Archbishop Laud recognized these societies as institutionalized consolidations of England's future leaders.

The social magic of the common law, and the contribution of this magic to the relative autonomy of the juridical field, depended on the benchers' maintenance of a clear division in commons between those who had legal power (readers and benchers) and those who did not (students). Like many institutions devoted to the transmission of knowledge, the Inns had a tradition of undermining this relationship through the occasional subversion of commons—reveals were carnivalesque reversals of the normal structure of institutional authority. It was during reveals especially that the law students were able to consider the potential utility of the legal capital they were amassing.

57 Bourdieu asserts that "grammaticality is not the necessary and sufficient condition of the production of meaning" (Wacquant 46):

Even the simplest linguistic exchange brings into play a complex and ramifying web of historical power relations between the speaker, endowed with a specific cultural authority, and an audience, which recognizes this authority to varying degrees, as well as between the groups to which they respectively belong. . . . [A] very important part of what goes on in verbal communication, even the content of the message itself, remains unintelligible as long as one does not take into account the totality of the structure of power relations that underlay the exchange.
Francis Beaumont’s Grammar Lecture

During revels, which also took place in the Inns’ halls, the furnishings that normally maintained a certain formal order—the tables, chairs, fireplace, and other partitions—were either rearranged or removed altogether. Students probably spoke on the benchers’ side of the bar, a place normally off-limits to them; they crossed the line into the reader’s place of privilege and authority. Revels created a festive environment in which the law students could freely fashion themselves as dominant agents in a cultural field of their own construction. The revels were, in fact, essential tools for the cultivation of their collective self-identity as future holders of positions in the royal court, in the professional legal sphere (in London or back home), or in other institutions. The cycles of legal education in commons provided a means for a student to gain professional success; the cycles of revels provided a means for a student to play the part of one who has achieved success. The effectiveness of revels, however, depended on the students’ memory of the established order they had rearranged.\footnote{I am grateful to Gretchen Minton for her help with this concept and for the invaluable advice she has provided on different aspects of this entire thesis.}

The third son of a Justice of the Common Pleas, a member of an old distinguished Leicestershire family, and a matriculant of Broadgate Hall, Oxford, Francis Beaumont (c.1584-1616) became a member of the Inner Temple (where his two brothers also resided) on 3 November 1600 around the age of eighteen, apparently because his father arranged for his admission \cite{Inner Temple Records, vol 1, 435}. Soon after his admittance, he delivered his mock oration, the Grammar Lecture, at one of the Inn’s Christmas Revels (c.1601-5) in the Inner Temple Hall.\footnote{Beaumont’s provision of entertainment for his fellow law students did not end here; on 20 February 1613, his Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray’s Inn was performed as part of a}
three types of law students at the Inns: the "young student," the "reveller," and the "plodder." The young student is a naive "soft imytating peece"; new to his Inn, he is just beginning to learn how to engage in mooting exercises and how to purchase a satin suit "on trust." Because he quickly runs into debt, he writes home for money—not to pay for books, but to see plays and puppet-shows. The reveller, with his pompous behavior and eccentric clothes, resides at the Inns solely for the sake of fashion. The plodder, wearing a "treble ruff and capacious cap," spends his time recording cases at Westminster Hall and reading legal yearbooks (Eccles 414); he is the diligent reader whom Coke claims will eventually enjoy a more complete understanding of the law than his less driven peers (Helgerson 1992: 100).

Beaumont concentrates his oration on the four "grammatical" elements that he claims an Inns' student must master in order to enjoy the festivities of revels: orthography, etymology, syntax, and pronunciation. He explains how each of the three types of law students cultivates a distinctive legal grammar. By cultivating an impressive script (orthography), the young student, for example, can sign his bills with flair; etymology affords him the skills to gather funds for his expenditures (his "compound"); with a command of syntax, he can efficiently spend this compound; his proper pronunciation enables him to match his eloquence with his habiliments.

Beaumont engages his auditors in a mock lecture in the style of an imaginary reading on the elements of the various legal dispositions or styles

series of celebratory performances at Whitehall in honor of the wedding of Princess Elizabeth and the Elector Palatine.

60 He also replenishes his wardrobe, as Francis Lenton notes in his Whirligigg:

He spends much money, and they send him more.
He ruffles now in Sattin, Silke, and Plush,
And oftentimes soliciteth the blush,
Imbroydred suits, such as his father ne'er
Knew what they meant . . .
of being a student at the Inns. Standing in the place of a reader in the Inner Temple Hall, he holds a place of authority in relation to his fellow students, and he explains what he sees in front of him. Beaumont is simultaneously one of these students and, in his role as the festive orator in the hall, also momentarily above his rank as student; he speaks in the powerful place normally occupied by the practicing barrister, and manipulates the anchored power dynamic that governs commons in order to legitimate a revised understanding of their relationship both to this dynamic and to the common law. The anchored state of the hall—its organization during term—marks a clear division between those who have access to the mysterious domain of legal knowledge through the medium of the spoken word (like Coke and other readers) and those who have not yet gained this power (the students). The conditions under which Beaumont delivered his lecture were characterized by the temporary dismantling of the hall's anchored state, which would not have been forgotten by the students who were enjoying the new possibilities offered by its transformation. In these conditions, Beaumont invites his auditors to join him in examining the different ways that they can use their association with the law as a power resource—as a form of convertible cultural capital.

The success of Beaumont's examination depends on the students' awareness of what diversions London has to offer them. In the early decades of the seventeenth century, the competition between market forces and institutional identities became a focus of primary concern—particularly at the Inns, where it conjured issues of personal and moral accountability. Beaumont understands that in such an environment as London, no man who remains honest, sincere, and upright can prosper; deception and
manipulation are the rules of the game. In a verse epistle written to his friend Ben Jonson "from the country," he acknowledges that

\[
\ldots \text{we want subtlety to do} \\
\text{The City tricks, lie, hate and flatter too:} \\
\text{Here are none that can bare a fained show,} \\
\text{Strike when you wink, and then lament the blow.} \quad (\text{qtd. in Smuts 78})
\]

In *Skialetheia* (1598), Everard Guilpin, who attended Gray's Inn from 1591 until at least 1598, claims that the law student (he calls him "Næuia" in epigrams 40, 41, and 42), "scarce honest, liue he how he can," enjoys two "engrossing occupations," for "He is a Lawyer, and a Merchant to[o]":

\[
\textit{Næuia} \text{ is one while of the Innes of Court,} \\
\text{Toyling in } \textit{Brooke, Fitzherbert,} \text{ and in } \textit{Dyer:} \\
\text{Another while th'Exchange he doth resort,} \\
\text{Moyling as fast, a seller, and a buyer:} \\
\text{Will not he thrive (think yee) who can deuise,} \\
\text{Thus to vnite the law and merchandise?} \\
\text{Doubtlesse he will, or cosen out of doubt;} \\
\text{What matter's that? his law will beare him out.}
\]

Guilpin's past experience as a law student enables him to understand the function of the law as a device that benefits those who understand it; by assuming the power of the reader during revels, Beaumont can take Guilpin's understanding a step further.

Beaumont uses the format of a legal reading to explain how students can either employ their membership in commons to learn how to transform legal capital into other forms, or to maintain it in its symbolic form (as
Fulbecke encouraged) by continuing the diligent study of the common law.61 Toril Moi observes that in Bourdieu’s science of fields, "the question of the exchange value of different forms of symbolic capital arises every time an agent attempts to move from one field to another" (507).62 Beaumont recognizes that in order for the law student to interact with other cultural fields in London, he must continuously assess the potential exchange value of his legal capital. It is just this sort of movement between fields that Fulbecke condemns in his Directions, for in order to amass the legal capital necessary eventually to become a reader like Coke, the student should avoid moving into other fields entirely; he should remain exclusively in the confines of commons and experience its rigorous rituals of cultural transmission.

Beaumont assesses the social conditions at the Inns that enable the production of such a reader. By unmasking the various uses that his fellow students make of their leisure/reading time, he also uses his lecture as an attempt to undermine the self-deception typically associated with one’s membership in a hierarchical institution.63 Basically, the plodding student’s

---

61 Craig Calhoun observes that “Bourdieu’s key original insights are that there are immaterial forms of capital—cultural, symbolic, and social—as well as material and economic forms and that with varying degrees of difficulty it is possible to convert one of these forms into the other” (69). Bourdieu’s aim in constructing a science of practices that recognizes all actions as "oriented toward the maximization of material or symbolic profit" is, according to Swartz, to "unite what has traditionally been thought of as economic (interested and material) and noneconomic (disinterested and symbolic) forms of action and objects. Thus, symbolic interest and material interest are viewed as two equally objective forms of interest. Actors pursue symbolic as well as material interests and exchange one for the other under specified conditions" (42).

62 Moi reminds us that “[w]hat constitutes a field is the fact that there are agents who compete for specific stakes: ‘A field defines itself by (among other things) defining specific stakes and interests, which are irreducible to the stakes and interests specific to other fields (you can’t make a philosopher compete for the prizes that interest a geographer) and which are not perceived by someone who has not been shaped to enter that field’” (507).

63 Bourdieu argues that "every sociological inquiry requires a simultaneous critical reflection on the intellectual and social conditions that make the inquiry possible" (Swartz 270). Reflexive inquiry of this kind demands the observer to "develop a critical awareness of the class lens through which [he or she] views the social world" (272)—to subject one’s position
diligence will eventually lead him to the bar; this is a straightforward correlation, but one that would operate most effectively under controlled conditions. Beaumont's point is that such conditions do not exist, and he sees his task as one of clarifying the place of the law student between the competing influence of London's luxury market and the rules of commons—rules that a character in Henry Parrot's *The Mastive* (1612) is loathe to follow:

Come; What shall's doe (qd. *Ned*) this afternoone?  
That hath at *Noddy* neither lost nor wonne:  
Theres not a Play (saith hee) worth looking on,  
And *Mistris Moll* from *Clarkenwell* is gone.  
Troth let's doo once what no man would conjecture,  
Turne honest for an houre, and heare a Lecture.

In the early decades of the seventeenth century, the effort of cultural institutions to maintain their autonomy against the encroachment of market forces became a focus of primary concern—particularly at the Inns, where this conflict was associated with personal and moral accountability.

**William Browne's *Ulysses and Circe***

Like Beaumont's *Grammar Lecture*, William Browne's Inner Temple masque of *Ulysses and Circe* depends on the conversion of the hall from a place of commons to a place of misrule and on the participants' awareness of this conversion's significance. In the same way that the transformed physical and social arrangement of the Inner Temple Hall allowed Beaumont to tell his version of the truth, the performance of Browne's masque likely freed the

---

in the field of criticism (and society more generally) to the "same critical analysis applied to the object of sociological investigation" (276).
space for the lawyer-masquers to examine collectively their relationship to the law and the City of London.

In April 1616, the chief cook of the Inner Temple registered the complaint that his chamber in the Inn's cloisters was damaged. More than a year before, numerous people had climbed the chimney in order to view a masque that was taking place inside the Inner Temple Hall by clinging to the hall's window sills (Inderwick, vol 2, xlii). The available evidence suggests that the popular masque in question was William Browne's *Masque of the Inner Temple*, which was performed by the law students in the packed hall on 13 January 1615 during the fourth and final week of the Inn's Christmas festivities.64

*Ulysses and Circe* is a myth about transformation. In Book 14 of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Circe transforms twenty-two of Ulysses' men into swine— not to be restored to human shape until Ulysses, under the protection of magic moly flowers, threatens to cut her throat. In Book 10 of Homer's *Odyssey*, Circe is described as a subtle witch—"dire beauty and divine" (1.150)—who lives in a "woodland hall" (1.166).65 After discovering Ulysses' identity, Circe swears not to trick him with her potions. However, not until Ulysses threatens to starve himself does Circe restore his men and warn him about the travails that lie ahead in his voyage back to Ithaca. In Book 12, Circe warns Ulysses of the Sirens and other dangerous perils that he will encounter in the next several years. In these and other stories, Circe is presented as an alluring, jealous temptress, who only becomes a source of goodness when her magic is undermined by a violent confrontation.

64 Browne, who also wrote a collection of poetry entitled *Britannia's Pastorals*, was admitted to the Inner Temple in November 1611 after leaving Exeter College, Oxford, without a degree. He was a poet, scholar, and antiquary, and maintained friendships with Michael Drayton, Ben Jonson, John Davies, George Chapman, and John Selden.

65 I refer here to Robert Fitzgerald's translation.
In his masque, Browne presents the Sirens as Circe's *handmaidens* who have the upper bodies of women and the lower bodies of hens. Circe controls all creatures and natural phenomena in her domain, and she summons the Sirens to entice Ulysses' men to her enchanted island. After waking Ulysses from his sleep under a tree, she tells him that it is with love, not anger, that she has guided him on his journey. Circe asks Ulysses what he thinks of her magical powers, which have transformed Ulysses' men not into pigs but into a dancing troop of stags, wolves, baboons, and one hog. Ulysses says that "[m]ost abject baseness hath enthrall'd that breast / Which laughs at men by misery opprest" (1.307-308). Circe is quick to defend herself, however, by claiming that she is not to blame for the transformation of his men into beasts:

\[
\begin{align*}
\ldots & \text{Some, I confess,} \\
& \text{That tow'rds this isle not long since did address} \\
& \text{Their stretched oars, no sooner landed were,} \\
& \text{But, careless of themselves, they here and there} \\
& \text{Fed on strange fruits, invenoming their bloods,} \\
& \text{And now like monsters range about the woods.} \\
& \text{If those thy mates were, yet is Circe free} \\
& \text{For their misfortunes have not birth from me;} \\
& \text{Who in th'apothecary's shop hath ta'en,} \\
& \text{Whilst he is wanting, that which breeds his bane,} \\
& \text{Should never blame the man who there had plac'd it} \\
& \text{But his own folly urging him to taste it.} \quad (1.321-32)
\end{align*}
\]

The misfortunes of Ulysses' men, according to Circe, are directly the result of their lack of restraint in the face of tempting "strange fruits," and her
reference to the apothecary's shop associates these pleasurable commodities with a distinctively urban luxury market.\footnote{Ben Jonson's \textit{The Alchemist} (1610) and Thomas Middleton's \textit{The Roaring Girl} (1611) both depict London apothecaries (Abel Drugger and Mistress Gallipot respectively) dealing in tobacco, a primary luxury. Abel Drugger also sells fucus, a substance used as a cosmetic whitening powder.}

Browne's masque provides a set of roles for law students to assume. Performing Ulysses' men at sea, under the spell of Circe's charms, they have been placed in a position of subjection within an imaginary institution. If we consider here Bourdieu's notion that "the space of symbolic stances and the space of social positions are two independent, but homologous, spaces" (1990: 113), we can interpret the lawyer-masquers' imaginary subservience to Circe as a symbolic expression of their homologous subservience to London and her burgeoning luxury market. Browne's adaptation of the \textit{Ulysses and Circe} myth, particularly his unique portrayal of Circe as a defensive governor, enables the law students to examine their own accountability in the face of the temptations afforded by the feminine City of London. Like the character of London in Dekker's \textit{The Dead Tearme} (and unlike the Circe of Homeric and Ovidian legend) Browne's Circe explicitly defends herself against Ulysses' accusation that she is guilty of tempting his men; she is, "as lilies, or the new fall'n snow . . . spotless yet" (1.231-32). Circe comments on the entrancing qualities of far-off things and the free will of those who choose to become distracted by them:

\begin{verbatim}
. . . What though the bow
Which Iris bends appeareth to each sight
In various hues and colours infinite?
The learned know that in itself is free
And light and shade make that variety.
Things far off seen seem not the same they are,
\end{verbatim}
Fame is not ever truth's discoverer;
For still where envy meeteth a report
Ill she makes worse, and what is good come short.  

Circe is aware that it was the distant sight of the tempting fruits that bound Ulysses' men to their sleep-inducing spells; this distance has enabled light, shade, hues, and colours to affect their perception of the things they have seen. Circe, however, says she is not to blame for the actions of Ulysses' men, for they were free to take and eat, or to resist that which "[f]ame . . . makes worse."

Who is in control here? In the masque world, Circe is a dominant force, though she admits that Ulysses' men have the freedom to do as they please; even so, they are under her spell, at least until the masque's conclusion. At the same time, in the "real" world of revels, which contains this imaginary dynamic, it is the student-masquers who are in control. Circe, as a masque-character, was likely performed by a law student in the very space in which the students were normally subservient to the authority of the benchers. A complex of power relationships is at play in this scenario. The students' roles as Ulysses' men in Browne's masque-world offers them an opportunity to examine their own position at the Inns and, more broadly, in the field of power. However, they also enjoy the momentary power that Beaumont enjoyed in his role as the orator when he gave his Grammar Lecture almost a decade before.67 Again, the effectiveness of this power is

---

67 This interpretation is modeled on Bourdieu's analysis of the homologous positions of Flaubert and Frédéric (from Sentimental Education) in their respective cities of Paris—Flaubert's Paris being "real," Frédéric's imaginary. Bourdieu argues that "the space of symbolic stances and the space of social positions are two independent, but homologous, spaces" (1990: 113). The successful "writing" of Frédéric into a fictional Paris, argues Bourdieu, establishes for Flaubert a sense of his own agency and success in the Parisian literary field in which he struggles to make a mark, even if his creation (Frédéric) fails to distinguish himself—to choose a side—in the political machinery of the fictional Paris he
contingent on the manipulation of one's community and the place it inhabits.

Accounts of masques indicate that these private entertainments were designed to transform the place of their performance into an imaginary world of swiftly shifting and inter-enveloping visual landscapes. The spectacle positioned the audience at the center of a magical show whereby they could join the masquers in a communal process of being *translated*, or momentarily conjoined in the world of the masque. The mechanics of this participation, this confluence of real and fictional worlds, rested in the device of the anti-masque (when the audience members and the antic masque characters joined in a dance in front of the playing space) and the unifying power of the lavish images that formed the background of the masque's mostly rhetorical action. Browne's descriptions of the scenes that envelop his revision indicate the extent to which the 70' x 29' x 23' hall had to conform to the demands of Browne's wonderland, likely obscuring the coats of arms englazed in the east window just as the scaffolding perhaps concealed those arms that lined the hall. Towards the left of the set was the cliff of Circe's island, and to the right was a composite sea-shore and pastoral setting: of the latter, Browne says that it was "so near imitating nature that I think had there been a grove like it in the open plain birds would have been faster drawn to that than to Zeuxis' grapes" (l.134-36). One sense of verisimilitude replaces another—a pastoral order governed by Circe is superimposed over the normal order of legal

inhabits. Bourdieu argues that the creation of Frédéric's symbolic stance, as inconclusive as it may be, functions as a sign of Flaubert's own success or social position in the Parisian literary field.

The status of the author is admittedly quite different in Flaubert's Paris of the 1840s and Browne's London of the early 1600s; even so, we can still acknowledge a striking relationship between the refusal of the lawyer-masquers to lose the battle in their mimetic experience with Circe and their simultaneous refusal to misunderstand the economic forces of London that cause them to surrender their pocketbooks.
commons. Circe's magic in her woodland hall takes hold over the magic of the common law in the real Inner Temple Hall.

This usurpation depends on the simultaneous inscription and interplay of civic and legal identities in the same physical space. The magic of the common law, as I have mentioned, depended on the relation of commons to the economic and political influences imposed by the City of London, whose possibilities for entertainment were (naturally) often more attractive to law students than the common law. I suggest, therefore, that Circe's representation in this masque invited law students to examine their own accountability in the face of London's luxury market. Just as Ulysses' men are attracted to Circe's alluring but poisoned island fruits, the men who migrated from the country to the Inns of Court were mesmerized by London's material pleasures. Upon a closer experience with urban vice,

---

68 Satyre V in Everard Guipin's Skialetheia voices the complaint of a law student frightened by the charms of London:

Let me alone I prethee in this Cell,
Entice me not into the Citties hell;
Tempt me not forth this Eden of content,
To tast of that which I shall soon repent:
Prethy excuse me, I am not alone
Accompanied with meditation,
And calme content, whose tast more pleaseth me
Than all the Citties lusheous vanity . . .

I wish to thank Jessica Winston (who shares my interest in early modern legal culture and is writing a doctoral thesis on the literature of the Inns in the Department of English at the University of California, Santa Barbara) for pointing out passages in Inns-of-Court drama that "depict the city as an effeminizing and transformative place." In George Gascoigne's The Supposes (1566, Gray's Inn), Erostrato, feigned master and suitor to the young Polynesta, "goes to the city to start at the University and instead winds up in a love affair that turns him into a servant" (private communication from Winston). Also, the third chorus after Act III of Wilmot, Noel, and Hatton's Tancred and Gismund (1592), "suggests that bad things happen to idle men in the cities" (Winston):

Whil'st Paris kept his heard on Ida downe
Cupid nere sought him out, for he is blinde.
But when he left the field to live in towne,
He fel into his snare, and brought that brand
From Greece to Troy, which after set on fire
Strong Ilium, and all the Phryges land.
Such are the fruits of love, and such his hire.
many students found themselves in debt (as the numerous accounts of usury attest), so the civic identity represented by Circe is both alluring and threatening.69

Circe's denial of accountability echoes the refusal of Dekker's personification of London to accept Westminster's accusations. But while Dekker's London claims that the luxuries of the City maintain a vital reciprocity between the law and the marketplace, Browne's Circe insists that temptation itself does not destroy Ulysses' men; rather, it is their habit of misperceiving the objects of vice that leads to their enchanted slumber. In both cases, a misperception of magical places (of London and Circe's island) directs the actions of the tempted.

The double subservience of Ulysses' men (in the masque-world) and the law students (in legal commons as well as London), however, leads to a double refusal. Circe's voice and those of her sirens are brought to life by the male voices and bodies of the student-masquers. A gender reversal of a kind occurs at the end of the masque, when Circe gives her magic wand—the source of her enchanting spells—to Ulysses, who assumes her power, waking the sleeping men while singing a song before they proceed down the Inner

---

69 Roger Fenton's *A Treatise of Usurie* (1611) and Thomas Lodge's *Alarum Against Usurers* (1584) are among the more prominent published warnings against usury. Richardson notes that the Inns "had no jurisdiction outside their own precincts, except for a summary authority over the entrances and exits through which these undesirables [forgers, debtors, highwaymen, perjurers, and probably also somewhat more dangerous characters] found their way into the yards of the Inner and Middle Temples, where they preyed upon the younger students, incited the wilder youths to riot or rebellion, and generally upset discipline" (287). In his "Fifty Apples of Admonition, Bestowed on . . . Gentlemen of Furnivall's Inn" (1576), George Whetstone warns impressionable students against associating with these characters and spending beyond their means:

Beware of tailors' curious cuts for they will shake your bags;
The merry mean I hold for best 'tween roist'ring silks and rags.
The tippling tavern, and such like, to haunt have small desire;
Of all reports it is the worst to be a drunken squire . . .
Out of the merchants' journals keep, buy seldom ware on trust;
Such usury bites above the rest . . .
Temple Hall to dance with the women in attendance.70 This transaction symbolizes London's willingness to negotiate her magic with the power of the law, a disposition also characterized by London's interaction with Westminster in Dekker's *The Deade Tearme*.

Browne's masque enables the law students to understand their vulnerable position in commons and, simultaneously, to use this knowledge as a tool of self-criticism. This process of self-confrontation, intricately staged as a form of dramatic art in controlled conditions, depended on the students' ability to write themselves into roles that Browne created for them. In his dedicatory letter to the "honourable society of the Inner Temple," he tells his peers,

> I give you but your own; if you refuse to foster it I know not who will; by your means it may live. If it degenerate in kind from those other our society hath produced blame yourselves for not seeking to a happier muse. ... What is good in it that is yours, what bad mine, what indifferent both, and that will suffice, since it was done to please ourselves in private by him that is

> All yours
> W. Browne. (l.1-10)

The uncertainty with which the law students regard their ability to make use of their legal art in London's marketplace is momentarily tempered by their certain power to revel in the halls of commons.71

---

70 W. C. Richardson notes that "[t]hough women were not officially admitted to Inn membership before 1919, ladies as guests were often invited on gala evenings to come from the spectator's gallery to join the revellers in social dancing" (477).

