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Abstract

During past investigations into early seventeenth-century sacred music practices, scholars have often presumed that due to their differing theological beliefs, the musical preferences of the Puritans and Laudians dramatically diverged. The Puritans are viewed as the enemies of all music except simple congregationally sung metrical psalms. The Laudians are the great innovators, promoting elaborate choral music practices that aligned with their ceremonial ideals. However, through ignoring historical evidence, focussing on the most extensive surviving music collections, not analysing all the available compositional evidence, and listening to figures who ‘shouted the loudest’, this period’s sacred music practices and voiced preferences and prejudices have been habitually exaggerated and over-generalised.

This thesis will present three case studies to address how prevalent certain musical practices, prejudices, and preferences actually were and whether they were solely theologically motivated. In the first chapter, compositional evidence from the Chapel Royal’s early seventeenth-century surviving musical sources will be used to re-examine the motivations behind the Chapel’s musical practices and anthem repertoire choices. It will be revealed that specific religious, practical, political, and economic aims influenced these. The second chapter will address the disputes between the conservative Peter Smart and ceremonial John Cosin at Durham Cathedral. Anthems and eucharistic music from the surviving partbooks will be investigated alongside personal accounts, contextual historical information, and theological beliefs. These investigations will challenge previous assumptions about Durham Cathedral’s practices and to what extent they reflected religious factions and countrywide preferences and prejudices. The third chapter will focus on the fate of musical artefacts during the Civil War and Interregnum. Destruction accounts will be examined alongside legal injunctions, voiced theological beliefs, and records of musical practices before and during the Interregnum. The collated evidence will be used to re-examine Interregnum musical practices and explore what this evidence implies about the Laudians’ and Puritans’ theological musical beliefs.
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**Introduction**

‘O sing unto the Lord a new song: sing unto the Lord, all the whole earth.

Sing unto the Lord, and praise his Name... O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness’

(Psalm 96: 1-2, 9).²

Psalm 96 has become synonymous with the ceremonial sacred music practices that were promoted in early seventeenth-century England. In past scholarly investigations, sacred music practices during this period have often been decisively divided into two categories. These are split between the Puritans and the Laudians. The Puritans are viewed as the enemies of all music except simple congregationally sung metrical psalms. The Laudians are the great innovators, promoting elaborate choral music practices that aligned with their ceremonial ideals. This picture however has been perpetuated as important historical, theological, and compositional evidence has been disregarded.

A huge range of preferences and theological opinions regarding sacred music existed in early seventeenth-century England. It is implausible to completely split these into two distinct categories. Practices and prejudices were firstly not novel to the religious conflicts of the 1620s and 1630s, they had developed far more gradually during the preceding Reformation years. Regarding the Laudians’ purported practices, certain establishments’ collections which happen to have survived, most especially the Chapel Royal, Durham Cathedral, and Peterhouse College, Cambridge, have become the primary focus of many past investigations. When such institutions’ repertoires have been analysed, examinations largely focus on contemporarily famous composers and the most elaborate works. If some of the music is missing or only the text has survived from a work, such pieces are often ignored. Scholars have consequently often determined that such institutions consistently promoted extensive and elaborate musical practices. Leading on from these conclusions, the works that are analysed are then often over-generalised as it is frequently presumed that the Laudians’ musical, theological, architectural, and physical ceremonial practices were comparatively enhanced. Considerations that music may not have always been a centrally important ceremonial practice and that certain institutions’ practices were actually more individualistic are often not incorporated. For example, if a religious establishment is known to have

---

² Ps. 96: 1-2, 9 BCP.
possessed musical artefacts (e.g. organs, scores), it should not be presumed that it therefore
must have encouraged extensive musical practices. Without also investigating the set texts
and compositional techniques, performance practices, and wider theological opinions, these
assumptions are often incorrect. Likewise, regarding the Puritans, it should not be presumed
that complaints against musical, theological, architectural, and physical ceremonial practices
were comparatively voiced. There is evidence that supposedly conservative figures promoted
a diverse range of musical practices throughout the early seventeenth-century and into the
Interregnum, these were not limited to congregationally sung metrical psalms. Moreover, as
complaints against musical practices were quite infrequently voiced, they should not be
automatically associated with wider theological beliefs. It has additionally often been
previously believed that both sides’ musical preferences were encouraged due to theological
beliefs. Such conclusions disregard how other practical, economic, political, and even
personal considerations could also have been influential.

This thesis will present three case studies that will begin to reveal the complexities
surrounding sacred music practices, preferences, and prejudices in early seventeenth-century
England. Before commencing these, it is important to introduce the history and theological
beliefs of England’s religious factions during the early seventeenth century. Explorations into
how past historians and theologians have defined differing groups’ beliefs and practices will
be presented. These investigations will identify how scholarly opinions have evolved to
determine that it is implausible to always conclusively define a person as a Laudian or a
Puritan. A detailed review of past historical and musicological studies that are relevant to this
thesis’ case studies will then be provided. This will consequently reveal what research is still
needed to provide a more accurate picture of the practices, preferences, and prejudices that

England had gone through several stages of religious turmoil prior to the seventeenth
century. This began when Henry VIII broke with the Holy See of Rome and established the
Church of England in 1534. Henry’s successor, Edward VI (r. 1547-53), brought the Church of
England closer to continental Protestantism and introduced the first vernacular Book of

---

3 Joseph Robson Tanner, *Tudor Constitutional Documents* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 17. Henry VIII is here titled as ‘their singular protector, only and supreme lord, and, as far as the law of Christ allows, even Supreme Head’.
Common Prayer. The first 1549 Book of Common Prayer was rejected by many Protestants for retaining too many traditional elements. The 1552 Book of Common Prayer which appealed to more radical protestant reformers was subsequently produced. The Church of England nevertheless retained a similar Catholic ecclesiastical structure with bishops, cathedrals, and church courts. Some traditional offices were also included in the Book of Common Prayer. Under Cranmer, 42 articles that formed a statement of doctrine were produced. A draft of the canon law of the church was also fashioned, but never enacted due to political disagreements. Edward died young at fifteen and was succeeded by his older half-sister, Mary I. During Mary’s brief reign (r. 1553-58), she returned England to Catholicism. Mary died childless and her younger half-sister, Elizabeth I, succeeded her. Although the Church of England was restored, the church still faced instability, fragmentation and contestation from differing Protestant and Catholic factions. The Elizabethan church demonstrated a wide variety of reformed practices often depending on the establishment and contained divines.

Elizabeth took on an almost mediatory position, wanting to reform doctrine but still retaining a preference for traditional ritualistic practices. Although some of the retained traditional practices could have been seen as concessions to appease Catholics, several 1559 parliamentary bills made English Catholics guilty of high treason. England’s subjects also faced fines and imprisonment for attending Catholic Mass, refusing to take an oath to certify their belief in royal supremacy, and defending papal authority.

11 Duffy, *Reformation Divided*.
Many Elizabethan church policies and practices paved the way for the later sixteenth-century Arminian and eventual seventeenth-century Laudian factions. Roger Bowers’ study into the 1559 Elizabethan Settlement revealed that Elizabeth originally appears to have wanted to reinstate the more ceremonial 1549 liturgy. This would have neither appeased Marian Catholics nor the re-emerging Protestants. Due to political pressures, she was forced to base the 1559 revision on the 1552 version. Bower’s evidence demonstrates that Elizabeth particularly aimed to retain certain ceremonies, processions, the use of a crucifix, and vestments that were prohibited in the 1552 version. She initially achieved this through orders such as the ‘ornaments’ clause in the Act of Uniformity to retain the altar crucifix and candlesticks, and vestments. The 1559 Prayer Book also included a clause from the 1552 Prayer Book which read that ‘the chancels shall remain as they have done in times past’. This would have had the effect of preserving certain preceding Catholic ornamental practices. These would have emphasised the Eucharist as the central part of the liturgy. Whilst the 1552 Prayer Book had expunged all but one rubric relating to choral performances, the 1559 Injunctions maintained that ‘for the comforting of such as delight in music’, choirs should be maintained and could sing suitable sections of the liturgy and additional anthems if the music did not mask the word of God.\(^\text{13}\)

The eventual practices that were promoted during Elizabeth’s reign varied greatly according to the religious setting and prevailing divines and political figures. Due to political pressures to remove the emphasis on the sacrament, following the 1559 injunctions, altars were removed along with the candlesticks and crucifixes. The 1566 Advertisements also largely reversed the ruling that parish priests should wear copes during Communion. Parish churches during Elizabeth’s reign therefore promoted simpler practices with little music apart from congregationally sung metrical psalms, especially as they were often blighted by economic instability.\(^\text{14}\) The cathedral churches of England however were partly maintained. These have been described by MacCulloch as ‘a hangover from King Henry’s Reformation which had no parallel anywhere else in Protestant Europe’ and were probably protected due to Elizabeth’s personal preferences.\(^\text{15}\) They utilised Cranmer’s Prayer Book as the basis for


\(^{14}\) Ibid., 342-343.

regular liturgical celebrations that both included ceremonial and musical practices; contrary to Cranmer’s original designs.\textsuperscript{16} Though again, economic instability often negatively affected the feasibility of certain practices, especially musical ones. Elizabeth’s own Chapel Royal retained strong exemptions to the Church’s official ordinances by featuring altar plate, vestments, and elaborate choral music. The Elizabethan mix of old and new liturgical elements and sacred practices led to what is seen as a ‘halfly-reformed church’,\textsuperscript{17} blighted by Protestant instability, a lack of enforced church doctrine, and Catholic contestations.

Around 1600, theologians such as Richard Hooker and Lancelot Andrewes re-addressed questions surrounding the beliefs in predestination and the eucharistic presence, emphasised episcopal government, and celebrated many cathedrals’ more ceremonial practices (these emerging practices will be discussed in greater detail further in this chapter). Into the following reigns of James I and Charles I, sacramental and ceremonially centred theological ideals became further established. At the same time, other Protestants worked to bring more extreme conservative reforms to the Church of England.\textsuperscript{18}

Diarmaid MacCulloch’s study into the myth of the English Reformation recounted that beginning in the seventeenth century, a division between England’s Protestant factions was notably drawn when upon James I’s death, William Laud, noted which members of the senior clergy were ‘Orthodox’ or ‘Puritan’.\textsuperscript{19} Authors such as Peter Heylyn and Jeremy Collier in the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries followingly voiced their disapproval at many of the more conservative Reformation practices. This of course led to rebuttals from Anglican authors such as John Foxe, John Strype, and Gilbert Burnet who stated that these men were ‘taking the very same methods, only a little diversified, that have been pursued in popery, to bring the world into a blind dependance upon the clergy, and to draw the wealth and strength of the nation into their hands.’\textsuperscript{20} These debates greatly influenced nineteenth-century historical studies into the Church of England which were largely dominated in academia by Anglo-Catholics. With so many ambiguous and rapidly altering traditions and policies, these historians purposefully emphasised how Anglo-Catholic practices had been
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consciously retained. They consequently extensively encouraged the view that the early seventeenth-century Laudians’ practices could be categorised as a ‘high-church’ movement. The opposing Puritans were side-lined as being separate from the Church of England.21

More modern historians (since 1964) likewise firstly divided the late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century Church of England into two religious factions, Anglicans and Puritans.22 The Anglicans were characterised by figures such as John Jewel, John Whitgift, Richard Hooker, and William Laud. These men had defended the Church of England’s official ecclesiastical policies. The Puritans had conversely worked to further reform the Church of England and remove ecclesiastical authoritative powers. However, as already demonstrated, to place the Church of England’s religious factions from 1559 to 1642 into just two categories vastly underestimates the spectrum of practices and theological preferences that existed.

Scholars such as Nicholas Tyacke instead proposed that prior to the 1590s, the Church of England was largely unified by shared beliefs. These included the doctrine of predestination and a desire to promote the English Bible and repress Catholicism. The rise of Arminianism in the 1590s disrupted this order.23 Tyacke however incorrectly associated the Puritans with mainstream Calvinism and overemphasised how centrally divisive the doctrine of predestination was.24 Arminianism was further defined by Kenneth Fincham and Andrew Foster as a radically innovative movement that encouraged sacramental and ceremonial practices.25 Tyacke concluded that England’s religious harmony was completely dismantled when the Arminians’ polices were more aggressively promoted in the 1620s and 1630s. This movement was led by William Laud and has consequently become contemporarily known as

24 Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists; Tyacke, ‘Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter Revolution.’
Laudianism. Scholars such as John Fielding and David M. Hoyle further evidenced how the ecclesiastical policies of the Laudians were not novel to the 1620s and 1630s; they evolved out of Arminian beliefs.26

For many years, scholars also often accepted Tyacke’s conclusions concerning the differences between James I’s and Charles I’s religious policies. Tyacke determined that Charles’ tolerance for the Laudians had caused further political tensions to emerge in England; these ultimately led to the Civil War. Laud himself is also often strongly implicated as being instrumental in the country’s downfall.27 Scholars such as Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake have conversely demonstrated that many of Charles’ religious policies stemmed from the 1604 canons.28 Almost all the leading religious figures under Charles had previously been encouraged and promoted during James’ reign.29 These monarchs’ religious policies consequently contain similar hallmarks. They both believed that they held a divine right to rule and aimed to unite the Church of England as the mediator between the dangers of popery and Puritanism. They were nevertheless also more conciliatory towards the Roman Catholic Church. For example, James I encouraged a match between Charles I and the Spanish Infanta, and Charles I later married Henrietta Maria who was openly allowed to practice Catholicism in the English court. These attitudes often led to discontent amongst England’s subjects.30 George Bernard, Kevin Sharpe, and Peter White have likewise demonstrated that Laud’s policies aligned with the beliefs in ‘obedience, order and uniformity’ that James I had endorsed. In the 1620s and 1630s, these were merely more zealously promoted.31

27 Ibid.
28 These canons were the official ecclesiastical laws of the Church of England which all the clergy had to subscribe to. These included 39 Articles of religion and the Book of Common Prayer. Their introduction was particularly significant as the only previous reformed canons had been drafted by Cranmer but never approved.
It is firstly important to explore what past research can tell us about the theological beliefs of the early seventeenth-century Puritans and Laudians. A group of churchmen who encouraged extreme Calvinistic views emerged and evolved in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. These men become derogatorily known as the Puritans; they called themselves titles such as the godly, saints, professors, and God’s children. From Calvinism, they adopted the belief in predestination and man’s inherently sinful nature. They strongly objected to ceremonial sacred practices and believed that everyone should have a deep familiarity and relationship with the Bible. \(^{32}\) They also maintained that the Reformation had not completely eradicated Catholic corruptions. \(^{33}\) Plain churches and extemporary services, featuring lengthy scripture readings and sermons, were instead promoted. These practices enabled people to demonstrate the work of the Holy Spirit, contemplate on the word of God, and show obedience to him.

A ceremonial religious faction that opposed Calvinism also emerged. This began in the later sixteenth-century theological writings of Richard Hooker and Lancelot Andrewes, closely followed by Herbert Thorndike. \(^{34}\) These men believed that the reformers, driven by their hatred of Catholicism and papal corruptions, had eradicated the true ‘grandeur of Christian truth.’ \(^{35}\) Consequently, ‘then are the public duties of religion best ordered when the militant church doth resemble by sensible means that hidden dignity and glory wherewith the church triumphant in heaven is beautified.’ \(^{36}\) In the 1590s, the Arminian movement consequently emerged. Followers rejected the Calvinists’ beliefs in predestination and instead supported the doctrine of salvation. They believed that it was highly important to show reverence towards the altar and especially the sacraments as these were where God and Jesus were represented. Churches were consequently encouraged to move their communion tables into an altar-wise position at the east end and place rails around them. The Arminians thereby

---


\(^{35}\) Ibid., 25.

ensured that the Eucharist was the central part of the liturgy. Services became more structured and further set prayers were introduced.

To increase the dignity and sanctity of sacred spaces and the liturgy, certain divines began to develop even more elaborate and ceremonial worship practices in the early seventeenth century. These were especially encouraged by the Durham House group – titled in reference to Richard Neile’s London house whilst he was Bishop of Durham from 1617 to 1628. Neile welcomed and encouraged discussions between many of the period’s leading theologians including William Laud, John Buckeridge, John Cosin, Augustine Lindsell, Richard Montague, Francis White, and Thomas Jackson. Due to Neile’s influence, patronage, and James I’s support for him, these theologians became highly influential.

Although Neile continued to promote similar ideals and practices after leaving Durham House, the leading theologians of the day had begun to look for guidance and leadership from William Laud. Laud had left the Durham House group in 1626 to become the Bishop of Bath and Wells. He became Dean of the Chapel Royal later this same year, Bishop of London in 1628, and then Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633. With Charles I’s support, ceremonial worship practices were further encouraged. As previously stated, this religious movement has consequently become known as Laudianism.

The Laudians closely followed the Book of Common Prayer’s liturgy as they believed that ‘so lovely and ravishing, that, like the purest beauties, it needs no supplement of Art and Dressing, but conquers by its own attractions.’ Drawing on the Arminians’ practices, they continued to promote the principle that the Eucharist was the most important, central part of the liturgy. They ‘produced some of the best prayers in the Prayer Book, the Anglican orders for the consecration of the churches and... the most satisfactory Eucharistic rite.’ They maintained that the liturgy should edify congregations and guide them towards

---

heaven. Opposing the Puritans’ beliefs, this teaching was not limited to sermons and scripture readings but involved 'whatsoever is a fit means to train and guide us in the way of godliness.' Whilst the Catholic Church had promoted the ideals of the ancient churches, the Laudians believed that these had become over-elaborated and their practices therefore detracted from the liturgy’s true meaning. As stated by Lancelot Andrewes, ‘one canon reduced to writing by God himself, two testaments, three creeds, four general councils, five centuries, and the series of Fathers in that period – the centuries that is, before Constantine, and two after, determine the boundary of our faith.’ The Laudians further believed that as God ‘hath framed that body of yours, and every member of it, let Him have the honour both of head and knee, and every member else.’ As ‘the external worship of God in his church is the great witness to the world that our hearts stand right in the service of God’, physical ceremonial practices and architectural church improvements were encouraged as they enabled people to worship God with their whole being.

During theological investigations, scholars have endeavoured to identify what physical practices were synonymous with the Puritans’ and Laudians’ beliefs. The differences between these religious factions’ architectural policies have been especially focussed upon. It is often concluded that the Laudians promoted innovative ceremonial worship styles and architectural improvements. The Puritans are pictured as the opposition, intent on eradicating the Laudians’ efforts. The Laudians’ altar policies were particularly controversial; they encouraged churches to place their communion tables altar-wise and enhance them with rails, church plate, crucifixes, and tapestries. Such introductions and the debates that surrounded them have received a lot of scholarly attention. Other architectural adornments

42 Ibid., 1: 222.
44 Lancelot Andrewes, Sermons by the Right Honourable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes, Late Lord Bishop of Winchester (London, 1629), 91.
47 Fincham and Tyacke, Altars Restored, 227-273; Addleshaw, The High Church Tradition, 41-44, 53-57.
such as statues, carvings, and stained glass were also encouraged by the Laudians.\textsuperscript{48} It is most commonly concluded that the Laudians promoted these changes to display ‘the beauty of holiness’.\textsuperscript{49} Margaret Aston and Jacqueline Eales have additionally shown that the Laudians’ endeavours often received royal support.\textsuperscript{50} Eales writes,

> on one side the Crown and its advisers, alarmed by what they perceived as a Puritan threat to political order and hierarchy; the Crown’s critics feared that traditional English liberties, including right religion, were being sacrificed in pursuit of Catholic-inspired authoritarian rule.\textsuperscript{51}

More recent studies however have endeavoured to demonstrate that a broad spectrum of theological opinions and practices existed in early seventeenth-century England. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales have redefined Puritanism as a ‘common spiritual and cultural outlook’. It was a ‘unique and dynamic religious culture’ in which varying attitudes and practices were expressed.\textsuperscript{52} Patrick Collinson and Peter Webster similarly concluded that Puritanism was not merely ‘a body of doctrine or as a set of religious and moral principles, it was also a social experience’.\textsuperscript{53} Durston and Eales consequently emphasised that divines and members of the populace should not be labelled as Puritans just because they expressed some of the same behaviours.\textsuperscript{54} Richard Cust and Ann Hughes also warned their readers that we cannot clearly define Puritan policies. Their account of Puritanism suggests that it included elements which were far from conservative or supportive of the status-quo; and it is as misleading to cast the Puritan-Arminian polarity as a progressive-


\textsuperscript{50} Margaret Aston, \textit{Broken Idols of the English Reformation} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).


conservative divide, as it is unhelpful to so categorize conflict in early-Stuart England generally.\textsuperscript{55}

Scholars have equally put forward revisions to the past definitions of Laudianism.\textsuperscript{56} Lake has described the Laudians’ style as ‘a coherent, distinctive and polemically aggressive vision of the Church, the divine presence in the world and the appropriate ritual response to that presence.’\textsuperscript{57} He nevertheless additionally emphasised that Laudianism ‘was not underpinned by an equally coherent argumentative or epistemological foundation.’\textsuperscript{58} Lewis Calvin Lane supports Lake’s conclusions by stating that through ‘developing arguments from scripture, from the practice of the early church or simply from the more obvious need to worship God with reverence, the Laudians shifted their apologetic strategies depending on the moment.’\textsuperscript{59} Lake concluded that it is highly difficult to identify hallmarks of the Laudian style. The practices and preferences of divines who are often labelled as Laudians could still diverge.\textsuperscript{60}

It is therefore not possible to always place divines and the populace in early seventeenth-century England into the two distinct Puritan and Laudian categories. Peter White determined that Protestantism in this period contained a spectrum of opinions.\textsuperscript{61} Kenneth Fincham nevertheless concluded that we cannot completely disregard how certain theological opinions and liturgical practices aligned together. Fincham instead identified that there were four broad categories of theological thought: ‘radial Puritans, moderate Puritans, conformist Calvinists and anti-Calvinists’.\textsuperscript{62} None of these groupings are secure however as various policies and preferences cross over these boundaries. Judith Maltby and John Morrill have likewise evidenced that there were practitioners who occupied a middle ground

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid., 163.
\textsuperscript{60} Peter Lake, ‘The Laudians and the Argument from Authority,’ in Court, Country and Culture: Essays in Early Modern British History in Honour of Perez Zagorin, ed. Bonnelyn Young Kunze and Dwight D. Brautigam (Rochester: Rochester University Press, 1992), 149-175.
between the Puritans and Laudians. Reactions during the outbreak of the Civil War reveal that there were those who believed that the Church of England needed to be reformed, but not to the extremes that the Laudians were encouraging. They supported the episcopy and the Book of Common Prayer, as the Elizabethan and Jacobean churches had, but not the growing ceremonial policies.\(^63\)

This emerging research, which suggests that we cannot securely identify hallmarks of the Puritan or Laudian style, is particularly important to the musicological investigations in this thesis. It will be revealed that it is not always possible to label specific musical practices as Laudian or Puritan; a wide range of preferences and prejudices were expressed. Certain practices were also often promoted due to personal, political, and economic desires, not just theological beliefs. Throughout this thesis, the broad labels ‘ceremonial’ and ‘conservative’ will consequently also be used to describe the differing divines and practices from this period. Relevant descriptions of figures’ religious beliefs are also provided.