Maintaining autonomy through symbolic violence

Where could the law students go from the Inns' halls? The task of extending their collective self-understanding beyond the Inns' halls and into the City had to be managed carefully. The legal profession was at once honored for its utility and despised for its insularity, so any attempt by the Inns to represent its identity depended on a careful process of determining exactly what this identity was, what made it unique, and how it related to more powerful institutions. Because a significant portion of this profession consisted of men who yearned to be associated with the aristocracy, rank was central to this process of institutional definition. Such individuals, Frank Whigham explains, were in the market for a "repertoire of rules" that would substitute for the aristocratic habitus they lacked (4-5). By "imitating the style of life of a group higher in the social scale," they could use conspicuous consumption and property as tools in their struggle to distance themselves from economic necessity (Burke 1992: 67-68).

Bourdieu observes that legal spaces are "organized around the conversion of direct conflict between directly concerned parties [physical or verbal violence] into juridically regulated debate between professionals acting by proxy [symbolic violence]" (1987: 831). Legal power depends on the willingness of people to channel what might otherwise be a physical challenge through an elaborately mediatory and coded form of conflict based on the construction of names and labels, social groups and categories (838). As "the gentle, hidden form which violence takes when overt violence is impossible" (1977: 196), symbolic violence is a power of legitimation monopolized by the ruling class, which seeks to gain the most through the imposition of a reserved language system on dominated groups, which "are
forced to recognize the ruling elite as legitimate and their own culture as illegitimate" (Burke 1992: 86). Through their association with the Inns, the law students themselves became representatives of the common law, which served as a kind of cultural property they could use to wage their own kind of symbolic violence through the medium of drama.

*Gesta Grayorum* is a prose account of how law students used the symbolic violence of the common law to construct an aristocratic identity and to parade this identity through the City streets. Just as Coke's creation of his own version of legal history legitimates his power as reader, the law students' construction of the State of Graya, wherein they act as the state and its nominees simultaneously, sanctions their appropriation of the rank on which their new roles depend. By mirroring royal processions, the law students portray themselves as close companions of the court. While this portrayal does not challenge the court's dominance (it in fact acknowledges the students' subservience to the Crown), it does fashion the students as part of a dominant culture by using their association with the common law as a tool of cultural violence against London's citizenry.

The Christmas Revels at Gray's Inn Hall began on 20 December, 1594, and ended on Shrove Tuesday, 1595. Margaret Knapp and Michal Kobialka provide a thorough summary of the events that are recorded in *Gesta Grayorum*; the highlights of these were the preliminary formalities that took place on 20 December, the "tumult" surrounding the performance of *The Comedy of Errors* (28 December), the conciliatory *Masque of Amity* (3 January), the procession through London to the Lord Mayor's for dinner (4 January), the trip by barge to the Tower of London (via Greenwich) and back to Gray's Inn through the City (1 February), and the performance of the *Masque of Proteus* before Elizabeth at court (Shrovetide).
The making(s) of *Gesta Grayorum*

In preparation for the revels, the gentlemen of Gray's Inn, having named themselves the "Honourable State of the Grayans," cordially invited by letter a representative of their "foreign" neighbor state, the legal society of the Inner Temple, to join them in their yearly Christmas revels. The letter, recorded in the text of *Gesta Grayorum*, asks that this representative "resort to the Court [Gray's Inn] there holden, to assist the proceedings with [his] person" (263). The Inner Temple records include an order of 1594 that stipulates "the treasurer of this House shall deliver unto the ambassador to be sent from the state of this House to Gray's Inn, towards his expenses, the sum of twenty marks" (vol 1, 401). What followed this amicable correspondence was a twelve-day-long series of festivities that celebrated the short reign of the "Prince of Purpoole."72

The Prince was played by Henry Holmes, a student from Norfolk, who was "honourably inthroned" as the leader of a "flourishing estate" delineated by the soke of Portepool. The Prince's full title acclaims him as the "Arch Duke of Stapulia and Bernardio, Duke of High and Nether Holborn, Marquis of St. Giles and Tottenham, Count Palatine of Bloomsbury and Clerkenwell, of St. Giles and Tottenham, Count Palatine of Bloomsbury and Clerkenwell,

---

72 First published by William Canning in 1688, the two-part text of *Gesta Grayorum* was a result of the efforts of several lawyers of Gray's Inn, who wished to remember the "State of Purpoole" of 1594. It was dedicated to "the Most Honourable Matthew Smyth, Esq. Comptroller of the Honourable Society of the Inner-Temple." I refer to John Nichols's 1823 edition of three manuscripts and two fragments in his *Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, vol 3, pp. 262-352. In *Three Revels from The Inns of Court*, Desmond S. Bland includes an edition of the second part of *Gesta*, preceded by an introduction that explains the complex textual history of the entire account (71-115). Nichols regards *Gesta Grayorum's* second part as a later parody of the original first part, which was possibly written around 1615-1617 (320).

73 The name *purpoole* is a prankish corruption of "Portepool," which was in the time of Henry III a pool located at the western extremity of the wards of Newgate and Ludgate. The name later referred to a northern district or judicial soke in what is now the north-eastern part of Holborn.
Great Lord of the Cantons of Islington, Kentish Town, Paddington, and Knights-Bridge, and the Knight of the Most Heroical order of the Helmet and Sovereign of the Same." The rites of the Inns-at-revels create the Prince both by "forging his social image" as the Inns' spokesperson and by giving him a name and title that "defines, institutes, and constitutes him" so that he can "fulfill his function, to take his place in the game, in the fiction, to play the game, to act out the function" (Bourdieu 1990: 195). The Prince's social function is part of the social fiction of revels—devoted in this case to the construction of a mock State that, like the imaginary world created by Browne's masque, depended on the transformation and memory of legal commons for its ability to serve as an effective tool in the students' game of symbolic warfare.

*Gesta* exhibits the students' keen understanding of the social politics involved in group formation; while the students ridicule these politics for the sake of entertainment, their creative work ventures beyond the typically efficient scope of burlesque entertainment.

Much of *Gesta* concerns the formation of the Prince's illustrious group of governors and the technicalities of its social hierarchy, policies, and customs. Bourdieu maintains that the

---

74 The first part of the *Gesta* tract lists the Prince's full title no less than seven times (and once in Latin). Stapulia and Bernardio referred to Staple Inn and Bernard's Inn—two Inns of Chancery under the jurisdiction of Gray's Inn. Holborn was and is the area of the legal quarter (particularly the northern portion of the quarter extending westward from St. Andrew's Church to Drury House). St. Giles and Tottenham were located at the western extreme of the legal quarter—just north of Covent Garden (now just north of Soho). Bloomsbury was at the northwestern extreme of the legal quarter, Clerkenwell the northeastern, Islington is northeast of Holborn, Kentish Town is north, Paddington is west, and Knightsbridge is southwest (north of Kensington).

75 *Gesta* is characterized by a spirit of excess. Before the Prince's newly assembled court, the Solicitor reads a "General and Free Pardon" to "all and every public person and persons, whether they be strangers or naturals, within Our dominions." This pardon lists nearly one hundred offenses (including over-thwartings, inhibitions, washings, clippings, shavings, pluralities, formalities, deformalities, and the like) for which his people "be by virtue hereof excused, suspended, and discharged." Immediately following this extensive pardon is a list of twenty lengthy exceptions that effectively negate all of the pardons (272-76).
ability to make groups—"the symbolic struggle for . . . the monopoly over legitimate naming"—is the form par excellence of symbolic power (1989: 21). Through their own struggle to form an imaginary cast of illustrious governors, the law students enact the legal capital they have acquired through their association with the Inns—a capital associated with those who, in real life, are able to construct groups that achieve specific goals in society (Swartz 187). While this group identifies itself as aristocratic, its labor is directly associated with the legal profession and, in particular, the jurisdiction of the common law over land transactions and property. After detailing the Prince's "intronization" and the appointments of the "Officers and Attendants" of "His Highness's Government" (Gesta 265), the first part of the Gesta tract lists ten "Names of such Homages and Tributaries as hold any Signories, Lordships, Lands, Privileges, or Liberties, under his [the Prince's] Honour, and the Tenures and Services belonging to the same" (269). These are the individuals whom the Prince had appointed as governors of the wards of London under his newfound jurisdiction.

76 David Swartz explains that a key dimension of Bourdieu's notion of class relations is "the struggle to legitimate particular definitions and classifications of the social world" (119):

Class power is nomination power. The classification struggle among groups centers around the capacity to appropriate and impose as official and legitimate group names and categorizations. . . . Processes of group formation require the delegation of symbolic powers as well as the creation of group identity. There must be agents capable of imposing themselves as legitimate spokespersons and delegates for the class . . . It is through the symbolic labor of specialized agents that class identity and hence action become possible. (186-87)

77 These appointments are accompanied by eccentric duties that the "Homagers" must undertake in tribute to the Prince. The "Moratto Marquairillo de Holborn," for example, "holdeth the manors of High and Nether Holborn by coinage in capite of the Prince of Purpoole, and rendring on the day of his Honour's coronation, for every of the Prince's pensioners, one milk-white doe, to be bestowed on them by the Prince, for a favour, or New-year's-night-gift: and rendring yearly two hundred millions sterling" (269-70). "Lucy Negro, Abbess de Clerkenwell," the tract explains, "holdeth the nunnery of Clerkenwell, with the lands and privileges thereunto belonging, of the Prince of Purpoole, by night-service in Caudâ, and to find a choir of nuns, with burning lamps, to chaunt Placebo to the Gentlemen of the Prince's Privy Chamber, on the day of his Excellency's coronation" (270).
The participants were not parodying legal commons and its discourse in order to feel superior to their institution; rather, they were acknowledging the sources of legal power and playing the part of the powerful in order to appear to have control over these sources. Before describing how the students "performed" their power, the text records, in scrupulous detail, how they fashioned this power through the formation of a mobile political body (the Prince and his court). Rhetorically, this body is composed of a series of loosely linked episodes that proceed according to a pattern of conflict and resolution, each episode contributing a new dimension to the State of Graya.

The performance of Shakespeare's *A Comedy of Errors* is the most familiar aspect of *Gesta Grayorum*, perhaps because of its allegedly disruptive involvement in the revels and the creative manner in which the students resolved this conflict. The tract informs us that the play's performance on Holy Innocents' Day (28 December) at Gray's Inn was a planned part of the revels; the State of Graya had invited the State of Templaria to see the play as its guest. Shakespeare's Lord Chamberlain's Men were the likely players. Yet before the play even began there arose such a "disordered tumult and crowd upon the stage" that the Inner Temple's Ambassador and his train left "discontented and displeased." The next night, an arraignment was held during which the Clerk of the Crown "read publicly" a confession that he had purposefully caused the "confused inconvenience" of the previous evening by erecting the stage and arranging for "scaffolds to be reared to the top of the house, to increase expectation." He had then invited "divers ladies and gentlemen, and others of good condition" to the evening's entertainment only to be disgraced by "throngs and tumults, crowds and
outrages" that he himself had "caused." "And lastly," concludes his indictment, "he had foisted a company of base and common fellows, to make up our disorders with a play of Errors and Confusions" (278-80).

Regardless of the legitimacy of this confession, it seems clear from this last point that there was some question, at least in retrospect, as to the appropriateness of the play for the occasion. The play is about a father (Ægeon, a merchant of Syracuse), under bond, looking for his lost twin sons (Antipholus of Ephesus and Antipholus of Syracuse) in a foreign city (Ephesus) inhabited by citizens arresting and being arrested for debt. Legal audiences were accustomed to the use of twins in plays performed at the Inns, but in the presentation of hierarchical relationships in Errors,

[we]no sooner consider ourselves superior in awareness to the twin Antipholi than we recall that these "masters" imagine themselves superior to their wives, who in turn enjoy superiority over their servants, who in turn feel superior to "their" women. Yet at any one level, superiority over another is accompanied by a limitation in awareness implied by the level above it. As a result, superiority and inferiority, master and bondage, knowledge and errors occupy the same site.

(Freedman 86)

The two Dromios (the twin clownish servants of the two Antipholi) especially "convey the sense of helplessness that accompanies the futile attempts to live in mutually exclusive worlds and to meet their contradictory demands" (88). Like the Dromios, the Inns' students live both as dominators and as the dominated; while they have some claim to the prestige of the

78 It appears that the revels had attracted a crowd of "disordered persons" who, taking advantage of the Inns' slackened surveillance, entered in at the "court-gates" and basically crashed the party with their "great disorders and misdemeanours, by hurly-burly, crowds, errors, confusions, vain representations, and shews, to the utter discredit of . . . state and policy" (279-80).
common law, this claim is severely challenged by their subservient position in both commons and the field of power. The play's presentation of ambiguous power reflects the instability of the students' position at the Inns and, more broadly, in London. "The specific property of symbolic power," Bourdieu explains, "is that it can be exercised only through the complicity of those who are dominated by it" (1987: 844); at the Inns, Errors forces the entire community of the Inns to acknowledge its complicity in the ever-shifting balance between the power of the law and the power of masses.

Whether or not the play's "Errors and Confusions" themselves contributed to the disturbances of that evening, it is interesting to consider the relationship between the play's dramatization of "a court of equity where the ruler suspends law, taking the nature of the circumstances into consideration" (Knight 1979: 79), and the structure of the mock arraignment that occurred immediately after the play's performance (29 and 30 December). The reconciliation between the two states exemplifies what Martin Butler regards as the key to the fascination of the termers' revels—that is, a "covert dialogue between jest and earnest" (1990: 153). The student organizers of the revels had to ensure that the vandalism and trespassing that allegedly took place just before the performance of Errors did not continue to displease the benchers; however, these disciplinary measures—part real and part theatrical—could not demystify the magic of the revels in progress. The solution was to incorporate the resolution into the theatrical world of revels they had created. Again, this amalgamation drew its power from the common law. For the reinforcement of discipline, the Prince imposed a tax on all those—"from the highest to the lowest"—whose failure to perform his duty had "suffered so many disordered persons to enter in at the court-gates," the prisoner was "arraigned at the bar," and "the Sheriff impannelled a jury of
twenty-four gentlemen, that were to give their verdict upon the evidence given" (280).

Like Ægeon's plea to the Duke of Ephesus that begins Errors, the "prisoner" in Gesta appeals to the Prince of Purpoole for justice and convinces him "to understand the truth of the matter" (280). The prisoner's petition offers a disclosure of all the knavery and juggling of the Attorney and Solicitor, which had brought all this law-stuff on purpose to blind the eyes of his Excellency and all the honourable Court there, going about to make them think that those things which they all saw and perceived sensibly to be in very deed done, and actually performed, were nothing but vain illusions, fancies, dreams, and enchantments, and to be wrought and compassed by the means of a poor harmless wretch, that never had heard of such great matters in all his life. (280)

The prisoner proves his case by listing undeniable "absurdities" committed by associates of the Attorney and Solicitor, who had used the prisoner's name "for means of quittance with them in that behalf." Upon hearing this evidence, the Prince "freed and pardoned" the prisoner and "the Attorney, Solicitor, Master of Requests, and those that were acquainted with the draught of the petition, were all of them commanded to the Tower" (280). Presiding over his court of Graya, both as ruler and judge, the Christmas Prince models his resolution of the matter on Solinus' standard of equity. By suspending the law of Graya (that would punish the prisoner for his mere association with the offending trespassers) and by considering the circumstances that point to his own court as the source of strife between the States of Graya and Templaria, he exhibits the whimsical qualities of royal prerogative in a way
that mocks Coke's high standard of juridical autonomy, especially because the Prince's decision seems to yield a swift, just sentence.

The mishaps that unite the sets of twins in Errors, together with those associated with the bizarre circumstances of the play's performance, are balanced in the Gesta revels by the reconciliatory Masque of Amity, which was attended on 3 January by "great and notable personages." Two revelers, identified as "Graius" and "Templarius," follow arm-in-arm four other revelers dressed as pairs of mythical friends (Theseus and Perithous, Achilles and Patroclus, Pylades and Orestes, and Scipio and Lelius), all of whom pledge their undying friendship before a sacrificial altar erected to the Goddess of Amity. Graius and Templarius offer additional vows of pacification in order to make the smoky altar flame burn clearly as a sign of their perpetual "true and perfect" friendship, but the Goddess does not accept their vows of service until after they are blessed by "hymns of pacification to her deity," the singing of which causes the flame to burn "more clear than at any time before" (282).

The masque's restoration of the political body is echoed in Gesta with a return to the continued development of the State of Graya. After annexing nineteen "rules of arms, and civil government, religiously to be observed by all those [Knights] that are admitted to this . . . honourable Order" (283-87), the tract includes six Gorbuducian speeches to the Prince by six different counselors, who advise him on the exercise of war, the study of philosophy, "eternizement and fame" by buildings and foundations, absoluteness of state

---

79 Gesta lists the following guests: "the Right Honourable the Lord Keeper, the Earls of Shrewsbury, Cumberland, Northumberland, Southampton, and Essex; the Lords Buckhurst, Windsor, Mountjoy, Sheffield, Compton, Rich, Burleygh, Mounteagle, and the Lord Thomas Howard; Sir Thomas Henneage, Sir Robert Cecil; with a great number of knights, ladies, and very worshipful personages: all which had convenient places, and very good entertainment, to their good liking and contentment" (281).
and treasure, virtuous and gracious government, and pastimes and sports. These speeches stipulate how lawyers should cultivate the cultural capital associated with aristocratic rank. The counselor who urges the study of philosophy, for example, advises the prince to cultivate not only a "perfect and general library" but a "spacious and wonderful garden," each of which serves as an "eye of the world" through learning and an appreciation of nature.

On 4 January, the Prince, accompanied by the Ambassador of Templaria and the trains of both houses, progressed from the Court of Graya (Gray's Inn) to the Lord Mayor's house to attend a "very sumptuous and costly dinner" (296). After the dinner, the two states "returned again the same way, and in

---

80 The reference to Knights refers to the ancient religious and military Order of the Knights Templar, who occupied the area that later became the legal quarter from around 1124 until their prosecution around 1309 (by Philip IV, Pope Clement V, and Edward II) for their allegedly subversive rites. Their mission was to protect the Holy Sepulchre and the roads for pilgrims on route to the Holy Land, but their growing influence and wealth over time soon became an object of royal and ecclesiastical jealousy.

Francis Bacon of Gray's Inn is reputed to have written the six speeches, and their structure, style, and syntax—reflecting the condensed expressive style and Senecan curtness of Bacon's *Essays Civil and Moral* (first edition, 1597)—support this conjecture. Much to his mother's dismay, Bacon was widely involved in Inns' revels throughout his lifetime. In 1587-88, he helped write and acted in the dumb shows of *The Misfortunes of Arthur* before Elizabeth at Greenwich, and, as the "chief contriver," he also superintended Francis Beaumont's *Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn* on 20 February 1613, the last of three masques given in honor of the marriage of James's daughter Elizabeth to the Count Palatine in the Banqueting House at Whitehall.

81 There are several extant records of several libraries of Inns' men, including that of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, who, when he entered the Middle Temple in 1620, began his first large-scale acquisition of books—much legal material, of course, but also books of history, theology, political theory, Bibles in a variety of languages, the classics, geology, and literature (see Andrew Watson's *The Library of Sir Simonds D'Ewes*, 1966). While a bencher at Gray's Inn, Francis Bacon oversaw the planting of elm trees in rows in the Inns' Fields, which imposed a striking visible order on the once disarrayed patches of grass (Cowper 1985: 11).

82 The parade through London . . . was very stately, and orderly performed; the Prince being mounted upon a rich footcloth, the Ambassador likewise riding near him; the Gentlemen attending, with the Prince's officers, and with the Ambassador's favourites, before; and the other coming behind the Prince; as he set it down in the general marshalling in the beginning. Every one had his feather in his cap, to distinguish of whether State he was; the Grayans using a white, and the Templarians using ash-coloured feathers; to the number of
the same order as he went thither, the streets being thronged and filled with people, to see the Gentlemen as they passed by; who thought there had been some great Prince, in very deed, passing through the City" (296-97). Having fully manifested the State of Graya—both in body and in word—in the privacy of Gray's Inn Hall, and having "recover[ed] their lost credit" resulting from "the disgrace that the former night of Errors had incurred," the students were finally able to brandish their political identity in symbolic warfare against the people of London—over whom they asserted cultural dominance. The epistle dedicatory of the 1688 edition of Gesta admits that the "strict Alliance which ever was betwixt your States . . . as the only Person in whom are revived the ancient Honours of both Houses" had behooved the students to make "a publick Sense of the same personal Abilities (which made that Prince so conspicuous) that gives us all a publick View of those Vertues, so much admired in private."

On 6 January, a series of ambassadorial engagements was initiated between the Prince of Purpoole and an appointed Ambassador from the Emperor of Russia and Muscovy, who requested the Prince's help with his wars at home. The Prince agreed to help the Russian Emperor by sending an army. The next day, the Prince departed for Russia with the Ambassador on an extended mission that the text implies was the students' attempt to avoid the beginning of term—a ruse which the "Readers and Governors [of Gray's Inn] made frustrate" by forbidding them to rearrange the hall for more revels (305). 83 This administrative hindrance did not stop the festivities, for, on the

---

83 An entry on 23 November 1632 in the Middle Temple Records indicates that benchers occasionally intervened when the spirit of revels went beyond the bounds of decorum:

\[\text{fourscore in all, very well appointed, and provided of great horses and foot-cloths, according to their places.}\]

Flamboyant accessories are a mainstay of the students' documented display of conspicuous consumption as a means of distinguishing themselves from others.
first of February, the Prince and his train floated eastward on the Thames on fifteen barges, "bravely furnished with standards, pendants, flags, and streamers," from Blackwall to Greenwich (306). A series of written exchanges upon the stairs to the Queen's palace at Greenwich between the Prince and Queen Elizabeth (via Sir Thomas Heneage) led to the invitation of Graya to a court entertainment during Shrovetide; this was the *Masque of Proteus*, which concludes the first part of *Gesta*. The Prince and his train then landed at the Tower of London, whose Lieutenant welcomed them with a "volley of great ordnance" and one hundred "gallantly appointed" horses for their westward parade back to Gray's Inn via Tower Street, Fenchurch Street, Gracechurch Street, Cornhill, Cheapside, St. Paul's Church Yard, Ludgate, and Fleet Street, "where, as all the way else, the streets were so thronged and filled with people, that there was left but room for the horsemen that were to pass" (307-309).

The tract twice mentions that the parades were witnessed by crowds all along their east and west-bound routes, which included wards in the City's "fayre" west and "unsavery" east, as John Stow says in his *Survey of London* (1598). The mock estates of Graya and Templaria proceeded from the seat of

In the presenting and performance of revels, no gentleman of the House shall make use of the gallery over the screen, or bring down any lady or gentlewoman to see their ordinary revels, or dance with them in the Hall in the absence of the Bench, or use of the Reader's Chair or any other preeminence for the master of the revels, on pain of censure.

84 Martin Butler proposes that these acts of royal homage to the Christmas Prince illustrate "one ambiguous aspect of this interaction between game and earnest" (1990: 154). It appears that the rules of the game in this case, however, are rather clear: an estate of power-in-suspension receives its motivation and drive from the possibility of royal favour—of the eventual performance of power. "By 1598," Butler notes, "the former Christmas Prince was himself a Gentleman Pensioner to the Queen" (154), so it seems that the repartée between the two rulers was envisioned as one step forward in the development of an extended relationship between the Inns and the Crown.

85 M. J. Power observes that in London's west, "parliament and the Inns of Court were drawing great numbers of gentry, lawyers, government servants and men of affairs, and a large service population of shopkeepers and the like to support them. In the east we find a more homogeneous society of mariners, craftsmen, sailors' victuallers, almost all moderately
their "principalities" based at the Inns, through its mock kingdom (London), and arrived at the houses of real political authority (the Queen at Greenwich and the Lord Mayor's house). Voyaging on horseback in full regalia through these wards, having cast themselves as the aristocracy of the law, the law students brandished the prestige of the legal profession, by land and water, to London society, from ordinary citizens to the Queen. Between the Inns and the houses of monarchical and civic authority—instiutions representing the cultural, political, and economic forces that dominated the students—was an intermediary zone where the students could use the spectacle of public performance to play the part of power without threatening the agents that actually retained this power.

Aesthetic warfare, a form of symbolic violence, was the means by which the students converted this potential into action. At the Inns, the students promoted social cohesion "by acting rhetorically upon themselves and one another" (Whigham 185). Outside the legal quarter, this rhetorical action assumed an even more stylized form, whereby "the continuous display of inimitable nuance and manner" served to maintain a vivid sense of distinction based on the typical indicators of group solidarity: conspicuous clothes, arcane language, and eccentric rituals (Whigham 36; Burke 1993: 70). Such ingredients were the mainstays of the law students' effort to

---

86 Very soon after Elizabeth died in March 1603, John Manningham observed that "upon the death of a king or Queen in England the Lord mayor of London is the greatest magistrate in England. All corporacions and their governors continue, most of the other officers authority is expired with the princes breath" (208).

87 In Epigram 83, "Of a Precise Lawyer," John Harington portrays these qualities in his description of a law student who has just been called to the bar:

  A Lawyer call'd vnto the Barre but lately, . . .
recognize the utility of the legal capital they were amassing, and to use this recognition to define and redefine their position at the Inns and in London's field of power.

Up to this point, I have focused on how these related processes operated within the legal quarter—at a distance from the centers of urban power that dominated the cultural fields in its purview. The Inns, however, were but one place where the law students could understand the relationship between their identity as bearers of legal capital and the external political and economic forces that shaped this identity. Institutions more closely connected to these forces, such as the commercial theatres, naturally yielded different kinds of mimetic experiences for the students than the Inns' halls allowed.

... hapt to be a bidden gesth,
With divers others to a Gossips feast.
Where though that many did by intercourse,
Exchange sometimes from this, to that discourse:
Yet one bent brow, and frowne of him was able,
To gourne all the talke was at the table.
His manner was, perhaps to help digestion,
Still to Divinitie to draw each question:
In which his tongue extraugant would range,
And he pronounced Maxims very strange...
CHAPTER 3

Staging Exchange: the Inns and the Blackfriars Playhouse

There, boy! kill, kill, kill, kill, kill, Rafe.

We have seen how legal and dramatic performances in the Inns' halls created an environment in which law students could recognize and understand the convertibility of legal capital. These environments were located in the space of legal commons, so they facilitated a specific kind of understanding that depended on the fabrication of an imaginary field of power nominally under the students' control. In this chapter, I discuss the conversion of economic and cultural capital in an environment that was managed, not by the students' manipulation of commons, but by the pressures of London's competitive theatre market.

I agree with Douglas Bruster's claim that the playhouses of Renaissance England were centrally tied to London's economic market, rather than marginal to the relatively "stable" culture of the City as Steven Mullaney has proposed. As places of commercial exchange, the playhouses "regularized and normalized carnival" in a manner that was "both responsive and responsible to the desires of their playgoing publics" (Bruster 10). The theatres were central institutions in London's culture industry. Their proprietors were intimately familiar with the City's dynamic political scene and had their fingers on the pulse of its economic and cultural markets; this awareness of
outside influences was an important component of the theatres' success (29).

Bruster describes the early seventeenth-century theatre as "a ludic platform upon which London explored the social implications of the market" (64). A significant part of this investigation concerned the place of law and lawyers in London's burgeoning economy, and this chapter proposes that performances at the Blackfriars playhouse offered law students the chance to engage in a cultural experience different from the kind they could encounter in the more regulated halls of the Inns—different because London's political and economic pressures had a more direct impact on the production of culture at the Blackfriars than at the Inns. Part of this chapter's project is to provide a more focused assessment of the students' patronage of the Blackfriars, and the social environment of this patronage, than the perspective allowed by Alfred Harbage and Ann Cook's respective analyses of this theatre's reputedly more elite audience in comparison to the public theatres.

The Blackfriars playhouse was located at the southwest edge of the City in an eclectic neighborhood. Like all of the commercial theatres, it was

---

88 Thomas Dekker, in *The Young Gallant's Academy* (1674; a republication of his *Guls Hornbooke* of 1609), describes the theatre as the "Poets Royal Exchange, upon which their Muses (that are now turned to Merchants) meeting, barter away that light Commodity of words, for a lighter ware than words, Plaudities, and the breath of the great Beast, which (like the threatenings of two Cowards) vanish into Air" (55-56).

89 In December 1602, John Manningham noted that Stephen Egerton (c.1555-c.1621), a zealous and popular Puritan divine, served as minister of St. Anne's, a "little church or chappell up stayres" in Blackfriars that had a "great congregacion, specially of women" (152). Apparently, Egerton's Wednesday morning sermons were so popular that people would come from all across the City and the Inns of Court to hear them (367-68).

At this time, Blackfriars was a fashionable suburb for politicians because the high demand for town houses drove London's expansion westward towards Westminster. Robert Cotton's house was "a meeting place of poets and antiquaries" (Sharpe 202-203). Robert Sorlien, the editor of Manningham's diary, informs us that in 1612, "Sir Henry Savile, his lady, and his whole household went to keep Christmas ... and to spend most of the winter" at Sir Edward Hoby's home in Blackfriars. Hoby (1560-1617) was a parliamentarian,
socially suspect. While there is little evidence to support any specific claim about the demographics of this theatre's audience, it is clear that patrons paid a higher entrance fee than at other theatres, a disparity that suggests that the theatre's proprietors were offering clients the experience of feeling a part of an "elite" cultural experience—even if this experience was only a dim reflection of court culture. During the early years of James's reign, the Blackfriars was a place in which London's wealthier playgoers, including law students, paid for the privilege of wasting time—an activity that was associated with the social elite. Attending a play at the theatre demonstrated one's engagement in a contest for prestige based on the appearance of having time and money to waste.

The students' position in this playhouse was complex. As students, they were part of the "bottom of a hierarchical structure [of legal commons] to which [they were] ideologically or pragmatically committed" (Shapiro 52). By attending a performance at the Blackfriars, they entered an intimate and socially competitive environment composed of other privileged playgoers, who perhaps perceived this environment as a duplication of the exclusive social network centered at Whitehall. In the close company of patrons possessing varying amounts of economic, social, and cultural capital, the students encountered a range of people to meet, flatter, criticize, or perhaps even avoid. London was becoming a playground for a rapidly growing leisure class (Neill 344), and the theatres were places "where the gentry who would normally have been at Westminster might associate and cultivate their

---

translator, and author known for his "proficiency in logic, wide reading, and love of the arts" (Manningham 382).

90 C. W. Wallace notes that in general, "the admission fee so far as known seems to have been from two to twelve times as great as at any other theatre of the period" (112). Harbage claims that after 1600, the price range "seems to have been six times that of the onepenny, twopenny, threepenny range of the public theatres" (45).
connections" (Butler 1984: 110, 133). The City was also England's purgatory for its "alienated intellectuals" (Curtis 28), many of whom found their way to the Inns, and the combination of these elements of London society in the more expensive theatres—those who had social prestige and those who sought it—created an environment in which competitive displays of conspicuous consumption among the members of a Blackfriars audience were as central to the experience of attending a play as the play's performance itself.

Norbert Elias and Eric Dunning contend that "what people seek in their mimetic leisure activities is not release from tension but, on the contrary, a specific type of tension, a form of excitement often connected, as Augustine clearly saw, with fear, sadness and other emotions which we would try to avoid in ordinary life" (82). With this hypothesis in mind, I think that the performance conditions of the Blackfriars created for the law students a kind of tension that both challenged and assuaged their concern for social status—a status that, at least for the more professionally-minded students, would eventually depend on their ability to apply their Inns education towards a profitable legal career. A seat in the Blackfriars afforded law students a chance to perform the status associated with the aristocracy. The students were low-ranking members of the legal community, however, so this advance was only temporary, and what we know about their involvement in the playgoing experience indicates that they constituted a somewhat marginalized group within the audience. Their continued patronage depended significantly on the ability of the plays to appease their psychic need for a sense that they were part of London's social elite, for the other members of the audience could not necessarily provide this need. The city comedies of George Chapman, John Marston, Thomas Middleton, Ben Jonson, and Francis Beaumont staged the exchange of capital (money for
social prestige) in a manner that addressed this requirement. The plays dramatize, among many other things, the function of law and the legal profession in London's economic and social market, a project that depends on the playwrights' awareness of the legal constituencies of their audiences at the Blackfriars.

Between 1604 and 1606, Chapman, Jonson, and Marston's *Eastward Ho*, Thomas Middleton's *A Trick to Catch the Old One*, and Francis Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* were performed as part of the Blackfriars' repertory. Plays such as these celebrate the ability of the protagonist—often a

---

91 After the theatre's first period of court-sponsored performances under the entrepreneurship of Richard Farrant (lasting from 1576 until 1584), the property came into the ownership of Richard Burbage, who rented the hall to Henry Evans on 2 September 1600. Evans started a new boy company designed to compete with the recently resurrected Children of Paul's, a boy company associated with St. Paul's Cathedral (Gair 49), as well as the King's Men at the Globe. Having formed an alliance with Nathaniel Giles, Master of the Chapel Royal, Evans continued the tradition of including royal choristers among his company, but this strictly commercial venture nevertheless led to the ruthless recruitment of non-chorister boys such as Henry Clifton's thirteen-year-old son and heir, Thomas, who in 1601 was kidnapped and involuntarily "comitted . . . amongst a companie of lewde & dissolute mercenary players" (qtd. in Leinwand 60).

When James acceded to the throne in 1603, court supervision of the theatres "was consolidated by transferring the acting companies to direct royal patronage" (Yachnin 71); accordingly, the company at Blackfriars was renamed the Children of the Queen's Revels. During a serious outbreak of plague in 1603, the playhouses were closed, then were reopened in 1604. Records indicate that it was in this period of the Blackfriars' history (around 1604-1606) that *Eastward Ho* (1605), *A Trick to Catch the Old One* (1604-6?), and *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* (1606-1607?) were included in the company's repertory (I. Smith 214 and Price 131). The conjectural dating of these performances is of some importance, since in November 1606 King James declared that the boys of the Chapel Royal were no longer allowed to perform at Blackfriars, thus severing the theatre's official ties to the court. James's action regarding the Blackfriars was fueled by the complaints of Puritans and other appalled auditors against what they saw as the demoralizing (effeminizing) effects of having boy actors perform women's roles in plays (a subject which Stephen Orgel eloquently discusses in *Impersonations: The Performance of Gender in Shakespeare's England*).

Consisting of apprentices and ex-choristers, the company at Blackfriars survived for two more years, now under the name "Children of the Revels." In 1608, the company changed its name again, this time to the Children of Blackfriars. Sentiments against boy companies were still brewing; in his *Sermon Preached at the Crosse* (14 February 1607), William Crashaw claimed the companies were growing "worse and worse," and in 1608 the French Ambassador de la Boderie expressed shock at what he saw at the Blackfriars. After a stream of ineffective libel statutes, James banned all boy companies from London in August of 1608—an event that allowed the King's Men to take over the theatre. The boy companies evidently did not completely disband, however, for there are records of performances by the "Revels" company in country towns after 1608 (Harbage 55).
disinherited young gentleman, or "prodigal son"—to use his wit and knowledge of the ways of the world in order to profit from the failures of the citizens around him. Prodigal-son plays performed by the boy companies parodied those performed by the adult companies, in which the protagonist rebels against established society, experiences a genuine conversion, and returns to the society he once fought. His rebellion usually involves the waste of his wealth in the City and the rejection of conventional social relationships, usually by deserting his wife or rejoicing at his father's (often feigned) death. Plays such as The Contention between Liberality and Prodigality (1602) and The London Prodigal (King's Men, c.1604) conclude with the prodigal son's "miraculous conversion, sudden repentance, and instantaneous contrition" (Shapiro 121). The prodigal sons in city comedies, however, approach their circumstances with a cynical disposition.

Certain aspects of the prodigal son plays stand out when we consider both the law students' concern about their ability to exchange the legal capital they were acquiring and how the contest for prestige in the Blackfriars manipulated this concern. These aspects include the frustrated and comical attempts of London's citizens to profit, symbolically and/or materially, from

---

Between 1604 and 1606, when the three plays under discussion in this chapter were performed, the playhouse at Blackfriars was at the peak of its success under the regime of court-sponsored boy companies. The plays that were staged at this time drew together wealthy citizens, members of the court, lawyers, law students, and other privileged playgoers into one audience, and the fact that these plays were performed by a company composed partly of choristers of the King's Chapel Royal could only heighten the law student's sense of his outing at the Blackfriars as an opportunity to be as close to court culture as his money could buy.

92 In The Elizabethan Prodigals, Richard Helgerson provides a thorough account of the Elizabethan prose fiction that uses the theme of the prodigal son—a theme that the writers of prodigal-son plays tailored for the Jacobean theatre.

93 Alexander Leggatt observes that the son then "retires to an outlaw world of drinking, dicing, and whoring, a world that preys on him and then leaves him helpless . . . But there are agents of salvation at work [a loyal servant, brother, disguised father, deserted wife], balancing the agents of destruction, as in a morality play . . . As the hero repents, society moves to reclaim him, and the social bonds he broke are restored" (34).
the exchange of capital, the particular means by which the prodigal son manipulates these failed attempts for his own benefit, and the plays' conservative claims about the kinds of people who are able to benefit from this system of exchange. In order to understand how these characteristics enable the various members of the audience to engage in a game of social-competition-as-entertainment (a game officiated by the players on the stage), we need to explore more specifically the distinction between the social capital associated with the Blackfriars and the Inns.

Bourdieu argues that explicit aesthetic choices among groups who regard themselves as elite are "often constituted in opposition to the choices of the groups closest in social space, with whom the competition is most direct and most immediate" (1984: 60). The decision of how to "waste one's time" is one such aesthetic choice, for one of the privileges of the elite is the unencumbered time directly associated with the freedom from economic necessity. One of the distinguishing qualities of an aristocratic gentleman in early modern London was his manner of time-wasting. In the Blackfriars playhouse, London's privileged playgoers flaunted their time-wasting as a sign of social prestige, and by attending plays in their company, the law students could, in their own way, participate in this performance of "aristocratic" dalliance by wasting their own time in fast company and by critiquing the attempts of others to do the same.

Just as the physical arrangement of the Inns' halls naturalized the social hierarchies of commons, the physical structure of the Blackfriars was conducive to the kinds of social competition the playhouse attracted. The various seating options in the theatre offered patrons the chance to express a

94 Among a set of paradoxes listed at the end of Gesta Grayorum is the stipulation that it is "better to be idle than industrious: for the grass-hopper lives merryer than the ante."
kind of aesthetic disposition—different seats, above and below, yielded unique vantage points from which to both view the action in the playhouse and be viewed by other patrons (see figure 9). What Sir John Davies describes as the preference of the "clamorous fry of Innes of court [men]" to "[fill] up the private roomes of greater price" in the theatre constitutes an explicit choice whereby the students could position themselves above the other playgoers. In his third epigram (1593?), Davies makes it clear that the gallants—who "[d]oth either to the stage himselfe transferre, / Or through a grate, doth shew his double face"—"in his singularity doth despise" the places in the theatres "where all may have resort," such as the private rooms the students allegedly occupied in the Blackfriars. By sitting on the stage, the gallants asserted their performance of superior social status; by occupying the private rooms, the students attempted to violate (symbolically) this status. Davies's epigram suggests that the question of seating contributed to the competitive dynamic in the playhouse—a dynamic in which the law students responded to the gallants' stage-sitting in the form of scathing social criticism.95

"Certaine Observations"

Little is known about Henry Fitzgeoffrey other than that he was a student at Lincoln's Inn when he wrote his Satyres and Satyricall Epigrams: with Certaine Observations at the Black-fryars (1617).96 Consisting of 289 lines

95 I am indebted to Dr. Paul Yachnin for the careful attention he has given to this chapter (as well as to the entire thesis).
96 In the Black Books, Fitzgeoffrey's name is mentioned three times: once in relation to a financial dispute with one Mrs. Wythins in Jan./Feb. 1618, once concerning his chamber, which was "disposed of for the payment of duties to the House" (25 June 1618), and once regarding his call to the bar on 14 June 1621. We can therefore assume that Fitzgeoffrey was
of unrhymed pentameter and divided into eleven parts of varying lengths, Fitzgeoffrey's *Notes from Black-Fryers* appears at the end of his collection. Not even aware of what play is on that day, Fitzgeoffrey meets his friend "Philemo" in one of the theatre's upper viewing boxes. Rather than smoking, they decide to "deceive Time... till the second sound" by observing who else is attending the performance. What follows is a series of unflattering portraits of the patrons they see in the theatre; in each portrait the students criticize the dress, speech, demeanor, and behavior of the playgoers.

Fitzgeoffrey describes the Blackfriars as a world of unabashed conspicuous consumption. He wonders, for example, if a man whom he calls a "world of fashions"—donning Spanish boots, Scottish spurs, a French-cut suit, and a Holland shirt, with "His Haire like to your Moor's or Irish Lockes"—has just wandered in from a "Countrey may-game." After "A Woman of the masculine Gender" proceeds to sit "into the Gallants Row," Fitzgeoffrey notices that a "plumed Dandebrat" appears to enjoy the ladies' high demand because of his ability to dance "skipping too and fro." A "Spruse Coxcombe, yon Affecting Asse," who "never walkes without his Looking-

---

97 The auditorium and the stage at the Blackfriars were lit equally, so in a sense the entire theatre was a place of performance. "Second sound" either refers to a trumpet that indicated the beginning of the play or perhaps the second of many intervals that divided each performance. These intervals featured popular musical performances by an outstanding ensemble of professional instrumentalists and boy choristers.
glasses," is obsessed with the tidiness of his apparel. This "witlesse Noddy" fasts on "Oatmeale, Milke, and crums of Barly-bread" and avoids the taverns just so that he can fit into his tight, tailored suits.

What is most interesting about Fitzgeoffrey's survey of the Blackfriars' clientele is its concluding description of the playwright John Webster, who appears in the theatre accompanied by a young foppish singer:98

But h'st! with him Crabbed (Websterio)
The Play-wright, Cart-wright: whether? either! h o—
No further. Looke as yee'd bee look't into:
Sit as ye woo'd be Read: Lord! who woo'd know him?
Was euer man so mangl'd with a Poem?
See how he drawes his mouth awry of late,
How he scrubs: wrings his wrests: scratches his Pate.
A Midwife! helpe! By his Braines coitus,
Some Centaure strange: some huge Bucephalus,

98 In 1617, John Webster (1580-1634) was thirty-seven. Little is known about him. He might have studied law for a time at the Middle Temple, though the Inn's records do not support this conjecture. Edward, his father, hired out coaches and hearses (or "carts")—a trade that Fitzgeoffrey ridicules in his character portrait. Webster collaborated with several playwrights associated with Philip Henslowe's company. By 1617, he had already written The White Devil (1612) and The Duchess of Malfi (c.1614, Blackfriars) under his own name, so he was a known figure in the theatre business.

Webster was engaged in an on-going war with a group of minor poets and playwrights at Lincoln's Inn. Early in 1615, John Stephens (Cynthia's Revenge, 1613), one of Fitzgeoffrey's friends at Lincoln's Inn, issued his Satirical Essays, Characters, and Others, which included a strongly derogatory portrait by his friend the lawyer J. Cocke (a pseudonym), entitled "The Character of a Common Player," to which Webster took offense (Forker 546; Bradbrook 168). The "Character of an Excellent Actor" appears in the sixth edition of the late Sir Thomas Overbury's (Middle Temple) ever-expanding Characters, drawn to the Life of Several Persons in Several Qualities (1615), which Webster probably edited (Forker 121; Bradbrook 167). In this character, Webster retaliates against Stephens in a vicious digression, later removed in subsequent editions (Forker 546). Otherwise, the character "is surely one of history's noblest and most eloquent defenses of the thespian's art" (127).

Subsequently, in a second edition of his book, Stephens refers to Webster's writing as being "dressed ouer with oyle of sweaty Post-horse" and as employing "hackney similitudes" (qtd. in Forker 24). Here Stephens includes more raillery by "Cocke" and the law student George Greene against the "nameless Detractor before mentioned" (qtd. in Forker 546). Cocke claimed that three characters in the sixth edition of Overbury's Characters were his own, and that an "vnknown botcher," whom he identifies as the author of "An Excellent Actor" (e.g. Webster), had crudely tampered with them (Forker 121).
Or Pallas (sure) ingendred in his Braine,
Strike Vulcan with thy hammer once againe.99

What begins as a string of personal insults and sexual puns turns into an assessment of Webster's reputation for convoluting the source material of his plays:

This is the Crittick that (of all the rest)
I'de not haue view mee, yet I feare him least,
Heer's not a word cursively I have Writ,
But hee'l Industriously examine it.
And in some 12. monthes hence (or there about)
Set in a shamefull sheete, my errors out...
But what care I it will be so obscure,
That none shall understand him (I am sure.)

This final ad hominem attack against Webster illustrates the extent to which law students perceived themselves as judges of the entire theatrical institution.

The backbiting assessments of the Blackfriars gallants are also a part of this cultural power-play.100 Fitzgeoffrey's reaction to the flagrant displays of wealth reads as arrogant aestheticism, a response that Bourdieu, in his own

99 Charles Forker observes that "Crabbed (Websterio)" is probably a jibe at the dramatist's attraction to Italian subject matter, or possibly a reference to a physical deformity of some sort, Webster's reputedly cantankerous personality, and/or his "knotty and contorted style." Fitzgeoffrey's reference to Bucephalus, Alexander the Great's bull-headed horse, appears to "ridicule the unnaturally mixed or hybrid quality" of Webster's plays. "Pallas," the goddess of wit or intelligence, was conceived in Jove's forehead after Vulcan had split it open; the reference "suggests not only the labored nature of Webster's style but also the junction of sexuality and violence so thematically central to his greatest dramas" (59).

100 In The Young Gallant's Whiligigg (1629), Francis Lenton admits that
In Court and City there's no small ado,
With this young Stripling, that [upbraids] the gods,
And thought twixt them, and him, there is no odds...
A haughty look, a more superbious minde,
And yet amongst his equalls too-too kinde. (12)
research, claims is characteristic of Parisian bourgeois adolescents, who, because they "are both economically privileged and (temporarily) excluded from the reality of economic power, sometimes express their distance from the bourgeois world which they cannot really appropriate by a refusal of complicity whose most refined expression is a propensity towards aesthetics and aestheticism" (1984: 55). Bourdieu's conjecture offers a convincing explanation of the environment Fitzgeoffrey describes in his Notes—especially when we consider his concluding assessment of his project as the product of his leisure-time:

Others may chance (that know me not a right,)
Report (injuriously) all my delight,
And strength of study I doe wholly bend
To this Losse-labour and no other end.
To these I wish my scandal Muse reply
In as plaine tearmes as may bee 'Tis a lye.
Heer's but Pate-pastime: Play-house Observation,
Fruits of the vacant howers of a Vacation.
Then (say all what they can) I am sure of this,
That for Play-time it is not spent amisse.