It is important to begin this discussion of previous early seventeenth-century English sacred music research with a study that focusses on the slightly earlier Elizabethan period. This is Jonathan Willis’ monograph *Church Music and Protestantism*. Willis builds on and provides important challenges to previous studies of Elizabethan church music by respected scholars such as Nicholas Temperley, Peter Le Huray, Percy Scholes, and Edmund Fellowes. Willis states that ‘the religious music of Elizabethan England both refines and complicates our understanding of the English Reform.’\(^64\) Willis importantly examines different religious establishments’ practices. Through an extensive archival survey of parish churches, it is firstly proven that such establishments did not solely promote plain congregationally sung metrical psalms. Equally, Elizabethan cathedral establishments are shown to have been more adaptable and accepting of congregational psalm singing, rather than exclusively encouraging polyphonic choral music. Willis’ study lays an important foundation for this thesis’ investigations as his research will be built upon into the seventeenth century to demonstrate how an equally complex picture of music practices, preferences, and prejudices existed.


\(^{64}\) Willis, *Church Music and Protestantism in Post-Reformation England*, 244.
There are however problems with Willis’ research methods which this thesis will seek to avoid. For example, the evidence that Willis uses to support his conclusions largely consists of organ maintenance records, musicians’ salaries, pricksong purchases, and psalter collections. He almost entirely avoids analysing set texts and specific compositional practices which can reveal important information about musical practices and therefore cast doubt on his arguments. For example, although he demonstrates that more than 50% of parish churches owned organs, he does not explore how or if they were used. As identified by Magnus Williamson, the parish pricksong books that he identifies are unlikely to have contained mensural part music; therefore Willis’ assessment of the proclivity of polyphonic singing in parish churches becomes questionable. Whilst arguing that cathedral churches were centres of musical excellence, through again avoiding source and compositional investigations, Willis over-generalises the largely centralised elaborate musical practices in Elizabeth’s Chapel Royal. He disregards the evidence that many leading Elizabethan and Jacobean composers were based at the Chapel Royal and therefore the broad statement that the repertoire ‘must stand testament to the abilities of Tudor choirs’ must be treated with caution. Similar errors have been made throughout the existing corpus of research into the early Stuart Church’s sacred music practices.

It is generally accepted that that the Laudians promoted enhanced and elaborate choral practices. The Puritans preferred simple, congregationally sung metrical psalms. As with Willis’ study, several past historical studies have concentrated solely on payments for musicians, organs, and in rare cases, partbook copying projects. Stanford Lehmberg focussed on such records but did not distinguish between pre- and post-Civil War cathedral practices. This period’s theological controversies were consequently disregarded. Claire Cross presented similar evidence during her research into the oppositions that cathedral foundations faced during the Reformation. Both Lehmberg and Cross’ studies incorrectly assumed that these payment records indicate that elaborate and extensive musical practices

were encouraged in the associated establishment. They did not consider how extensively these resources were used, what repertoire was performed, and what performance practices were encouraged. The religious beliefs that divines in the associated establishments held were also often not explored. In his PhD thesis, John Morehen analysed an expansive range of early seventeenth-century partbooks and musical manuscripts. He did not however explore what compositional techniques the repertoire in these sources contained or the associated institutions’ theological principles and practices.68

Past studies have most extensively concentrated on the Chapel Royal, Durham Cathedral, and Peterhouse College, Cambridge. This is largely because these establishments’ extensive music manuscript collections have survived, and their practices were politically significant; many foundations’ sources were destroyed during the Interregnum or have been lost over the years.

Investigations into the early Stuart Chapel Royal have predominantly focussed on the theological motivations behind architectural beautifications, physical ceremonial practices, and the general decorum. Simon Thurley, Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, and Charles Rogers’ studies are prime examples. Their comments on the Chapel’s musical practices focus on its musical artefacts, most especially organ installations.69 Studies, such as Andrew Ashbee’s and David Baldwin’s, also examined the Chapel’s musical employees and payment records.70 It is often automatically assumed that these artefact and financial records demonstrate that the Chapel Royal supported a flourishing choral foundation which exclusively performed elaborate musical works. By not also considering compositional and performance practices, the Chapel’s musical practices are often exaggerated and generalised.

Discussions that extend into the Chapel’s early seventeenth-century repertoire often focus on ‘famous’ composers and their most elaborate and well-known works. These investigations dominate Graham Parry and Peter Le Huray’s studies.71 As in Andrew Gant, Philip Brett, and Matthias Range’s works, the musical practices during significant Chapel
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services (e.g. coronations, marriages, baptisms, and royal visitations) are often concentrated on. These are of course frequently investigated as they were politically significant occasions. Records of the, often compositionally excellent, music that was performed during these services have also survived far more extensively than those that describe the Chapel’s everyday practices. During important services, the Chapel’s musical practices would have been elevated to enhance these politically significant occasions. The performed repertoire is likely not representative of the Chapel’s everyday practices. Many ‘famous’ composers (e.g. William Byrd, Thomas Tallis, and Orlando Gibbons) who produced highly polyphonic works also did not extensively work at the Chapel Royal during the height of the Laudians’ influence in the 1620s and 1630s. Past investigations have incorrectly promoted the belief that the Laudians encouraged the Chapel Royal to exclusively perform elaborate musical works. The view that the Laudians only promoted elaborate musical practices was also consequently furthered.

John Morehen has investigated what types of texts were used in this period’s anthem repertory. His article importantly explores the Chapel Royal’s wider, presumably every-day, repertoire. Further explorations into the textual uses and compositional techniques that the Chapel’s surviving manuscripts contain are nevertheless still needed. Jonathan Wainwright’s ‘King’s Music’ chapter provides a tantalising glimpse into the Chapel’s musical repertoire. He recounts that ‘although more adventurous than many cathedrals – [the Chapel’s music] was still relatively conservative; certainly not reflecting the Italian stile nuovo.’ Apart from Arkwright’s source study of the Rawl. Poet. 23 Chapel Royal wordbook however, no precise compositional evidence is given to support this statement.

Julian Davies and Anthony Milton have considered how the Chapel’s political functions could have influenced its architectural projects and sacred practices. They proposed that these could have been heightened to display the splendour of the English

---


Church, royal court, and monarchy.\textsuperscript{75} As Peter McCullough accounts, the Chapel Royal’s services were ‘one of the most important... political theatres in early modern England.’\textsuperscript{76} Newman has additionally proposed that the Chapel’s practices could have been enhanced to compete with England’s conflicting Roman Catholic faction.\textsuperscript{77} As they had been throughout previous monarchs’ reigns, the seventeenth-century Chapel’s musical practices could likewise have been augmented to contribute to these political agendas. In many of the cited studies that investigated the Chapel’s musical practices however, these alternative motivations are not considered. For example, Morehen’s study is primarily concerned with the theological motivations behind text choices.\textsuperscript{78} The Chapel’s musical practices are attributed to the Laudians’ ceremonial and theological ideals and are therefore often viewed as accurate representations of countrywide theological preferences and practices. As in Willis’ Elizabethan study, the early seventeenth-century Church of England’s musical practices, most especially those in Cathedrals, are consequently incorrectly presumed to have been extensively elaborate.

Durham Cathedral and Peterhouse College, Cambridge’s musical practices have also often been explored. Such investigations are common because these establishments’ extensive collections have survived and their practices were highly controversial. Arguments raged between the conservative Peter Smart and ceremonial John Cosin about Durham Cathedral’s practices, including its musical ones. Smart bitterly complained that Cosin and others had introduced “popish” ceremonial practices.

These foundations and their divines’ musical practices and prejudices have often been greatly over-generalised. Lothar Bleeker’s study of John Cosin’s musical activity paints Cosin as the ideal Arminian.\textsuperscript{79} Fincham and Tyacke, Trevor Cooper, and John Hoffman likewise use Cosin’s practices at Durham and Peterhouse as exemplars of the Laudians’ ‘beauty of holiness’ tradition. Unrelated theological principles are taken from Laudian treatises to defend Cosin’s practices. It is consequently concluded that his musical preferences mirrored

\textsuperscript{75} Davies, \textit{The Caroline Captivity of the Church}, 18-24; Milton, ‘“That Sacred Oratory,”’ 69-96.
\textsuperscript{76} Peter McCullough, \textit{Sermons at Court: Politics and Religion in Elizabeth and Jacobean Preaching} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 74.
\textsuperscript{77} Newman, ‘Holiness in Beauty?,’ 303-312. Newman nevertheless concludes that the Laudians’ policies, even if they appeared to mirror “popish” beliefs, always aligned with their beauty of holiness ideals.
\textsuperscript{78} Morehen, ‘The English Anthem Text, 1549-1660.’
wider Laudian ideals, even though comparisons to other institutions are often not included. When past studies have addressed the Smart/Cosin controversy, it is often presumed that Smart’s prejudices reflected wider Puritan attitudes. Largely due to the aversions that Smart and William Prynne voiced, it is habitually believed that the Puritans objected to all musical practices, apart from the congregational singing of simple psalms. They are often portrayed as the enemies of musical excellence and progress. Willis’ study re-examined Elizabethan attitudes to metrical psalmody which demonstrated how varied attitudes towards these actually were. He concludes that parish churches did not exclusively promote such works; though as previously recounted, his lacking detailed source studies cast some doubt on these conclusions. Cathedrals are also shown to have been more tolerant towards metrical psalmody than previous scholars presumed. It is consequently necessary to examine whether a similarly complex picture of attitudes can be shown to have existed in the seventeenth century.

Scholars such as Brian Crosby and Nick Heppel have cross-examined the Cosin/Smart controversy alongside evidence from Durham’s partbooks. Conclusions were drawn about the significance of Cosin’s contribution to the development of English sacred music, the validity of many of Smart’s grievances (and some possible uses of hyperbole), and how Durham’s practices correlated with wider Laudian beliefs. In their investigations, they especially included works by contemporary Durham composers whose practices were presumably encouraged by the Cathedral’s ceremonialists. However, these scholars rarely analysed the compositional techniques in Durham’s repertoire. They focussed more on identifying works whose texts corresponded with the received complaints. Composers’ lesser known, and often musically simpler, works were also often overlooked. They therefore exaggerated how elaborate Durham’s musical practices were. They additionally did not challenge Cosin’s defences, explore how individualistic certain practices were to Durham, or
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82 Willis, *Church Music and Protestantism in Post-Reformation England*. 
consider the broader implications of their musicological findings. Anderson’s thesis presents an important corpus of editions of music by members of Durham Cathedral’s seventeenth-century choral foundation. However, analyses of the textual usages, compositional techniques, and what these implied about Durham’s musical preferences are not extensively provided. Anderson later began to address the disparity between Durham’s every-day and feast-day practices. He proposed that some of the encouraged musical practices could have been more Durham-local, rather than general Laudian, innovations. Nevertheless, political, economic, and even personal motivations behind musical practices are still very rarely considered.

Some scholars have gone beyond Durham, Peterhouse, and the politically charged practices of the Chapel Royal. Inconclusive evidence however has often been used during such investigations. Erroneous conclusions that elaborate musical practices were widely promoted by the Laudians have been propagated. Fincham and Tyacke recounted that the Cambridge colleges Christ Church, Jesus, Queen’s, and Pembroke all progressively emulated Durham and Peterhouse’s practices. Organ building records or the mere existence of partbooks, as in the case of Christ’s and Pembroke, is the only evidence that they provide. Ian Payne similarly examined expenditure records from Cambridge’s colleges that detail organ building work, other instrumental provisions, and music copying projects. These enhancements are then attributed to the Laudian movement, even though detailed examinations of the associated colleges’ chapters are not provided. John Twigg began to move past these assumptions. He suggested that some colleges (e.g. Pembroke and Trinity) enhanced their musical equipment, and not necessarily their practices, more because they
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86 Fincham and Tyacke, Altars Restored, 227-273.
were pressured to conform to the increasingly popular ceremonial attitudes. Stephen Bicknell and Ian Payne have provided evidence that organs were prevalently built between 1594 to 1610, before the height of the Laudians’ influence. Even in cathedrals whose chapters were dominated by Laudian divines, organs were not consistently erected or maintained. Gloucester Cathedral identified in March 1614 that their organ needed to be replaced, though no work was undertaken. Laud appealed during his tenure as the Dean of Gloucester in 1618 that the organ should be replaced as it was ‘in greate decay and in short time likely to be of noe use’. The organ was nevertheless not replaced until 1640/41. The view that organ revivals were exclusively encouraged by the Laudian movement is therefore implausible. Studies have also often concluded that if an establishment contained musical artefacts, they automatically promoted elaborate musical practices that mirrored Durham’s and Peterhouse’s. Explorations into how organs were played and what repertoire partbooks contained to support these conclusions are not provided. Durham and Peterhouse’s practices have consequently been over-generalised. Moreover, the Laudians’ and the Church of England’s sacred music practices have thus been overinflated.

As previously discussed, scholars have often concluded that the prejudices that figures such as Smart, Prynne, Charles Butler, and George Wither expressed represented wider Puritan views. The spectrum of theological opinions and diverging performance and compositional practices that were promoted in early seventeenth-century England have consequently often been disregarded. Recorded complaints were not actually prevalent, they were merely loudly voiced. Scholars have nevertheless incorrectly presumed that the same prejudices were felt by the Parliamentary Puritans in the English Civil War. It is therefore believed that these views fuelled musical artefact destructions.

These conclusions have firstly been drawn as past studies have exaggerated pre-Civil War sacred music practices. From across the centuries, scholars such as Charles Burney, Edward Dent, and Edmund Fellowes have viewed Elizabethan England as a ‘golden age’ for choral music. Their investigations however largely focus on ‘famous’ Chapel Royal composers

whose compositional techniques were not necessarily representative of wider practices.\textsuperscript{91} It is often believed that the sacred works by composers such as Byrd, Tallis, and Gibbons were centrally important in early seventeenth-century England. The attitude that ‘after the Elizabethans, the greatest figure in the world of music in England is Purcell’ has even been voiced.\textsuperscript{92} Henry Colles likewise stated that ‘there can be no doubt that his [Charles II’s] coming was good for music, for the Puritan rule had forbidden theatres and suppressed cathedral services, so that the grand old church music of Byrd and Gibbons had been long silenced.’\textsuperscript{93} Studies have frequently ignored the Stuart era’s contemporary musical practices which were highly varied and often included performances of simpler repertoire. It is consequently often concluded that the destructions and changes that the Civil War brought were far more extreme than they actually were.

Many studies have focussed on recorded organ destructions; the ‘fanatical onslaught ... made on choirs [and] organs’.\textsuperscript{94} Even Bicknell’s English organ monograph reduces the period of the Civil War and Interregnum to half a page of organ destruction and dismantling records; he instead focusses on the Dallam family’s work in France during the Interregnum.\textsuperscript{95} Le Huray, Lehmbeg, and Kenneth Long likewise concentrate exclusively on these records. It is often believed that the surviving accounts evidence that almost all musical practices were suppressed.\textsuperscript{96} Charles Burney’s opinion that ‘from the death of Charles I till the Restoration ... the gloomy fanaticism of the times had totally prohibited the public use of every species of music, except unisonous and syllabic psalmody’ has prevailed.\textsuperscript{97} The condemnation that the Interregnum was a dark time for sacred music has been propagated. Samuel Gardiner concluded that ‘the work of Cromwell and his associates had been purely negative. They had


\textsuperscript{95} Bicknell, \textit{The History of the English Organ}, 90.


overthrown everything; they had constituted nothing."98 Past music history publications have often almost completely bypassed the Civil War and Interregnum.99

This picture has also been promoted as studies, such as those by John Bumpus and Fellowes, have often exclusively focussed on cathedral practices and records of attacks on these institutions. Historians and musicologists have presumed that comparable destructions occurred across England. Distinctions between cathedral, parish church, and domestic sacred practices are not made. Fellowes, for example, wrote that for ‘some fifteen years Church music was non-existent in England.’100 As stated by Shaw however, ‘cathedral music had no relation to the parish church, nor was any such intended.’101 Long and Temperley’s works have partially addressed this imbalance, but their comments on Civil War practices are still limited.102

Scholars have instead focussed on secular domestic practices to ‘refute the common supposition that Puritan influence impelled the decadence of music in England.’103 Proposals that ‘the energies of composers were directed into exclusively secular channels’ are nevertheless far from true.104 In recent decades, research into sacred music during the Interregnum has become more prevalent. Highly eminent studies have been produced, though these have largely investigated individual composers and the practices at the displaced Oxford court.105

101 Shaw, ‘Church Music in England From the Reformation to the Present Day,’ 696.
The biggest challenge to previous studies’ over-generalisations and exaggerations has come from Percy Scholes. Scholes began to consider how widespread organ destructions actually were and even demonstrated that these instruments were continually used in secular spheres. Domestic psalm collections were also explored. Scholes did not however consider what this evidence implied about the Puritans’ theological views about sacred music. Studies as recent as those by Curtis Price and Kenneth Long drew on Scholes’ discoveries. Charles Carlton proposed that the Parliamentarians’ destructions may not have been solely theologically motivated; other political and personal vendettas played their part. Bronwyn Ellis’ thesis has most extensively built on Scholes’ work. She explored how parliamentary policies, church directives, and the Elizabethan economy had affected musical artefacts before the Civil War. Destruction accounts are also examined with the reminder that they could have been inflated for propaganda purposes. Parish church and domestic practices are analysed to demonstrate that it was not only congregationally sung metrical psalms that were heard during the Interregnum. Alternative practical motivations behind sacred musical artefact destructions are also briefly considered.

Musical artefact destruction records nevertheless still need to be analysed more extensively alongside past musical conflicts, broader theological attitudes, and historical sacred music practices. These investigations would enable scholars to correctly recount what the Church of England’s musical practices were before the Civil War, and therefore how extreme the changes were. Further explorations into how musical artefact destructions related to official Parliamentary orders should be conducted. Studies should distinguish between musical artefact records and compositional and performance practices to consider why objections against artefacts were most frequently raised. It should also be questioned what the destruction records and musical practices that were continued during the Civil War and Interregnum can tell us about the Puritans’ and Laudians’ theological musical beliefs.

As previously discussed, Willis’ monograph laid an important contemporary foundation that revealed how complex Reformation musical practices actually were. This

thesis will consequently aim to reveal a similar picture for sacred music during early seventeenth-century England. The first chapter will provide a forensic investigation of the textual base of early Stuart Chapel Royal worship and the associated compositional techniques by examining the full breadth of the Chapel’s surviving early seventeenth-century anthem repertoire. This study will reveal that the Chapel choir would have performed works that featured a plethora of texts and compositional techniques and not exclusively elaborate pieces. It will be revealed that anthems were composed and performed to defend specific ceremonial religious practices. This chapter will also evidence that practical, political, and economic motivations were influential. Importantly, the Chapel’s recorded practices during significant occasions and everyday repertoire will be considered. A complex picture of the Chapel Royal’s practices will consequently emerge where the repertoire of the Chapel and its choral practices varied according to the occasion. It will also be demonstrated how anthem texts were susceptible to multiple readings which could be contested. These might not have been intended by their authors or composers, but could shift according to audiences, contexts, and times. The practices at Durham Cathedral will be addressed in the second chapter. The disputes between Peter Smart and John Cosin will be re-examined through analysing anthems and eucharistic music from the surviving partbooks alongside personal accounts, contextual historical information, and theological beliefs. Rather than seeking to extrapolate evidence of Durham’s practices from external composers’ works, this chapter will largely focus on the repertoire produced by contemporary, local-Durham composers. It will be shown that Durham’s musical practices were far more varied, and that these composers did not only produce elaborate repertoire as Smart’s testimony has led scholars to believe. Durham’s practices also developed more gradually than previous scholars have suggested. Instead of reflecting the Puritans’ and Laudians’ religious beliefs, or the wider country’s practices, the individuality of Durham’s sacred music practices will be demonstrated. These investigations will also reveal how personal preferences and political and economic desires influenced Durham’s practices. The third chapter will focus on the fate of musical artefacts during the Civil War and Interregnum. Destruction accounts will be examined alongside legal injunctions, voiced theological beliefs, and records of musical practices both before and during the Interregnum. This thesis’ previous conclusions will consequently be vital to these re-examinations. The collated evidence will prove that the early seventeenth-century was not an age of general splendour that gave way to total destruction. It will be evidenced that the
Civil War did not completely eradicate sacred musical artefacts and practices. This chapter therefore further demonstrates that the dividing line between ceremonial and conservative musical preferences has been exaggerated. When these destruction accounts are exemplified, careful examinations as to why these artefacts were ruined will be provided. It will be revealed that many musical artefacts were destroyed as they were viewed as physical idolatrous objects. The performance practices that they helped to produce were not the principal concern. This chapter therefore builds into the seventeenth century on Willis’ Elizabethan focussed arguments that music was a type of *adiaphora*. This is that music was an indifferent matter. Although divines might have disagreed on what sacred musical practices were appropriate, and tried to enforce their differing opinions, it was largely outside the legislative scope as there were very few official ordinances concerning music. Personal and economic desires also appear to have motivated the recorded ruinous reactions. Sacred music practices, preferences, and prejudices during early seventeenth-century England were not all strictly divided between desires to further conservative theological aims or to pursue ‘the beauty of holiness’.
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110 Ps. 96: 9 BCP.
Chapter 1 – The Motivations Behind the Musical Practices and Anthem Repertoire from the Early Stuart Chapel Royal

Introduction
From the early seventeenth-century Chapel Royal, it is unfortunate that very few musical sources have survived. The only source that can conclusively be proven to have originated from the early Stuart Chapel Royal is an anthem wordbook (Rawl. Poet. 23). There is evidence that three bass partbooks (Ojc 180/181 and Lambeth 764) were also from the Chapel Royal, though their provenance is not definite. Detailed records of the Chapel’s musical practices largely only exist for important ceremonial events. Due to the lack of complete musical manuscript sources, past studies have frequently focussed on the musical practices that are exemplified in these accounts. Scholars have consequently often incorrectly concluded that the Chapel consistently promoted elaborate musical practices. As detailed studies of the texts and music that the surviving sources do contain have not been undertaken, the broad range of repertoire that the surviving sources contain has been disregarded.