Here Fitzgeoffrey presents the playgoing law student as a critic of fashion, someone who prides himself on his ability to dissect the complex system of personal display at the Blackfriars. More importantly, he makes it clear that

101 "Objectively and subjectively," Bourdieu argues, "aesthetic stances adopted in matters like cosmetics, clothing, or home decoration are opportunities to experience or assert one's position in social space, as a rank to be upheld or a distance to be kept" (1984: 57). Like Fitzgeoffrey's Notes, the character of "A Fantastic Inns of Court Man," published in one of the many editions of Overbury's Characters, illustrates how the law student uses his proclivity to criticize the stances of others as an expression of his own social position:
[He] laughs at every man whose band fits not well or that hath not a fair shoe-tie, and he is ashamed to be seen in any man's company that wears not his clothes well. His very essence he placeth in his outside, and his chief prayer is that his revenues may hold out for taffeta cloaks in the summer and velvet in the winter...
his role as social critic is an integral part of his competitive time-wasting—criticism is his most adept weapon in the competition because it is the basis of commons culture.

The authors of the Blackfriars plays demonstrate their awareness of the law students' place in the social order both within and outside the theatre. The plays are also demonstrations of the playwrights' ability to balance this awareness against the need to entertain a wider critical audience of non-lawyers. In his discussion of London's theatre market, Paul Yachnin has argued that playwrights such as Marlowe, Shakespeare, and Middleton "developed the possibilities of indeterminacy inherent in drama's dialectical production of meaning so that their plays could be staged both at Court and in the public theatres, and so that the plays would please both the orthodox and the heterodox" (66). Entertaining a narrower, wealthier market, the playwrights who wrote citizen comedies for the Blackfriars (and St. Paul's) also took advantage of these "possibilities of indeterminacy" so that their plays would appeal to a cross-section of London's privileged residents and visitors—an audience composed of men and women enjoying varying degrees of cultural, social, and economic capital. Entertaining audiences of this kind presented a different set of challenges to the playwright than attracting patrons to the public theatres, for while a Blackfriars audience might have been more socially homogeneous than an audience at the Globe, it also contained a spectrum of London society competing for social status.102

In order to entertain such an audience, the playwrights had to understand the kinds of competition that drew it together.

---

102 After taking over the Blackfriars playhouse in 1609, Shakespeare's King's Men performed individual plays, such as Cymbeline, both at the Globe and Blackfriars.
George Chapman, Ben Jonson, and John Marston's *Eastward Ho*

The disparity between economic and cultural capital that afflicted the law students' sense of social affiliation in London is reflected, to a degree, in the predicament of Quicksilver, the protagonist in *Eastward Ho*, who is the younger son of a gentleman, and therefore does not stand to inherit his father's estate. He is apprenticed to a thrifty, virtuous Cheapside goldsmith, Touchstone, against whom he rebels by affecting the fashionable tastes and vices of a young gallant. To the dismay of Golding, an industrious fellow apprentice, Quicksilver uses Touchstone's profits to pay for his lavish expenditures until he is banished from the household—two years before his apprenticeship should expire. By the end of the play, Golding is married to Mildred, Touchstone's daughter, and has become the deputy alderman; in this role, he sentences Quicksilver to jail for his crimes, though he later decides that Quicksilver's melodramatic conversion at the end of the play is sincere and threatens to put himself in prison unless the stubborn Touchstone agrees to pardon Quicksilver. Moved by Golding's sacrifice, Quicksilver forgives Touchstone and reclaims him.

Touchstone also has a daughter, Gertrude, who scorns her family's middle-class status and yearns to be a gentlewoman. She abhors the marriage of her sister to Golding, though she does not know that he is in fact a gentleman. Gertrude marries a disenfranchised knight, Sir Petronel Flash, because she thinks he is rich and will remove her from Cheapside and take her to his enchanted castle east of London. Sir Petronel is only interested, however, in Gertrude's inheritance, which he plans to invest in a voyage-for-riches to Virginia with the assistance of Security, a usurer, who draws up a document permitting the sale of her lands to Sir Petronel. Believing that the
document allows for the sale for a "poor tenement" that would fund the purchase of furniture for the castle, Gertrude, now "Lady Flash," signs it (3.2.190-93). In the meantime, the "egregious pander" Security (2.2.227) schemes to use his daughter Sindefy (Quicksilver's mistress) to manipulate Gertrude into ceding her lands to Sir Petronel; Sindefy will pretend to be a gentlewoman recently arrived from the country. Leaving Gertrude destitute and aimlessly looking for his non-existent castle, Sir Petronel heads eastward on the Thames for the New World, where he will eventually wed Winifred, Security's wife, who is smuggled to Cuckold's Haven, a tavern east of London, where she will be taken aboard Sir Petronel's ship.

The whole eastward enterprise falls to pieces in a fierce storm that lands everyone on the Isle of Dogs. The arrogant children of Cheapside, who have rejected the City and its values of thrift and hard work, are brought to justice by the violent Thames, which returns them to Cheapside and the Counter prison, poverty, or both. Though this disaster identifies the characters' pursuit of higher social status as unnatural, it is never clear that we should trust the claims of repentance and moral conversion that bring the play to a close. In this "subtlest and most elaborate parody of the standard prodigal story" (Leggatt 47), behaviors that seem "natural" are in constant competition. While the human desire to excel is natural, the hasty pursuit of social advancement, Mildred claims, is not; at the same time, this moral perspective is juxtaposed with Security's description of usury as the life and breath of his existence:

103 Ralph Cohen describes *Eastward Ho* as a "topographical comedy" (85); the play "abounds with allusions to places with infamous associations and mentions, among others, the disreputable precincts of Whitefriars and St. Katherine's; prisons such as Bridewell, the Fleet, King's Bench, and the two city prisons, the Counters; and even Tyburn and Wapping, notorious as places of execution" (88).
Mildred [to Golding]. These hasty advancements are not natural. Nature hath given us legs to go to our subjects, not wings to fly to them. (2.1.74-77)

Security. Where we that trade nothing but money are free from all this, we are pleased with all weathers. (2.2.134-36)

Security [to Quicksilver]. How I do hunger and thirst to have the honour to enrich thee . . . (2.2.164-65)

Security later tells Quicksilver again that he "do[es] hunger and thirst to do you good, sir" (3.1.76), emphasizing the treacherous environment of feeding and preying in which the aspiring characters must pursue their social advancement. The condition of Quicksilver, Gertrude, and Sir Petronel is complex. While the degree of social status for which they each aspire depends upon the achievement of a lifestyle unburdened by the need for money, they must nevertheless rely on the likes of Security in order to secure the funds that this lifestyle demands. Gertrude and Sir Petronel are most especially caught in a hopeless cycle of unaffordable dreams because they have the most to lose (Gertrude, her lands; Sir Petronel, his reputation) and because they are the most gullible. Touchstone, Golding, and Mildred function as a kind of control group against which the efforts of Gertrude and Sir Petronel are measured.

Quicksilver, however, stands apart from this crowd because he understands the subtle ploys and motivations involved in the social and economic transactions that occur around him, and he is able to manipulate these transactions, in the end, for his own benefit. Though he is cast in prison like the rest of the Virginia-bound entrepreneurs, he knows that the key to
his freedom is a polemical display of piety (he sings a song called "Repentance") that will pull the heartstrings of Golding and Touchstone. 
While most of the play is focused on Gertrude and the Virginia expedition, Quicksilver remains relatively in the background; he observes the actions of others more than he acts himself, and it is for this reason that he is able to gain his freedom with a song.

Throughout the play, we are reminded of Quicksilver's reputation as "the royallest fellow that ever was bred up i' the city" (5.3.47-48):

Prisoner. He would play you his thousand pound a night at dice; keep knights and lords company; go with them to bawdy houses; had his six men in a livery; kept a stable of hunting horses, and his wench in her velvet gown and her cloth of silver. (5.3.48-53)

The primary occupation of a gentleman in this play, at least as thrifty Touchstone perceives it, is to throw money away. What makes Touchstone so angry is that Quicksilver so explicitly identifies Touchstone's money as that which funds his "pedigree" (1.1.124)—his inherited cultural capital. In Quicksilver's eyes, Touchstone's earnings function as the inheritance he will never receive (Quicksilver is a second son):

Quick. Why, 'sblood, sir, my mother's a gentlewoman, and my father a justice of the peace and of quorum; and though I am a younger brother and a prentice, yet I hope that I am my father's son; and by God's lid, 'tis for your worship and for your commodity that I keep company. (1.1.26-31)

Richard Horwich observes that Touchstone's obsession with thriftiness "reveals itself in a willingness to utilize human and emotional resources to the utmost; to accept human imperfection in a husband or wife; to find contentment with simple and unornamented people as well as possessions" (226).
Well, I am a good 
member of the City if I were well considered. 
How would merchants thrive, if gentlemen 
would not be unthrifts? How could gentlemen be 
thrifts if their humours were not fed? How 
should their humours be fed but by whitemeat 
and cunning secondings? 

Quicksilver understands that the "humours" of English gallants depend on 
London's luxury market. As a successful goldsmith in the fashionable Strand, 
Touchstone also understands this relationship (he depends on it for his 
livelihood), but only to a certain extent. At the beginning of the play, it is clear 
that he does not fully recognize the relationship between his craft and the 
conspicuous consumption it supports:

_Touch._ Did I gain my 
wealth by ordinaries? no! By exchanging of my gold? 
no! By keeping of gallants' company? no! I hired 
me a little shop, bought low, took small gain, kept 
no debt book, garnished my shop . . . 

Touchstone is naturally angry that Quicksilver is squandering his profits, 
which is what forces him to banish the young prodigal from his home. 

During the trial scene in Act 4, Touchstone's position is unchanged:

_Touch._ [M]y prentice, Master Quicksilver here . . . when 
he had two year to serve, kept his whore and his 
hunting nag, would play his hundred pound at 
gresco, or primero, as familiarly (and all o' my 
purse) as any bright piece of crimson on 'em all; 
had his changeable trunks of apparel standing at 
livery, with his mare, his chest of perfumed linen,
and his bathing tubs, which when I told him of, why he—he was a gentleman, and I a poor Cheapside groom. (4.2.254-63)

But what seems to anger Touchstone even more is that Quicksilver identifies his trade so closely with the stereotypical vices of gentlemen—conspicuous consumption and wasteful idleness:

*Quick* [to Golding]. Why do nothing, be like a gentleman, be idle; the curse of man is labour. Wipe thy bum with testons; and make ducks and drakes with shillings. ¹⁰⁵ (1.1.138-40)

*Touch.* Sirrah, sirrah, y' are past your hiccup now; I see y' are drunk.
*Quick.* 'Tis for your credit, master.
*Touch.* And hear you keep a whore in town.
*Quick.* 'Tis for your credit, master.
*Touch.* And what you are out in cash, I know.
*Quick.* So do I. My father's a gentleman. Work upon that now. Eastward Ho!
*Touch.* Sir, 'Eastward Ho' will make you go Westward Ho! I will no longer dishonest my house, nor endanger my stock with your licence. There, sir, there's your indenture; all your apparel—that I must know—is on your back; and from this time my door is shut to you... (2.1.125-38)

During the trial scene, Quicksilver learns how to reopen the door. With his newfound authority as deputy alderman, Golding condemns Quicksilver's prodigality in a speech tinged with the rhetoric of puritanical sermons:

*Gold.* It is a great pity: thou art

---
¹⁰⁵ "Testons" are coins. "To make ducks and drakes with shillings" is a proverbial saying referring to the game of skipping coins (squandering money) over water like stones.
a proper young man, of an honest and clean face, somewhat near a good one—God hath done his part in thee—but thou hast made too much, and been too proud of that face, with the rest of thy body; for maintenance of which in near and garish attire, only to be looked upon by some light housewives, thou hast prodigally consumed much of thy master's estate . . .

(4.2.297-305)

Taking his cue from the tone of Golding's speech, Quicksilver composes his "Repentance," whose five stanzas "ravish" Touchstone (5.5.115) and bring him to his knees with joy. In the penultimate stanza, Quicksilver exclaims his desire to "cut off the horse-head of Sin, / And leave his body in the dust / Of Sin's highway and bogs of Lust" (5.5.104-106).

Quicksilver's success with his wit is set against Gertrude's failed pursuit of a title. Both characters are dissatisfied with their respective social rank:

_Sindefy._ But alas, Frank, how will all this be maintained now? Your place maintained it before.

_Quick._ Why, and I maintained my place. I'll to the court, another manner of place for maintenance I hope than this silly city.

(2.2.60-64)

_Gert._ I must be a lady, and I will be a lady.

(1.2.21)

Unlike Quicksilver, however, Gertrude is consistently foiled by her naive understanding of the ways of the world and the social protocols of the rank to which she aspires. Quicksilver's inherited cultural capital has afforded him a certain understanding of the intricate layers of English society; Gertrude's more humble social background misguides her into thinking that her
marriage to Sir Petronel can automatically reverse the cultural effects of her family upbringing.

The disparity between the situations of Quicksilver and Gertrude is conveyed by the different manner in which they articulate their frustrations. Quicksilver fights his way with wit and observation, ultimately with success. Just as Donne can see through Coscus's unconvincing use of courtly discourse in Satire II, the Blackfriars audience can amuse themselves with Gertrude's unskilled articulation of a language and decorum she claims is rightfully hers—a performance that her citizen background gives away. At the beginning of the play, she explains the ridiculous logic of her social aspirations:

Gert. O sister
   Mil, though my father be a low-capped tradesman, yet I must be a lady; and I praise God my mother must call me medam. (1.2.3-6)

Gert. Ay, mother, I must be a lady tomorrow; and by your leave, mother—I speak it not without my duty, but only in the right of my husband—I must take place of you, mother.

M. Touch. That you shall, lady-daughter, and have a coach as well as I, too.

Gert. Yes, mother. But by your leave, mother—I speak it not without my duty, but only in my husband's right—my coach horses must take the wall of your coach horses. (1.2.120-29)

Gertrude's interactions later in the play are no less comical. She can no longer stand to be in the presence of Mistress Fond and Mistress Gazer, whom she calls "good people"—she runs for her coach soon after she encounters them
Having been told by Quicksilver that Golding and Mildred are married, Gertrude crudely suggests that the mis-matched newlyweds should be "pebble[d] / . . . with snowballs as they come from church" (3.2.69-79). Even after Sir Petronel leaves her, she will not heed her mother's advice and respect her father's livelihood:

_M Touch_. Speak to your father, madam, and kneel down.  
_Gert_. Kneel? I hope I am not brought so low yet; though my knight be run away, and has sold my land, I am a lady still.  

(4.2.132-36)

At the end of the play, Gertrude still believes that money can serve as an easy substitute for the social graces of an aristocratic upbringing:

_Gert_ [to Sindefy]. I'm sure I remember the time when I would ha' given a thousand pound, if I had had it, to have been a lady; and I hope I was not bred and born with that appetite alone: some other gentle-born o' the city have the same longing, I trust.  

(5.1.73-77)

Gertrude's yearning for social capital fuels Sir Petronel's greed; he is a knight, but financially insolvent, and he mortgages her dowry in order to bankroll the Virginia voyage, leaving Gertrude with a worthless title of Lady Flash and a castle "built with air" (2.2.247). Surprisingly, Sir Petronel at one point wonders what people will think of his deed. Quicksilver tells him this sort of thing happens all the time, and Sir Petronel quickly changes his tune:

_Sir Pet._ Nay, 'tis no matter, I care little what they think; he that weighs men's thoughts has his hands full of nothing. A man in the course of this world should be like a surgeon's instrument, work in the wounds of others, and feel nothing himself. The
sharper and subtler, the better. (3.2.214-19)

Sir Petronel's final observation here is a crucial point to the play—achieving success depends on the sharpness of one's wit. Yet Quicksilver is the only character clever enough to take advantage of this fact:

Quick. No, I say still, he that has wit, let him live by his wit; he that has none, let him be a tradesman.
Security. Witty Master Francis! 'Tis pity any trade should dull that quick brain of yours. (2.2.146-49)

Quicksilver stands aside and observes as Security helps Sir Petronel prepare the scheme to gain control of Gertrude's dowry. They call upon an old lawyer, Bramble (a name suggesting the tangles of the law), to tailor the contract that Gertrude must sign. Security clearly resents his reliance on the law to achieve his goals, and he speaks viciously about lawyers when "prickless" (3.3.150) Bramble is not present: "A lawyer is ambitious, and his head / Cannot be praised nor raised too high, / With any fork of highest knavery" (3.2.278-80). Security is thrilled when Sir Petronel informs him of his plan to sneak Bramble's wife away to Virginia in order to free her from her husband's "tyrannous jealousy" (3.2.263), and he enthusiastically agrees to distract the old lawyer while they carry out the plan:

Security. Who would not strain a point of neighbourhood, For such a point-device, that, as the ship Of famous Draco went about the world, Will wind about the lawyer, compassing The world himself: he hath it in his arms, And that's enough, for him, without his wife. (3.2.272-77)

Security. 'Tis a trick rampant! 'Tis a very quiblin!
In the end, however, Security is ridiculed and not Bramble; after Security finally departs, Sir Petronel asks Quicksilver to bring Security’s wife, Winifred:

Sir Pet. So, so. Now, Frank, go thou home to his house,
Stead of his lawyer’s, and bring his wife hither,
Who, just like to the lawyer’s wife, is prisoned
With his stern, usurous jealousy, which could never
Be overreached thus, but with overreaching. (3.2.282-86)

Like Quicksilver, Sir Petronel later faces the authority of the law under Golding, but the shrewdness he so highly praises in 3.2 escape him at the end of the play (when it really counts), and he remains silent while Quicksilver sings their way out of prison.

Criticism frequently points to the play’s lack of precise objects of social censure. Alexander Leggatt, for example, argues that the play’s "comic form is broad enough to support a wide range of sympathies, and the happy ending can be a triumph for the social bond and the responsibilities that go with it, or . . . for the witty individual who is concerned only with his pleasures" (53). This degree of ambivalence can be explained in part by the play’s collaborative authorship. Each playwright’s idiosyncracies—Jonson’s costive earnestness and sense of entertainment, Marston’s notorious social satire and grandiloquence, and Chapman’s contentiousness and scholarship—are evident throughout the play. The quarto of 1605 may well have been screened
of its more pointed wit, for Jonson and Chapman were imprisoned for at most twenty weeks because the play's satire on the Scots offended James I.\textsuperscript{106}

The interactions between Gertrude, Sir Petronel, Quicksilver and their fellow characters represent systems of capital exchange among various sectors of London society. But only Quicksilver, representing the disenfranchised sons of gentry, stands out as one who recognizes how these systems operate and how they can be manipulated. When we consider the staging of this recognition in light of Fitzgeoffrey's account of the ways law students engaged in the competition for prestige in the Blackfriars, specific aspects of Quicksilver's understanding stand out: the facility with which he manages his pseudo-redemption by understanding the institutions of which he was a part (Touchstone's household, London's luxury market, and prison), his position within each of them (a goldsmith's apprentice on the Strand, a dandy, and a prisoner), and the behaviors he must assume in order to use these positions to his own advantage. Chapman, Jonson, and Marston are careful not to portray Quicksilver as a prodigal obsessed by his lack of money; he never lets his situation divert him from his daily pleasures. The thought of gainful employment appalls him, and his tangential involvement in the Virginia expedition seems to be perpetuated more by thoughts of adventure than by any financial profits the trip might bring.\textsuperscript{107}

\textsuperscript{106} Remnants of this satire remain in Seagull's monologue about the Virginia expedition in 3.3.39-59, where he suggests that the New World is populated by "a few industrious Scots" (3.3.44), a remark that tacitly associates the race with the thieves and outcasts who were sent to the New World. In the quarto, Seagull welcomes the possibility of living freely with his "friends"—"I would a hundred thousand of 'em were there, for we are all one countrymen now" (3.3.49-50)—but we can imagine that the references to the Scots were much less gracious in the version that was actually performed! Letters that Chapman and Jonson wrote in prison indicate that Marston was responsible for the offending remarks against the Scots. ...

\textsuperscript{107} In his exchanges with his mistress, Sindefy, in 2.2, Quicksilver expresses his desire to proceed "to the / court, another manner of place for maintenance / hope than this silly city" (60-64). He also chastises Sindefy for thinking that "'tis but to / learn to live; and
As a form of private entertainment, these performances of power relationships, generated by staging failed exchanges of different kinds of capital, fulfill several mimetic functions at once, but they do so subtly because they were marketed for an audience in which the variations in symbolic and economic capital of its members were confined to a narrower margin of London's privileged society than might have been found in other theatres. In an environment in which social distinctions among the members of the audience were defined more by degrees of symbolic capital than by money (admission to the playhouse was relatively costly for everyone), city comedies like *Eastward Ho* present a society whose citizens are so caught in a cycle of economic necessity that they fail to enjoy, or even recognize, aesthetic pleasures. Only Quicksilver, with his art of observation, manages to beat the system, and even then his feigned creativity merely serves as an empty escape strategy.

*Eastward Ho* typifies the parody of capitalism characteristic of citizen comedy. The sub-genre presents a London-based society whose members, struggling for the means (money, rank) either to gain leisure time or to appear to have the ability to enjoy it, are unaware of how the logic of the market dominates and undermines their struggle. While the citizens devote all of their energies to the procurement of luxuries, the economy in which these luxuries circulate does not make available the time necessary either to enjoy the fruits of the luxury market or to learn how best to enjoy these fruits. There is a perpetual lack of free time because the capitalist market thrives on the mechanics of acquisition rather than the culture of appreciation. The entire monetary society, obsessed by the pursuit (rather than enjoyment) of

---

does that disgrace a man?" (95-96); in response, Sindefy's father, Security, informs her that "all trades complain of / inconvenience, and therefore 'tis best to have none" (102-103).
luxuries and the social rank associated with them, becomes a source of the audience's entertainment—a "pageant," Quicksilver informs the audience at the very end of the play, that he hopes will continue to attract them "hither once a week" (5.5.7-10). Quicksilver's concluding aside clearly acknowledges *Eastward Ho*’s function as a desirable commodity in London's entertainment market, which the play, at the same time, parodies, functioning, in performance, as both an expensive waste of time and a critique of the cultural ignorance associated with the feverish pursuit of the signs of social prestige—signs that this waste ironically represents.

The cultural illiteracy that this spectacle stages stands in contradistinction to the reflexive understanding of the use of culture promoted by the Inns' masques and revels, which resisted political ignorance by inscribing symbols of dominant agents in the field of power into the very fabric of performance. The success of revels hinged on the students' ability to create an environment in which they could imaginatively position themselves in relation to the forces that dominated them. The success of the market-driven Blackfriars playhouse, on the other hand, depended on the perpetual reconstruction of an "elite" social space, the attractiveness of which was determined by the space's ability to make playgoers feel a part of high culture. Together, legal commons and the Blackfriars provided law students an institutional circuit in which they could experience for themselves an impression of how legal capital might eventually serve them as a convertible form of prestige: revels enabled the students to understand their pursuit of social prestige, while performances at the Blackfriars appeased this pursuit by staging *failed* capital exchange as entertainment.
While Quicksilver achieves his ends through passive observation and subsequent action, Theodorus Witgood, the disreputable young prodigal and Leicestershire gentleman of Middleton's *A Trick to Catch the Old One*, exhibits a more consistently assertive approach in his endeavor to reclaim his estate from his greedy usurer uncle, Pecunius Lucre, and to reestablish himself in respectable London society. Witgood has many creditors in the city, and he is wary of encountering them until he feels able to pay his debts. With the help of a tavern host, Witgood passes his mistress (a courtesan) off as a "rich country widdow" (1.1.61) under his care in the City so that he can manipulate Lucre into marrying her—a match that would fuel the jealousy of Walkadine Hoard, a competing usurer and Lucre's sworn enemy. Witgood's plan is to trick Lucre into releasing his lands, then to marry Joyce Hoard, Walkadine's niece. Joyce, however, is also sought after by other suitors. Out of spite for Lucre, Walkadine upstages Lucre by marrying the "rich" widow himself. Furious with Walkadine for stealing his intended bride, Lucre hopes that the "widow" will avoid consummating her marriage to Walkadine until he has restored Witgood's lands; however, he is too late.