This chapter will aim to address this gap in the research by investigating all of the Chapel Royal’s early seventeenth-century surviving musical sources. These investigations will focus on the Chapel’s anthem repertoire. The anthem style emerged during Elizabeth I’s reign. Anthems were originally choral compositions that were largely homophonic to ensure that the text could be clearly heard. They were written in either the ‘full anthem’ style, for full choirs, or the ‘verse anthem’ style, for choirs and soloists. The set texts and compositional techniques in the Chapel’s anthem repertoire will be examined alongside contextual information. This will include works’ compositional and performance history, manuscript annotations, accounts of specific Chapel Royal services, and financial records.

Historical studies have increasingly considered how political and economic aims could have influenced the Chapel’s practices. These same deliberations however have often not been included in musicological studies. It is repeatedly assumed that the Chapel’s musical practices were exclusively religiously motivated. They are viewed to have reflected the
ceremonial theological ideals that the Laudian-dominated Chapel encouraged. Detailed analyses of the early Stuart Chapel Royal’s anthems will consequently be presented in stylistically linked sections which will examine why composers chose certain texts and compositional techniques and the motivations behind the Chapel’s repertoire choices. Anthem texts were susceptible to multiple readings which could be contested. These might not have been intended by their authors or composers, but could shift according to audiences, contexts, and times. It will be revealed that specific theological aims, and political and economic desires, influenced composers’ decisions and the Chapel’s practices. It will also be demonstrated that whilst the Chapel’s musical practices were probably heightened more than any other establishment’s, more simplistic anthems can also be found in its sources.

A brief description of how the Chapel’s architectural and physical ceremonial practices developed throughout the early seventeenth century will firstly be provided. Records will demonstrate that all the Chapel’s practices were continually enhanced. Improvements did not just occur during the height of the Laudians’ influence in the 1620s and 1630s. These investigations will also establish that the Chapel’s evolving practices were not just religiously motivated. Thereafter, the Chapel’s musical equipment, personnel, and sources will be exemplified.

The Chapel’s primary function was to conduct sacred services and offer up the court’s prayers to God. Past studies have often presumed that the Chapel encouraged heightened musical practices to add another ceremonial dimension to services. This chapter will evidence that anthems were composed and performed to defend more specific religious practices. These include feast day celebrations, the physical practice of bowing, and the use of choral and instrumental sacred music itself.

It will then be demonstrated how practical motivations would have influenced the Chapel’s repertoire. The utility of certain texts and their potential promotional properties would have influenced composers when they were deciding which words to set. Composers would also have used different compositional techniques depending on the needs of the intended performers and listeners. The Chapel Royal would have likewise considered the

needs of its congregations and the capabilities of its choral foundation when selecting repertoire.

Potential political and economic motivations behind the Chapel’s musical practices will then be explored. This chapter will consider how composers’ text choices and compositional decisions would have been affected by desires to please patrons, earn favour with important poets, nobles, and divines; and gain employment opportunities.

The Chapel Royal was the public face of the Church of England where the monarch’s and court’s religious allegiances were displayed. England’s most significant religious services were celebrated in the Chapel Royal; these included church festivals, weddings, and coronations. Many important nobles and foreign dignitaries would have attended such services. At these occasions therefore, the Chapel’s musical practices would have undoubtedly been politically enhanced to display the splendour and talents of the English Church, court, and monarchy. The need for high quality and elaborate music and poetry even overruled many textual concerns. Anthems with dramatic compositional techniques would also have enabled the Chapel Royal to compete with the court’s secular entertainments; courtiers and visitors would have been far more likely to attend these.

It was also highly important for members of the royal court to express their loyalties to the monarch and England. Anthems in the Chapel’s repertoire that include royalist and nationalistic texts will be exemplified. In addition to general royalist and nationalistic repertoire, works that celebrated, commemorated, and prayed for specific royal occasions were performed. These supported the early Stuarts’ aims to incorporate royalist texts into the Church of England’s liturgy. They provided humanistic support and would have demonstrated the composers’ and performers’ loyalty to the monarch. Works that seemingly contained royal/ caesaro-sacramentalist ideals can even be found. These would have supported James’ and Charles’ beliefs in their divine right to rule. There were nevertheless also anthems whose texts reminded people that God was above all on earth. Other important nobles and divines were similarly honoured through the Chapel’s musical practices. Anthems that celebrated these figures’ safety and enhanced exclusive celebrations and inaugurations were composed and performed.

Royal/caesaro – sacramentalist ideals promoted the belief that the monarch held a divine right to rule and was therefore above all in the church.
There are even anthems in the Chapel Royal’s repertoire that would have warned potential domestic and foreign enemies not to attack England. The country’s divinely-given militaristic powers and the righteousness of the Church of England’s evolving ceremonial practices were demonstrated. Most significantly, there was a growing Catholic community in England, particularly as Charles I’s Queen, Henrietta Maria, was Catholic. Investigations into how composers’ and the Chapel’s chosen techniques and repertoire could have been enhanced to compete with their Catholic counterparts will also be included.

Throughout this chapter, tables that provide contextual information about the discussed anthems will be provided. These will note down the name of the composer, the anthem’s title, the text source (if known), which of the Chapel’s sources the work can be found in, whether it is exclusively contained in the Chapel’s sources, and any other relevant information. These tables are not always exhaustive lists. There are occasions when only the most significant works have been selected and analysed. Background information about the texts that were used in the Chapel’s anthem repertoire has only been included in this chapter when it is necessary to support the prevailing argument. If the reader wishes to explore the utilised text sources further, information can be found in this thesis’ appendix (pages 288-296). This supplementary material has not been provided in this chapter to ensure that the reader is able to remain focussed on this chapter’s musical investigations and the central arguments.

Through providing detailed forensic examinations of the full breadth of the Chapel’s surviving anthem repertoire, a complex picture of the Chapel Royal’s practices will consequently emerge. It will be shown that the Chapel’s repertoire and choral practices varied according to the audience, context, and time. Specific theological, practical, political, and economic considerations greatly influenced the Chapel Royal’s individualistic musical practices.
The Evolution of the Chapel Royal Under James I and Charles I

This chapter centres on the Chapel Royal during the height of the Laudians’ influence in the 1620s and 1630s. However, the Chapel Royal’s enhanced practices (compared to other institutions and noble houses) were established before these years. The changes that were implemented during the early seventeenth century aligned with James’ and Charles’ progressive religious views. For this study, it is not necessary to provide a detailed account of the Chapel’s non-musical practices and decorations. The works of David Baldwin, Simon Thurley, and Peter Lake can be consulted if the reader wishes to explore these enhancements.¹¹³ Records can also be found throughout The Cheque Books of the Chapel Royal.¹¹⁴ It is nevertheless important to briefly explore how the Chapel Royal developed during James I’s and Charles I’s reigns. These investigations will demonstrate that the Chapel extensively promoted a wide range of elaborate ceremonial practices, including musical ones.

It should be remembered that the Chapel Royal was not a set building; the monarch owned and used chapels all over the country. It was the personnel, divines, and musicians who travelled with the monarch who made up the body of the Chapel Royal. These men were responsible for organising and performing divine services for the monarch. Depending on the location and time in the liturgical calendar, the practices and personnel of the Chapel Royal could differ. As in Elizabeth I’s reign, the early Stuarts’ most important places of worship, due to their key accessibility, were in their houses in the Thames Valley. The most important of these were the palaces of Greenwich, Whitehall, and Hampton Court. Records of the practices in these establishments’ chapels have consequently most extensively survived. Architectural improvements were made to these chapels almost as soon as James I’s reign began. The royal pews and closets were decorated; the interiors were painted and gilded; and stained-glass windows, stone carvings, and rich pieces of church plate were installed. The chapels were later especially heighted when the Calvinist James Montague was replaced by the ceremonialisit Lancelot Andrewes as Dean of the Chapel Royal in 1618.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁵ Lake, ‘Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-Garde Conformity at the Court of James I,’ 113-133.
When Charles I ascended to the throne in 1625, he aimed to restore the Church of England to its former glory. His 1640 canons exemplify his beliefs that since Elizabeth I’s time, the said rites and ceremonies had begun to fall into disuse and in place thereof other foreign and unfitting usages by little and little to creep in... whereby it may please Almighty God so to bless us, and this church committed to our government, that it may once return unto the true former splendour of uniformity, devotion, and holy order.\textsuperscript{116}

Further improvements to the Chapel’s architecture, internal fittings, and holy books were consequently made.\textsuperscript{117} The Church of England’s altar policies were especially enhanced during Charles’ reign; the tables were turned altar-wise and adorned with decorative fabrics, tapestries, and church plate. These controversial changes were particularly encouraged by Laud. During Laud’s 1644 trial,\textsuperscript{118} he was accused of introducing and urging other ministers to bow towards the Chapel Royal’s altar, onto which he had placed a crucifix with a naked Corpus Christi during Holy Week. Various other unnamed ‘popish innovations’, probably including the installation of altar rails, elaborate vestments, and organs, were also recorded.

James and Charles also attempted to enhance the Scottish Chapel Royal during their reigns. Conflicts between the Church of England and the Scottish Kirk raged throughout the early seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{119} Enforced alterations were often met with dismay. After becoming the King of England in 1603, James only returned to Scotland once in 1617. For this visit, he gave an ‘expres command and directioun for repairing of his majesties chapell... with daskis, stallis, laftis ... in suche decent & comlie forme & maner as is aggreaible to his majesties princelie estate’ at Holyrood House.\textsuperscript{120} We know that the Scottish Presbyterians

\textsuperscript{117} A rare record of the improvements that were carried out on Whitehall’s internal fittings can be observed in: Fincham and Tyacke, \textit{Altars Restored}, 228.
were appalled at these changes. Charles also made changes to the central royal religious establishments in Scotland. These included Holyrood’s chapel and St Giles’ Abbey; this was used for Charles’ 1633 Scottish coronation. The Scottish congregations again expressed their dissatisfaction with the Anglican rite at Charles’ coronation. It ‘bred great fear of inbringing of popery’. The chapels at Falkland Castle, where Charles stayed after his coronation, and Stirling Castle were also redecorated. Before leaving, both James and Charles gave orders that the ceremonial services should be maintained in the Scottish chapels ‘for example’s sake to the kingdom’. It can consequently be concluded that the Scottish chapels were likely improved in line with the London ones to quash the Scottish Presbyterians’ practices and promote the Church of England’s evolving ceremonial beliefs.

The Chapel’s heightened ceremonial practices were supposedly implemented to accentuate the sanctity of the buildings and the liturgy that took place within. Rich architectural decorations and displays of decorum would have demonstrated the religious allegiances of the court and monarch, and the splendour of England and its church. These modifications would have demonstrated that the Chapel supported the Church of England’s emerging and evolving ceremonial practices. Theological beliefs in decorum, sanctity, and order, which were important to both James and Charles, would likewise have been promoted. From 1623, James enforced a set of orders for ‘civility in sithings either in the chaple or elswhe in the court.’ These instructed that his subjects should attend public worship at least once a week, even though he himself did not uphold this rule. The Chapel’s congregations were instructed to approach and enter services in a dignified and orderly manner. They were not allowed to wear boots or spurs, and directions pertaining to
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125 Anthony Milton, “‘That Sacred Oratory’,” 86.
when and how headwear was to be worn were given. Courtiers were also told where they could sit, depending on their rank. Charles reissued, and made several additions to, James’ 1623 orders during the 1630s. For example, Charles encouraged the singingmen, groom, sergeant and yeoman of the vestry, and other Gentlemen of the Chapel Royal to improve their behaviour. Laud also persuaded Charles to attend the whole Sunday service, rather than merely arriving in time to hear the sermon as his predecessors had done. In 1637, whilst at Hampton Court and Greenwich, Charles expressed how disappointed he was that the congregations were so small. He consequently instructed that all courtiers, privy councillors, and members of the royal household should receive communion at least once a year. If they did not do so, they were suspended. They were then only allowed to return if they obtained a letter from the Dean of the Chapel Royal to say that they had subsequently received communion. The Chapel Royal’s heightened practices were also important to other religious establishments across England. It was noted that ‘the King’s chapel… or the King’s practice in his chapel maybe… is the best interpreter’ of the ‘rubrics, laws and canons of the Church.’ Other institutions consequently used the Chapel Royal to their advantage by citing the Chapel’s elaborate ceremonial practices in defence of their own. In particular, divines such as Christopher Potter and Laud used the Chapel Royal’s altar policies to refute criticisms from men such as John Bastwick, Henry Burton, and William Prynne. In Peter Heylyn’s *Antidotum Lincolniense*, which defended the new ceremonial altar policies, Charles I is presented as a pious and religiously righteous monarch. Heylyn praised how Charles had encouraged the restoration work at St Paul’s and writes,

> when did you ever find a king that did so seriously affect Church work, or that hath more endeavoured to advance that decency and

---

126 Thurley, ‘The Stuart Kings, Oliver Cromwell and the Chapel Royal 1618-1685,’ 241.
128 Milton, “’That Sacred Oratory’”; 84; Rogers, *History of the Chapel Royal of Scotland*, clviii-clix, clxxvii. Charles I’s orders and practices were supported and guided by his ministers.
comeliness in the performance of divine offices which God expecteth and requires than his sacred majesty?... [he has] set a copy to his people how to perform all true humility and religious observations in the house of God.  

Nevertheless, the Chapel Royal also held a highly significant political function. It provided a very public view of the monarchy where important services were celebrated, petitions could be passed to the King, and political ambassadors and visitors were hosted. Improvements to the Chapel were also made when it was preparing for important ceremonial celebrations such as Princess Mary’s christening in 1605, James’ return to Scotland in 1617, and Charles’ Scottish coronation in 1633. These events would have been attended by many important and foreign dignitaries. It can consequently be proposed that practical and political considerations also inspired both James and Charles to ceremonially heighten their chapels’ fittings and practices; these would have displayed the splendour and power of the English monarchy, court, and Church.

Such demonstrations would have been especially encouraged as James and Charles both wanted to reconcile England with the Roman Catholic Church and countries who followed Catholicism. The Chapel could have been improved due to James I’s ambition that Charles would marry the Spanish Infanta. This marriage ratification ceremony at Whitehall Palace’s chapel on 20 July 1623 was supposedly immortalised in a German/ Netherlandish engraving. Art historians and architects have however concluded that this engraving is a fictitious realisation, likely produced as a propaganda tool to promote the event throughout Europe. Descriptions and the debates surrounding this engraving can be found in Simon Thurley and Jonathan Wainwright’s referenced studies.  

132 Peter Heylyn, *Antidotum Lincolniense* (London, 1637), 85. This book was commissioned by Charles I. It is therefore possible that a certain amount of royalist propaganda and flattery was included by Heylyn.
133 Francis Walsingham, *A Search Made into Matters of Religion* (St Omer, 1609), 31-33.
It is nevertheless still likely that Whitehall and Greenwich’s furnishings and architectural decorations were designed to appeal to the Spanish Catholic King. Such improvements would in turn have made these chapels into suitable locations for the desired elaborate wedding ceremonies.  

When League Treaties were reaffirmed (with Spain in August 1604, and France in January 1611), these always involved a ‘diplomatic’ service. This would have been conducted in the Chapel Royal with the Kings and ambassadors in attendance. The Chapel Royal’s decorations and practices could consequently have been heightened for these important events to demonstrate England’s political and religious power. 

---

136 Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church*, 20; McCullough, *Sermons at Court*, 33-35. James I also commissioned Inigo Jones to rebuild Whitehall’s Banqueting House; this was completed to a highly elaborate standard in 1622. It is likely that these improvements were also influenced by James’ aim that the splendour and power of England would be displayed during the desired marriage celebrations.  

It was stipulated in the Spanish marriage treaty between Charles and the Spanish Infanta that two new central royal chapels were to be built, though these would not be Church of England establishments. Roman Catholic chapels were commissioned at Somerset House and St James’ Palace for the Spanish Infanta. Between 1623 and 1625, a Catholic chapel at St James’ was built; this being the traditional residence of the Prince of Wales.\(^{138}\) Although this marriage treaty never came to fruition, the chapel at St James’ was completed and used by another Catholic royal in later years: Charles I’s wife, Queen Henrietta Maria.

Henrietta Maria, the youngest daughter of Henry IV of France, was a devout Catholic. It was dictated in her 1624 marriage contract that she would be free to practise Catholicism in her own chapel in England. When the chapel at St James’ was completed however, Charles had already ascended to the throne. Henrietta Maria was therefore in the process of moving her household to the official residence for the King’s consort, Somerset House. Somerset House’s chapel had of course previously belonged to Anne of Denmark, James I’s wife. Although improvements were made, this chapel was seemingly still deemed unsuitable. Inigo Jones’ 1623 plans were revived, and a brand-new, extremely elaborate chapel was built at Somerset House between 1630 and 1635;\(^{139}\) this chapel will be described in more detail later in this chapter (pages 155-156). The Queen’s court and chapel unsurprisingly became a magnet for Catholic recusants. As attempts to only allow the Queen’s closest servants and courtiers to attend services in this chapel were unsuccessful, several high-profile conversions to Catholicism occurred.\(^{140}\) It is consequently possible that James’ and particularly Charles’ Chapel Royals were also heightened to compete with these Catholic counterparts and dissuade further people from converting to Catholicism.

It is additionally probable that court protocol, rather than religious beliefs, motivated the shows of decorum that James and Charles encouraged in their Chapel Royals. For example, the order that anyone below the ranks of the nobility should remove their hat could have been enforced to show respect to the King and courtiers.\(^{141}\) Furthermore, Charles’
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\(^{138}\) Thurley, ‘The Stuart Kings, Oliver Cromwell and the Chapel Royal 1618-1685,’ 241-242; Baldwin, The Chapel Royal, 99-100.


\(^{140}\) Thurley, ‘The Stuart Kings, Oliver Cromwell and the Chapel Royal 1618-1685,’ 247-248; Sharpe, The Personal Rule of Charles I, 304-307; Birch, The Court and Times of Charles the First, 315.

ruling that members of the court had to receive holy communion at least once a year hardly seems enough to have ensured true religious devotion. The hierarchical seating arrangements in the Chapel and the decorative royal closets and pews could also have been controversially included to celebrate James’ and Charles’ beliefs in their divine kingship and royal supremacy.

**The Chapel Royal’s Musical Equipment, Personnel, and Sources**

Various improvements to the Chapel’s musical equipment were made throughout James’ and Charles’ reigns. The organ loft, music pew, and galleries, as depicted in the Spanish marriage treaty ratification engraving, were real elements of Whitehall’s chapel. For James’ 1617 visit to Holyrood in Scotland, a Dallam organ was built and installed. This cost £133 6s 8d, and Inigo Jones designed an elaborate case for it.\(^{142}\) During Charles’ reign, organs were repaired, given elaborate cases, and even newly built in his English residencies.\(^{143}\) Descriptions of these organs are very rare. Records of payments to Edward Norgate, ‘Keeper of his Majesty’s Organs’ have nevertheless survived. Norgate carried out repair work at Whitehall, St James’, Hampton Court, and Greenwich. For example, he was paid £140 in February 1637 for ‘the altering and repair of the organ in the chapel of Hampton Court and for the making of a new “chayre organ” there conformable to those already made in the Chapels at Whitehall and Greenwich’.\(^{144}\) Whitehall chapel’s organ is described as a ‘double organ’ with a ‘Great’ and ‘Chair’ organ. The last recorded payment to Norgate was in January 1641.\(^{145}\)

It is also important to explore what musical personnel the Chapel employed. The head of the Chapel Royal was the Dean and under him there was a sub-dean who was elected from the chaplains. There were 32 ‘Gentlemen’, otherwise known as the singingmen, the

---


\(^{145}\) Ibid., 42, 48, 60, 63, 66, 80, 85, 97, 101, 106 134, 138, 141, 144, 150, 154, 156; Wainwright, ‘Precedents for the Symphony Anthem,’ 10.
organists, Master of the Children, and twelve choristers. The Chapel Royal was of course naturally able to attract the highest quality performers and composers.

Music was performed during morning and evening prayer every day. The Gentlemen were paid £40 a year, though they were not required to attend all the services. According to Laud’s ‘Orders for the Attendance’, they all performed on Sundays and major feast days. On the other days, they operated on a one month on, one month off rota. The Chapel’s musical practices were therefore seemingly heightened on Sundays, Feast Days, and at ceremonial occasions such as coronations, weddings, and inaugurations. James’ 1623 orders also instructed that when the King and Prince of Wales were absent from morning and evening services, the liturgy should be sung ‘like a Collegiatt church’; unless the royal family was on progress away from that chapel.\textsuperscript{146} As the practices between collegiate chapels varied so greatly during the early seventeenth century, it is impossible to ascertain exactly what this order implied. It can nevertheless be assumed that the Chapel’s musical practices would have been reduced when the monarch and royal family were not in attendance. The Gentlemen also received three months off in the Summer when the King went on progress, and eight other weeks off in the year.\textsuperscript{147} Several Gentlemen consequently held dual positions at other institutions. For example, Thomas Tomkins also worked at Worcester Cathedral, Giles Tomkins at Salisbury Cathedral, and Richard Portman at Westminster Abbey.

Instrumentalists were also employed in the early seventeenth-century Chapel Royal. Aside from the organ, cornetts and sackbuts were regularly played upon during the Chapel’s services.\textsuperscript{148} From December 1633, a rota ‘to be observed throughout the year by his Majesty’s musitions for the wind instruments for waiting in the Chapell and at his Majesty’s table’ was established.\textsuperscript{149} It is likely that the Chapel’s wind players doubled the choir’s vocal lines or possibly performed independent parts in verse anthems. Although no instrumental partbooks from the Chapel have survived, William Lawes’ ‘Before the mountains were brought forth’ is subtitled in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook as ‘an anthem with Verses for

\textsuperscript{147} Ashbee and Harley, eds., \textit{The Cheque Books of the Chapel Royal}, 1: 111–113.
\textsuperscript{149} Ashbee, ed., \textit{Records of English Court Music}, 3: 74, 81, 94.
Cornetts and Sagbutts’. The engraving of the Spanish marriage treaty ratification ceremony depicts various figures playing ‘a cornett, a violin being played ‘chin-off’, sackbut, trumpet(?) or another sackbut, and a bass violin’. It is however possible that such an elaborate collection of instrumentalists was only used at especially important services, such as this ratification.

A letter from Dean Cowper of the Scottish Chapel Royal to James in September 1618 noted that ‘the organs and musicians, four on every part, men and boys, agreed in pleasant harmony, to the contentment of all, because they understood what was sung’. On 24 January 1631/32, Edward Kelly reported to Charles that Holyrood employed 16 men, six boys, and an organist; the singers were seated antiphonally. An organist and ‘two men for playing on the cornets and sackbuts, and two boys for singing divisions in the verses’ were added to this existing roster during Charles’ reign. Kelly was a prebend of the Scottish Chapel Royal, director of music, and receiver of the revenues. Kelly also informed Charles that Holyrood’s chapel had a specific room for the boys to practise in. Unlike the English Chapel Royal, the boys wore ‘sad coloured coats’ and the men wore black gowns. Before the sermon was preached, Kelly noted that the choir sang a full anthem and afterwards, ‘an anthem alone in verses with the organ’. On Charles’ command, communion was also accompanied by trumpet fanfares. For Charles’ Scottish coronation, a large proportion of the English Chapel Royal’s musicians (16 gentlemen, eight boys, two organists, and officers of the vestry) sailed to Scotland. We fortunately also know the names of these men as they were recorded in the chamberlain’s papers.

Within two months of returning to England after his coronation, Charles wrote to Dean Bellenden of the Scottish Chapel Royal. He instructed Bellenden to improve the Scottish Chapel Royal’s musical practices. Services were to be sung twice a day ‘with the choir, as well in our absences as otherwise’. Bellenden wrote back that the Chapel did not have the finances to support such activities. The gentlemen there were already not being paid

152 This extensive collection of instrumentalists may have been another fictitious part of this engraving.
154 Baldwin, The Chapel Royal, 170; David Baldwin, Royal Prayer: A Surprising History (London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2009), 44.
155 Baldwin, The Chapel Royal, 171.
156 Stevenson, The History of the Church and State of Scotland, 143-144.
regularly; this was a common problem for musicians at this time. Laud promised them relief, but none seemingly came. Suspicions that Edward Kelly was embezzling these funds consequently arose. The skills and duties of the musicians in the early Stuart’s Scottish Chapel Royals were undoubtedly less than their English counterparts. Both James and Charles nevertheless seemingly aimed to ceremonially heighten the Scottish Chapel Royal’s musical practices, in line with England’s.

The musical practices that the Chapel Royal promoted were not new Laudian innovations. Since Elizabeth I’s reign, a resurgence of the belief that more elaborate music should be used to praise God had been occurring. Nevertheless, as the Chapel Royal’s surviving partbooks were probably mainly copied during the Laudian heights of the 1630s, these demonstrate that there was a renewed focus on the importance of sacred music.

Payments for music copying projects were very infrequently logged into the Chapel Royal’s Cheque Books. In the Cheque Book, it is nevertheless revealed that the wages of deceased Chapel Royal Gentlemen were used to finance these. It is recorded that

all dead Payes fro[m] the death of any Gent until the swearing of him

yt is to suckseed in the place is of Ancient Costome due to the Clarke

of the Check. Provided another be chosen before the end of the

moneth afterwards the pay goeth to the Kings or as he shall please to

dispose of wch of the late hath been ymployed for Chappell books of

Services and anthems and pricking of them.

Some specific records of music copying jobs were recorded in the Old Cheque Book.

1621 – ‘Anthony Harrison Clark died the xxth of ffebruarie:…. the wages

in the meane tyme was disposed of by ye Deane for pricking of songes,

& for a new sett of books for the Chappell, & other dispensinges &

allowances by his said Lo[0]:.

1623 – ‘Wm Bird died… To Mr. Stephens the xxxixth of May… pte for

pricking of a sett of books for the iijliij. To him the this of December

---

157 Baldwin, The Chapel Royal, 177.
161 The Chapel Royal Register (1560-1643), MS Rawl. D. 318, Rawlinson, Bodleian Library, Oxford.
for pricking in the books iijli xijl. Itm, for ij quire of ruled [paper..].

Item, M’ Stephens the third of May 1627 for paper, pricking 20 smale booke for the Chappell iijli iji‘.

1623 – ‘John Amery died...To m’ Stephens for pricking as in the next before iijli.’

1625 – ‘John Croker died...To m’ Tomkins xl-s for Composing of many songes against the Coronacon of Kinge Charles. To m’ Stephens for pricking those songs xxxl.’

1625 – ‘John Cooke died... To m’ Stephens towards the pricking of songes in the sett of books iiiijli xii.

c. 1625 – ‘Peter Hopkins died... To m’ Stephens, in full paiem1 of xxxviijl

ixl, for pricking the said sett of booke xijli xixl.’

There are unfortunately no earlier or later records of Chapel Royal music copying projects. John Stevens, the Stephens in the above records, was listed in 1625 as ‘Recorder of Songes’ in the main Cheque Book.¹⁶³ Stevens became a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal from 1590 and was also appointed as the Clerk of the Cheque in 1627; he held this position until his death in 1636. There are presumably further musical manuscripts that Stevens copied for the Chapel Royal during his tenure as ‘Recorder of Songes’ that were not individually logged.

Charles also aimed to improve the Scottish Chapel Royal’s musical repertoire before his coronation. Edward Kelly visited London in 1630 to carry out a music copying project. He produced ‘twelve great books, gilded, and twelve small ones with an organ book’, though unfortunately, none of these have survived.¹⁶⁴

As previously described, only four musical manuscripts from the early seventeenth-century English Chapel Royal have survived and all of these source’s provenances cannot be securely confirmed. These are the manuscripts that have been investigated in this chapter. Brief descriptions of the contents and copying date ranges for these collections are provided below. For more detailed information about these sources, please see this thesis’ prefatory material (pages 21, 25, and 27).

¹⁶³ The Chapel Royal Register (1560-1643), MS Rawl. D. 318, Rawlinson, Bodleian Library, Oxford.
¹⁶⁴ Baldwin, The Chapel Royal, 170; Baldwin, Royal Prayer, 44.
The first of these is the only surviving manuscript that has been securely proven to have come from the early Stuart Chapel Royal. This is the Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson Poetical 23 (Rawl. Poet. 23) manuscript. This is a wordbook containing a large collection of full and verse anthem texts. The penultimate leaf in this wordbook includes a list of ‘The King’s Chaplains in ordinarie attendance 1635’. Through observing the references to members of the royal family such as King Charles, Prince Charles, and Prince James; the list of chaplains; and known composition dates, Rawl. Poet. 23 was almost certainly copied between 1634 to 1635.

Lambeth Palace, Archiepiscopal Library, MS 764 (Lambeth 764) is a single bass partbook which contains a large collection of late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century ‘preces and festal psalms’, ‘services’, ‘verse anthems’ and ‘full anthems’. This partbook’s repertoire is highly similar to the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook’s. Even though several of the contained anthems’ composition dates are known and references to King Charles are made, it can only be concluded that this partbook was copied sometime between 1633 to 1642.

The final two surviving manuscripts are the Oxford, St John’s College Library, MS 180 and 181 (Ojc 180/181) bass partbooks. Both feature separate sections for services, full anthems, and ‘anthems alone’ (verse anthems); the Ojc 180 partbook also contains various preces and psalms. The repertoires in these two sources are entirely different, there are no duplicated works. The contents of these partbooks are again highly similar to Rawl. Poet. 23’s and Lambeth 764’s. As with the Lambeth 764 partbook, past 1633 to 1642, a more exact copying date range for these partbooks has yet to be discovered.

---

165 Rawl. Poet. 23, 310.
Motivations Behind the Musical Practices and Anthem Repertoire from the Early Stuart Chapel Royal

Specific Religious Motivations
The Chapel Royal primarily provided a religious centre where services were conducted, and prayers were offered up to God. Scholars have often concluded that the Chapel Royal’s sacred music practices reflected the Laudians’ and Charles I’s ceremonial worship preferences. However, sacred music performances were not just another way to display the ‘beauty of holiness’. Through examining the full breadth of Chapel’s repertoire, the contained set texts and compositional techniques support several more specific religious beliefs and practices. By composing and selecting pre-existing anthems with texts that contained authoritative biblical and Book of Common Prayer texts, such works could defend the Chapel’s ceremonial practices. These include feast day celebrations and the importance of the Eucharist, the physical practice of bowing, and the use of choral and instrumental sacred music itself.

Feast Day Celebrations and the Central Importance of the Eucharist
One of the most important purposes of the Chapel’s anthem repertoire appears to have been to support the Laudians’ strongly held beliefs in hierarchy and order, which James and Charles shared. The importance of celebrating feast days, and enforcing the central importance of the Eucharist, was consequently impressed. These enhanced sacramental beliefs had of course evolved from the Arminians’ practices. The Laudians believed that in accordance with the practices of the ancient churches and the Book of Common Prayer’s ritual and calendrical observances, holy days should be restored to their former glory with even more ceremonially enhanced services. From the 1559 Book of Common Prayer, ‘The Table and Calendar: Expressing the Order of the Psalmes and Lessons, To Be Said at the Morning and Evening Prayer Throughout the Year, Except Certain Proper Feasts, as the Rules Following More Plainly Declare’ was therefore closely followed. Whilst complaints from more conservative figures about feast days had been raised throughout the sixteenth

century, these had mainly concerned how these days were marked with drinking and feasting.\(^{168}\)

Charles regularly attended the Chapel Royal’s feast day services. His presence reinforced how important it was to honour these days. The court gentlemen ushers were also instructed ‘to send warning to all noblemen wheresoever they be in towne’ to remind them to attend the Chapel Royal on any ‘high day or any other holyday’.\(^{169}\) A large number of the Chapel’s anthems include texts from the seasonal collects, lessons proper for Sundays and holy days, and the proper psalms for certain feast days; these can be seen in table 1.1. These would have supported the Laudians’ and early Stuart monarchs’ shared aims to augment feast day services.

Table 1.1 – Anthems that include texts from the festal collects, the proper psalms, and proper lessons at morning and evening prayer for Sundays and certain feast days
(Ordered according to the 1559 Book of Common Prayer’s Liturgical Calendar)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Feast Source</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>Hear, O heavens, and give ear (v)</td>
<td>Isaiah 1: 2,4, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20; 40: 31</td>
<td>First Sunday of Advent, Matins, proper lesson</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Jesus came when the doors were shut (v)</td>
<td>John 20: 26-29</td>
<td>St Thomas the Apostle’s Day subtitled ‘The Antheme’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>Behold, I bring you glad tidings (v)</td>
<td>Luke 2: 10, 11, 14</td>
<td>Nativity of Christ, Matins, second lesson</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Portman</td>
<td>The Lord spake to Ahaz (v)</td>
<td>Isaiah 7:10-14</td>
<td>Nativity of Christ, Evensong, first proper lesson</td>
<td>Lambeth 764</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{168}\) Hugh Latimer, a sixteenth-century divine, stated that ‘the Devil hath more service done unto him on one holiday, than on many working days’. Hugh Latimer, *Sermons by Hugh Latimer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844), 53.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Collect</th>
<th>Subtitle</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Hooper</td>
<td>Almighty God, which hath given us thy only-begotten son</td>
<td>Christmas Day Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘The Collect for Christmas Day’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>Almighty God, which hath given us thine only-begotten son</td>
<td>Christmas Day Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Anthem for Christmas Day’</td>
<td>Ojc 180 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons?</td>
<td>Almighty father, which didst give</td>
<td>Proper Preface, BCP</td>
<td>Christmas Day, and 7 days after, subtitled ‘An Antheme for Christmas Day’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Portman</td>
<td>The heavens declare the glory of God</td>
<td>Psalm 19: 1-5, 12, 14</td>
<td>Christmas Day, Matins, first Proper Psalm</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Tomkins</td>
<td>Thou art fairer than the children</td>
<td>Psalm 45: 3-6</td>
<td>Christmas Day, Matins, second Proper Psalm</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Arise, O Lord, into thy resting place</td>
<td>Psalm 132: 8-10</td>
<td>Christmas Day, Matins, third Proper Psalm</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Stephen being full</td>
<td>Acts 7: 55-56</td>
<td>St Stephens Day, Evensong, second lesson subtitled 'St Stephan’s Day’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Merciful Lord, we beseech thee</td>
<td>St John the Evangelist Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Anthem for St John Evangelist Daye’</td>
<td>Ojc 181 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Almighty God, whose praise this day</td>
<td>Holy Innocents Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Anthem for Innocents Daye’</td>
<td>Ojc 181 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>Mortify and kill all vices</td>
<td>Innocents Day Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Anthem for Innocents day’</td>
<td>Lambeth 764</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Hooper</td>
<td>Almighty God, which madest thy blessed son</td>
<td>Circumcision Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Circumcision Day’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bull</td>
<td>Almighty God which by the leading</td>
<td>Epiphany Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Starre Anthem’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Psalm or Reading</td>
<td>Subtitle</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet.</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>Almighty and everlasting God, mercifully look (f)</td>
<td>Epiphany 3 Collect</td>
<td>'The Collect for the Third Sunday after Epiphanie'</td>
<td>23 Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Byrd</td>
<td>Teach me, O Lord (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 119: 33-38</td>
<td>Festal Psalm (after preces) for Epiphany, Evensong</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Almighty and everliving God, we humbly beseech thy majesty (v)</td>
<td>Purification of the BVM (Candlemas) Collect</td>
<td>'For Candlemas Day'</td>
<td>23 Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Almighty and everlasting God, which hatest nothing (f)</td>
<td>Ash Wednesday Collect</td>
<td>Ash Wednesday Collect</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tomkins</td>
<td>We beseech thee, O Lord, pour thy grace (v)</td>
<td>Annunciation of the BVM Collect</td>
<td>'Antiphona'</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cobe</td>
<td>O most gracious God (v)</td>
<td>Easter Eve Collect</td>
<td>Easter Eve</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>If ye be risen again (v)</td>
<td>Colossians 3: 1-4</td>
<td>Easter Sunday, Epistle</td>
<td>23 Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Byrd</td>
<td>Christ rising (v)</td>
<td>Romans 6: 9-11, 1 Corinthians 15: 20-22</td>
<td>Easter Day, Matins, first lesson and Tuesday in Easter, Evensong, second lesson</td>
<td>23 Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Christ rising (v)</td>
<td>Romans 6: 9-11, 1 Corinthians 15: 20-22</td>
<td>Easter Day, Matins, first lesson and Tuesday in Easter, Evensong, second lesson</td>
<td>Ojc 181 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Subtitle</td>
<td>URL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>We praise thee O Father (v)</td>
<td>Collect and Proper Prefect, BCP</td>
<td>Easter season collects, Proper Preface to Easter and 7 days after</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Easter Day’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Byrd</td>
<td>Exalt thyself, O God (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 57: 6, 8-12</td>
<td>Easter Day, Matins, second proper psalm</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Hooper</td>
<td>O how glorious art thou (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 113</td>
<td>Easter day, Evensong, first proper psalm</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles Tomkins</td>
<td>In thee, O Lord, have I put my trust (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 31: 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 6, 27</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Anthem for St Markes Day’</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Almighty God, which hast instructed (v)</td>
<td>St Mark Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Anthem for St Markes Day’</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>O God, the King of Glory (v)</td>
<td>Ascension 1 Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Ascension Day’</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Portman</td>
<td>Lord, who shall dwell (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 15</td>
<td>Ascension day, Matins, second proper psalm</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tomkins</td>
<td>The King shall rejoice (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 21: 1, 3, 5, 7, 13</td>
<td>Ascension day, Matins, third proper psalm</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Tomkins</td>
<td>O God, when thou wentest forth (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 68: 7, 8, 16</td>
<td>Ascension day, Evensong, second proper psalm, also Whitsunday, Matins, second proper psalm</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Hooper</td>
<td>Behold, it is Christ (f)</td>
<td>Acts 10: 42-43</td>
<td>Whitsunday, Matins, second lesson</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Giles</td>
<td>God, which as on this day (v)</td>
<td>Whitsunday Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Whitsunday’</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Text (v)</td>
<td>Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled</td>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>God, which as upon this day</td>
<td>Whitsunday Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Anthem for Whitsunday’</td>
<td>Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Giles</td>
<td>Have mercy on us, Lord</td>
<td>Psalm 67</td>
<td>Whitsunday, Matins, proper psalm</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Hooper</td>
<td>I will magnify thee</td>
<td>Psalm 145: 1, 2, 9, 10</td>
<td>Whitsunday, evensong, second proper psalm</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert White</td>
<td>Let thy merciful ears</td>
<td>Trinity 10 Collect</td>
<td>Trinity 10 Collect</td>
<td>Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>This is the record of John</td>
<td>John 1: 19-[23]</td>
<td>St John Baptiste Day Subtitled ‘An Antheme for St John Baptist’s Day’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael East</td>
<td>As they departed</td>
<td>St John Baptist’s Day Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Anthem for St John Baptist Daye’</td>
<td>Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>Almighty God, who by thy son</td>
<td>St Peter Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘An Antheme for St Peter’s Day’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Giles</td>
<td>Everlasting God, which hast</td>
<td>St Michael &amp; All Angels Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Michaelmas Day’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Almighty God, which hast knit</td>
<td>All Saints’ Day Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘All-Saint’s Day’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The collect of the day, which was used during Holy Communion and as the first of three collects during Morning and Evening Prayer, was seemingly a popular text choice for composers; at least 84 collect settings have survived in early seventeenth-century sources. Collects were season-specific prayers that were written for particular occasions in the Church’s calendar. Many collect anthems were copied into the Chapel Royal’s sources with designations that describe which feast day they were associated with. It is therefore probable that these works were used on that feast day to enhance the celebrations. It is unsurprising
that texts from the major church festivals were popular; these include Christmas, Whit Sunday, All Saints’ Day, the Circumcision, Epiphany, and Trinity. There are also settings for saints’ days that the Church of England had sanctioned; these include St Peter, St Mark, St John the Evangelist, Ascension Day, and St Michael and All Angels. There are no anthems for saints’ days that are not featured in the Book of Common Prayer as celebrating the cult of saints was discouraged by the Church of England. These compositions and their performances would have supported the Laudians’ and Chapel’s beliefs in celebrating feast days and seemingly the central importance of the Eucharist.

Through examining the Chapel’s surviving ferial collect settings however, collect anthems do not appear to have been especially promoted to exemplify the sacramental importance of the Eucharist. There are only two ferial collect settings in the Chapel Royal’s sources. Thomas Tomkins’ ‘Almighty God, the fountain of wisdom’ and William Byrd’s ‘Prevent us, O Lord’ feature texts from the eight post-offertory collects at Holy Communion. These were ‘Collectes to be sayd after the ofertory when there is no Communion’. ‘Almighty God, the fountain of all wisdom’ is an elaborate, polyphonic work with surprising and almost unearthly harmonic shifts, particularly during the final ‘Amen’.

172 Booty, ed., The Book of Common Prayer 1559, 266.
Whilst ‘Prevent us, O Lord’ is more homophonic, it does contain some expressive imitative and polyphonic vocal textures. Harmonically, the ending of this anthem is particularly striking.\footnote{Ibid., 34-35. (Transposed up a minor third and note values halved)} ‘Prevent us, O Lord’ appears to have been very popular in the Chapel Royal as it was listed in the Old Cheque Book as one of the anthems that was performed during the Royal Maundy service. This description proceeds:

The Order of the Maundy

The Subdean begins the Exhortation, Confession, and Proper Psalm for the occasion, Psalm. 41. Then the Lesson, St John, cap. 13\textsuperscript{th} from verse 1\textsuperscript{st} to verse 18; which ended, his Ma\textsuperscript{st}, (attended by the Lord Almoner and the white staves) goes to the poore men in order, sprinkles their feet with a sprig of hyssop dipt in water, wipes them

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
and kisses them; which ended, his Majestie returns to his chair of State.