In the meantime, Witgood is arrested for his debts, and again his ex-mistress aids him by convincing her new husband that only he can save Witgood by drawing up a contract that would put Witgood into Walkadine's dependency, thereby tricking him into having to pay Witgood's debts. After these transactions are made, Witgood and Joyce Hoard elope. With their trick successfully executed, Witgood and the courtesan are each reclaimed by society—he regains financial solvency, she attains the security and respectability of marriage. Lucre must relinquish his mortgage on his
nephew's lands, and Walkadine must reconcile himself to the fact that he has married a courtesan; each, however, accepts his defeat gracefully.

As an "excellent schemer as well as an architect" of his success, Witgood "engag[es] the other characters in a game" of wit and strategy "whose rules only he knows" (Covatta 111). While Quicksilver tends to observe, then act, Witgood is more completely involved in the action that surrounds him. The play associates Witgood's ability to anticipate and prevent crises with his past experiences in the City as a "prodigall, a dayly Rioter, and a / Nightly vomiter" (4.3.19-20). Like Quicksilver, Witgood has been denied access to the family fortune; Quicksilver is a second son, while Witgood has been cheated by his uncle of his lands. Quicksilver and Witgood are both disenfranchised social outcasts caught in an endless cycle of debt. Witgood's reputation comes before him; throughout the play he is described in derogatory terms by those who perceive him as a possible threat to their own aspirations. Monylove, a poor "scholler" (1.1.127) who desires to wed Joyce Hoard for her "thousand good / Pound" (1.1.138-39), and Onesiphorus Hoard (Joyce's uncle) both detest Witgood, possibly because his marriageable status is threatening:

Mony. Now sir you know this yong Wit-good is a spendthrift—dissolute fellow.
Hoard. A very Raskall.
Mony. A mid-night surferetter.
Hoard. The spume of a Brothel-house.

Witgood, however, understands the forces that have led him to his current condition of poverty, and he also knows that he can use his wit to reverse the course of his depraved life:

---

108 We could interpret Monylove's pursuit of Joyce as his attempt to marry her money, for his status as a scholar has afforded him only cultural capital.
Wit. I perceive there's nothing conjures up wit sooner then poverty, and nothing laies it downe sooner then wealth and lecherie? this has some savour yet, oh that I had the morgage from mine Uncle as sure in possession as these trifles, I would forsweare Brothel at noone day, and Muscadine and eggs at midnight. (3.1.69-74)

In the character of Lucre's stepson, Sam, a "pompous citizen" whose mother encourages his "class pretensions" (Mount 263) in order to spite her husband, we find echoes of Gertrude's yearning to escape her station in life through a wealthy marriage:

Sam [aside]. I am a Gentleman now too, by my fathers occupation, and I see no reason but I may kisse a widdowe by my Fathers Coppys, truely I thinke the Charter is not against it, surely these are the wordes, the Sonne once a Gentleman, may revell it, tho his father were a dauber . . . (2.1.312-16)

Set against this dynamic is Witgood's good-hearted desire to see his mistress (the courtesan) socially initiated into the institution of marriage—not for his own good, but for hers:

Wit. Wench, make up thy owne fortunes now, do thy selfe a good turne once in thy Dayes, hees rich in money, moveables, and lands,—marry him, he's an old doting foole, and thats worth all, marry him, twould bee a great comfort to me to see thee do well ifaith,—marry him, twould ease my conscience well to see thee well bestowed, I have a care of thee ifaith. (3.1.95-101)

His primary task, however, is to use his wit to cut through the adversarial relationship between Walkadine and Lucre and thereby carve from it his
rightful estate—wit that "costs nothing" and that will "serve as a picklock of the law to free his land, so that, the trick once successful, the law will stand behind Witgood as it stood behind his cunning uncle when Witgood was being gulled" (Messina 111). Feeding off each other, Witgood and Lucre both work within the law (which seems the real whore in this case) to achieve their respective goals, and in the first act of the play we are introduced to a world where retributive acts of potentially physical violence are symbolically channeled through the institution of the law. Having been struck by Monylove for expressing his interest in Joyce, Sam Freedom claims that he will "bring this boxe into the Chancery" (1.3.78).

Sam's exclamation first articulates the legal motif that is concentrated in three famous scenes involving Harry Dampit at the conclusion of Acts 1, 3, and 4. Critics have described Dampit in a variety of ways. The play makes it clear that Dampit either lives near or perhaps even has some association with Barnard's Inn, an Inn of Chancery, where attorneys and solicitors were trained how to undertake the more menial tasks and transactions of the common law. Dampit's self-portrait in 1.4, in which he describes himself to Witgood as "now worth ten thousand pound my Boye" (1.43) and as having had his "feet stincke about / Westminster hall and come home agen" (1.46-

---

109 Rick Bowers, Joseph Messina, David Mount, and Richard Levin have considered the purpose of Dampit in the play and what "psychological effect he [was] intended to have" (Messina 116).

110 As I mentioned in the first chapter, attorneys and solicitors formed the lower ranks of the common law profession, and they congregated at the churchyard of St. Paul's Cathedral, one of the major places in London where "scriveners and notaries, attorneys and solicitors, court officials of many kinds, even tradesmen . . . familiarized themselves with legal documents," and where barristers, in the early years of their career, could enjoy ready access to potential clients among the steady stream of public traffic (Keeton 9). As a career, the law "was a gamble, for lawyers as well as litigants; while a few barristers or serjeants could perhaps demand £10 for a single appearance in Westminster Hall and expect to clear £400 in three weeks of term, there were also professional failures supported from the poor-box of their Inn and 'solicitors and pettifoggers an infinite number,' whose incomes and mode of life kept them at the level of yeomanry, or even below it" (Prest 1972: 22).
appropriates all of the derogatory stereotypes of early modern attorneys such as those exhibited in John Ferne's *The Blazon of Gentrie* (1586). Characterizing "[o]ne Lawyer of gentle linage" as more vigilant, well-intentioned, courageous, generous, and honorable than "tenne Aduocates, of base and vngentle stock" (qtd. in Whigham 70), Ferne expresses the socio-professional snobbery driven by the profession's division into several castes, the lowest of which was occupied by attorneys. *A Trick* shares Ferne's distaste for the attorneys' use of the law for money-making; our last glimpse of Dampit occurs when he is on his deathbed—an epitome of the pettifogging attorney. This disdainful attitude fuels Dampit's rage, which he has channeled throughout his career by flaunting the intermingling of law and money—an association that established barristers nominally despised because it tainted the prestige of their profession with economic necessity:

*Dampit. . . . Tramplers of time,  
Motions of Fleet-streete, and Vision of Holborne, here I  
have fees of one, there I have fees of another, my clients  
come about me . . .  
(1.4.59-62)\textsuperscript{111}*

The Dampit scenes entangle the entire play in the traditionally seedy part of London's legal culture. Middleton thereby associates the entire social dynamic among the characters on the problematic relationship between the law and money. By explicitly manifesting this relationship in terms of the distinction between the proper uses of wit (the lawyer's primary tool),

\textsuperscript{111}The song sung by a boy and Dampit's maid Audry in 4.5 enhances this image of a conniving attorney scavenging his way through the streets and institutions of the legal quarter in order to profit from his rudimentary legal skills:

\begin{quote}
*Let the Usurer cram him, in interest that excell,  
There's pits enow to dam him, before he comes to hell.  
In Holborne, some; in Fleet-street some,  
Where ere he come, there's some there's some.*
\end{quote}  
(1-4)
Middleton constructs an opposition between legitimate and illegitimate applications of the language of law.\textsuperscript{112} Like Dampit, Witgood is the target of suspicion because of his wit.\textsuperscript{113} But considered in relation to Dampit's conniving exploits, Witgood's use of wit to reclaim his wealth and social status appears noble. This distinction has everything to do with the respective fields in which each struggles for legitimacy. While Dampit contends with professional snobbery, Witgood must battle the forces of legally-sanctioned economic power, personified by Hoard and Lucre, whom he regards not so much as personal enemies, but as faceless agents in London's commodity market.

The differentiation between respectable and gauche methods of exchanging legal capital that \textit{A Trick} stages is intimately linked to the parallel social discriminations that were being made by the members of the Blackfriars audience, drawn together as they were by the excitement of social possibilities and intrigue and by the power to exercise judgment in such a setting. Just like the characters portrayed on the stage, the playgoers were channeling their

\textsuperscript{112} Fulbecke (\textit{Direction or Preparative . . .}) and Dodderidge (\textit{The English Lawyer}) articulate the reasons for the lawyer's crucial possession of an excellent and dexterous wit, which they directly associate with the higher orders of the profession. Fulbecke urges that "hee who is not onely wise but eloquent, is without comparison the best in all professions." Dodderidge explains how the natural gift of wit renders the lawyer "readily to invent, and fitly to apply his proofes and arguments to the point in question" (7).

\textsuperscript{113} Witgood's creditors want his money, not his words:

\textit{Wit.} Will you but here me speake?
\textit{Creditor 2.} You shall pardon us for that sir, we know you have too faire a tong of your owne, you over-came us to lately, a shame take you, we are like to loose all that for want of witnesses, wee dealt in policy then, alwaies when we strive to bee most politique we prove most cockscombs, \textit{Non plus ulter.} I perceive by us, were not ordaynde to thrive by wisdome, and therefore wee must be content to be Tradesmen. (4.3.31-38)

In the next scene, an exchange between Witgood and Hoard makes it clear that Witgood's rhetorical polish is threatening to the other characters:

\textit{Hoard.} Why are not debts better then words sir?
\textit{Wit.} Are not words promises, and are not promises debts sir.
\textit{Hoard.} He plaies at back-Racket with me. (4.4.194-96)
pursuit of social prestige through the psychological devices of symbolic warfare. As Fitzgeoffrey depicts in his *Notes*, the law students in the audience were affected by their affiliation with the Inns, which they used as a basis for passing judgement on those whom they perceived as competitors in the pursuit of the more valuable prestige associated with court culture. Witgood's wit associates him with this culture, however peripherally, and through the consistent juxtaposition of respectful (Witgood) and inferior (Dampit) means of exchanging kinds of capital, *A Trick* establishes legitimate grounds for making distinctions between individuals based on their different uses of culture. The parody of legal culture on the stage reinforces, rather than upsets, the efforts of the students to evaluate the consumption of culture among the people in the Blackfriars audience.

**Francis Beaumont's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle***

Consciousness of rank pervades all of Middleton's plays, and this obsession is sometimes conveyed in terms of the characters' aesthetic tastes. In *A Trick*, the would-be gentleman Sam Freedom appropriates the language of chivalric romance. Mount argues that it is possible to read Sam's new vocabulary as a "sign that Middleton is involved in some way in the kind of mockery of citizen tastes in literature and drama so prominent in [Beaumont's] *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*" (264), a play in which the relationship between rank and taste is the focus of an intricately constructed dramatic burlesque.

Just after a member of the Children of the Revels announces that the company is about to perform *The London Merchant*, two citizens, George (a substantial freeman and a grocer in the Strand) and his wife Nell, climb onto
the stage to join the gallants sitting on stools and inform the boy that they would prefer to see something more to their taste. They insist that their apprentice (and amateur actor), Rafe, should improvise and take the lead role in a play that derives its plot from chivalric romance and that celebrates their rank and guild. George and Nell audaciously suggest that the play should be titled *The Grocers' Honour*, and the boy belligerently retitles their "play" *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* in response. The intruders refuse to back down, and the actors are forced to allow the citizens' play to be staged "in an impromptu fashion" between the scenes of *The London Merchant* (Bliss 34).

The play was likely performed several times between 29 June 1607 and 1 April 1608 (Gayley 313)—only a few years after Beaumont gave his *Grammar Lecture* at the Inner Temple (c.1601-5). If Beaumont were not a law student at the Inner Temple when he wrote *The Knight*, then he had only recently given up his legal studies in order to begin writing plays for the theatres. As a professional playwright, Beaumont creates a performance:

---

114 *The London Merchant* is another parody of the genre of prodigal son plays. At the beginning of the play, Jasper Merrythought, son of Charles and Mistress Merrythought, is expelled from his apprenticeship to the rich London merchant Venturewell, a social climber who wishes his daughter Luce to marry the rich and pompous gentleman Humphrey, whom Jasper calls an "arrant noddy." Honest and faithful Jasper has already stolen Luce's heart, however, and Venturewell therefore dismisses him, even though he is otherwise an exemplary apprentice. Jasper returns to his parents' home in the country for support, but his mother refuses to help him because she is devoting her entire attention to his recalcitrant brother, Michael, so that he might attract a wealthy wife. Charles Merrythought, a misfit who sings songs all day and eats luxuriously, decides not to support his wife's prodigious plans for Michael, and the son and mother leave the household in disgust, only to come begging for readmittance later. In the meantime, Luce and Humphrey are about to be married, and Jasper sends a letter to Venturewell confessing his wrongs and requesting that his dead body be brought to Luce in a coffin so that she will know how much he loved her. With this request granted, Jasper smuggles Luce away in his coffin, then appears before Venturewell as his own ghost, condemning his hardheartedness towards him and Luce's planned marriage to Humphrey. In the end, Luce and Jasper marry with Venturewell's blessing.

At various points, Rafe interferes with the performance, while George and Nell boldly interject their ongoing commentary at every opportunity.
condition in which the close proximity of citizen and elite tastes, personified by George and Nell's placement among the gallants sitting on the stage, commands the two-way game between the players and the audience—a game in which "the sacrilegious reuniting of tastes which taste dictates shall be separated" serves as a vehicle for provoking the aesthetic sensibilities of those who regard themselves as the possessors of legitimate culture. Bourdieu observes that "[a]esthetic intolerance can be terribly violent" and that "perhaps one of the strongest barriers between the classes" is the learned "[a]version to different life-styles" (1984: 56-57).115 The Knight constructs this violence by setting the players' intention to perform The London Merchant alongside George and Nell's desire to see their apprentice perform in a romance. The violence of competing tastes that Beaumont stages is itself an exhibition of the fierce social dynamics contained within the Blackfriars playhouse. This exhibition, in which the players articulate the kind of aesthetic intolerance against the gallants that is voiced in Fitzgeoffrey's Notes, is Beaumont's means of appropriating the institutional culture of the Inns for the theatre.

This clever synthesis is structurally driven by a steady stream of interruptions and inside jokes. This "framing fiction of audience disruption" (Bliss 55) breaks the theatrical illusion in order to expose the socio-cultural politics that make the Blackfriars playhouse function as a fashion-house of elite culture—a place where London's privileged playgoers, like Fitzgeoffrey's characters, competitively displayed their social status through the clothes they

---

115 Bourdieu sees lifestyle differences as "perhaps the strongest barriers between the classes. Taste implies distaste. Symbolic distinctions are simultaneously conceptual and social. Our practical everyday preferences are organized around primary forms of conceptual classifications such as high/low, brilliant/dull, unique/ordinary, and important/trivial. These primary conceptual classifications are simultaneously social classifications that serve to rank individuals and groups in the stratification order" (Swartz 185).
wore, the stories they told, and the seats they chose. The citizens' violation of the play's "privileged space" (44), and their presentation as intruders, invites the audience to consider that they too are intruders, and the play focuses this twist of perspective on the gallants on the stage—they are the real trespassers, not the citizens, who are part of the play.

The cast's affiliation with the court—a company of boys wearing "periwigs" (1.471)—may well have enhanced this motif of invasion. The boy-prologue's announcement in the induction makes it clear that his company has brought the play from "all that's near the court, from all that's great" (1). The immediate invasion of George and Nell into the "gallants' row" implicates the stool-sitters in their encroachment on the "courtly" entertainment. Nell's scripted conversation with the gallants emphasizes the sense that she has embraced their company and involved them in her trespassing into a courtly space:

*Nell.* By your leave, gentlemen all, I'm something troublesome; I'm a stranger here; I was ne'er at one of these plays, as they say, before; but I should have seen *Jane Shore* once; and my husband hath promised me, any time this twelvemonth, to carry me to *The Bold Beauchamps*, but in truth he did not. I pray you; bear with me.116

This intimate dynamic is further complicated when we consider that Nell and George were performed by members of the boy company, who represent the court (as Children of the Revels) and the citizenry (in their roles as George and Nell) simultaneously. The dialogue between the grocers and

---

116 Jane Shore was the bourgeois mistress of Edward IV and the subject of Thomas Heywood's play *Edward IV* (1594). *The Bold Beauchamps* is perhaps a lost play by Heywood about a legendary hero.
the players on the stage (all performed by members of the company) was thus part of an elaborate system of inside jokes whereby the boys both ridiculed citizen tastes and celebrated their own status as professional players. Beaumont brings this intricate duplicity and interiority to the forefront before the play's concurrent plots become complex. In the induction, the boy-prologue implies that George's musical expectations are misplaced:

George. What stately music have you? You have shawms?
George. No? I'm a thief if my mind did not give me so. (110-12)

Other jests focus on the gallants' habits of luxury:

Nell. Fie, this stinking tobacco kills me! would there were none in England.—Now, I pray, gentlemen, what good does this stinking tobacco do you? Nothing, I warrant you: make chimneys o' your faces! (1.210-14)

Beaumont's more subtle technique, however, is to interrogate the gallants' aesthetic disposition by intruding citizen tastes into their tight elite circle. He reserves these maneuvers for the intermissions. Between the first and second acts, for example, a boy dances to "fiddles":

Nell. Hark, hark, husband, hark, fiddles, fiddles; now surely they go finely. They say 'tis present death for these fiddlers, to tune their rebecks before

---

117 It is clear that Beaumont was very familiar with the business of playgoing at the Blackfriars and the social status associated with it.

118 The intermissions are part of the burlesque. Plays at the Blackfriars were broken into short segments, between which the orchestra played music and boys danced or sang on the stage. By incorporating the intermissions themselves into the play, Beaumont includes the entire theatrical experience—audience, stage, backstage, and the business aspects of playgoing—in his burlesque.
the great Turk's grace; is't not, George? But, look, look! here's a youth dances.—Now, good youth, do a turn o' the toe.—Sweetheart, i' faith, I'll have Rafe come and do some of his gambols. . .

(1.460-66)

Nell and George's dialogue between the second and third acts accentuates their unfamiliarity with the practices, protocols, and vestments of the Blackfriars:

_Nell._ The fiddlers go again, husband.
_George._ Ay, Nell, but this is scurvy music. I gave the whorson gallows-money, and I think he has not got me the waits of Southwark. If I hear 'em not anon, I'll twinge him by the ears.—You musicians, play 'Baloo.'

_Nell._ No, good George, let's ha' "Lachrymae."
_George._ Why, this is it, cony.
_Nell._ It's all the better, George. Now, sweet lamb,
what story is that painted upon the cloth? the Confutation of St. Paul?
_George._ No, lamb; that's Rafe and Lucrece. (2.556-67)

Abstracted from the play as a burlesque, comments such as these would possibly have triggered a similar sense of disgust with which aficionados of classical music concerts regard those in the audience who applaud between movements; this disgust derives from their unwilling association with the distasteful act and with the lack of cultural knowledge it represents.\footnote{The extent of the grocers' complete misunderstanding of the theatrical profession is made evident again in the fourth act, when they suddenly demand that Rafe court the daughter of a Polish king, that the king's house be "covered with black velvet" (36), and that his daughter should stand in her window wearing "beaten gold" (38). This scene, they exclaim, should be "done quickly" (43).}

Within the burlesque, the grocers' comments seem to be designed to create an environment that thrives on the perpetual waging of this kind of
aesthetic warfare—to make this conflict explicit. During the third intermission, for example, Nell indicates her inability to appreciate a dancing boy's artistry, then further exemplifies her bad form by throwing money at him so he can buy new tumbling shoes.120

\[ \textit{Nell. ... Begin,} \\
\text{brother, Now 'a capers, sweetheart.—Now a turn o'} \\
\text{the toe, and then tumble. Cannot you tumble, youth?} \\
\textit{Boy. No, indeed, forsooth.} \\
\textit{Nell. Nor eat fire?} \\
\textit{Boy. Neither.} \\
\textit{Nell. Why, then, I thank you heartily: there's two-pence to buy you points withal.} \]

(3.614-21)

The staging of citizen tastes by a company of boys nominally associated with the court was perhaps meant to mock the tastes of the gallants, and not those of the citizens—or even to mock both by revealing the symbolic violence of taste difference. These conjectures are supported by the play's epilogue, wherein Nell implies that the gallants' luxurious expenditures on wine and tobacco are as conspicuous as their proclivity for masking their opinions:

\[ \textit{George. Come, Nell, shall we go? The play's done.} \\
\textit{Nell. Nay, by my faith, George. I have more manners than so; I'll speak to these gentlemen first.—} \\
\text{I thank you all gentlemen, for your patience and} \]

---

120The play includes another financial exchange of this kind. In the induction, George offers the boy-prologue two shillings so that he might hire the "waits of Southwark"—a city band that George would prefer to hear far more than the pit orchestra at the Blackfriars (118-20).

At other points in the play, George and Nell display what Bourdieu describes as the "naive exhibitionism of conspicuous consumption," which seeks distinction in the crude display of ill-mastered luxury" (1984: 31). Nell offers Rafe candy (1.71-74); George gives him money as well—once to pay the twelve shillings Rafe owes to avoid arrest (3.183), and once to purchase something nice that will grace the home of the King of Cracovia (4.112-114).
countenance to Rafe, a poor fatherless child; and if I
might see you at my house, it should go hard but I
would have a pottle of wine and a pipe of tobacco
for you; for truly I hope you do like the youth, but I
would be glad to know the truth. . .

By including the entire audience—the stool-sitting gallants most
directly—in the performance world, the play creates a situation in which high
and low tastes can be isolated, juxtaposed, and compared. The grocers offer the
players money for their demands; they reduce the complex association
between money and culture to a simple series of financial transactions,
illustrating the extent to which they depend on the economy for their
existence. By becoming part of the gallants' row, the grocers associate the
gallants with this dependency, thereby subverting the "precondition[s] for all
learning of legitimate culture . . . characterized by the suspension and
removal of economic necessity and by objective and subjective distance from
practical urgencies, which is the basis of objective and subjective distance
from groups subjected to those determinisms" (Bourdieu 1984: 54). By
collapsing the imagined disassociation between the status of the Blackfriars as
a fashion-house of culture and the economic realities on which this status
depends, Beaumont's technique of disruption challenges the gallants' sense
of power over a dominated necessity (in this case, time) with which they
claim their "superiority over those who, because they cannot assert the same
contempt for contingencies in gratuitous luxury and conspicuous
consumption, remain dominated by ordinary urgencies" (55-56).

121 According to Bourdieu, the "dominant-class taste for freedom is defined in opposition to the
working-class taste for necessity" (Swartz 167). While dominated (popular) classes are
"homogeneous in their habitus, driven by material necessity, lacking in cultural capital,
and hence dominated by dominant culture," they are still "inseparably tied to dominant
culture" because their identity is defined in terms of their relationship to this culture (170).
Beaumont traps the gallants into a situation in which their "claim to a legitimate superiority" is denied and ridiculed through the imposition of a performance condition that exposes the fiscal machinery on which their investment in cultural capital depends. The careful and sophisticated manner in which the play stages this system of exchange identifies the entire Blackfriars audience, including the law students, as a class of actors "pursuing, consciously and unconsciously, social reproduction strategies that maintain or improve their positions in the stratification order" (Swartz 180). The law students enter this game of distinction but they, like the petite bourgeoisie of Bourdieu's Paris, have "neither the capital nor the corresponding habitus to appropriate fully dominant-class lifestyles," so they attempt to "emulate the standards set by the dominant class." In doing so, they betray an "awkward pretension where the dominant aesthetic displays ease and familiarity in the world of culture" (177). In the next and final chapter, I explore a political situation that arose during the reign of Charles I in which the law students had to learn quickly how to overcome this awkwardness in order to alleviate a situation in which the dominant culture imposed by the Crown seriously threatened the autonomy of the cultural fields in its domain.
CHAPTER 4

Converting Capital: the Crown, the Inns, and the City, 1633-34

For, knowing men will all conclude in this,
Where one proves fortunate, a hundred misse.
—John Goysh, "To my friend, Master
Francis Lenton, upon his Anagrams,"
in Francis Lenton's Innes of Court
Anagrammatist.