Then begins the first Anthem, which let be, Hide not thou thy face from us, O Lord &c.; which done, the Lord Almoner distributes the shoes and stockings. He being returned, **sing the second Anthem, which let be, Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings**, [my emphasis] &c.; which done, he distributes the cloaths, woollen and linen. Being return’d, sing the third Anthem, which let be, Call to remembrance, O Lord, thy tender mercyes; which done, he distributes the purses; and being return’d, sing the fourth Anthem, which let be, O praise the Lord all ye Heathen, &c.; which done, he distributes the fish and bread. After which, being returned, the Gospel is read, St Mat. 25th from ver. 14th to the end; which ended sing the last Anthem, which let be, O Lord, make thy servant King Charles, &c.176

With the ceremonial pomp that accompanied the alms distributions and as five prescribed anthems were performed, the Royal Maundy services appear to have been especially important; the Gentlemen were also paid 20s for their participation in this service.177 This service would have demonstrated the monarch’s generosity and piety. Although no composer designations are provided, this description most likely refers to Byrd’s ‘Prevent us, O Lord’ anthem. Whilst Byrd set a post-offertory collect text, this anthem was probably not exclusively used at this point during the Eucharist.

The only other work that uses a eucharistic text is the anonymous anthem ‘Godliness is great riches’; this sets one of the offertory sentences. These sentences were listed in the 1549 Book of Common Prayer alongside the instruction, ‘then shall folowe for the Offertory, one or mo, of these Sentences of holy scripture, to bee song whiles the People doo offer, or els one of them to bee saied by the minister, immediately afore the offeryng’.178 This directive was changed in the 1552 Book of Common Prayer, the sentences were instead to be

---

177 Ibid.
said by the officiant. It is consequently probable that this anthem did not replace the spoken sentence. It is additionally possible that this setting was not extensively encouraged in the Chapel Royal as its text criticises those who hoard riches on earth. This would have opposed the Laudians’ and Chapel’s usages of rich copes, plate, and other architectural sacred ornaments.

With so few surviving settings and the Book of Common Prayer’s directives, it is likely that these ferial collect anthems did not replace their set texts. If they did, it is probable that they would have been reserved for particularly important ceremonial Communion services. As no settings of the two fixed collects from Matins and Evensong that were recited after the seasonal collect have survived, it is also likely that festal collect settings did not often replace the spoken text during the Eucharist. The primary function of collect settings consequently appears to have been to enhance their associated feast day. It is important to note that feast days were very public occasions in the Church’s, and especially the Chapel Royal’s, calendar. Later in this chapter, investigations to determine whether musical practices were also enhanced in the Chapel on feast days due to political and royalist influences will be presented.

**Bowling**

The Laudians also encouraged all clergy, singers, and congregational members to bow before the altar when approaching it; objections to these physical ceremonial practices were often raised. The Puritan divine Peter Smart criticised how some at Durham Cathedral practiced ‘ducking’ and ‘make a low legge’ in his 1628 sermon. Charles Chauncy testified before the High Commission Court in 1635 against certain new ‘popish’ ceremonial practices. Chauncy was a vicar at St Mary’s Church, Ware and then Marston St. Lawrence before he emigrated to New England in 1637. Chauncy recorded how ‘they will have priests and ministers, altars not communion tables, sacrifices not sacraments; they will bow and cringe to and before their altars’. Several publications that defended this practice were consequently produced.

---


180 Peter Smart, The Vanitie & Downe-Fall of Superstitious Popish Ceremonies, or, A Sermon Preached in the Cathedral Church of Durham by one Mr. Peter Smart, a Præbend there, July 27. 1628 (Edinburgh, 1628), 12.

181 Charles Chauncy, The Retraction of Mr. Charles Chancy (London, 1641).
These most famously include William Page’s *A Treatise or Justification of Bowing at the Name of Jesus* and Giles Widdowes’ *Lawless, Kneeless, Schismatical Puritan*; both were published in 1631. Page was a fellow at All Souls, Oxford and Widdowes was a divine in Oxford for much of his life. Both men emphasised that these actions were permitted by Canon 18:

> In time of Divine Service the Lord Jesus shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, as it hath been accustomed; testifying by these outward ceremonies and gestures, their inward humility, Christian resolution, and due acknowledgment that the Lord Jesus Christ, the true and eternal Son of God, is the only Saviour of the world, in whom alone all the mercies, graces, and promises of God to mankind, for this life, and the life to come, are fully and wholly comprised.\(^{182}\)

Widdowes in particular also cited how, throughout the English Reformation, many prominent religious figures had not objected to the sacred practice of bowing.\(^{183}\)

Two of the Chapel’s anthems include texts that endorse this practice. These are Nathaniel Giles’ ‘O Lord, turn not away thy face’ and William Mundy’s ‘O Lord, I bow the knees’.

**Table 1.2 – Anthems that support the physical ceremonial practice of bowing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Giles</td>
<td>O Lord, turn not away thy face (v)</td>
<td>The Lamentation of a Sinner (S &amp; H – John Marckant)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Mundy</td>
<td>O Lord, I bow the knees (f)</td>
<td>Prayer of Manasseh</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{182}\) Anon., *Sermons or Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches* (London, 1833), 443.

Both works espouse how all should ‘bow the knees of my heart’\textsuperscript{184} and ask God to ‘turn not away thy face from them that lieth prostrate’.\textsuperscript{185} Mundy paints this action through downwards falling phrases for the text ‘I bow the knees of my heart’.\textsuperscript{186}

\textbf{Extract 1.2 – William Mundy ‘O Lord, I bow the knees’ (bars 1-5)\textsuperscript{187}}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{anthem.png}
\caption{William Mundy, O Lord, I bow the knees of my heart,\textsuperscript{187}}
\end{figure}

It is important to state that Mundy was a prominent composer during Elizabeth’s reign, therefore he would not have composed this anthem with the express intention of defending Jacobean/ Caroline attitudes to bowing. Moreover, although Giles worked for James I, John Marckant’s set text was originally published in John Day’s 1562 collection. This text was therefore not written as a statement to endorse sacred ceremonial practices that involved bowing and kneeling. These works therefore demonstrate how anthems and texts were susceptible to multiple readings and could be repurposed to fulfil ceremonial aims. These anthems were probably selected and performed to defend the ceremonial practice of bowing, which would have been encouraged by the Laudians and in the Chapel Royal.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[\textsuperscript{184}] Rawl. Poet. 23, 13.
\item[\textsuperscript{185}] Ibid., 111; Nathaniel Giles, ‘O Lord, turn not away thy face,’ in Nathaniel Giles: Anthems (Early English Church Music 23), ed. J. Bunker Clark (London: Stainer & Bell, 1979), 102-116.
\item[\textsuperscript{187}] Ibid. (Original key and note values halved)
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Sung and Instrumental Sacred Music

As previously mentioned, enhanced sacred music practices were not newly introduced to the Chapel Royal during the height of the Laudians’ power in the 1620s and 1630s. Elizabeth I favoured composers such as Byrd and Tallis throughout her reign. The musical practices in her Chapel were more elaborate than those in any other contemporary English religious establishment. James I and Charles I similarly ensured that their Chapels cultivated superior musical foundations. As criticisms of sacred music practices were raised, it is unsurprising that several anthems in the Chapel’s repertoire include texts that defend sacred singing and instrumental playing. Sections from the Bible are most commonly found in these works which would have demonstrated how musical practices were encouraged in scripturally authoritative texts. A few unidentified, presumably extra-devotional, texts were also used.

Table 1.3 – Anthems that support the use of singing and instruments to praise God

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>My beloved spake (v)</td>
<td>Canticles 2: 10-13</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bull</td>
<td>Praise we the Lord our God (v)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Byrd</td>
<td>Sing joyfully unto God our strength (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 81: 1-4 (Genevan Bible)</td>
<td>Raw. Poet. 23 Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“</td>
<td>Sing ye to our God (Lord) (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 149: 1-4 (1599 Primer)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“</td>
<td>O be joyful (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 100 and doxology</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Child</td>
<td>O let my mouth be filled (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 71: 7-8, 22: 11?; 86: 6; 84: 8</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Ford</td>
<td>All glory be to God on high (f)</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“</td>
<td>Let us with loud and cheerful voice (v)</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Source(s)</td>
<td>Use?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>This is the day wherein the Lord (v)</td>
<td>Wither – Psalm 56 for ‘Easter Day’?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Giles</td>
<td>I will magnify thee, O God (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 30: 1-4, 11-13</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O give thanks unto the Lord, for he is gracious (f)</td>
<td>Paraphrases of psalms (four lines)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O sing unto the Lord a new song, let the congregation (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 149: 1, 5; 30: 4; 145: 10; 148: 13; 116: 13; 149: 9; lesser doxology</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Hooper</td>
<td>O God of Gods, O King of Kings (v)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hunt</td>
<td>O light, O blessed Trinity (v)</td>
<td>Latin of the Hours (Sunday Vespers, second and fourth weeks of the Psalter) and a Vespers hymn for the ferial office on Sundays and Trinity Sunday.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O lux beata Trinitas (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Lawes</td>
<td>Before the mountains were brought forth (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 90: 2-7, 13-14</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Porter</td>
<td>Awake, thou lute and harp (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 108: 2-4; 113: 6-7 (112 in wordbook); 113: 1-2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Lord, though thou hast searched me out (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 139: 1, 2, 6-8; 73: 24; 71: 21; 72: 18</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Portman</td>
<td>O sing unto the Lord a new</td>
<td>Psalm 149: 1-4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composers</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Give sentence with me, O God</td>
<td>Psalm 43: 1-6</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23, Ojc 180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My beloved spake</td>
<td>Canticles 2: 10-13</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23, Peterhouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O sing unto the Lord a new song, let the congregation</td>
<td>Psalm 149: 1-2</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23, Ojc 180, Lambeth 764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several composers drew on a psalm text that has become commonly associated with the Laudians’ musical practices. This is Psalm 149, ‘O sing unto the Lord a new song’. These works extoll the use of singing to praise God. Amongst these, only the music from Thomas Tomkins’ setting has fully survived. This anthem features polyphonic vocal parts throughout, apart from the effective homophonic rendering of the text ‘let the congregation of saints’. Imitative, ascending dotted figures for the text ‘rejoice in him’ illustrate this psalm’s joyful message.\textsuperscript{188}

---

Anthems that include texts which support the use of instruments to praise God also appear in the Chapel’s sources. Byrd’s ‘Sing joyfully’ instructs God’s people to ‘take the song, bring forth the timbrel, the pleasant harp, and the viol. Blow the trumpet in the new moon’. This six-voiced, almost madrigalian style anthem is extensively contrapuntal and contains word painting techniques throughout. The opening text is illustrated through a series of upwards leaps in the medius, contratenor, and tenor voices. The combined force of the six voices is firstly heard for the line ‘sing loud unto the God of Jacob’. In the second verse, which calls for people to ‘take the song, bring forth the timbrel, the pleasant harp, and the viol’, syncopated rhythms are used to create dance-like textures. Upwards strumming motifs are passed between the voices to represent the ‘pleasant harp’. The sound of a ‘viol’ being played is painted through an elaborate melismatic phrase in the second contratenor part. All

189 Ibid., 47, 51. (Transposed up a minor third and note values halved)
of the voices then embody the ‘trumpets’ through coming together in a homophonic fanfare before the same phrase is imitatively passed between them.\textsuperscript{190} From its copying records, this is seemingly one of this period’s most popular anthems.

Extract 1.4 - William Byrd ‘Sing joyfully’ (bars 24-34)\textsuperscript{191}

Edmund Hooper’s ‘O God of Gods, O King of Kings’ encourages a particularly elaborate collection of instruments. The set text directs, ‘all laud be given. With organs, trumpets, and with flutes, with cornets, clerons and with lutes, with harpes, with cymbals and with shalmes, with sacred anthems, hymns and psalms’. Extensive multi-parted, imitative verses lead into contrapuntal choruses with melismatic closing phrases. The final chorus is


\textsuperscript{191} Ibid., 85-86. (Transposed up a minor third and original note values)
especially elaborate as it expands into 12 antiphonal vocal lines. The multitudes of instruments that people are encouraged to use to praise God are consequently imitated.\textsuperscript{192}

The production of these anthems and their inclusion in the Chapel Royal’s repertoire would have demonstrated that the described ceremonial practices were royally endorsed. The use of biblical texts that promoted these ceremonial practices would have further theologically defended the Chapel’s practices. Moreover, the Chapel Royal was often viewed as an establishment that perfectly embodied the Church of England’s ideals. Performances of these anthems in the Chapel Royal could therefore have been cited by other institutions to defend any similar ceremonial practices.

**Practical Motivations**

One of this chapter’s primary aims is to investigate how the Chapel’s anthem repertoire choices were influenced by non-religious motivations. It is pertinent to start with the composers themselves and consider their practical reasons behind text and compositional technique choices. Composers could have chosen texts based on how easy they were to set and whether they could use previous works as compositional models. They would also have avoided repressed texts, particularly unofficial psalm translations. Extra-devotional texts could have been chosen if composers already had a working relationship with the author. Composers would also have considered how they could promote their work through setting popular texts, ones that past successful compositions had used, and even ones that included puns on their name. Congregational needs, the capabilities of the intended performers, and even where the works were originally published would have affected which compositional techniques were chosen. The needs and capabilities of the Chapel Royal’s choral foundation would have likewise influenced repertoire choices.

**How Practical Considerations Influenced Composers’ Text Choices**

Composers would naturally have favoured texts that could easily be set to music. For example, Sternhold and Hopkins’ widely favoured metrical psalms were largely written in the popular ballad metre and contained simple language. These attributes could have drawn Nathaniel Giles to these texts; Giles prolifically set these translations.

Table 1.4 – Anthems that include Sternhold & Hopkins’ metrical psalms and hymn texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Giles</td>
<td>Have mercy on us Lord (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 67 (S &amp; H)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O hear my prayer O Lord (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 102 (S &amp; H)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O how happy a thing it is (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 133 (S &amp; H)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Lord in thee is all my trust (v)</td>
<td>A Lamentation (S &amp; H)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Lord, my God, in all distress (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 71 (S &amp; H)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Lord, turn not away thy face (v)</td>
<td>The Lamentation of a Sinner (S &amp; H – John Marckant)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Giles was an organist and composer who served as the Master of the Choir of St George’s Chapel, Windsor (srv. 1585-97) and as a Gentleman and Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal (srv. 1597-1634).193 Throughout his career, Giles would have been enveloped in the royalist and evolving ceremonial culture of the English court. Whilst Giles’ compositions largely contain vocal lines with unadventurous textures, there are some more elaborate harmonic moments. For example, in the opening of ‘O Lord, my God, in all distress’, the voices in the full chorus passages consistently fall by a step to create descending, dissonant thirds.194 (Giles’ Sternhold and Hopkins’ settings will be continually explored in this chapter’s next subsection).

The Stationers Company, who held the psalm printing royal patent, strongly promoted Sternhold and Hopkins’ psalms. Many alternative psalters were consequently repressed.\textsuperscript{196} With the persecution that other translations could face, it is understandable that composers would have largely avoided these substitutes.

Nevertheless, although they were not officially sanctioned, composers could have been drawn to other translations because they already had a working relationship with the poet. Henry Lawes’ anthem ‘Make the great God thy fort’ features Thomas Carew’s version of psalm 91.

\textsuperscript{195} Ibid., 90. (Transposed up a minor third and note values halved)
\textsuperscript{196} James Doleman, ‘George Wither, the Stationers Company and the English Psalter,’ \textit{Studies in Philology} 90, no. 1 (1993): 72-84. For example, the Stationers Company had already objected to the unlicensed publication of George Wither’s \textit{Motto} (1621) and had refused to comply with the royal patent granted to Wither’s \textit{Hymnes and Songs of the Church} (1623). The \textit{Psalms of David} was Wither’s third publications that faced persecution and suppression.
Table 1.5 – Anthem where the composer and poet had a working relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lawes</td>
<td>Make the great God thy fort (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 91</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although only this anthem’s text has survived, several notable annotations were included in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook.

Figure 1.2 - Henry Lawes ‘Make the great God thy fort’ (Rawl. Poet. 23, fols. 125-126)\(^{197}\)

Lawes’ setting appears to have largely featured solo or duet verses, apart from the final four-part verse. The choruses also repeat text from their preceding verses, thereby increasing the clarity of the text. Lawes also set Carew’s translations of Psalm 137, ‘Sitting by the streames’, and Psalm 104, ‘My soule the great Gods praises singes’, as symphony anthems. Although these works are not listed in the Chapel’s sources, they can be found in GB-Lbl Add. 31434 and in a printed pamphlet entitled *Select Psalms of A New Translation, To be Sung in Verse and Chorus of Five Parts, with Symphonies of Violins, Organ, and Other Instruments, Novemb. 22. 1655. Composed by Henry Lawes, Servant to His Late Majesty*. These symphony anthems could have been performed one-to-a-part in Charles I’s privy chamber, or even in the Chapel Royal itself, especially as Lawes was a member of the royal band in the ‘lutes and voices’ and

\(^{197}\) Rawl. Poet. 23, 125-126.
Clerk of the Cheque in the Chapel Royal. Lawes also set Carew’s poetry in his secular compositions and produced music for Carew’s famous masque, *Coelum Britannicum*. Having cultivated a strong working relationship, Lawes consequently appears to have greatly admired Carew’s writing. A setting of one of Carew’s psalms is therefore not an unusual choice for Lawes.

Composers also appear to have considered how certain texts could have promoted their work. Some texts were set by multiple composers, but it is not obvious why they were favoured. It can be proposed that previously successful anthems and texts could have been used as compositional models.

Table 1.6 – Anthems with texts that could have been copied from previous compositional models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Psalm Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Cobb</td>
<td>The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 20: 1-6</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Giles</td>
<td>O Lord in thee is all my trust (v)</td>
<td>A Lamentation (S &amp; H)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Holmes</td>
<td>The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 20</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tallis</td>
<td>O Lord in thee is all my trust (f)</td>
<td>A Lamentation (S &amp; H)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tomkins</td>
<td>The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 20</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Composers could have set the same texts from popular anthems in the hope that their work would be similarly successful. For example, ten settings of the Sternhold and Hopkins’ hymn ‘O Lord in thee is all my trust’ have survived; two of these can be found in the Chapel Royal’s sources, and will be discussed later in this chapter. The success of Thomas Tallis’ setting, which was originally printed in John Day’s *Certaine Notes Set Forthe in Foure and Three Partes* (1560), could have inspired other composers to use this text. Three settings

198 Wainwright, ‘Precedents for the Symphony Anthem.’
of the royalist text ‘The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble’ can also be found in the Chapel Royal’s wordbook; only the texts for these anthems have survived. This psalm text trusts that ‘the Lord helpeth his Anointed’\textsuperscript{200} and ‘will hear him from his holy heaven’. \textsuperscript{201} Composers could have been drawn to this text as it was probably royally favoured.

Some texts even appear to have been selected as they featured a pun on the composer’s name.

Table 1.7 – Anthems that feature a pun on the composers’ name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Crosse</td>
<td>Hear me O God, a broken heart (v)</td>
<td>Ben Jonson – <em>Hymn to God the Father</em></td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Palmer</td>
<td>Almighty and everlasting God, who of thy tender love (v)</td>
<td>Collect for Palm Sunday</td>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>N (Not in CR sources)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

William Crosse’s anthem ‘Hear me, O God, a broken heart’ features the poem ‘A hymn to God the Father’ by Ben Jonson; no music for this work has survived.\textsuperscript{202} A pun on the spelling of Crosse’s name can be seen in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook.

\textsuperscript{200} Rawl. Poet. 23, 203.
\textsuperscript{201} Ibid., 225.
Similar motivations appear to have influenced Henry Palmer’s text choices. His anthem ‘Almighty and everlasting God, who of thy tender love’ features the Collect for Palm Sunday,”204 this work is not featured in the Chapel’s collections. These texts choices would surely have been intentional and would have publicised the composers and their works.

How Practical Considerations Influenced Composers’ Compositional Techniques and the Chapel Royal’s Anthem Repertoire Choices

As this chapter has and will continually demonstrate, a wide range of compositional techniques appear in the Chapel’s musical sources. Whilst there are works with more complicated and polyphonic vocal settings, these are not featured as extensively as previous scholars have suggested; many simpler works can also be found. These could have been primarily incorporated to uphold the Church of England’s official directives that works which could be ‘plainly understood, as if it were read without singing’ should be encouraged.205 Nevertheless, congregational needs, publication origins, and the capabilities of the intended performers must have influenced compositional technique decisions.

203 Rawl. Poet. 23, 158.
204 Morehen, ‘The English Anthem Text, 1549-1660,’ 76-77.
Sternhold and Hopkins’ psalter was often bound alongside copies of the Bible and Book of Common Prayer. These translations were therefore widely available and would have been recognised by many congregations. Although writing in the later seventeenth century, Bishop William Beveridge accounted that ‘they [congregations] have got many of them [Sternhold and Hopkins’ psalms] by heart... They also that cannot read... can say many of them by heart.’ The Chapel’s congregational members would presumably have also been familiar with these settings, especially as literacy skills would largely not have been a problem. Although the congregational members would not have sung these choral anthems, if the set texts were widely known, they would still have been able to listen to, understand, and share in, the word of God.

Table 1.8 – Anthems with texts which congregations would have been familiar with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Psalm Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Giles</td>
<td>O Lord in thee is all my trust (v)</td>
<td>A Lamentation (S &amp; H)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“</td>
<td>O Lord, turn not away thy face (v)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Tye</td>
<td>I lift my heart to thee (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 25 (S &amp; H)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Weelkes</td>
<td>All laud and praise (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 30 (S &amp; H)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some settings of these psalm translations included simpler compositional techniques, presumably to aid the congregations’ comprehension. Giles set two metrical hymns from Sternhold and Hopkins’ psalter; ‘O Lord in thee is all my Trust’, otherwise known as ‘A Lamentation’, and ‘O Lord turn not away thy face’, subtitled ‘The Lamentation of a Sinner’. ‘O

---

206 Hannibal Hamlin, “Very Mete to be Used of all Sortes of People”: The Remarkable Popularity of the “Sternhold and Hopkins” Psalter,’ *The Yale University Gazette* 75, nos. 1/2 (2000): 41. 1588 (ESTC 2475), 1604 (ESTC 2512a), 1606 (ESTC 2519), 1609 (ESTC 2528), 1612 (ESTC 2539), 1916 (ESTC 2555). Sternhold and Hopkins’ psalter was most frequently bound with copies of the Genevan Bible.

Lord, turn not away thy face’ only includes solo verses, apart from a final duet verse. The choruses are also largely homophonic and include repeats of the text from their preceding verses. Thomas Weelkes’ ‘All laud and praise’ is a verse anthem setting of Psalm 30. The four soloists do not sing together, except in the final verse. The chorus sections also consistently feature borrowed musical material and repeat the concluding words from their preceding verse. The compositional techniques that Giles and Weelkes chose appear to reflect the simplicity of the translations, Sternhold and Hopkins’ conservative aims, and would have improved the clarity of the texts.

More complicated musical settings of Sternhold and Hopkins’ psalms have nevertheless also survived. ‘I lift my heart to thee’ by Christopher Tye is included in the Chapel’s sources. Tye was Ely Cathedral’s master of the choristers and organist (srv. 1541-61). This full anthem is a five-voiced setting of psalm 25 and features some elaborate compositional techniques. The opening builds through long polyphonic phrases to almost homophony for the second phrase ‘O God most just’. The word ‘just’ is also harmonically intensified through a suspension and resolution.

---

208 Giles, ‘O Lord, turn not away thy face,’ 102-116.
210 For information about Ely Cathedral’s musical practices, please see: Ian Payne, ‘Music and Liturgy to 1644,’ in A History of Ely Cathedral, ed. Peter Meadows and Nigel Ramsay (Woodbridge, Boydell Press, 2003), 225-244.
Tye’s work ends with an extensive melismatic ‘amen’ section, though this is a common compositional feature. Composers could have defended their use of more polyphonic and elaborate compositional techniques which opposed the Church’s official directives by setting a widely recognised and poetically accessible text.

Simpler compositional techniques could have been decided upon because of where a work was originally published.

---

211 Christopher Tye, ‘I lift my heart to thee,’ in Christopher Tye: English Sacred Music: I (Early English Church Music 19), ed. John Morehen (London: Stainer & Bell, 1977), 101-102. (Transposed up a minor third and note values halved)
212 Ibid., 99-124.
Table 1.9 – Anthems with compositional techniques that were likely influenced by their publication origins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>O Lord, I lift my heart to thee (f)</td>
<td>William Leighton - <em>The Teares or Lamentations of a Sorrowful Soule</em> (1613)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23, Lambeth 764</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tallis</td>
<td>O Lord in thee is all my trust (f)</td>
<td>A Lamentation (S &amp; H)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tallis’ ‘O Lord in thee is all my trust’ was published in John Day’s *Certaine Notes Set Forthe in Foure and Three Partes* (1560). This collection provided simple and undemanding choral settings for the three principal services in the Anglican liturgy. Tallis’ full and highly homophonic anthem setting is therefore very fitting.²¹³ Orlando Gibbons’ ‘O Lord, I lift my heart to thee’ set William Leighton’s paraphrase of Psalm 25. This anthem was featured in Leighton’s 1614 collection, *The Teares or Lamentacions of a Sorrowfull Soule*. Leighton seemed set for greatness, his family were members of the Shropshire gentry, he became a Member of Parliament for Much Wenlock in 1601, was made a Gentleman Pensioner in 1602, and was knighted in 1603. From 1604 however, a series of poor, backhand financial deals and debts led to ‘a wofull, large and long experience of imprisonment, troubles, crosses, sickness and afflictions’. Leighton wrote a collection of repentant poems whilst in Marshalsea prison: *The Teares or Lamentacions of a Sorrowfull Soule* (1613). He informed the readers of this collection that ‘I intend (God willing) likewise to divulge very speadely in print, some sweete Musicall Ayres and Tunable Accents’. True to his word, a collection under the same name was published in 1614. Here, ‘some of the most excellent Musitians this age can afford haue in their loue to me composed (for the better grace of my poor labours) most full and melodious music’. This collection of domestic, sacred vocal compositions for four and five voices and four voices with viol consort was printed in a table book format (where the parts are arranged so that they can be read from around a table).²¹⁴ Appropriately for this domestic collection, Gibbons provided a concise setting which only contains a few scattered

word painting techniques. For example, the motion of ‘lifting’ is illustrated in the melody lines.

Extract 1.7 – Orlando Gibbons ‘O Lord, I lift my heart to thee’ (bars 1-7)\textsuperscript{215}

![Musical notation]

Only the first four-line stanza of Leighton’s poem is featured in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook and the Lambeth 764 bass partbook. It was nevertheless noted in Leighton’s collection that the subsequent stanzas should be sung to the same preceding music.\textsuperscript{216}

In addition to simpler compositional techniques, approximately 67% of the Chapel Royal’s anthems are verse anthems which feature solo parts. This is unsurprising however as


\textsuperscript{216} Ibid., 115-117.
there was also a practical need for more uncomplicated compositions in the Chapel Royal’s repertoire. Only half of the Chapel’s musicians worked during midweek services and many other unrecorded circumstances could have affected the Chapel Royal’s attendance numbers. Musicians could have been ill or travelling and therefore unable to attend services. With fewer singers attending midweek services, simpler repertoire and verse anthems would have been essential. There would also have been less need for rehearsals if verse anthems were to be sung in a service.217

**Composers’ Personal Political and Economic Motivations**

Political and economic motivations could have governed composers’ text and compositional technique choices. As previously mentioned, as musicians were often poorly paid, many held positions at multiple institutions. Musicians would also have sought commissions from colleges, nobles, and important court figures and divines. These figures could additionally have been able to provide and improve composers’ future employment opportunities.

In the Chapel Royal’s sources, there are anthems that were composed for specific figures and institutions. These works’ texts and compositional techniques would therefore have been influenced by their patrons’ desires and preferences.

Table 1.10 – Patronised anthems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Composition motivation</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael East</td>
<td>As they departed (v)</td>
<td>St John Baptist’s Day Collect</td>
<td>Ojc 181</td>
<td>St John’s College, Oxford</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>This is the record of John (v)</td>
<td>John 1: 19-23</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181</td>
<td>Written for Laud at St John’s Oxford (St John Baptist’s Day) (Och 21)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Blessed are all they that fear (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 128: 1-7 (lesser doxology)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poe.t 23 Ojc 180</td>
<td>Wedding of the Earl of Somerset</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

217 As no rehearsal records have yet been discovered, it is probable that the Chapel Royal’s choir did not extensively rehearse. It is certainly unlikely that rehearsals were conducted for the ordinary mid-week services.

218 Oxford, Christ Church Library Mus. 21, fols. 200-209.
| “” | Behold, thou hast made my days (v) | Psalm 39: 6-8, 13-15 | Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180 | Anthony Maxey, the Dean of Windsor on his deathbed | N |

Gibbons’ ‘This is the record of John’ was copied into the Och 21 manuscript with the rubric, ‘This Anthem was made for Dr. Laud, President of Saint John's Oxford, for St. John Baptist’s day’.²¹⁹ Laud was the President of St John’s College, Oxford between 1611 and 1621. This anthem’s text is unsurprisingly from the Gospel according to St. John (John 1: 19-23), and concerns John the Baptist. St John’s College, Oxford also paid Michael East 44s in 1620 to compose ‘As they departed’.²²⁰ This work features the collect for St John Baptist’s Day. As these works were commissioned by St John’s when it was under Laud’s leadership, they seemingly evidence that Laud personally endeavoured to enhance sacred music practices. However, as evidence in chapter 3 (page 221) of this thesis will demonstrate, Laud rarely voiced opinions about sacred music practices.

Two other anthems by Gibbons were composed at the bequest of patrons. ‘Blessed are all they that fear’ is a verse anthem setting of Psalm 128. This psalm is featured in the Book of Common Prayer during the ‘Solemnization of Matrimony’ with the description ‘then the ministers or clerkes goyng to the Lordes table, shall saie, or syng this Psalme following Beati omnes’.²²¹ In Och 21, this anthem appears with the ascription ‘a wedding anthem first made for My Lord of Somerset’.²²² This marriage was between Robert Carr, the newly made

---

²¹⁹ Ibid.
²²⁰ Maggie Humphreys and Robert Evans, eds., Dictionary of Composers for the Church in Great Britain and Ireland (London: Mansell, 1997), 100. Humphreys and Evans, and other scholars, have not recorded where this information originates from.
²²² John Harley, Orlando Gibbons and the Gibbons Family of Musicians (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018); Oxford, Christ Church Library Mus. 21, fol. 262.
first Earl of Somerset, and Lady Frances Howard, the daughter of the Lord Chamberlain, the Earl of Suffolk. Their wedding was held on 26 December 1613 in Whitehall Palace’s chapel, though it was not without its controversies as Carr, James I’s favourite courtier before the Duke of Buckingham, had fallen for Lady Howard when she was still married to the Third Earl of Essex. This previous marriage was annulled by James only shortly before Howard’s marriage to Carr.223 It is noted that ‘the gent of the Chappell for their extraordinary service & attendance v[li], as before had byn payd them in & for the lyke service’,224 and Gibbons presumably received more for his composition. This anthem is highly befitting of this important, royally favoured ceremonial occasion. Contrasting textures are featured in the vocal parts throughout this work. The simple solo opening verse moves into a full chorus exclamation. The second melismatic solo verse is followed by a chorus section with alternating trios. A verse with six imitative vocal lines leads into the final chorus which features a powerful tutti declamation of the doxology.225 Viol consort parts also survive for this anthem. Given how extravagant this wedding was,226 it is likely that an instrumental consort also played during the service.227

Gibbons’ verse anthem ‘Behold, thou hast made my days’ was ‘made of the entreaty’ of Anthony Maxey, the Dean of Windsor, whilst on his deathbed in 1618. Maxey called Gibbons to him and dictated which verses he wanted Gibbons to use. These all demonstrate the deep penitence of the burial service.228 The anthem begins with Psalm 39: 5-6 which discusses the transitory and uncertain nature of life in which humans ‘walketh in a vain shadow’ and ‘heapeth up riches and connot tell who shall gather them’. Psalm 39: 7 then acknowledges that God is the only hope. Through Psalm 39: 12, God is finally beseeched to

223 David Lindley, The Trials of Frances Howard: Fact and Fiction at the Court of King James (Abingdon: Routledge, 2005), 17.
224 Ashbee and Harley, eds., The Cheque Books of the Chapel Royal, 1: 172.
226 Kevin Curran, Marriage, Performance, and Politics at the Jacobean Court (Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009), 129-160. Several masques were staged before the King, Queen, and Prince Charles during the course of the celebrations that accompanied this wedding. They included The Masque of Spires by Thomas Campion, and A Challenge at Tilt and The Irish Masque by Benjamin Jonson. Jonson also wrote the poem ‘They are not those, are present will theyre face’ in celebration. The anonymous Masque of Flowers was also presented at the Gray’s Inn.
227 Ibid. This marriage was unfortunately short lived as in 1615, the bride and groom were condemned to death due to their part in poisoning of Sir Thomas Overbury. This occurred in September 1613 whilst Overbury was a prisoner in the Tower of London. Overbury had strongly opposed Carr and Howard’s marriage. James commuted their sentence, but they were imprisoned in the Tower until 1622.
228 Harley, Orlando Gibbons and the Gibbons Family of Musicians.
hear humanities’ prayer and spare his people before they all ‘go hence, and be seen no more’. Several effective word painting techniques can be heard in Gibbons’ setting. For example, descending harmonies evoke the cry ‘o spare me a little, that I may recover my strength’. The alternating solo verses and full choruses also evocatively reflect the personal nature of the prayers, but also the communal plea that they embody for all of humanity.\textsuperscript{229} Viol parts survive and given the undoubted reverence and importance of Maxey’s funeral, it is likely that these consort parts would have been performed during this service.

Whilst Thomas Tomkins’ anthem ‘O pray for the peace of Jerusalem’ was not commissioned by Magdalen College, it was likely written in homage to Richard Nicholson; Nicholson was Magdalen's Informator Choristarum from 1595 to 1639. Tomkins received his BMus from Magdalen and was likely taught by Nicholson. This four-part full anthem is relatively simple with some uses of imitation between the vocal lines.\textsuperscript{230} The opening is particularly significant as it uses music from Nicholson’s own compositions.\textsuperscript{231} It is likely that Tomkins composed this work not only in homage to his previous teacher, but also with the hope of future patronage.

These anthems would have exhibited the devotion and splendour of the patron or commissioning establishment. They would also have demonstrated the importance of the ceremonial occasions that they were composed for and performed at. As Gibbons was such a favoured Chapel Royal composer, to have him accept and complete a commission to write an anthem would have surely reinforced the status of the patron and occasion. These works would have immediately economically benefited the composers. Performances of these anthems at prestigious events would then have publicised the composers’ work. These would have increased their chances of gaining future prestigious commissions and jobs. As many of the patrons were important court and church figures who were royally favoured, it is unsurprising that these high-quality anthems were incorporated into the Chapel Royal’s repertoire.


Anthems with non-Biblical and non-Book of Common prayer texts also appear in the Chapel’s repertoire. Through setting texts that had been written by influential court members and divines, composers could have praised and demonstrated their loyalty to these authors. Composers could consequently have hoped that the authors would in turn be inspired to patronise them or use their influence to provide them with more auspicious employment opportunities.

Several works that set metrical texts will firstly be explored.

Table 1.11 – Anthems that include metrical poetic texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text author</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Bull</td>
<td>Deliver me O God (v)</td>
<td>John Rhodes’ collection&lt;br&gt;The Countrie Mans Comfort (1588) – Queen Elizabeth I</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Byrd</td>
<td>Alack when I look back (v)</td>
<td>William Hunnis - Seven Sobs for a Sorrowful Soule for Sinne (1583)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Let us be glad and clap our hands (v)</td>
<td>William Hunnis - Seven Sobs for a Sorrowful Soule for Sinne (1583)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Thou God that guidest (v)</td>
<td>William Hunnis - Seven Sobs for a Sorrowful Soule for Sinne (1583)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Crosse</td>
<td>Hear me O God, a broken heart (v)</td>
<td>Ben Jonson – Hymn to God the Father</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>O Lord, I lift my heart to thee (f)</td>
<td>William Leighton - The Teares or Lamentations of a Sorrowful Soule (1613)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>So God loved the world (v)</td>
<td>George Wither – The Hymnes and Songs of the Church (1623)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Texts by William Hunnis were particularly prevalently used. Hunnis became a Gentleman at the Chapel Royal around 1550 during Edward VI’s reign. He continued this appointment under Mary I until he was imprisoned for being a co-conspirator in a plot against Mary in 1555. When Elizabeth I ascended to the throne, Hunnis was released. He was made Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal in 1566 and held this position until he died in 1597.

Byrd set three texts from Hunnis’ *Seven Sobs for a Sorrowful Soule for Sinne* (1583) collection in his anthems ‘Alack when I look back’, ‘Let us be glad and clap our hands’, and ‘Thou God that guidest’. ‘Alack when I look back’ is subtitled in Hunnis’ collection as ‘A Lamentation touching the follies and vanities of our youth’. Hunnis wrote a monophonic tune for this text which Byrd used, with some modifications, as the basis for a consort song. Byrd later reworked and expanded this consort song into a verse anthem with reharmonised five-part choruses.

As previously discussed, William Crosse set one of Ben Jonson’s ‘Poems of Devotion’ from his *Underwood* collection in his anthem ‘Hear me, O God, a Broken heart’; Jonson was a highly regarded member of the royal court. Thomas Tomkins’ anthem ‘Above the stars my saviour dwells’

---

stars my saviour dwells’ is recorded to have featured ‘an hymne’ by Joseph Hall. Hall was the Dean of Worcester Cathedral (srv. 1616-27), and Tomkins was Worcester’s Organist during Hall’s tenure.237 Tomkins’ anthem includes solo verses and mostly homophonic choruses; these repeat text from their preceding verses. Only a few imitative entries and the extensive polyphonic setting of the final line ‘come, Lord Jesus come away’ disrupt these textures.238 These techniques would have likely appealed to Hall who took a moderate religious stance during his life.

Freely composed texts were also set.

Table 1.12 – Anthems that include freely composed poetic texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text author</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>Glorious and powerful God (v)</td>
<td>Henry King</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23; Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wilson</td>
<td>Hearken, O God unto a wretches cry (f)</td>
<td>Henry King</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two anthems that feature texts by Henry King can be found in the Chapel’s sources. After various religious appointments, King served as the Dean of Rochester from 1639 to 1642 and the Bishop of Chichester from 1642 to 1643. He was also the eldest son of John King who was the Bishop of London from 1611 to 1621.239 Gibbons’ verse anthem ‘Glorious and powerful God’ sets one of King’s texts. This work features melismatic verses which are sung by contratenor and bass soloists and five-voiced polyphonic choruses; these repeat text from

their preceding verses. Some word painting effects can also be heard. Rising chromatic harmonies depict the text ‘above the starry sky’, a melismatic ascending figure illustrates the word ‘arise’, and descending melodies reflect the text ‘o down on us full show’rs of mercy’. Shorter and dotted rhythms are also used throughout when joy is expressed.240

Extract 1.8 - Orlando Gibbons ‘Glorious and powerful God’ (bars 58-60, 64-66)241

The only clue as to who wrote the text for Thomas Ford’s ‘Look, shepherds look’ appears in James Clifford’s The Divine Services (1663). In this collection, the initials R. G. are recoded beside the piece. It has been speculated that these initials referred to either Richard Gardiner, who had served as Charles I’s chaplain from 1630, or Robert Gell, who was Laud’s personal chaplain (the dates of Gell’s appointment are unknown).242 The only music that is purportedly connected to Ford’s anthem is found in an anonymous handwritten manuscript on the closing flyleaf of John Playford’s Cantica Sacra II Cantus book (1674). This work is here described as ‘A Dialogue Anthem Betwixt the Angel and Shepherds’ and a ‘Proper for Christmas Day’.243 In the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook, a section for ‘The Angel’ and a chorus are delineated.244

241 Ibid., 60-61. (Transposed up a minor third and note values halved)
242 Morehen, ‘The English Anthem Text, 1549-1660,’ 85.
244 Rawl. Poet. 23, 151.
In Clifford’s collection, sections for a first and second shepherd and an additional chorus are also marked alongside the text.246

One of the Laudians’ aims was to revive ancient, purer forms of worship. Extra-devotional, contemporarily written texts were therefore encouraged. For the composers who were contemporary to the Laudians’ movement, by setting such texts in anthems, these works would have supported the belief that more personal prayers to God were permissible. Composers and musicians could also have demonstrated that they trusted in authors’ sacred writings through settings and performances. The inclusion of these anthems in the Chapel Royal’s repertoire would have additionally demonstrated that these sacred texts and the Laudians’ beliefs were royally endorsed. The inclusion of earlier sixteenth-century works with extra devotional texts once again demonstrates how anthems could be repurposed to fulfil later theological ideals. As many of the authors were important divines and court members, even if more conservative figures objected to their unauthorised theological texts, it would have been difficult to suppress them.

Composers could also have been motivated to set these texts in the hope that these influential authors would have positively influenced their employment opportunities; they may not have believed in their religious convictions. A prime example is Crosse’s setting of

---

245 Ibid., 151-152.
Jonson’s ‘Hear me O God a broken heart’. During his life, Jonson converted from the Church of England to Catholicism in 1598 and then returned to the Church of England in 1610. During conversations in the Winter of 1618/19, Jonson remarked to William Drummond, the Scottish poet, that he was ‘for any religion as being versed in both’. Influenced by his personal experiences and education, Jonson appeared to adopt more of an ecumenical approach to his beliefs. It is consequently likely that Crosse set this text because of how influential Jonson was in the royal court, rather than believing in the religious convictions behind the poetry.

The Chapel Royal’s Political and Economic Motivations
The Chapel Royal also held a highly important political function. It provided a very public view of the monarchy where important services were celebrated, petitions could be passed to the King, and political ambassadors and visitors were hosted. Rich architectural decorations and displays of decorum would have demonstrated the religious allegiances and splendour of the English monarchy, court, and Church. As the Chapel Royal was at the heart of a politically tumultuous society, sacred music practices would have been influenced by economic and political desires.

General Displays of the Splendour and Talents of English Church, Court, and Monarchy
Because of its royal status and the influential divines and nobles who would attend its services, the Chapel was able to attract the most talented performers and composers. The works that were written and performed by the Chapel’s musicians would have played a vital role in demonstrating the Chapel’s majesty and entertaining its congregations.

Anthems with texts that were not sanctioned by the Church of England could have been included in the Chapel’s repertoire as high quality and elaborate music and poetry was needed to demonstrate the splendour of the Chapel. For example, texts from the Genevan Bible, Douai-Rheims Bible, 1599 Catholic Primer, and contrafacta works can be found in the Chapel’s musical sources.

248 Francis Walsingham, A Search Made into Matters of Religion (St Omer, 1609), 31-33.
Table 1.13 – Anthems that use texts from the Genevan Bible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Byrd</td>
<td>Exalt thyself O God (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 57: 6, 9-12</td>
<td>Ojc 180</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O God the proud are risen (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 86: 14-15</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sing joyfully unto God (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 81: 1-4</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>This is the record of John (v)</td>
<td>John 1: 19- [23]</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Oxford</td>
<td>Have ye no regard (v)</td>
<td>Lamentations 1: 12; Isaiah 53: 4; Psalm 66: 10; Isaiah 53: 5; Colossians 1: 21-22; Psalm 10: 8</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding works that include texts from the Genevan Bible, it is likely that these settings were all produced before this version of the Bible was banned in England in 1616. Byrd’s ‘Sing joyfully unto God’ and ‘Exalt thyself O God’ both feature highly imitative vocal lines. They are also identically scored, in the same key, and likewise omit the bass from the opening. The texts also similarly encourage the use of instruments to praise God. As previously discussed, texts that supported sacred singing and instrumental playing would undoubtedly have been intentionally chosen by Byrd. The vocal lines in Byrd’s ‘O God the proud are risen’ are similarly highly contrapuntal and imitative throughout. Word painting techniques are also employed. For example, the text ‘slow to anger’ is set in a prolonged section where the preceding shorter rhythms are replaced with longer notes.