The circumstances that led to the most spectacular and expensive masque witnessed in England, James Shirley's The Triumph of Peace, began with a puritan's dream of an England free of playhouses, a dispute between the Soapboilers of Westminster and the Soapboilers of London about who could legitimately claim to produce the best soap, and the desperate need for Inns' students to help soothe the conflicts arising from these disagreements. In the four-and-a-half months between the publication of William Prynne's anti-theatrical tract Histriomastix in early November 1633, and the death of the Lord Mayor, Ralph Freeman, on 16 March 1634, these political conflicts became a crisis, and this chapter argues that the law students played a central role both in mediating relations between London and the Crown and identifying the Inns of Court before the citizens of London and Charles I himself, as institutions fundamental to England's peace and success.

My endeavor here is to reconsider the circumstances surrounding Shirley's masque by taking advantage of a greater fund of historical evidence than that which has been available to critics in the past (Stephen Orgel, Lawrence Venuti, and Martin Butler in particular)—evidence that sharpens the understanding of how the City of London, the Inns, and the Crown were individually involved. By introducing new material from City archives into
scholarly discussion of the masque, the research of C. E. McGee (1991) increases our understanding of the interaction between the contending forces of institutional power in London at this time, and invites us to reconsider the lawyers' commitment to the masque's production in relation to that of the City rather than merely that of the Crown. John R. Elliott Jr.'s article (1992) includes a complete, annotated transcription of Folger MS Z.e.1 (item 25), entitled "The Manner of the Progression of the Masque," which Jerzy Limon discovered in 1988 and which records the identities of many of the Inns' participants. Finally, N. W. Bawcutt's 1996 edition of the Records of Sir Henry Herbert (Herbert was the Master of Revels from 1623-73) provides a thorough account of Charles's and Henrietta Maria's involvement in dramatic performances.

Drawing largely from Bulstrode Whitelock's substantial recollections of the masque, which he recorded in his Memorials of the English Affairs (1682) some thirty years after its two performances, Orgel, Venuti, and Butler discuss the masque's intervention in the tenuous relationship between the Inns and Charles in terms of the masque's ability to disguise criticism as compliment. While the "nature of the medium" may well have convinced "the royal solipsist" to see "nothing . . . but adulation" in episodes of the masque that read as the lawyers' critique of royal prerogative and Charles's policies regarding monopolies (Orgel 1975: 80-81), I contend that the new evidence recently presented by McGee, Elliott, and Bawcutt, as well as my closer examination of the Inns' records themselves, compels us to understand the masque's "success" as an inevitable outcome of its production.122 The masque was but one part of an elaborate system of symbolic exchange between

122 After viewing The Triumph of Peace at Whitehall on 3 February, 1634, Charles and Henrietta Maria asked to see the masque repeated, this time in the City. The repeat performance took place on 13 February in Merchant Taylors' Hall.
the Inns and the City. The lawyers and the City aldermen each had an important investment in approaching the ultimate source of power embodied in the "mystical person" of the king, who alone "could fulfill or frustrate ambition" (Sharpe 160-64). The problem was that the social magic that continued to make this "source" so desirable was, more than ever before, dependent on the money that Charles derived from monopolies to support his newly organized court.

With Charles's power so closely tied to money, the ritual of gift exchange between the monarch and his subjects had, by Charles's reign, evolved into a recurring pattern of exorbitance whereby groups and individuals were forced to convert money into cultural capital in the form of costly masques and entertainments in order to have even a remote chance of winning the favor of the Crown. In James's and especially Charles's movement towards autocracy, the Elizabethan game of collective flattery, whereby the Queen took strategic advantage of the "ties of suspense, uncertainty, ambivalence, and . . . power" created by the "temporal structure of gift exchange" (Bates 157; Bourdieu 1977: 5), had been transformed into an arrangement in which "[a]ccess and proximity to the king's person were the goals of political ambition, and access was determined by the arrangement of the newly reorganized and cloistered institution of Whitehall" (Sharpe 148). Elizabeth's myth of interdependency had become a more routine process of converting cash into ostentatious displays in which the total dependency on the court for access to power was made explicit.

The "consensual basis of Charles's personal government" (Butler 1987: 120), characterized by the delegation of authority among the various levels of court, served also to increase the steps to the monarch. The process of alienating the Crown from London's various cultural fields forced
interactions between these fields and the Crown to be waged in economic terms more than ever before. In order to be able to compete for Charles's favor, institutions had to invest an amount of money that could support the mounting of an entertainment whereby they could converse with the Crown in symbolic terms. The events between November 1633 and April 1634 exemplify a situation in which the stakes involved in the conversion of capital were higher than London had yet seen. With access to the King as the common goal of inter-competition among occupants of differing fields, and with this access complicated by the imposition of an elaborately micro-managed system of institutional barriers to the throne, agents found that their negotiations with the Crown were increasingly frustrated by the miscommunication and misunderstandings associated with a monarch more "aloof, alien, and English" (Sharpe 312) than his two immediate predecessors.

The following chronology is designed to illustrate how two lines of conflict that I discuss in this chapter—that between the Inns and the Crown (regarding a dispute over an anti-theatrical tract) and between the Crown and the City (regarding the dispute among the soapboilers of London and Westminster)—converged into a stream of interdependent political circumstances that led to two performances of *The Triumph of Peace:*123

1633

early Nov. Having taken several years for William Prynne to write, the tome *Histriomastix,* a lengthy anti-theatrical tract, is published in its complete form.124 An inquisition, led by Archbishop Laud,

123 In this chapter, I have derived most of the dates pertaining to publications and performances from the records of Sir Henry Herbert. In cases where Inns' records and State Papers offer slightly varying dates from those Herbert provides, I have sided with Herbert.

124 There is much discrepancy of dates among scholars. Though it is unclear precisely when *Histriomastix* appeared in the booksellers' stalls, the records of Herbert indicate
brings a case against Prynne in order to convince the King and Queen that his book is an act of treason against the Crown. Because Prynne dedicates his book to his own Lincoln's Inn, where he was a barrister, the entire Inns of Court are associated with Prynne's political blunder; members of the court hint that a gesture of apology by the Inns is in order.

7 Nov. The benchers of Lincoln's Inn approve funds to support a masque; the other Inns follow close behind. Preparations begin.

Nov. London's soapboilers register a complaint against the notorious monopoly enjoyed by the Soapboilers of Westminster by virtue of their charter under Charles; they also complain that the soap from Westminster damages cloth and the laundresses' hands (McGee 313). An intense dispute develops.

6 Dec. A test of the soap is ordered by Charles.

24 Dec. Lord Mayor Freeman endorses the soap produced by the Westminster company, admitting that their soap, "with very small difference," indeed cleansed cloth marginally better than the London soap (McGee 314).

1634

3 Jan. Prynne is sent to the Tower.

26 Jan. Charles reinstitutes the Westminster monopoly, and Freeman begins to mediate on behalf of the London soapboilers, who continue to complain. Charles angrily condemns Freeman, who falls ill from the ensuing anxiety and remains bed-ridden for a month (McGee 314-16).

Feb. Prynne is prosecuted in the Star Chamber.

3 Feb. At tremendous expense, The Triumph of Peace is performed at Whitehall following a procession westward from the Inns. Charles requests another performance—this time in the City. Temporarily relieved by this gesture, Freeman begins expensive preparations.

5 Feb. Charles proclaims the Westminster soap monopoly as law;

---

November 1633 as the month of its publication, and the records of Lincoln's Inn inform us that on 7 November 1633 the benchers were ready to begin preparations for the conciliatory masque that would take place in February of the following year.
the London soapboilers are imprisoned.

6 Feb. Queen Henrietta Maria performs in *The Shepherd's Pastoral* at Somerset House.

13 Feb. *The Triumph of Peace* is restaged at Merchant Taylors' Hall.

18 Feb. Upon Charles's invitation, a group of lawyers participate in Thomas Carew's masque *Coelum Britannicum*.

21 Feb. The London soapboilers are released from Fleet prison.

16 Mar. Ralph Freeman dies.

This chapter examines how the King and Queen, the Inns' lawyers, the Lord Mayor and his aldermen—agents who are each conditioned by the specific interests and constraints associated with their positions in their respective fields—formulate private desires or grievances, transform these desires into social problems, and then organize the means to act on these problems (publications, performances, decrees). I begin by assessing the positions these agents occupy in their respective fields. In the remainder of the chapter, I show how these positions correspond to those between the cultural works (or position-takings) within their own independent system of competition.

**Positions**

**King Charles and Queen Henrietta Maria**

In 1634, Charles's government decided to impose a levy (ships or, preferably, money) on all of the counties for the replenishment of England's ships in response to an "emergency situation created by the depredations of 'certain thieves, pirates, and robbers of the sea'" (Lockyer 265). These and other contentious levies were actually part of Charles's effort to meet the growing expenses caused by his consolidation of the court at Whitehall, where he built a banqueting house expressly for the purpose of housing the
twenty or thirty performances he hosted each year. Charles's process of isolating the social magic of the Crown within a tightly controlled court culture, distanced from many of its people, reached new heights.

Drama was very much a part of this interiorizing process. The number of plays that Charles and Henrietta Maria attended was considerable and, because the queen loved to act, their own private banqueting house allowed for the ready participation of the court in performances of masques. Or
gen suggests that Charles's involvement in the staging of masques likely included the composition of the masque itself. "To take the stage was a royal prerogative," as long as the entertainment "argued the royal case" (1975: 43). Like Charles, Henrietta Maria also "saw in plays a didactic medium, a forum in which her philosophical position might be thoroughly argued" (20). In January 1634, she commissioned one of her courtiers, Walter Montague, to write a pastoral about Platonic love that would involve herself and her ladies. At Somerset House, on a set designed by Inigo Jones involving nine scene changes, they staged an elaborate, eight-hour production of The Shepherd's Pastoral (19).

Entertainments such as these exhibit the high standard set by the Crown for engaging in a conversation with the court. As the reigning monarchs, Charles and Henrietta Maria were the primary sources of social prestige. What became clear in the 1630s, however, was the increasing extent to which this prestige depended on the Crown's pressing financial needs. These needs placed legal institutions and City markets in the monetary service of the Crown in ways that demystified its symbolic capital, which loses

125 Herbert's records indicate that in the month of January 1634 alone, the King and Queen attended a performance of Cymbeline at court on the 1st, Twelfth Night at Denmark House on the 6th, The Guardian at court on the 12th, The Tale of the Tub at court on the 14th (this play was "not likt" by Charles), The Winter's Tale on the 16th, The Witts on the 28th, and The Night-Walkers on the 30th.
its prestige when it becomes too closely tied to economic necessity. Charles's downfall stemmed to a great extent from this correlation, most especially because of the way it bound the court masque—a form serving as "an extension of the royal mind" (Orgel 1975: 43)—to a dependent relationship with London's trade and legal markets.

William Prynne

The legal profession had never been particularly sympathetic to the puritan cause; in the 1630s, however, a marginal group of lawyers formed an alliance with a growing number of puritan clergy who, either by installation as chaplains or by invitation, were preaching sermons regularly in the Inns' chapels (Prest 1972: 210-11). With a few notable exceptions, the puritanism of the [I]nns and their common-lawyer members

---

126 A sermon preached in Lincoln's Inn chapel by the divinity student Thomas Ailesbury in 1624 exemplifies the aggression of puritan preachers in the Inns' chapels. Ailesbury, who was likely invited to preach his sermon, entitled "Paganisme and Papisme: Parallel'd and Set forth in a Sermon at the Temple-Church, upon the Feast day of All-Saints," as a one-time guest, based his virulent anti-papist thesis on 1 Cor. 10. 19, 20: "But I say, the thing which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to Devils, and not to God: and I would not that you should have fellowship with devils." The Inns' barristers and law students sitting in the pews of the Temple Church (Prynne was likely among them) heard a masterpiece of rhetoric, wherein the precocious Ailesbury extracts "Truth" from "Error" by systematically exposing how "[m]en on earth" have intermingled godly virtues and human vices toward the creation of a grossly paganized notion of the "Rulers of Heaven":

What Religion may that bee which is adored in the Temples, and flouted at in Theatres? ... Jupiter was an Adulterer; Mercury, a thiefe; Venus a wanton; Quirinus a murderer; Flora a Curtizan... . What folly is it to admit them for Rulers of Heaven, who are not worthy to live upon this earth? (11-12)

In order to avoid the temptations of the "Jezabel of Rome," whose crafty "superficial glosses" and "painted delusions oft-times robs Truth of probability," the lawyers (whom Ailesbury is addressing) must side with the "Spouce of Christ." The true believer must not let his "vaine curiositie" lead him to believe that he can "rake the dung for gold," or "dip his hand into a fiery Crucible to pull out gold," or "hazard his soule for acquaintance with all Religions." "Hee that will be safe from the act of evil," Ailesbury concludes, "must wisely prevent the occasions" (17-18). Warnings such as this speak forcefully to the successful lawyer, who was "as much a selfmade man as could be found in seventeenth-century England," and therefore would "very likely find the puritan emphasis on a direct relationship between individuals and their god and the necessity of labouring in one's calling attractive" (Prest 1972: 210).
was conservative, erastian, and moderate (differing little from the typical cast of thought among the country gentry, with whom the lawyers predominantly identified themselves)" (214). One of these exceptions was the radical William Prynne, whose puritanism, articulated in his *Histriomastix*, was aggressively shunned by his contemporaries at the Inns, particularly because he involved the whole legal community in his obsessive vilification of the entire enterprise of drama.127

*Histriomastix* caught the immediate attention of the Crown. Under the impetus of Archbishop Laud, a group of prelates sought to undermine Prynne, whose prolific publications were attracting a growing readership.128

---

127 Prynne graduated from Oriel College, Oxford, in 1621; that same year, he went to Lincoln's Inn, where he was called to the bar in 1628 (Elliott 200). Prynne's contemporaries claimed he learned his religious radicalism from Dr. John Preston, who, succeeding Donne, was a radical preacher in the chapel of Lincoln's Inn from 1622 to 1628 while Prynne was a law student there (Lamont 12-13).

In *Histriomastix* (the title translates "the player's scourge"), Prynne laments that "the Inns of Court men were undone but for playes; that they are their chiefest guests and employment, and the sole business that makes them afternoons men: that this is one of the first things they learne as soon as they are admitted; to see stage-playes," whereby they "lose their souls" (27). Prynne labels playhouses as "the Schools, Playes the Lectures, which teach men how to cheate, to steal: to plot and execute any villainy: how to conceale it, to evade it being executed" (515).

Orgel explains that, according to Puritans, roles in plays were "impostures and lies" that required men to present themselves in a manner that falsified their true selves. The implications of role-playing at court were, then, inordinately significant; "[t]he very act of imitation, in drama as in art, usurped a divine prerogative, and theatrical productions were therefore often seen to be at the heart of the court's degeneracy and impiety" (1975: 60). Even more importantly, playgoing diverts the colloquium in which ideas are exchanged from the legitimate houses of law and God to the unstable domain of the playhouse, where this colloquium is subverted.

128 The Laudians had long feared Prynne's criticisms of the "genres in which the court read itself" (Patterson 171)—genres that Prynne found decadent and unchristian—and were intent on humiliating him by exposing the seditious implications of his arguments, despite his protestations of loyalty to the Crown. In his *Memorials*, Whitelock notes that the day after the Queen performed in her pastoral, Archbishop Laud and other prelates ("whom *Prynne* had [already] angered" with his books against Arminianism and the jurisdiction of bishops) "shewed *Prynne's* Book against Plays, to the King, and that place of it, 'Women actors notorious Whores,' and they informed the King and Queen, that *Prynne* had purposely written this Book, against the Queen, and her Pastoral, whereas it was published six weeks before that Pastoral was acted." "Though thus exasperated" with Prynne, Whitelock continues, the King and Queen "did direct nothing against him, till *Laud* set Doctor *Heylin* (who bare a great malice to *Prynne*, for confuting some of his
One Royalist said that Prynne's books were more prevalent than ministers' sermons (Lamont 4)—not because of any intellectual substance they might contain but because of the impassioned vehemence of his anti-theatrical rhetoric. During his nine months in the Tower, Prynne reaffirmed, as he had always done, his loyalty to the Crown, but the prelates were intent on seeing their grievances against him fully resolved in the Star Chamber in February 1634. Despite Prynne's claim that *Histriomastix* was the result of years of extended contemplation and that its coincidental publication before the Queen's performance of *The Shepherd's Pastoral* had no direct bearing on the Queen herself, the prosecution chose to interpret his statements about the inappropriateness of plays in a well-ordered, Christian state as condemnations of the Caroline government, and his comments about Nero, Caligula, and women actors as *ad hominem* attacks against the King and Queen.129

For these allegedly treasonous offenses, Prynne suffered substantial losses. His fine of £5000 and the benchers' decision in April to expel him from Lincoln's Inn and to disbar him from future legal practice served to discredit permanently both his financial and social status.130

Doctrines) to peruse Prynne's books, and to collect the scandalous points out of them; which Heylin did, though (as Prynne affirms) not at all warranted by the text of his book."

129 As the chronology at the beginning of this chapter indicates, the Queen's performance took place a little more than three months after the time I have conjectured for the publication of Prynne's treatise. Annabel Patterson observes that Prynne argued before his judges "that he had begun his work as early as 1624, when he first arrived in London and was shocked by the tone of the theatres; that he had obtained a license for its publication in 1630, and seen it through the press in 1632; in other words, that it should have been read as an orthodox Puritan treatise of moral and religious intent" (105).

130 By a unanimous vote of the benchers, Prynne was expelled from Lincoln's Inn on 24 April 1634:

Whereas Mr. William Prynne, one of the Utter Barresters of this House, on the xvijth day of Febr: last was censured in his Ma's High Court of Starr Chamber for the contriveing, frameing, writing, and publishing of an infamous, scurrilous, and seditious booke and libell, by him intitled 'Histrio Mastix, the Player's Scourge and Actor's Tragedie' being indeed no other then a rayleing invective against his Ma's, his dearest Consort the Queene, the Lords of his Councell, the Magistrates, and the whole present
on the pillory was designed to humiliate him in public. The objectified forms and credentials that determined Prynne’s cultural capital—his Oxford degree, his books, and his personal papers—were revoked, confiscated, and/or burnt by the common hangman. Annabel Patterson interprets these punishments as desperate acts of institutions struggling to "preserve the illusion of power" to the extent that they were willing to sacrifice "the power of allusion, the saving grace of indeterminacy, the principles of authorial intention, and of the reader’s responsibility" (107). The wide variety of these punishments also shows that the Inns’ benchers had anticipated the extent to which they would have to recuperate the great degree of royal favor they themselves had lost through their association with Prynne in order to respond to the Crown’s intimations that a joint "expression of [the Inns’] love, and duty to their Majesties" would be "well taken from them" (Whitelock).131

\[\text{state and governm}^1\text{ of the kingdome; conteineinge not only scandalls to all his Ma}^\text{ts people in generall, but alsoe divers incitements of his people to sedition, and to infuse dangerous opinions into them that there are just causes for which they may lay violent hands upon Princes; conteineing also personall aspertions and contumelies of her Ma}^\text{te, and excessive rayleing, uncharitable and unchristian censures of all sorts of people except the factious and disobedient contenmers of the present governem}^1, \text{who are therein by him commended. For which said offences it was by the said Honoble Court ordered and decreed that the said William Prynne (being expelled out of this Societie of Lincolne’s Inne) should, beside his fyne and ymprisonm}^1, \text{suffer and undergoe such corporall punishm}^1\text{ as in the said sentence is expressed. It is therefore ordered att this Counsell, with an unanimous consent of all the Masters of the Bench now present, that the said William Prynne bee utterly expelled out of this Societie, and hee is expelled out of the same accordingly. And this Order to bee forthwith fixed upon the skreene in the Hall.} (\text{Black Books, vol 2, 317-18})

This entry also further exemplifies the benchers’ awareness of the tactics that were being used against Prynne:

\[\text{[T]hough not in expresse tearmes, yet by examples and other implicite meanes, hee laboures to infuse an opinyon into the people, that for acteinge or being spectatours of playes or masks it is just and lawfull to laye violent hands upon Kings and princes. Yf hee had positively named his Ma}^\text{te in theis places his meanyge would have been to playne, therefore he names other princes, and leaves the application to the reader.} \]

131 I am grateful to Dr. Paul Stanwood for his assistance with this section and the entire thesis.
The "younger sort" of lawyers

The Inns lavishly complied with the royal hint. Committees of barristers were formed to collect funds and appoint the artists and performers who would be involved in "the most glorious and splendid shew that ever was beheld in England" (Whitelock). Since the subject of The Triumph of Peace was the relationship between Charles and the law, there was no room for failure. No corners were cut, and the Inns' records fully demonstrate the care with which the benchers, in consultation with the Lord Chamberlain, supervised the preparations, which gradually demanded more and more money as the winter progressed. Simon Ivy and William Lawes were hired for nearly £1000 to write the music (Whitelock); the King's Musick, the Gentlemen of the Chapel, and the organist of Winchester Cathedral were recruited to sing and play it (Elliott 212); either the King's Men or the Cockpit players were hired for £80 to perform the roles in the antimasque (Elliott 200); and James Shirley composed the text in consultation with a committee of barristers. These expenses, along with payments to Inigo Jones and his staff

132 On 7 November 1633, the parliament of Lincoln's Inn "unanimouslie approved that a Maske should some time this winter be presented unto his Mastie from the said four Houses and Societies of the Innes of Court and in their name" (Black Books, vol 2, 312). One week later, the same parliament itemized by rank—bencher, barrister of seven years standing, barrister under seven years standing, and students—how much everyone in the Inn should contribute to meet "the proportion of moneys fitt to be expended upon the said Maske . . . to be raised by lower equal contributions or parts of the said fourer Houses" (312). As the preparations continued, the organizing committees quickly discovered that they had underestimated the costs of the masque. An entry in the benchers' minutes of the Middle Temple records the admission of one Mr. Thorpe "that 600l. more was wanted from each House . . ." The Masters of the Bench ordered that "600l. be borrowed on security" (vol 2, 814). Even after the performance of the first masque, one Mr. Willis had to inform the Inner Temple's benchers that the costs of the masque had in the end exceeded "the moneys taxed upon all the gentlemen" the previous November by "so great a sum" that a significant disbursement from the "stock" of the house was essential (Inner Temple Records, vol 2, 212). Payments continued as late as November 1635.

133 Shirley's intriguing relationship with the Crown and the Inns is worth mentioning here. A prolific playwright, he was popular with Charles even while he "was not in his other writings exactly an uncritical admirer of kings" (Butler 1987: 127). The king apparently provided outlines of plays to Shirley on a regular basis; Herbert's records indicate that on 6 February, The Gamester, a play "made by Sherley," was performed "out of a plot of the
of carpenters for the construction of the set in the Whitehall Banqueting House, disbursements for costuming the sixteen Grand Masquers (four from each Inn) and several hundred accompanying masquers, horsemen, musicians, dancers, and torchbearers, and fees for three thousand copies of the text (printed before the masque was staged), brought the total cost to the staggering sum of around £21,000 (Whitelock).134

Almost every known contemporary account of the masque emphasizes the acclaim with which the lawyers' triumphant procession at night from the Inns to Whitehall—complete with "Torches and flaming huge Flamboys" that "made it seem lightsom as at Noon-day"—was received by the "multitude" of "Spectators in the streets," who "seemed loth to part with so glorious a Spectacle" (Whitelock). The cover-leaf of the British Library's copy of Francis Lenton's collection of poems (shelf-mark C.30.e.11.), entitled The Innes of Court Anagrammatist: or, the Masquers Masqued in Anagrammes, features an undated hand-written account of the enthusiastic reception of the masque by London's citizens:

In 1634 a masque was presented at Whitehall by the members of the Four Innes of Court to the King and Queen... Nothing could have been got up with greater magnificense; ... the masquers went in grand procession from Ely House to Whitehall and the population of London accompanied them through the streets.