---

Henry Oxford also set texts from the Genevan Bible in his verse anthem ‘Have ye no regard’. Unfortunately, nothing is known about this composer. This is seemingly his only surviving composition and only the text has survived in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook. It is nevertheless highly probable that this work was produced before the 1616 Genevan Bible ban. This piece is particularly unusual as it combines texts from the Old (including the psalms) and New Testaments. As the New Testament included alterations to the Old Testament’s ecclesiastical laws, strong disagreements raged throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as to which should be followed.\(^{252}\) An anthem that included texts from both

\(^{251}\) Ibid., 38. (Transposed up a minor third and original note values)

Testaments would therefore have been controversial. It can only be assumed that Oxford’s music overruled any textual concerns.

The embellished poetic psalm translations from the Genevan Bible would have appealed to composers and the Chapel Royal’s political aims. To demonstrate the splendour of the Chapel’s musical practices, the quality of these compositions could have overruled any textual concerns.

Two psalm settings that resemble the 1599 Catholic Primer’s and Douai-Rheims Bible’s translations can also be found in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook. It is unsurprising that these are by Byrd, a recusant Catholic.

Table 1.14 – Anthems that use psalm texts from the Douai-Rheims Bible and 1599 Catholic Primer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Byrd</td>
<td>Have mercy upon me O God (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 51 (not the exact D-R translation)</td>
<td>Ojc 181, Lambeth 764</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“</td>
<td>Sing ye to our God (Lord) (v)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholars have previously presumed that the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook’s record of ‘Sing ye to our God (Lord)’ refers to the same work that was published in Byrd’s 1611 Psalms, Songs and Sonnets.253 Both settings draw on an identical translation of Psalm 149 from the 1599 Catholic Primer, or Office of the blessed Virgin Marie.254 The 1611 full anthem setting is typical of Byrd’s compositional style with extensively imitative and polyphonic vocal lines. The text ‘rejoice in their King’ is particularly effectively reflected through decorative melismatic figures. Longer note values, when approaching and for the word ‘King’, emphasise and add gravitas and dignity to this description of God.

There are however important differences between the 1611 and wordbook records. Only the first and second verses are set in Byrd’s collection, whereas verses one to four are noted in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook. Byrd’s 1611 setting is a full anthem, but this text is featured in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook in the verse anthem section. As with several other anthems, this text could have been copied into the wrong wordbook section. Alternatively, it is possible that Byrd composed an extended setting which was more suitable for trained choirs, such as the Chapel Royal’s, rather than domestic audiences. There could even be a wholly separate verse anthem setting that has been lost. As this psalm text encourages singing and instrumental playing to praise God, it is plausible that Byrd favoured this text and set it

---

255 Ibid., 15. (Original key and original note values)
256 John Bull’s verse anthems ‘The man that fears the Lord’ and ‘God the Father, God the Son’ are incorrectly listed in the full anthem section. Thomas Tomkins’ full anthem ‘Who is he that cometh out’ is incorrectly listed in the verse anthem section. Thomas Tallis’ full anthem ‘O Lord in thee is all my trust’ is also incorrectly listed in the full anthem section.
multiple times for different audiences. The text in Byrd’s anthem ‘Have mercy upon me, O God’, likewise originally published in his 1611 collection, resembles the Douai-Rheims translation. Congregations would have been able to easily hear this work’s text as it features melodic, solo medius verses. The choruses repeat the text from their preceding verses and feature limited uses of imitation. In terms of word painting techniques, descending figures are repeatedly included for the text ‘wipe away’ and the use of homophony in the chorus for the line ‘wash me clean’ emphasises this desire for purity.

Extract 1.11 – William Byrd ‘Have mercy upon me, O God’ (bars 40-47, 56-59)

257 Bowers, ‘Ecclesiastical or Domestic?,’ 145.
259 Ibid., 110, 112. (Original key and original note values)
The first two verses from ‘Sing ye to our God (Lord)’ alongside the Book of Common Prayer’s (Coverdale) translation of this psalm are featured below; similarities between these translations can be observed.

Byrd 1611 and Rawl. Poet. 23 text (1599 primer) – Sing ye to our God (Lord) a new song; His praise in the Church of Saints.; Let Israel be joyful in him, that made him: and let the daughters of Sion rejoice in their King.

BCP (Coverdale) – O sing unto the Lord a new song: let the congregation of saints praise him. Let Israel rejoice in him that made him and let the children of Sion be joyful in their king.260

As these settings were both originally published in Byrd’s 1611 domestic collection,261 this likely explains why Bryd felt able to draw upon unofficial translations. The set psalms both included recognisable elements from Coverdale’s translations, therefore this could explain why these settings were continually permitted in the Chapel Royal.262 Once again, their musical quality could also have outruled any textual concerns.

With the emergence of the 1549 Book of Common Prayer, there would have been a sudden and urgent need for English sacred music.263 Throughout the Reformation, English versions of Latin works by composers such as Thomas Tallis, William Byrd, John Taverner, and Robert White were produced. These are known as contrafacta anthems. They are compositions where the texts have been substituted, but very minimal changes have been made to the music. Several of these were included in the Chapel Royal’s seventeenth-century sources.

261 Bowers, ‘Ecclesiastical or Domestic?,’ 145.
263 Morehen, ‘The English Anthem Text, 1549-1660,’ 69.
Table 1.15 – *Contrafacta* anthems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Contrafacta Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Original Work</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tallis</td>
<td>With all our hearts and mouths (F)</td>
<td>Romans 10: 9-10 (adapted)</td>
<td>Salvator mundi (i) (f)– Matins Antiphon, The Exaltation of the Cross</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“”</td>
<td>Blessed be thy name, O God (f)</td>
<td>Katherine Parr (translation of petitionary prayers from Vulgate Bible or <em>Horae beatissime virginis marie ad legitimum sarisburiensis ecclesie ritum</em> (Paris: F. Regnault, 1536))264</td>
<td>Mihi autem nimis (f) – Psalm 139: 17. Introit for the Feast of Apostles</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Most of these works feature elaborate compositional techniques. The vocal lines in Tallis’ anthems ‘With all our hearts and mouths’ and ‘Blessed be thy name’, works which were originally arranged during the Elizabethan period, feature extensive imitative phrase entries. The soaring leaps during the opening of ‘With all our hearts and mouths’ and the extensive melismas for the word ‘fathers’ in ‘Blessed be thy name’ are highly evocative compositional moments.\(^{266}\) Perhaps the most surprising contrafacta anthems in the Chapel’s repertoire are Byrd’s adjoining works ‘O Lord turn thy wrath’ and ‘Bow down thine ear’.\(^{267}\) Originally named ‘Ne irascaris Domine’ and ‘Civitas santi tui’, these anthems formed one of Byrd’s ‘Jerusalem’ motets. They were written in the 1580s to protest the persecutions that Catholics were facing during Elizabeth I’s reign.\(^{268}\) Whilst many contrafacta works use completely different texts, both these anthems unusually include adapted translations of their original Latin texts. Polyphonic vocal lines with expressive imitative phrases, some extended melismas, and word painting techniques are featured throughout. For example, the homophonic rendering of the line ‘Sion is wasted’ emphasises this cry, and the descending imitative figures illustrate ‘Jerusalem’ as ‘desolate and void’.\(^{269}\)

---

| “” | Blessed are they/those that are undefiled (v) | Psalm 119: 1-6 and minor doxology (Coverdale) | Beati immaculati (same psalm verses in Latin)\(^{265}\) | Rawl. Poet. 23 | N |

---


With the controversial pro-Catholic messages behind Byrd’s anthems, their music must have overruled any textual concerns. The desire to have high-quality pieces performed in the Chapel Royal could once again have motivated the Chapel to include these contrafacta anthems in its repertoire.

As Charles I had ordered that members of the royal court would be suspended if they did not receive communion at least once a year, it is apparent that there were attendance problems in the Chapel Royal. As previously discussed, Charles also instructed the court gentlemen ushers ‘to send warning to all noblemen wheresoever they be in towne’ to remind them to attend the Chapel Royal on ‘high day of any other holyday’. Members of the court and visitors were probably far more likely to attend secular entertainments, which often included musical and dramatic productions. Several of the Chapel Royal’s anthems contain elaborate and even pseudo-dramatic compositional and performance techniques; they are almost very early precursors to the later oratorio style. These works could have primarily been performed to augment the Chapel’s devotional practices. Through demonstrating the skill of the Chapel Royal’s musicians and entertaining the congregations, enhanced musical techniques could also have encouraged court members to attend worship services more regularly.

270 Ibid. (Original key and note values)
Table 1.16 – Anthems with dramatic texts and compositional techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>This is the record of John (v)</td>
<td>John 1: 19-[23] (St John the Baptist Day)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Porter</td>
<td>O praise the Lord (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 147: 1; 105: 2, 5; 103: 2-3; 107:3; 103: 4, 20, 22; 146: 1</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Jesus came when the doors were shut (v)</td>
<td>John 20: 26-29 (St Thomas the Apostle’s Day)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amongst this list is Gibbons’ verse anthem ‘This is the record of John’. The set text recounts when the Jews and Levites from the Temple authorities came to question John as to whether he was the Messiah. The verse anthem setting is consequently highly appropriate for this conversational text. The solo contratenor verses are written in a quasi-declaratory style. Although the melodic lines are elaborate, as they are sung by a single soloist, they do not mask the contained text. The choruses repeat text from their preceding verses in alternating homophonic and imitative, polyphonic sections. There are also some creative uses of word painting. When John quotes Isaiah by calling himself the ‘voice of him that crieth in the wilderness’ in the third verse, there is a sudden shift to an unrelated minor mode. The music then returns to the tonic when the command ‘make straight the way of the Lord’ is sung.272

Thomas Tomkins’ anthem ‘Jesus came when the doors were shut’ features similar techniques; this work sets the story of doubting Thomas. The opening two verses are sung by a solo contratenor who provides an introductory narrative to the story. The third verse features a dialogue between a contratenor soloist, Thomas, and a bass soloist, Jesus. The

---

choruses seemingly only comment on the action that is taking place in the verses. For example, the last musical phrase of each verse is incorporated and reworked in the following chorus. The same distinctive falling motif for the text ‘peace be unto you’ and ‘blessed are they that have not seen’ is also featured in the verse and chorus sections. As the choruses repeat parts of the text and music from the verses, alongside the dramatic character verses, congregations’ comprehension of the set text would have been improved.  

More generally, verse anthems would have displayed the talents of the Chapel’s musicians and entertained the congregations. These aims could further explain why such a high percentage of the Chapel’s anthems are verse anthems (67%). A particularly notable verse anthem that would have required highly skilled soloists is Walter Porter’s ‘O Praise the Lord’. Porter spent several years (c. 1612-15) studying in Italy, apparently with Claudio Monteverdi. Back in England, Porter published his Italianate collection of Madrigales and Ayres in 1632. Porter was working as a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal (Tenor) at this time and later served as the Master of the Choristers at Westminster Abbey from 1639. This work is very elaborate, featuring distinct, highly melismatic Italianate solo verses; extremely skilled performers would have been required. It is therefore likely that Porter’s work was very rarely performed outside of the Chapel Royal. The tenor solos would probably have been performed by Porter himself, and the treble solos could have been sung by the ‘little singing boys’ of the King’s Private Music. This anthem also includes bass viol and basso continuo parts; the use of these in anthems was a relatively new technique from Italy.

Displays of the Splendour and Talents of English Church, Court, and Monarchy at Specific Occasions

Apart from the feast day anthems, it is unknown when many of the previously discussed works were performed in the Chapel Royal. There are also no records of how often these pieces were performed. There are nevertheless accounts that describe specific Chapel Royal

273 Boden, Thomas Tomkins: The Lost Elizabethan, 292; Thomas Tomkins, ‘Jesus came when the doors were shut,’ ed. Peter James (Swansea: Cathedral Press, 1998).
275 Ibid., ix–xii.
276 It is also possible that this work was performed in the King’s privy chamber. Peter Le Huray, The Treasury of English Church Music 1545-1650 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), xxix; H. C. de Lafontaine, ed., The King’s Musick: A Transcript of Records Relating to Music and Musicians, 1460-1700 (London: Novello & Co, 1909), 59.
services. These reveal how sacred music practices were enhanced during important celebrations. Musical performances were presumably primarily included to theologically enhance these sacred services. Feast days and special services would have been attended by a large range of important and foreign dignitaries. These services’ musical practices could additionally have been heightened to augment the grandeur of these occasions and entertain the congregations.

One of the most important and public times in the Chapel’s calendar was Christmas. This was also a time of great celebration and feasting in the Stuart court. Particularly during the 12 days of Christmas, many noblemen and ambassadors would visit the court. The Christmas masques of James I and Charles I have been extensively explored in past literature. These would have contributed to the Christmas celebrations and enabled the monarchs to show off their hospitality and wealth. As so many important visitors attended Christmas services, more elaborate sacred music settings would have been encouraged to demonstrate the splendour of the Chapel Royal. Indeed, many anthems for the feast days that surrounded the 12 days of Christmas have survived; the existence of settings for more unusual feast days such as Holy Innocents Day and Epiphany 3 is seemingly therefore explained.

Whilst these contain a mixture of compositional techniques, there are many with polyphonic, imitative, and melismatic vocal lines. The anthems whose musical settings have fully survived and those that were copied with annotations that reveal musical features, will be focussed upon.

Table 1.17 – Anthems that include texts from the festal collects, the proper psalms, and proper lessons at morning and evening prayer from the Christmas period
(Ordered according to the 1559 Book of Common Prayer’s Liturgical Calendar)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Feast Source</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>Hear, O heavens, and give ear (v)</td>
<td>Isaiah 1: 2, 4, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20;</td>
<td>First Sunday of Advent, Matins, proper lesson</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


278 This theory also explains why a setting of the collect for Trinity 10 was composed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work Title</th>
<th>Page Reference</th>
<th>Subtitle</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>In Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Jesus came when the doors were shut (v)</td>
<td>John 20: 26-29</td>
<td>St Thomas the Apostle’s Day Subtitled ‘The Antheme’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Portman</td>
<td>The Lord spake to Ahaz (v)</td>
<td>Isaiah 7: 10-14</td>
<td>Nativity of Christ, Evensong, first proper lesson</td>
<td>Lambeth 764</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Hooper</td>
<td>Almighty God, which hast given us thy only-begotten son (f)</td>
<td>Christmas Day Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘The Collect for Christmas Day’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>Almighty God, which hast given us thine only-begotten son (v)</td>
<td>Christmas Day Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Anthem for Christmas day’</td>
<td>Ojc 180 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons?</td>
<td>Almighty father, which didst give (v)</td>
<td>Proper Preface, BCP</td>
<td>Christmas Day, and 7 days after subtitiled ‘An Antheme for Christmas Day’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Portman</td>
<td>The heavens declare the glory of God (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 19: 1-5, 12, 14</td>
<td>Christmas Day, Matins, first Proper Psalm</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Tomkins</td>
<td>Thou art fairer than the children (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 45: 3-6</td>
<td>Christmas Day, Matins, second Proper Psalm</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Arise, O Lord, into thy resting place (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 132: 8-10</td>
<td>Christmas Day, Matins, third Proper Psalm</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Merciful Lord, we beseech thee (v)</td>
<td>St John the Evangelist Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Anthem for St</td>
<td>Ojc 181 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Collect</td>
<td>Subtitle</td>
<td>Partbook</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Almighty God, whose praise this day (v)</td>
<td>Holy Innocents Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Anthem for Innocents Daye’</td>
<td>Ojc 181</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>Mortify and kill all vices (v)</td>
<td>Innocents Day Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Anthem for Innocents Day’</td>
<td>Lambeth 764</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Hooper</td>
<td>Almighty God, which madest thy blessed son (v)</td>
<td>Circumcision Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Circumcision Day’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bull</td>
<td>Almighty God, which by the leading (v)</td>
<td>Epiphany Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Starre Anthem’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Byrd</td>
<td>Teach me, O Lord (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 119: 33-38</td>
<td>Festal Psalm (after preces) for Epiphany, Evensong</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>Almighty and everlasting God, mercifully look (f)</td>
<td>Epiphany 3 Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘The Collect for the Third Sunday after Epiphanie’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Collect</th>
<th>Subtitle</th>
<th>Partbook</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are firstly anthems that would have been performed during the advent season before Christmas. The anonymous anthem ‘Hear, O heavens, and give ear’ draws its text from Isaiah 1 which was the first proper lesson for Matins on the first Sunday of Advent. Although the text for Thomas Tomkins’ ‘Jesus came when the doors were shut’ is not listed in the Book of Common Prayer’s calendar, it is titled in the Ojc 181 partbook as an ‘Anthem for St Thomas daye’ (21 December).[^279]

Eight of the Chapel Royal’s anthems feature texts that relate to Christmas day or the Nativity of the Christ on December 25; this is of course the first day of the 12 days of Christmas. Orlando Gibbons’ ‘Behold, I bring you glad tidings’ sets the second lesson from the Christmas Day Matins service. The verses from Luke 2 tell of when angels announced the Messiah’s birth to the shepherds. This setting features verses of up to six voices and

[^279]: Ojc 181, 168.
polyphonic choruses. Dotted and irregular rhythms and effective moments of word painting are also included throughout the vocal lines. For example, ascending figures illustrate the call ‘glory be to God on high’. More homophonic textures are only used in the choruses to emphasise the importance, joy, and celebratory nature of certain angelic announcements such as ‘glory be to God on high’ and ‘unto us a son is given, a saviour’.\(^{280}\)

Extract 1.13 – Orlando Gibbons ‘Behold, I bring you glad tidings’ (bars 48-54, 84-86)\(^{281}\)

Edmund Hooper produced a relatively conservative verse anthem setting of the Christmas Day collect ‘Almighty God, which hast given us thy only-begotten son’. Although this work features three multi-voiced verses, they are very short, with largely homophonic vocal


\(^{281}\) Ibid., 16, 22. (Transposed up a minor third and note values halved)
lines. Richard Portman’s ‘The heavens declare the glory of God’ and Robert Tomkins’ ‘Thou art fairer than the children’ feature two of the proper psalms from Christmas Day. These have unfortunately only survived as texts and in organ parts. Annotations in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook nevertheless reveal that the verses in Portman’s anthem were written for up to five voices, and Tomkins’ anthem features three-, five-, and six-part verses. It can therefore be assumed that these were elaborate, complex anthems.

Figure 1.5 - Richard Portman ‘The heavens declare the glory of God’ and Robert Tomkins ‘Thou art fairer than the children’ (Rawl. Poet. 23, fols. 202, 157)

The second proper lesson for Evensong on St Stephen’s Day (26 December) was set by Thomas Tomkins in his anthem ‘Stephen being full’. Although this work features multi-voiced verses, the text is usually firstly clearly sung by a solo voice before other imitative vocal lines enter. As the choruses are more homophonic, important lines such as ‘and saw the glory of God’ and ‘Jesus standing on the right hand of God’ would have been clearly heard by any assembled congregations. Tomkins also set the collects for the following two

---


days. These are ‘Merciful Lord, we beseech thee’ for St John the Evangelist’s Day and ‘Almighty God, whose praise this day’ for Holy Innocents Day. In ‘Merciful Lord, we beseech thee’, the voices often sing the text in homophony before breaking into more imitative and polyphonic lines. Sections of the text are also repeated between the verses and choruses.‘Almighty God, whose praise this day’ is highly contrapuntal and the verses and choruses do not share text apart from the final line, ‘through Jesus Christ out Lord’. Congregations would have consequently found it hard to decipher this anthem’s text, especially during the five-voiced verses. This anthem also contains some effective word painting techniques. For example, descending melismatic figures illustrate the word ‘dying’ and the voices sing the text ‘mortify and kill all vices in us’ in homophony to emphasise this plea.

After the 12 days of Christmas, two anthems that were written for the feast of Epiphany (6 January) have survived in the Chapel’s sources. One of these is John Bull’s ‘Almighty God, which by the leading’ which draws its text from the Epiphany Day collect. This anthem was known as the ‘Starre anthem’. It appears to have been a highly popular work as it is featured in more sources than any other anthem. Imitative and antiphonal vocal textures are featured throughout this piece, with some more homophonic sections in the choruses.

Figure 1.6 – John Bull ‘Almighty God, which by the leading’ – ‘Starre anthem’ (Lambeth 764, fol. 148; Ojc 180, fol. 57)

288 Lambeth 764, 148; Ojc 180, 57.
Orlando Gibbons also set the collect for the third Sunday in Epiphany in his anthem ‘Almighty and everlasting God, mercifully look’. This anthem’s five sections, which correspond with the five lines of the set text, are articulated with a cadence, a change in texture, and a new musical motive. The opening is broadly imitative, as if to evoke the expansiveness of God’s power through the counterpoint. The following plea for God to ‘mercifully look upon our infirmities’ is set in a more compact and contrapuntal passage. The imitative entry for the text ‘and in all our dangers and necessities’ emphasises the urgency of this universal plight. More homophonic textures also depict the belief that God will ‘stretch forth thy right hand’, despite the dangers.289

The exemplified Christmas period anthems demonstrate that the Chapel’s sacred music practices were enhanced for highly significant religious celebrations, which would have been attended by many important and foreign figures. Religious and political motivations appear to have governed the Chapel’s sacred music practices on feast days.

There are also records of what sacred music practices were included during special, one-off Chapel services. The works that were performed at these celebrations can consequently often be found in the Chapel’s sources. A notable example is the marriage of Elizabeth, James I’s daughter, to the Elector Palatine, Frederick V. This wedding took place on St Valentine’s Day, 14 February 1613, in the Chapel Royal at Whitehall.