King's given him by mee [Herbert]; and well likte. The king sayd it was the best play he had seen for seven years."

Shirley was also highly sought after by the benchers of the Inns in 1633 even while (or perhaps especially because) he ridiculed Prynne in his preface to his play The Bird in a Cage, which was published the same year. Though Shirley's "early residence in London was near or at Gray's Inn," it was not until after the success of the Triumph of Peace that Shirley's status at the Inns was clarified through his admission as an honorary member of Gray's (Butler 1988: 204).

134 The "habits" of the Grand Masquers, observes Whitelock, included "Doublets, Trunk-hose, and Caps, of the most rich cloth of Tissue, and wrought as thick with silver Spangles as they could be placed, large white silver Stockings up to their Trunk-hose, and rich Sprigs in their Caps."
King Charles was also impressed, for he demanded to see the cavalcade three times, once at Salisbury House and twice at Whitehall. One wonders whose strength and glory this pageant was meant to signify—the Inns' or the King's? Martin Butler suggests that the answer to this question likely depends upon the spectator. A poem in the State Papers Domestic, described as a "briefe expression of the delight apprehended by the [anonymous] Author att the seeing of the solemne triumphs of the gent. of the Innes of Court, riding with the Masque presented before his Ma\textsuperscript{tie}," depicts the lawyers as warriors in defense of Charles:

So full of joy, that I was confident,  
When I first saw this goodly Regiment  
And all the glitteringe of this comely traine,  
The Silver Age was now returned againe...  
Theis are the Sonnes of Charles his peacefull Raigne,  
Whome yet if warr's rude accents shall constraine  
To put on armes, will quickly understand  
The Lawes of Armes, as well as of the Land,  
And be as valiant in the midst of fight  
As they seemd glorious in the Masque of night.\textsuperscript{135}

Having asked to see this procession not once but three times, the King, like the delighted author of the poem, seems to have received the procession as the lawyers' complimentary willingness to identify, before the public, their own cultural capital as inherited from his own. The implication here is that, in the King's eyes, the Inns were institutional extensions of the Crown rather than important agents within a relatively autonomous juridical field.

\textsuperscript{135} State Papers, Domestic, Charles I, vol 260, no. 15; the poem also appears as note xii in the appendix of Black Books, vol 2, pp. 456-57.
Butler proposes that the multitude of citizens lining the Strand, on the other hand, likely interpreted the lawyers' parade "as a statement of the wealth and importance of one section of the gentry, England's parliamentary class" (1987: 137; my italics). Evidence offered by Whitelock offers a finer-grained classification of the actors Butler identifies. Whitelock, who was on the Middle Temple's sub-committee, observes that "the younger sort" among the Inns' membership was particularly eager to follow the barristers' lead and bring the masque to fruition through weeks of rehearsals. The list of students performing the roles of the Grand Masquers confirms Whitelock's observation.\(^{136}\) The signs of wealth on display, according to the Inns' records, were financed mostly by the higher ranking members of the Inns. What the citizens saw, however, was this wealth in the hands of young students, who, as "proper and beautiful young gentlemen" (Whitelock), were deemed best able to embody and display the Inns' prestige.

This situation exemplifies how the Inns' task of maintaining its appearance of permanent dominance within the juridical field, afforded by its seemingly "endless reconversion of economic capital into symbolic capital," could not have succeeded without the involvement of the entire legal community, for "the work of denial which is the source of social alchemy is, like magic, a collective undertaking" (Bourdieu 1977: 195). The Folger manuscript indicates that at least some of the Inns incorporated the full extent of their community in the masque—from the most illustrious benchers to the lowest-ranking servants. The chariot containing the Middle Temple's masquers was led by the Inn's porter; the Inn also recruited its turnspit, cook, and washpot as flambeaux bearers (Elliott 212-13). The chariot

\(^{136}\) These names are listed in Frances Lenton's Innes of Court Anagrammatist and in Folger MS Z.e.1.
of Gray's Inn was led by the Inn's cook and the keeper of the boghouse (213). "Once a system of mechanisms has been constituted capable of objectively ensuring the reproduction of the established order by its own motion," Bourdieu argues, "the dominant class have only to let the system they dominate take its own course in order to exercise their domination; but until such a system exists, they have to work directly, daily, personally, to produce and reproduce conditions of domination which are even then never entirely trustworthy" (1977: 190). The need for the benchers to reinforce the identity of the Inns as dominant agents in the juridical field is exhibited by their full-scale recruitment of the entire community of the Inns—from top to bottom—in the parade. This strategy would bolster the image of the Inns as hierarchical communities and also enhance the representation of the students on horseback as dominators of institutional culture.

Under Charles, the autonomy of the common law was already being contested by the Crown, and the political blunder caused by Prynne's treatise directed this challenge more precisely at the Inns. Charles's rebuff not only threatened the Inns' status in the juridical field—it challenged the common law itself. Because of the Inns' institutional identity as England's "ancient schools of priviledge" (Buc), the royal disfavor placed the future of England's gentry, represented in the masque by the Inns' "younger sort," into some doubt. Thus a great deal more was at stake in mounting the "most important spectacle to be staged publicly in [Caroline] London" (Butler 1987: 137) than counteracting Prynne's polemics with ceremonial apologetics. The entire efficacy of the common law as a source of authority, and the security of those who would depend on this cultural currency as a source of income, depended on the manner in which the carefully choreographed spectacle simultaneously appeased the royal eye and mystified the public one.
The Lord Mayor

The government of London was in the hands of the Lord Mayor and aldermen, who were elected from among the City's wealthy "merchant oligarchs" (Lockyer 9). These officials constituted the Corporation of London; while in office, they interacted closely with the royal government (10). On occasion, their allegiance to the City conflicted with royal objectives. Having risen to the peak of the textile trade before becoming Lord Mayor, Ralph Freeman was sympathetic to the textile guilds' need for affordable, high quality soap for the production of clean fabrics. Because Freeman's loyalty to London's craft-based companies (including the London Soapboilers) posed a potential threat to Charles's monopolies, which were enacted through royal proclamations and therefore protected by threat of Star Chamber prosecution, the Soapboilers' dispute became one more element that exacerbated the already strained relationship between the City and the Crown (McGee 314).

So, oddly enough, the law students' second performance of *The Triumph of Peace* was initiated in part by a dispute about soap. The Crown had already summoned the Inns to produce a second run of the parade and masque; the soap extravaganza drew the City authorities into this spectacle, which was, as a result of the Lord Mayor's involvement, magnified in scale. Under Freeman's firm direction, the Corporation of London contributed substantial sums of money toward the construction of an elaborate material infrastructure designed to prepare the City for the logistical nightmare of the parade, and the aldermen under Freeman's authority were charged with enforcing the citizens' compliance. One may well speculate that Freeman perceived his role in the masque as an opportunity to assuage Charles's discontent towards him after their disagreement regarding the Crown's soap monopoly. The masque itself also offered a chance for Freeman to manifest
the City's ability to afford a conversation with the Crown with as much pomp and circumstance as the lawyers had just displayed, regardless of the financial burden it would bring to London. The compassion with which Freeman deliberated on behalf of the London Soapboilers suggests that the City's burden was his own. His valiant effort during the ten-day interval between the first and second performances of Triumph was a civic-minded enterprise whereby he could establish London as a forum in which the City and the Crown might resolve their conflicts in a language that Charles understood.

The means by which the four agents I have identified—the King and Queen, William Prynne, the Inns' lawyers, and the Lord Mayor—vie for an advancement (or suffer a diminishment) of their positions in their respective cultural fields is based on the exchange of symbolic capital. As "the unrecognizable, and hence socially recognizable, form of the other kinds of capital," symbolic capital (costly as it is in economic terms) is the only form in which economic capital can be accumulated, and thus the only form of capital with which agents can durably exert power (Bourdieu 1977: 195). That Charles understood this correspondence is clear through his demands for elaborate entertainments; this same correlation also explains the panoply of punishments suffered by Prynne, the massive cooperative effort undertaken by the Inns towards the masque, and the stress of Ralph Freeman's political battle with Charles that allegedly ended his life.

The concept of the interconvertibility of forms of capital helps us to understand the bizarre events I have introduced in this chapter—events that exhibit a tightly integrated network of symbolic exchanges between agents occupying (or attempting to occupy) dominant positions in their respective fields of production. The tense political conditions in which these events
occurred had the effect of increasing exponentially the economic expenses necessary for agents to acquire the volume of symbolic capital with which they might engage in fruitful negotiations with the Crown. In the next section, I explain how the two primary works located at the center of this controversy—Prynne's *Histriomastix* and Shirley's *Triumph of Peace*—occupy, within the system of literature (or "space of works," as Bourdieu describes it), competing positions whose relationship to each other corresponds to that of their producers (that is, Prynne, along with his colleagues at the Inns who collaborated with Shirley) within the juridical field.

**Position-takings**

Prynne's incarceration in the Tower and conviction in the Star Chamber during the first two months of 1634 were part of the combined plot of the Crown and the Inns to label formally both Prynne and his book as aberrations from legitimate court and legal culture. The enthusiasm with which the Inns printed and sold thousands of copies of Shirley's masque served to counteract further the popularity of Prynne's pamphlets and to distance the legal community from its alleged traitor. The competition between Prynne and his colleagues at the Inns is based on a struggle for the power to determine not only what the members of the legal profession collectively stand for, but also what institutions (and their members) outside the profession represent. According to Prynne, the Inns should join the church and state in a collective attack against playhouses. Soon after Prynne's *magnum opus* (dedicated to the Inns) was available in the bookseller's stalls, the Inns' benchers quickly needed to revise and rearticulate the convictions of
the Inns and the entire profession of the common law—convictions that Prynne had presumed to formulate on their behalf—before the King and the citizens of London.

At issue in the struggle between Prynne and the barristers are questions regarding the place and identity of the individual within the institution: who can decide (or nominate) the desirable qualities associated with institutional membership? who speaks for the institution? and how might an individual use the power of nomination itself as a source of cultural capital within the institution? This struggle for dominance within the juridical field is manifested, in the space of works, as a system of oppositions among texts (Histriomastix and The Triumph of Peace), spectacles (the street parade and the Queen's performance of The Shepherd's Pastoral), and political acts (Laud's intervention, Charles's decrees, and Prynne's prosecution). Conflict within the realm of art is contingent upon factors outside the direct control of agents within the field of production; at some level, the realm has a life of its own. Nevertheless, the ability of a work to affect the desires of its producer—to maintain or enhance the producer's position within his cultural field—is dependent on its capacity to change the literary system. This capacity is determined by many factors including timing, predominant fashions, and, most of all, the form of the work itself.

One of Prynne's aims in his nearly one-thousand-page treatise is to use his position as barrister as a source of power for making authoritative claims about the relationship between virtuous institutions (the law, the church, the Crown) and the theatres. The particular state of literature when Histriomastix was published, however, served to undermine his position because his self-appointed power of nomination, in this instance, was interpreted as an affront to the Crown. Shirley's Triumph of Peace is the textual result of his
colleagues' attempt to reclaim their usurped position within the juridical
field while still repairing the damaged status of the Inns and the law in the
eyes of the Crown. In the masque, the relationships among institutions that
Prynne had liberally defined in Histriomastix are reconceived and rearranged
in a manner that takes full advantage of the structure of masque performance
in Whitehall—a structure that places the King and Queen at the center of
power, around which all invited guests must maneuver.

William Prynne's Histriomastix

Throughout Histriomastix, Prynne is obsessively devoted to the
authority of "old stories, other men's words" (Patterson 106); he regards this
kind of authority as the source of the "bare and naked Truth" about plays—
that is, that they are "the very Pompes of the Divell" (Prynne 5-6). Prynne's
concern about illuminating Truth through his work was derived in part from
his early exposure to puritan preaching in the chapel of Lincoln's Inn, and
Prynne accordingly emphasizes in his text the institutional conditions that
might permit or disallow one to know the truth. In other words, Prynne
consistently locates the individual's pursuit of truth within a larger
institutional framework. Institutions provide roles for their members to play,
but if, in performing these roles, the members misrepresent their true selves,
the institution and its members are sinful because they spread the disease of
falsity throughout society at large. Prynne is particularly concerned about the
situation of impressionable young gentlemen in London:

[M]anny godly Citizens, and well-disposed Gentlemen of London,
considering that Play-houses and Dicing-houses were traps for young
Gentlemen and others; and perceiving the many inconveniences, and
great damage that would ensue upon the long suffring of the same, not
only to particular persons, but to the whole Citty: and that it would also be a great disparagement unto the Governors, and a dishonour to the government of this honourable Citty: if they should any longer continue . . . desiring them to take some speedy course for the supression of common play-houses and Dicing-houses within the Citty of London and the Liberties thereof. (491-92)

Prynne depicts the plight of the law student in London as a battle between good and evil on which the entire future of the City depends.

The tone of urgency that fuels Prynne's relentless truth-finding in Histriomastix is not, however, substantiated by evidence from his own surroundings. Prynne does not construct his institutional framework with details that refer to the specific conditions of London playgoing in his day (this is too risky), even though these conditions are at the center of his concern. Rather, he packs his treatise with the voices of the ancient past in order to speak to the present institutional conditions that so disgust him. To substantiate his argument against the dressing of boy actors in women's clothing, for example, he paraphrases the record of the "learned Jew" Philo (from Philo De Fortitudine), who argues that the effort of law to "confirme mens mindes to fortitude" includes the prohibition of attire that might "stamp some blemish on the masculine sex" (Prynne 186). The implication here is that cross-dressing on the London stage tempts law students into a dangerous landscape of "Lascivious dancing, Amorous obscene songs[, and] Effeminate lust-exciting Musicke" (156). In Prynne's eyes, the act of witnessing the art of role-playing and disguise not only hinders the viewer's ability to carry out his proper institutional obligations—it also corrupts his self-knowledge.
Some evidence, such as Richard Brathwaite's *The English Gentleman* (1633), suggests that a few members of the Inns (or at least some who had once been students there) had anticipated the publication of Prynne's treatise, and were prepared to challenge the position of Prynne and his puritan followers at the Inns. The shock with which *Histriomastix* was received suggests that the political climate at the Inns in the 1620s was marked by a slowly brewing contest between various factions of the Inns' membership regarding the question of who possessed the authority to determine the most appropriate institutional affiliations for England's future parliamentary class. Once a student at Gray's Inn, Brathwaite offers one strand of evidence for this conjecture.\^{137} He argues that playgoing, when

used in Moderation, is not altogether to be disallowed . . . But for as much as diverse objections have beene, and worthily may be made against them, we will here lay them downe, being such as are grounded on the sacred word of God: and, with as much perspicuity and brevity as we may, clear and resolve them.

Brathwaite tacitly targets Prynne as the figure most responsible for the gradually declining status of playgoing lawyers, and he describes the anti-theatrical thesis as a vehicle of Prynne's pursuit of personal glory at the expense of the reputation of the entire legal profession:

> Yea, but our stage-stingers, or Poet-scourgers will again object, that these Theatres, which were at first erected for honest delight and harmlesse merriment, grow manie times busie with states, laying asperations on men of eminent ranke and government; and in breife,

\^{137}Brathwaite entered Oriel College, Oxford in 1604, and then went to Cambridge, but being urged by his parents "to tune [his] course of studies from these sweet academical exercises," entered Gray's Inn in 1609 (Prest 1972: 142). At Gray's, Brathwaite began to pursue his literary ambitions, and he wrote fifty or more books between 1611 and 1662.
will spare none; so they may gaine by themselves by disparaging others. But I will answer thus much for them, albeit . . . that such as implo

y their pens in taxing or tainting any noble or meriting person in this kinde, deserve no better, than as they whipt, so to be whipt themselves for their labour: for they must know . . . that some things are privileged from jest, namely Religion, matters of state, great persons, any man's business of importance, and any case that deserveth pity.

Brathwaite regards the playhouse as an honourable diversion that can grace Crown and country, provided that this diversion does not take the place of a gentleman's "better imployment."

Aside from its inordinate length, there is nothing especially noteworthy about Prynne's Histriomastix—like most puritan tracts of its kind, it is laboriously earnest, repetitive, and poorly written. But the violence of its reception is indicative of the specific conditions that made its particular form and content ideally suited for triggering further displays of retaliatory excess on the part of the Inns, the Crown, and the City.¹³⁸ If Prynne's book

¹³⁸ These retaliations took the form of direct refutations as well as playful tricks. The most thorough contemporary refutation of Prynne is Theatrum Redivivum, or the Theatre Vindicated By Sir Richard Baker in Answer to Mr. Pryns Histrio-Mastix (1662). Regarding Prynne, Baker (d. 1645) professes:

I wrestle not with him, as he is in his own Person, for I know him not; and he may be better, then he seems to me: but I wrestle with him, onely as he appears in his Book; which cannot be fuller of words, and emptier of reason, then it is. (4)

The anonymous authors of Mr. William Prynne; His Defence of Stage-Plays, or A Retraction of a former Book of his called Histrio-Mastix (1649) sought to undermine Prynne's credibility by composing, in his name, a public acknowledgment of the errors of his thoughts and an apology for his condemnation of the King; "Prynne" concludes that "good Plays, which are not profane, lewd, bad, blasphemous, or ungodly, may be acted" (8). This scandalous publication was quickly met with The Vindication of William Prynne, Esquire, From some scandalous Papers and Imputations, newly Printed and Published, to traduce and defame him in his Reputation (10 January 1649):

Whereas A scandalous Paper have been newly printed and published in my Name by some of the imprisoned Stage-Players, or Agents of the Army, intituled Mr. William Prynne his Defence of Stage-Plays . . . of purpose to traduce and defame me: I do hereby publishly declare to all the world, the same to be a meere Forgery and imposture, and that my judgement and opinion concerning Stage Plays and the Common Actors of them, and their intollerable mischeivousness in any Christian state, is still the same, as I have more amply manifested it to be in my Histriomastix.
had been published at any other time, it would have been ingloriously ranked among the countless other anti-theatrical tracts that lined the booksellers' stalls.

James Shirley's *Triumph of Peace*

The misunderstandings wrought by the appearance of *Histriomastix* required the Inns quickly to renew the lines of communication between the legal quarter and the Crown. To this end, the Inns' significant financial investments were devoted—besides the street procession—to the construction of a highly ordered performance space within the Banqueting House at Whitehall in which the discursive pathways between the Inns and the Crown could be directly channeled and contained. The text of Shirley's masque makes it clear that the lawyers endeavored to prepare a forum in which the lawyers could "instruct the King on what they took to be the proper relationship between his power and the law" (Butler 1993: 122) without directly challenging his authority. What I hope to make more evident is the complex strategy of this instruction—a two-part scheme whereby the Inns' lawyers, represented by the character of Fancy, locate themselves at the center of a quickly shifting series of antimasques involving an exchange of capital between actors representing different social classes. Then, upon this foundation, they stage a masque that clarifies the broader interdependent relationship between the lawyers' role in the exchange and the Crown that makes this exchange possible.

Despite the masque's themes of interdependence between the King and the law, however, the performance conditions in which these themes are voiced make it clear from the very beginning that the Crown is still the primary source of all forms of power. These conditions impose an order of
monarchical dominance on any representation of power within the masque itself. Whitelock points out that a gallery, located at the end of the banqueting house behind Charles's and Henrietta Maria's central seats, "was reserved for the Gentlemen of the Inns of Court, who should come thither to see their Masque, that there they might sit together, and none else to be admitted with them into that place." Such seating arrangements, along with Inigo Jones's magnificent perspective settings, were designed to make available

only one focal point, one perfect place in the hall from which the illusion achieves its fullest effect. At court performances this is where the king sat, and the audience around him at once became a living emblem of the structure of the court. The closer one sat to the monarch the 'better' one's place was, an index to one's status. (Orgel 1975: 11)\(^{139}\)

The Whitehall portion of \textit{Triumph} begins with a meeting of Confidence (a fashionable London gentleman) and a family from the country (Opinion, Lady Novelty, and their daughter Admiration) who have been

---

\(^{139}\) The masque's dazzling display of scene changes, dances, and costumes, which Shirley describes in detail, occurs at the center of a backdrop of civic splendor and perpetual order suggested by Jones's "Forum of Peace" (see figure 7), in front of which the entire masque was performed. The ornate Italian architecture situates the events of the masque in a foreign urban setting—the implication being that a mutual understanding between the Inns and the Crown necessitates the transformation of the banqueting house (in which this peace is being negotiated) into a forum that transcends the social and political realities of London and the legal quarter.

Per Palme's study of the architectural evolution of the Whitehall Banqueting House enlightens our sense of the intricacy with which the material-technical components of the performance space created this imaginary landscape. A symmetrical arrangement of inter-enveloping vistas—produced by optical effects involving the proscenium, the backdrops, and the descending stage—perfectly synthesized their proportions from the viewpoint of the King, whose viewing position enables him to witness the full effect of this marvelous integration of technical mastery and myth-making. "The action of the drama," Palme explains, "proceeded towards a goal within the illusion as circumscribed by the boards and the scenery. The action of the masque proceeded towards a goal outside these bounds" (142).

Thus the action of the Caroline masque finds itself in a perplexing state of cross-purposes, for its status as a masque, as a royal entertainment, by definition confines the pathways of its persuasive utility through the imposition of a narrowly delineated set of optical illusions, thereby enabling the masquers only to gesture towards the political situations that have created the need for the masque in the first place.
invited to attend a court masque. Upon arriving, they call upon Fancy, who arrives with his friends Jollity and Laughter, to "help the Masque" (l.222). Opinion informs Fancy of a rumor that the court has expected Fancy to furnish antimasques for the royal entertainment, but it is clear that a series of miscommunications and short timing have complicated this undertaking. Unabashed, Fancy assures Opinion that because it is "a time of peace" (l.291), he will instantly conjure representations of the effects of peace to please him. Lady Novelty, Admiration, Confidence, Jollity, and Laughter rush into a tavern to get drunk, leaving Fancy and Opinion to observe the antimasques.

Lawrence Venuti describes Fancy as "the lawyers' offspring" (l.195); Confidence refers to him as a "prince of th' air" (l.188), "a bird of night" (l.189), and "a quaint hermaphrodite" (l.192). Indeed Fancy is a personification of the Inns in that his role is to stage, in short order, a performance at court that fashions political corrective as entertainment. Venuti argues that the lawyers' creation of Fancy exhibits their "Machiavellian strategy" of using a legal figure "as an anticipation of the [masque's] later attack on the gentry," thereby "criticizing a social group with whom [the lawyers] were closely associated in order to save face with the king" (195). Fancy's role in the antimasques, however, is more assertive than Venuti allows, for when one antimasque fails to convince Opinion that he is witnessing images of social peace, Fancy almost magically conjures another. Serving as "an immortal spring" from which all "Invention flows" (l.444-45), Fancy functions as both a scapegoat for the Inns and a grand mediator—as both a liminal figure between "An owl and a bat" (l.193) and a "Strong" character who can "crack a halbert with his wit" (l.179) and "[Break] his way / Thorough the guard" (l.174-75).
Fancy's assertiveness and imagination allow him to explain to Opinion the multifacetedness of the chicanery that develops throughout the antimasques; he describes the exchange of capital between classes as a crucial part of a peaceful social regime. In the fourth episode, for example, a gentleman "bestows his charity" on crippled beggars who dance for him in a tavern. After the gentleman departs, the beggars discard their prosthetic legs and dance. Sensing Opinion's discomfiture with the "corruption" he has just witnessed, Fancy assures him that the beggars in fact "show / The benefit of peace" (1.329-30). The implication of Fancy's rebuttal is that the beggars' trickery should not be interpreted as an affront to the gentry but rather a sign of social stability, for exchanges of economic capital between the gentry and the poor maintain the social order by ensuring that beggars will not become thieves. Thus what appears as corruption is actually a system of social security. Unwilling to hear more, Opinion nonetheless complains that "such base and sordid persons" (1.335) are not becoming at court.140

Fancy's solution is to present six "projectors" with ludicrous inventions on their heads: a jockey "who has designed a . . . bridle

---

140 Opinion's objection introduces into the masque's narrative a theme of intrusion that weaves its way through the masque-world as it metatheatrically gestures towards the conditions of the masque's performance in the banqueting house. Towards the end of the masque, sixteen masquers (performed by lawyers) enter and arrange themselves in a "pyramidal figure" as the sons of the celestial goddesses Peace, Law, and Justice. This geometrically arranged fraternity resists the intrusion of a group of mechanicals, introduced by a carpenter exclaiming, "D'ye think to keep us out?" (679). We soon discover that these intruders—the carpenter, along with a painter, guard, and tailor, as well as the wives of a property-man, feather-maker, and embroiderer—all represent artisans whose craftwork has made the masque possible, and whose desire it is to "challenge a privilege" (694) by observing the fruits of their labor.

While the intrusion that interrupted the 1594 Christmas revels at Gray's Inn appears to have been incorporated into the account of these revels after the fact, the intrusion of this antimasque within the masque of Triumph is a scripted event that suggests an underlying unease among the lawyers that they too were intruders in a private space. The intrusion of the mechanicals into this rarefied setting also points to the gravity of a situation outside the masque in which the increasing dependence of the Crown's symbolic capital on the profits of City monopolies stifled social fluidity by inflating the rate of exchange between forms of capital to a prohibitive degree.
contain[ing] a hollow iron tube through which a 'vapour' could pass to cool off his horse" (Elliott 211), a country fellow with a wheel that enables him to thresh corn all day without using his hands, a gowned philosopher with a furnace that boils beef efficiently, a black leather suit with glass eyes that permits one to walk underwater all day to find gold, a physician who has given up his practice in order to invent a new way of fattening poultry with carrot scrapings, and a seaman with a ship that can sail against the winds and melt rocks. It would seem that this display was the lawyers' effort to criticize Charles's monopolies; Butler contends that the lawyers used this and other antimasques "to censure the monopolies on which Charles's finances depended" (1990: 155). But Fancy's role in the antimasques indicates that the art of interpretation and the need for proper perspective was even more at issue than censure. The antimasque of projectors, in particular, places less significance on the projectors themselves and what they represent than the manner of Fancy's efficient mediation in their encounter with Opinion.

The mediatory function of the Inns that Fancy introduces in the antimasques is, in the main masque, affirmed and cemented by a "pyramidal figure" formed by the Inns' sixteen Grand Masquers. Strategically located at the center of Jones's visual regime suggesting themes of ancient heritage and civic order, the lawyers fashion themselves as holders of the new codes of taste and judgment. Their presence is legitimated and inspired by the songs sung just before their entrance by their heavenly "parents": the sisters Irene (Peace), Eunomia (Law), and Dice (Justice)—roles performed by singers of the

\[141\] On the sides of the proscenium, the lawyer-masquers are bordered by two statuesque images representing ancient deities of scholarship—Numa with a sceptre and scroll, and Minos with a diadem and writing instruments. These images appear in Jones's proscenium border (see figure 8) and bring to mind the lawyers' preoccupation with the ancient foundation of the common law. The backdrop of the "Forum of Peace" (see figure 7) contextualizes this concern by locating it in a contemporary, though foreign, urban setting.
Chapel Royal. Having acknowledged their interdependence in the first four songs, the sisters conclude by together "Sing[ing] / The triumph of Jove's upper court abated" (1.568-69):

To you great King and Queen, whose smile  
Doth scatter blessings through this isle,  
   To make it best  
   And wonder of the rest,  
We pay the duty of our birth,  
Proud to wait upon that earth  
   Whereon you move,  
   Which shall be nam'd,  
And by your chaste embraces fam'd,  
   The paradise of love.  
Irene, plant thy olives here,  
Thus warm'd, at once they'll bloom and bear;  
Eunomia, pay thy light,  
While Dice, covetous to stay,  
Shall throw her silver wings away  
   To dwell within your sight.  

Venuti argues that it is "possible to see Eunomia, the personification of law, as a symbol of Parliament" and to "read the song as an assertion that the King's peace (Irene) should not have prerogative over the MPs' contribution to the legislative process" (202). A perspective that more directly links these characters to the primary agents involved in the circumstances of the masque's production reveals Eunomia as a symbol of the Inns of Court and her song as the lawyers' clear indication to Charles that the peacefulness of his reign is dependent on their continuous payment of the common law's "light." Yet the lawyers carefully articulate this argument in a manner that avoids forthright or arrogant rhetoric that might offend the Crown, for they
cast Charles and Henrietta Maria as power and law, thereby designating themselves as the grandchildren of the king and queen and maintaining the Crown's relation to the divine powers of the three heavenly sisters. The lawyers depict their relationship to the Crown as that between grandparents and their grandchildren, each receiving different strengths from the other in an interdependent alliance. Eunomia, after all, must "pay" her light to the Crown—a rhetorical gesture that acknowledges the subservient nature of their legal wisdom. The entire spectacle was carefully structured in order for the lawyers simultaneously to offer an apology to the Crown and to clarify both the position of the Inns within the juridical field and the symbolic force of the common law.

Flattered by the lawyers' display, the Queen "did the honour to some of the Masquers to dance with them her self, and to judge them as good Dancers as ever she saw" (Whitelock). Because of the circumstances outside the masque involving the Lord Mayor, however, this compliment turned out to be the first of a series of recuperative exchanges among the Crown, the Inns, and the City that even further drained London's financial resources and tested even further the lawyers' ability as intervenors.

The politics of gift-giving

Courtship is a social transaction involving a "complex interplay of giving and receiving, offering and responding, asking and replying" (Bates 12). Designed to maintain a relationship of suspense between givers and receivers of gifts, the behaviors that make courtship work are organized as a formal process of strategic exchanges among the monarch and her subjects. The suspense is created by the temporal configuration of gift exchange,
whereby the "lapse of time that intervenes between the receiving of a gift and giving in return [functions as] a deliberate oversight," a pretense of incertitude that both avoids the semblance of rudeness and forces the benefactor to "wait and see" how the recipient will undertake his or her obligation to reciprocate the gift (Bates 12-13). "In every society," Bourdieu contends, "it may be observed that, if it is not to constitute an insult, the counter-gift must be deferred and different, because the immediate return of an exactly identical object clearly amounts to a refusal (i.e. the return of the same object)" (1977: 5).

The events that drew together the Inns, the Crown, and the City of London from November 1633 to April 1634 reveal a set of circumstances in which the temporal structure of gift exchange was fundamentally awry. The gifts and countergifts among the lawyers, the King and Queen, and the Lord Mayor—extravagant and stunning—were clearly given in the name and spirit of courtship, but in fact what the records of the Inns and the City, along with other contemporary accounts, reveal is a struggle for power in which the exchange of cultural currency between these agents was so directly tied to money that the mystery of royal power was itself in an urgent struggle to maintain its dominance. With the Crown under attack, the very fabric of privileged society was beginning to unravel.

**King Charles, the Corporation of London, and the lawyers**

The conventional reward for a masque presented at court was, at the very least, a banquet for the masquers (Prest 1972: 224). Through their strategic scheme of integrating the throne within a system of alliance based on gracious exchanges between Crown and subject, both Elizabeth and James had refined the process of rewarding such services to an art. In the case of Charles,
however, this art gradually served to isolate the Crown from its subjects by creating between them ties of dependence that more explicitly identified the King himself as the source of all forms of capital. The lawyers were evidently concerned about the impression that *Triumph* made on Charles and Henrietta Maria; on 6 February 1634, only four days after the performance, the benchers of Lincoln's Inn included in the *Black Books* a letter from Philip Herbert, the King's Lord Chamberlain, to Lord Coventry, the Lord Keeper, indicating Charles's willingness to continue his conversation with the Inns by inviting one hundred and twenty lawyers to a performance of Thomas Carew and Inigo Jones's masque *Coelum Britannicum* at court.\(^\text{142}\) By performing a central role in the masque, Charles presents "his own view of his place in the commonwealth" in what Orgel describes as "the greatest theatrical expression of the Caroline autocracy" (1975: 83). Charles's invitation was less an exchange of favors than an opportunity to locate himself at the center of action just as the lawyers had done in *Triumph*. This was an act of competition—an affirmation of royal prerogative—rather than a felicitous reward for a job well done.

The Queen also expressed her admiration for the masque—she was in fact "so taken with this Show and Masque, that she desired to see it acted over

\(^{142}\) Like those of the other Inns, the records of Lincoln's Inn rarely include much beyond the minutes of decisions made by the benchers regarding appointments to the bar and disciplinary actions taken against offending members, so the transcription of a letter from an outside authority into the records is an exceptional occurrence that likely reflects an important development in the Inn's relation to higher powers. The letter in question, dated one day before its receipt at Lincoln's Inn, reads:

> The King is so much taken with the noble entertainment which hath been brought unto him by the gentlemen of the Innes of Court that, being not satisfied with the many expressions which he hath hither to made of his gracious acceptance, his Ma^lie^ is further pleased to favour them with a soleme invitacion of one hundred and twentie gentlemen of their companie unto the Masque which is to be danced by his Ma^lie^ upon Shrove Tuesday next; And his Ma^lie^ hath made choice of your Lo^PP^ to convey this information unto them. Which I assure myself your Lo^PP^ will perfourme with that civilitie and grave direccion which may expresse the bountie of his Ma^lie^s intentions. And so I take my leave and rest.

*(vol 2, 315)*
again: wereupon an Intimation being given to the Lord Mayor of London, he invited the King and Queen, and the Inns of Court Masquers to the City, and entertained them with all state and magnificence, at Merchant-taylors Hall" on 13 February—only ten days after the performance of Triumph at Whitehall (Whitelock; McGee 339). While the civic records suggest, as McGee observes, that Freeman regarded Charles's "Intimation" as an open door to repairing the City's (as well as his own) damaged relationship with the Crown, they also show that the gesture was less an invitation to a diplomatic rapprochement than a demand for more of the same kind of expenditures that would maintain the façade of courtship on which Charles's reign was increasingly depending—less an appeal for reconciliation than a continuation of the increasingly expensive masquerades that depicted the King as a commander, rather than negotiator, of subservience. The King's hint, in fact, was a demand to affirm in public the sovereignty of the Crown that his performance in Coelum Britannicum would articulate in private.

The City authorities had little time to meet this demand, and the pressure to reproduce the street procession (this time, east-bound from the legal quarter) and masque performance at the Merchant Taylors' Hall was financially taxing on everyone, especially the Corporation of London, which had to postpone the event for two days in order to handle the logistics of ensuring both a safe passage for the King and Queen through the City and a means by which the

---

143 Orgel and Strong have transcribed a letter, dated 27 Feb. 1634 and written by Mr. Garrard to the Lord Deputy of Ireland, that describes the royal "Intimation" in more explicit terms:

This riding Shew took so well, that King and Queen desired to see it again, so that they invited themselves to Supper at my Lord Mayor's within a Week after, and the Masquers came in a more glorious Show with all the Riders, which were increased to twenty, to Merchant-Taylors Hall, and there performed it again.

The largest of the livery companies' halls and conveniently close to the Lord Mayor's house in St. Michael's parish (McGee 340), the Merchant Taylors' Hall in the ward of Cornhill had for centuries been owned by the "Guild of Taylors and linnen armourers" (Stow's Survey, vol 1, 181).
royal couple, power and law, could be easily seen by the people (McGee 309-10, 313). 144

Rather than an invitation for the City to engage in a courteous routine of courtly exchange, the King's demand for more elaborate festivities was

144 The Inns incurred expenses for new torches, silk stockings, and an additional speech by James Shirley; the Merchant Taylors had to contribute moneys towards preparing their hall (McGee 311); and the City Cash Books include payments, totaling around £1300, to "carpenters, drapers, uphol[sterers], grocers, waxchandlers, confectioners, butchers, painters, plaisterers, glasiers, bricklayers, brewers, trumpettors" (McGee 329-33). McGee's study of the City records reveals that repairing the streets along the route of the triumphal procession, [and] clearing, cleaning, and lighting them not only enhanced the brilliance of the glittering cavalcade, but also demonstrated to the King and the court that the city fathers were capable of providing 'the good government of this Cittie.' The double watch and ward, especially in that it closed off cross-streets along the parade route, helped define that route and to exclude disorderly persons; it dramatised at the same time the allegiance of London whose citizens stood, armed with halberds, ready to defend King Charles. Similarly, while outfitting Merchant Taylors' Hall with scaffolding, furniture, and lighting was necessary for the performance of the masque, adorning it with a cloth-covered walkway, tapestries, the king's arms, and his picture were ways of making a statement . . . of the City's affection and respect for the monarch. The practicalities had to be well taken care of if an edifying ideal—the harmony of a loving and gracious monarch and an obedient and loving city—were to be acted out convincingly and efficaciously.

Freeman's fastidious execution of these practicalities is evidenced by seven orders he made to the various aldermen around the City demanding their maintenance of order along the procession route. To the chief alderman of the ward of Cornhill, he stipulated that every householder aswell during all the time of passage of their Majesties & the said gentlemen from Temple barre to my said house & Merchantailours hall & from thence backagaine to Temple Barre be streightly commanded to have at his doore a Torche lighted and soo to be renewed if need require to give plentifull light unto their Majestes and the said Gentlemen in that their passage to & froe and alsoe to hange forth Lanthorne and Candle light duringe all the time aforesaid And that every householder himselfe be then present before his doore with a faire halbert or other weapon readie to suppresse any disorder or tumult that may happen there. (580)

A gallery of scaffolding and broadcloathes was constructed in front of the Lord Mayor's gate and served as a stand where Charles and Henrietta Maria could view the lawye-masquers and also be clearly seen by the people:

Besides improving the sight lines of the royal party, the gallery made Charles and his consort the 'observed of all observers.' In the account of the entertainment in the minutes of the Court of Alderman, nothing is more important than this 'privileged visibility' of the royal couple; not the author of the masque, nor the architect (Inigo Jones), nor the title, nor the antimasque's portrayal of seedy features of urban life, nor the main masque's critique of royal prerogative are mentioned. The thread running through the account of the event in the Repertory of the Court of Aldermen is that the King and Queen allowed themselves to be seen . . . 'in their open Chariot' [as] they proceeded . . . to Merchant Taylor's Hall 'in publique view . . . of the Aldermen their Ladies and wifes and many others of the Cheife Citizens men and women . . . '

(313)
instead a call for the City to produce in short order an entertainment that would top the Inns' previous offering. The evidence suggests that this situation had unnerving effects on both the Corporation of London and the Inns, for they each had to determine how best to negotiate a monarchical system that seemed to operate according to new rules. Under this new regime, the Corporation, on 12 February, proposed to give the King and Queen each a velvet purse filled with gold, but the Lord Chamberlain apparently advised its members that such a gift was inappropriate (McGee 309-10). Two days later, they decided instead to give the King a diamond valued at £4000 for "the great and extraordinary favour and love of their Maj[es]tys herein declared and manifested unto this Citty" (McGee 311-12). What the laudatory rhetoric of the City records illustrates is that the presence of the royal couple was supposed to be regarded as itself a gift, one that the City could not match in terms of symbolic capital, especially since they had no masque of their own with which to honor them, so money and jewels were deemed the best alternative counter-gift.

Whitelock's account shows that the Inns' barristers needed assurance that the Crown had favorably received their gift of the twice-performed masque. The organizing committee ordered one barrister from each Inn (including Whitelock) to "attend the King and Queen . . . to return their humble thanks for their Majesties gracious acceptance of the tender of their service in the late Masque." They were first taken to the King, whose hand

145 The records of the Court of Aldermen, "takeing into their mature consideracion the espetiall favour and love of their Royall Majestys herein demonstrated unto this City here in great honor unto the same doth agree and soe order that the King shall at that tyme be presented with a faire Velvett purse and in it one Thousand pounds in gould and alsoe the Queene with afaire purse of Velvett and in it five hundred pounds in gould as aplege of the Cityyes true and harty affeccion and dutifull obedience unto their Royall Majestys" (McGee 322).
they each kissed before Sir John Finch, speaking for all of them, conveyed their thanks:

Sir, by the Command of your Majestie's most affectionate and loyal-subjects, the Readers and Gentlemen of the Four Inns of Court, we are here to attend you with their most humble thanks, for your great Favour to them, in your gracious acceptance of the tender of their Service and Affections to your Majesty, in the late Masque presented to you, and for vouchsafing your Royal Presence at it.

With "great affability and pleasingness," Charles responded:

Gentlemen, pray assure those from whom you come, that we are exceeding well pleased with that Testimony which they lately gave us, of their great respect and affection to us which was very acceptable, and performed with that Gallantry, and in so excellent a manner, that I cannot but give them thanks for it, and shall be ready upon all occasions, to manifest the good opinion I have of them, and to do them and you in particular any favour.

The same routine was next undertaken with Henrietta Maria, who again told them she had never seen "any Masque more noble, nor better performed than this was, which she took as a particular respect to her selfe, as well as to the King her Husband, and desired that her thanks might be returned to the Gentlemen for it." With the City significantly cash-strapped and the Inns' committee beset with bills for months to come, the Queen's compliment was a costly sign of a small triumph of peace that had been gained between the Crown, the Inns, and the City—a peace that would prove to be short-lived.
Francis Lenton

The enthusiasm with which the Inns' members received the Queen's frank compliments and thanks is conveyed in an eccentric collection of epigrams written by Francis Lenton entitled *The Innes of Court Anagrammatist: or, the Masquers Masqued in Anagrammes*. Unlike the masque that inspired it, the collection was written in explicit celebration of the Inns (and not the Crown). Frank Whigham observes that a subject who has received "positive feedback" from the Crown in response to a gracious gesture might discard (however reluctantly) the acclaim as mere "flattery or self-delusion," either out of a sense of cynicism or paranoia. "As the theoretical force of the audience response becomes increasingly valorized," Whigham argues, "so the need grows for reactive and self-protective (and paranoid) interpretation" (42). By fashioning the Grand Masquers who led the street procession as symbols of the Inns' spirit of independence, Lenton's epigrams demonstrate this very tendency.

Dedicated to "the Foure Honourable Societies, and famous Nurseries of Law, the Innes of Court," the collection articulates a sense of fraternal solidarity with a purpose as brazen as Prynne's is earnest. It thereby enables the "younger sort" of lawyers to strengthen even further their stake in the struggle for a dominant position in the juridical field—a struggle that Prynne's treatise significantly hindered and that their role in the masque only began to facilitate. The collection is divided into four parts, one for each Inn. Each part contains four (sometimes five) epigrams; every one is "in the name of" a barrister of the respective Inn who served as one of the Grand Masquers
in the street procession of Triumph. Every epigram is preceded by one or two anagrams of the barrister's name.

Both the epigrams and the anagrams exhibit the young barristers' developing awareness of both the honorable virtues and remunerative rewards of their profession—the epigrams by emphasizing the stereotypes of a lawyers' behavior, the anagrams by cleverly equating these stereotypes with each lawyer-masquer's name. The bawdy twist that Lenton sometimes brings to this theme reflects the tawdry side of this market of exchange. His three anagrams and two epigrams on John Crawley (Gray's Inn) most clearly exemplify these characteristics. Spelling Crawley's name as "Iohn Cravvley" in order to simplify the reorganization of the letters of his name, Lenton concocts "I Valu Her Coyn," "I Valu Her Cony," and "Con Hie Lawyer." The two related epigrams expand upon these playful linkages between the law, money, and seduction. The first relates the economics of the legal profession to the negotiations between a man and a "handsome woman," and the second casts into a traditionally paternal light the lawyers' duty to maintain the high standards of his profession:

Lawyers (although they use not to purloyne
Like Usurers) yet by instinct, love coyn,
And though distracted Clients doe him curse,
If the cause crosse them, he's nere the worse,
Valuing his or hers, if his due fee:
Or else his tongue will very silent be,

---

146 Because each Inn contributed four Grand Masquers, the expected count of poems would be sixteen, but the total number comes to nineteen. For some reason, Lenton wrote two epigrams for the "hopefull Barrister, . . . the courteous and well spoken, John Crawley, Esq" (Gray's Inn) and two for "that loved Gentleman, Master Arthur Baker" (Inner Temple), whereas he wrote one for everyone else. Lenton also introduces the collection with an additional epigram in honour of Thomas Dayrell (Lincoln's Inn), who served as the Marshall of the procession—a role for which he was knighted "the day after the masque was performed at Whitehall, in reward for his services" (Elliott 200).
But if faire vertue in her soule doth shine,
(Which makes a mortal creature halfe divine)
If coyn hee values more than that, his Name
Himselfe and Anagram, shall beare the blame,
Nor dare I thinke it, cause I know his merit
In that great Masque spoke his more noble spirit.
No, no, brave Masquers, all marke your lov'd Brother,
Values a little of the one, and other.
I heard some Lawyers, tho their fees be comon,
Will take but small fees of a handsome woman:
But tell you truely, he may value either,
So that his valuation wrongeth neither,
Which his mature judgement can decide,
And safe twixt Scylla and Caribdis ride.
Thus you may value both, but (rul'd by me)
Nor Coyn nor Cony should have masterie.

Exalt thy honour, Con, apply thy way
In Law, that thou in Justice seate may sway
The righteous Cause, and make the quarrell even,
By which faire vertue, you aspire to heaven.
Goe on then worthy Barrister, and be
Thy Fathers equall in sincerity:
Nor may the fallacies of time, nor age,
Ecclipse thy glory on this terrene Stage.
Con then, and higher rise in the Lawes lore,
Comfort the rich, timely relieve the poore;
Then shall your vertuous parts, & honour live,
Till I can lave the Ocean with a sieve.

The last anagram and epigram in the collection is written on "the courteous Gentleman, Master Stephen Jay" (Lincoln's Inn). The anagram of Jay's name, "A Hie Step In," introduces a theme of aspiration that the
epigram expands into an account of a law student's climb from the Inns to a position at court:

It is the nature of the soule t'aspire,
And upwards flie, like sparks or flames of fire,
As not contented with this lower frame,
But seeking still the place from whence it came,
Which may the reason be as I suppose,
Why higher spirits doe not here repose,
And set their rest up with a competence,
But strive for honour and magnificence.
Thus by or wealth, or friends they favour win
And to the height doe climbe, a hie step in;
So this brave spirit by his resolv'd endeavour,
Which in a vertuous path did still persever,
By person, parts, and graces of the minde,
The Fates to him a higher place assign'd,
Fro Innes of Court (great'st Gentryes education)
Unto the Royall Court in neare relation;
And that I must account a step in [...]
Which doth approach such twi[...]
[...] lofty step indeed, where I desire
[...] deserts may flourish, and grow higher,
And that each Noble sparke of this brave train,
May serve those Dieties without disdaine.
Set on as this your Brother doth begin,
From Innes of Court, to Court, a hie step in.

Here the Inns enjoy, at least in theory, the last word in the power-struggle that had destabilized many of London's institutions since the publication of Prynne's treatise. The image of the "hie step" that structures the epigram refers as much to the high culture of the court as to the increasing difficulties

147 Certain words in this line and the following three are illegible because a portion of the last page in the original printed edition is missing.
involved in moving from legal commons to positions of influence outside the juridical field.

The concluding line of Lenton's collection—"From Innes of Court, to Court, a hie step in"—grounds the generally jovial tone of his epigrams on a gentle hint of warning. We detect here a careful reference to the increasing frustration, felt both inside and outside the legal quarter, with the growing austerity of the Crown. The masque(s) that initiated these epigrams had everything to do with the new order of expensive mitigation demanded by Charles, and the grossly self-congratulatory tenor of the epigrams illustrates the desperate measures to which the Inns had to resort in order to preserve any sense of proprietorship of the common law. That even the Inns—traditionally one of London's most obstinate sets of institutions—were forced to be so overtly amiable in their dealings with Charles during this period was a vivid indicator of the not-so-symbolic violence that would face the Crown in years to come.
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