Table 1.18 – Anthems that were sung during the marriage of Elizabeth, James I’s daughter, to the Elector Palatine, Frederick V (14 February 1613)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Bull</td>
<td>The man that fears the Lord (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 128 (adaptation)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“</td>
<td>God the Father, God the Son (v)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Giles</td>
<td>Blessed art thou that fearest God (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 128: 1-6</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was a highly elaborate affair. In the lead up to the ceremony, a firework display and a mock sea battle were performed on the Thames. For the wedding service, Frederick was attended by ‘a number of young gallant courtiers... all in rich manner, every one striving to exceed in sumptuous habiliments’. Elizabeth was ‘clothed in a gown of white satin, richly embroidered... upon her head a crown of refined gold, made Imperial by the pearls and diamonds thereupon placed’. ‘The Chapel was in a royal sort adorned, the upper end of it was hung with very rich hangings.... A stately stage or scaffold was raised in the midst of the Chapel... underneath with rich carpets, and railed on both sides.’ An organ voluntary was presumably played before the service began as it is accounted that ‘the royal assembly being in this sort settled in the Chapel, the organ ceased, and the Gentlemen of the Chapel sung a full anthem.’ It is unfortunately unknown which anthem was sung here. Later, ‘the sermon being ended..., the choir began another anthem, which was the psalm “Blessed art thou that fearest God”’ (Psalm 128). This psalm’s text is highly appropriate for a wedding anthem as it is featured in the wedding liturgy after the Benediction and prays that ‘thy wife shall be as the

---

fruitful vine: upon the walls of thy house.'

There are two anthems in the Chapel Royal’s collections that feature this text. Nathaniel Giles set a metrical version of Psalm 128: 1-6 in an anthem entitled ‘Blessed art thou that fearest God’. As Giles was the Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal at the time of this wedding, it is very likely that his anthem was used. Nevertheless, an adaptation of this same psalm appears in John Bull’s anthem ‘The man that fears the Lord’. This work is recorded in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook on the same page as this wedding ceremony’s next anthem. The ascription ‘Two songs composed by John Bul Dr in Musick’ appears above these texts in the wordbook. It is therefore possible that both works were composed for this wedding. Although the title given for the recorded psalm and Bull’s anthem title do not correspond, it is likely that the scribe was more concerned with noting which psalm was featured, rather than the actual anthem name. Unfortunately, only the texts for both Giles’ and Bull’s works have survived. Near the end of the ceremony, ‘when the Archbishop had ended the Benediction, “God the Father, God the Son”’, the choir sung the same benediction in an anthem made new for that purpose by Doctor Bull’. This is the anthem that is featured alongside ‘The man that fears the Lord’ in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook. Again however, no music has survived for this anthem. At the end of this wedding ceremony, it is noted that ‘another psalm was sung’, but it is not recorded which psalm or anthem this was.

The musical works that were performed during James I’s and Charles I’s coronations are unfortunately often recorded without a title, or with a title, but without the composer’s name. Some of the music that was performed at these ceremonies has nevertheless been uncovered. As studies of the music at these coronations have already been undertaken, it is not necessary to extensively explore these in this thesis. Matthias Range provides a particularly detailed study of these coronations’ musical practices in his book *Music and Ceremonial at British Coronations: From James I to Elizabeth II*. Range’s tables in figure 1.8

293 It should be noted that although Bull’s anthems appear in the ‘full anthems’ section, they both include notes as to where the verses and choruses appear.
294 The account of this marriage and the subsequent quotes included in this chapter have been drawn from: Nichols, *The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First, his Royal Consort, Family, and Court, 2*: 541; *The Magnificent Marriage of the Two Great Princes Frederick Count Palatine, &c. and the Lady Elizabeth* (London: T.C. for W. Barley, 1613).
295 Charles I was also crowned King of Scotland in Edinburgh in June 1633. As this service was almost identical to Westminster’s, it is therefore probable that the same music was used in both coronations.
demonstrate that these were elaborate ceremonies that were filled with music to enhance the occasions.

**Figure 1.8 - Synoptic table of the music at James I’s and Charles I’s coronations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ceremony</th>
<th>James I, Queen Anne, 1603</th>
<th>Charles I, 1626</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procession from Westminster Hall to the Abbey</td>
<td>omitted?</td>
<td>'O Lord, grant the King a long life?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance into the Abbey</td>
<td>'Behold, O Lord, our protector' ???</td>
<td>'I was glad' ???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>'Let thy hand be strengthened' ???</td>
<td>Firmetar manus/Strong is thy hand' ???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of the Communion Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anointing</td>
<td>'Come, Holy Ghost' ???</td>
<td>'Come, Holy Ghost, eternal God' ???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Litany, in Latin ???</td>
<td>Litany ???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Zadok the Priest' ???</td>
<td>'Zadok the Priest' T. Tomkins?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| After the Investiture | — | — |
| Crownings | 'Be strong' | The King shall rejoice' |
| T. Tomkins? and | | I. Tomkins? |
| | | ???
| Inthronization | Te Deum? | Te Deum? |
| Homage | perhaps: | 'Behold, O God, our defender' |
| | 'O Lord, grant the King a long life' | T. Tomkins? |
| | T. Tomkins |
| Coronation of the Queen | — | — |
| Second Part of the Communion Service | Nicene Creed, Sanctus and Gloria??? | Nicene Creed???; 'Let my prayer be sett forth'???; followed by Organ Music???, Sanctus????; Gloria omitted |
| Procession from Altar to Throne | 'O hearken unto the voice of my Calling' ??? |
| Procession from Throne into St Edward’s Chapel Recess | |

Several of these works were also copied into the Chapel’s sources.

297 Ibid., 281-283.
It is very likely that the musical practices during these ceremonies were far more elaborate than the Chapel’s everyday activities. The Chapel’s practices could have primarily been enhanced to praise God and ask for his blessing during these important ceremonial occasions. Works could nevertheless also have been composed and included to demonstrate the power and splendour of the English court, church, and monarchy to the important and foreign dignitaries who would have been in attendance. Many elaborate secular amusements and dramas would have been produced alongside these services. Sacred music performances would have consequently further entertained the assembled congregations. As these services’ anthems can often be found in the Chapel’s sources, this also suggests that these, often elaborate, works were repeatedly performed; such performances would have commemorated the associated occasion.

**Royalist and Nationalistic Motivations**

The records of how coronation services were musically enhanced demonstrate that it was also important for the Chapel Royal, and the royal court in general, to praise and show reverence to the monarch. Many anthems in the Chapel Royal’s sources display royalist and nationalistic sentiments. In the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook, these are often grouped together. Such anthems even start and close the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook: Byrd’s ‘O Lord, make thy servant’ and John Cobb’s ‘Give the King thy judgements’ respectively. As the monarch was the Supreme Governor of the Church of England, it is understandable that the Chapel’s

---

**Table 1.19 – Anthems that were sung at James I’s and Charles I’s coronations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Tomkins</td>
<td>The King shall rejoice (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 21: 1, 3, 5, 7, 13</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23, Ojc 181, Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>O Lord, grant the King a long life (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 61: 6-8</td>
<td>Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O pray for the peace of Jerusalem (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 122: 6-9</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23, Ojc 180, Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zadok the priest (f)</td>
<td>1 Kings 1: 38-48</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
musicians would have selected and performed anthems that asked for God’s blessing for the King and royal family. Performances of these works would have demonstrated the composers’, performers’, and congregations’ loyalty to the King.

There are around 10 general royalist and nationalistic anthems in the Chapel’s sources.

Table 1.20 – General royalist and nationalistic anthems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title of Work</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Purpose of Anthem</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anon. (possibly Gibbons)</td>
<td>O all true British hearts (v)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Pray to God for health to our King</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>With heavy heart I call to thee (v)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Pray to God to bless the King and defend him from foes</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elway Bevin</td>
<td>Hear my crying, O God (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 61</td>
<td>Pray to God to grant the King a long life</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bull</td>
<td>Preserve most mighty God (v)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Pray to God to preserve the King and Britaine land</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“</td>
<td>Praise we the Lord our God (v)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Praise God for blessing King and his Princely Ibue</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cobb</td>
<td>The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 20: 1-6</td>
<td>Faith that the Lord will help his anointed</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Holmes</td>
<td>The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 20</td>
<td>Faith that the Lord will help his anointed and hear him from Heaven</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Randall</td>
<td>O Father dear, O Son most dear (v)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Pray to Trinity for security, health, and long felicity for the King</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tomkings</td>
<td>The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 20</td>
<td>Faith that the Lord will help his anointed and hear him from Heaven</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many of the set texts ask God to ‘bless our noble king, to bless our gracious queen Marie’. They pray for the King’s ‘securitite, with health and long felicitite’ and that ‘with thy hand in this our time, our gracious King o Lord defend’, as ‘the Lord helpeth his Anointed’ and ‘will hear him from his holy heaven’. Although these appear to be politically charged anthems, many still recognise God as the ultimate authority ‘by whom all kings their scepters bear’. Amongst the works in table 1.20, only the music for Thomas Weelkes’ ‘O Lord God almighty’ has survived. This anthem was originally written for James I and the text was then adapted for Charles I. This work contains the prayer from the Book of Common Prayer’s Litany for the royal family. It is largely homophonic throughout with some imitative phrase entries. The voices usually only become more polyphonic to paint the set text. For example, more intricate vocal lines emphasise the urgency of the communal plea ‘and bring them to thy everlasting Kingdom’. John Bull’s anthem ‘Praise we the Lord our God’ asks for God’s blessing for the King. Although the music for this work has not survived, it is noted in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook to have featured ‘10 parts’. It is therefore likely that this was an elaborate setting.

299 Ibid., 167.
300 Ibid., 162.
301 Ibid., 203.
302 Ibid., 225.
303 Ibid., 135.
306 Rawl. Poet. 23, 177.
The King’s Day, although not officially recognised until after the Restoration, was still an important occasion in the Church’s calendar during the early Stuart’s reigns. This marked the day that the monarch ascended to the throne. There are several anthems in the Chapel’s sources that were used to enhance this day’s celebrations.

Table 1.21 – Anthems to celebrate the King’s Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Lord, make thy servant Charles (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 21: 1-4 (adapted)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>Grant O holy Trinity (v)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181 Lambeth 764</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Hooper</td>
<td>O God of Gods, O King of Kings (v)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

307 Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Anthem</th>
<th>Psalms</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Tomkins</td>
<td>O Lord, grant the King a long life (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 61: 6-8</td>
<td>This psalm was included in a prayer to mark the anniversary of the sovereign's accession. This was introduced by James I, but was not formalised into the Book of Common Prayer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>O Lord, grant the King a long life (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 61: 6-8</td>
<td>This psalm was included in a prayer to mark the anniversary of the sovereign's accession. This was introduced by James I, but was not formalised into the Book of Common Prayer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Weelkes</td>
<td>Give the King thy judgements (v)</td>
<td>Psalms 72: 1-2; 84: 9; 19: 14-15 (adapted to form a prayer in the Book of Common Prayer for the King’s Day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“</td>
<td>O Lord, grant the King a long life (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 61: 6-8</td>
<td>This psalm was included in a prayer to mark the anniversary of the sovereign's accession. This was introduced by James I, but was not formalised into the Book of Common Prayer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The anthems for this day ask God to ‘grant the king a long life’\textsuperscript{308} ‘and thy righteousness unto the King’s son’\textsuperscript{309} that ‘his [King] health, his joys, his peace, may his reign

\textsuperscript{308} Rawl. Poet. 23, 17.  
\textsuperscript{309} Lambeth 764, 150.
and years increase’, 310 ‘so long bless his royal state’ 311. Thomas Weelkes’ ‘O Lord, grant the King a long life’ sets part of a hymn that was ‘a form of prayer with thanksgiving to Almighty God, to be used in all Churches and Chapels in his Realm, every Year, upon the... being the Day on which His Majesty began his happy Reign.’ 312 This text is made up of several psalms and was introduced into the Church of England’s liturgy during James I’s reign to mark the monarch’s accession day. However, it was not formally incorporated into the Book of Common Prayer until the 1662 revision. Apart from the masterful final Amen, the counterpoint in this work is somewhat limited. There are some effective word painting techniques. The line ‘that his years may endure throughout all generations’ is extensively repeated, and decorative falling figures illustrate the joyful cry ‘so shall we always sing and praise thy name’. 313 The same text was set by Thomas Tomkins. Tomkins’ anthem includes some imitative and polyphonic vocal lines in the choruses. Even alongside multi-voiced verses however, the text can usually be clearly heard. The line ‘throughout all generations’ is similarly extensively repeated during the opening solo verse. 314 This text was also set by Robert Tomkins. Even though only the text for this work has survived, the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook notes that it included four- and six-part verses. 315

310 Rawl. Poet. 23, 135.
311 Ibid.
315 Rawl. Poet. 23, 228.
Although it is not specifically noted in the Chapel’s sources that the other six anthems in table 1.21 were written for the King’s Day, they are recorded in Durham Cathedral’s Dunnington-Jefferson partbook under the heading ‘The King’s Day’. Notably, more settings are listed for ‘The King’s Day’ than for any other feast day in the Dunnington-Jefferson manuscript. This list also demonstrates that royalist allegiances were being expressed through anthems in Elizabeth’s and James’ reigns and how such anthems were continually used and repurposed for the successive monarchs. Amongst this list is Thomas Weelkes’ ‘Give the King thy judgements’; this is widely regarded as one of Weelkes’ finest compositions. This anthem features a section of the Book of Common Prayer’s prayer for the King’s Day. Extensive polyphonic and imitative vocal lines appear throughout the verses and choruses. The voices only join in homophony to emphasise certain sections of the text such as ‘O God our defender’. It is consequently highly probable that the King’s Day services would have been filled with elaborate music.

Anthems that were written to celebrate the King’s recovery from illnesses, the Queen’s safe deliverance of her children, and the King’s escape from the Gunpowder plot (to be discussed later in this chapter) can also be found in the Chapel’s sources. The royalist sentiments that these anthems express would have been expected in the royal court.

316 Ibid.
The anthems that prayed for the King when he was ill or in times of plague had humanistic motivations behind them; they would have provided hope to the monarch’s subjects.

Table 1.22 – Anthems to pray for, or praise, the King’s recovery from an illness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Byrd</td>
<td>Behold, O God, the sad and heavy case (f)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>O all true faithful hearts</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Och 21</td>
<td>NOT IN CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Portman</td>
<td>I will always give thanks (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 34: 1-4, 6, 8-13, 15, 17-18; 107: 20-21 Subtitled ‘A thanksgiving after ye late sickness’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Originally composed during Elizabeth I’s reign, Byrd’s ‘Behold, O God, the sad and heavy case’, possibly originally a consort song, asks God to ‘preserve in perfect health’ and ‘support with quiet health’ the monarch. This text implies that Elizabeth was not actually unwell, but needed protection from an illness. As the text later notes that ‘we all confess, our sines such plagues deserve’ which were rising ‘throughout the flock’, this implies that there was a nationwide illness. A composition date of 1593, when the plague reappeared, has consequently been proposed. This work could then have been revived during Charles’ reign to pray for his health during further times of plague, most especially the 1625 outbreak. Byrd’s anthem includes animated vocal lines which often feature short and dotted rhythms. Techniques such as the use of melismas when the line ‘and ev’ry limb will tremble, shake and quake’ is sung also effectively paint the text.

---

319 Bowers, ‘Ecclesiastical or Domestic?’, 147.
Another anthem that is supposed to have been composed in response to a specific illness is Richard Portman’s ‘I will always give thanks’. This is subtitled ‘a thanksgiving after ye late sickness’.\(^{323}\) Although it does not appear in the Chapel’s surviving sources, Gibbons’ anthem ‘O all true faithful hearts’ is likewise subtitled in Och 21 as ‘a thanksgiving for the King’s happie recoverie from a great dangerous sicknes’.\(^{324}\) Morehen has proposed that both of these anthems were composed in 1619 when James I returned from Scotland and faced attacks of gout and problems with gallstones. With the court mostly resigned to the King’s death, his recovery was greatly celebrated. For example, a special thanksgiving service was held in St Paul’s Cathedral in April 1619; these anthems could have been composed for this service.\(^{325}\) These works could likewise have been revived during Charles’ reign.

There are also anthems that include texts which pray for Queen Henrietta Maria’s safe deliverance of her children. Aside from their texts, only an organ part for Cranford’s work has survived from the list in table 1.23.

---

\(^{322}\) Ibid., 109. (Transposed up a tone and original note values)

\(^{323}\) Rawl. Poet. 23, 144.


\(^{325}\) Morehen, ‘The English Anthem Text, 1549-1660,’ 84.
Table 1.23 – Anthems that pray for the Queen’s safe deliverance of her children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>Most gracious God and loving father (v)</td>
<td>William Laud</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Child</td>
<td>Praise ye the strength of Britain’s hope (f)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cranford</td>
<td>O eternal God and merciful father (v)</td>
<td>William Laud</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Portman</td>
<td>Most gracious God and merciful father (v)</td>
<td>Unknown Subitled ‘a prayer for the Queen’s majestie’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The anonymous anthem ‘Most gracious God and loving father’ and William Cranford’s ‘O Eternal God and merciful father’ are featured directly after each other in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook. They are particularly notable as they both feature texts that were written by William Laud. ‘Most gracious God and loving father’ thanks God for blessing ‘the Queen’s Majestie with a happy deliverance from the great pain and perill of childbirth’. This anthem’s text is taken from a prayer by Laud that was originally subtitled ‘A Thanksgiving for the Queen’s safe Delivery, and happy Birth of the Lady Mary, Nov. 4, 1631’. It was ordered that this prayer was to be said in all churches during divine services, after the prayer for the Queen and her royal progeny. Laud later modified his prayer into ‘a thanksgiving for the Queen’s safe Delivery, and happy Birth of James, Duke of York’. In the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook, the anonymous anthem asks God to bless ‘Prince Charles and the rest of their Princely Ibue, particularly in the new-born Prince the Duke of York’ (James II). In the margin of the wordbook, the name ‘Princess Elizabeth’ is also noted. This prayer and anthem were presumably spoken and sung interchangeably for the births of Charles I’s and Henrietta Maria’s successive children.

326 Rawl. Poet. 23, 206.
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Cranford’s following anthem thanks God ‘for the great blessing, which thou art working for our Gracious King Charles and this whole state, in giving the Queen’s Majesty further hope of a desired and happy issue.’ This anthem is also repeated in the wordbook on the following page.\textsuperscript{332} The second copy on page 208 is the original text that Laud wrote ‘for the safe Child-bearings of the Queen’s Majesty, 1629’;\textsuperscript{333} this would have been in anticipation of Charles II’s birth. It is probable that Laud was especially motivated to write this prayer as Charles I’s and Henrietta Maria’s first child had died very soon after his birth. Laud notes in his diary,

\begin{quote}
May 13. Wednesday. This day, about three of the clock, the Queen was delivered before her time of a son. He was christened, and died within a short space. This was Ascension Eve. The next day being May 14, Ascension Day,\textit{ Paulo ante medium noctem,} I buried him at Westminster.\textsuperscript{334}
\end{quote}

The same prayer was reissued in 1631, though no record of this later text has survived.\textsuperscript{335} This was presumably released in anticipation of Mary, the Princess Royal’s birth. It is probable that page 207 of the wordbook features the 1631 version. Some very subtle changes to the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[331] Ibid.
\item[332] Ibid., 207-208.
\item[333] Laud,\textit{ The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud,} 3: 102-103.
\item[334] Ibid., 102.
\item[335] Ibid.
\end{footnotes}
Performances of these anthems in the Chapel Royal would have ornamented and enhanced Laud’s prayers. They were however probably not performed in the presence of Henrietta Maria. Henrietta Maria and Laud notoriously clashed several times over attempts to protect their respective religions. Henrietta Maria even refused to attend Charles’ coronation as it was overseen by Laud. These disagreements most notably came to a head in 1637 when Lady Anne Blount, the Countess of Newport, converted to Catholicism; this was after several other high-profile conversions. Urged on by the Countess’ husband, Mountjoy Blount, the first Earl of Newport, Laud advised Charles to enforce further laws against Catholics in England. Laud also recommended to Charles that he should close the Queen’s chapel at Somerset House and those of several other Catholic ambassadors to all English subjects. Due to Henrietta Maria’s influence over Charles, when the subsequent proclamation was published in December 1637, it merely acted as a warning that Catholics should not encourage further conversions. Henrietta Maria continued to flout these orders, most notably by holding a mass on Christmas Day at Somerset House where Lady Newport and other recent converts received communion. ‘Boasting of her open act of defiance, Henrietta later told Signor Con that he would soon see what would become of the proclamation.’

Even though Laud did not agree with Henrietta Maria’s religious beliefs, he would still have been required to show loyalty and obedience to her as she was the Queen. Performances of these anthems would have likewise demonstrated the Chapel’s and the royal court’s loyalty to the royal family. Moreover, if the accessions of Henry VIII, Mary I, Elizabeth I, James I, and Charles I had taught the people of England anything, it was that the births of all royal children should be prayed for and celebrated.

The Chapel Royal’s services have been described as ‘one of the most important... political theatres in early modern England,’ ‘a tableau vivant of the ideal... body politic’. Each service began with a procession, ‘one of the most eminent and frequent occasions

---

337 Range, Music and Ceremonial at British Coronations: From James I to Elizabeth I, 38.
338 Michelle A. White, Henrietta Maria and the English Civil Wars (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 32-34.
339 McCullough, Sermons at Court, 74.
where mens’ ranks and praecedencie are distinguished and discerned’. The Earl who held
the sword of state would lead the procession; he was followed by senior nobles and any
visiting dignitaries. Peers were seated on the left side of the Chapel, the King’s side. They
were arranged so that the higher a man’s rank, the closer he would be seated to the King.
Throughout the service, the King would be assisted by several noblemen. For example, when
he made his offertory, the peer ‘greatest of estate’ would hand him his offertory with the
next most senior peer kneeling on the other side. These practices would have
demonstrated the King’s power and his semi-divine status.

There are anthems in the Chapel’s sources that would have enhanced these physical
practices and endorsed James’ and Charles’ strongly held beliefs that they held a divine right
to rule. These works appear to promote highly controversial royal caesaro-sacramentalist
ideals. The set texts support the view that the ‘gracious King, whom thou to us hast sent’, ‘to this land all happiness doth bring’. Past worshipping God, they also instructed, ‘let
songs of praise and thanks be had for King, for Queen, for Prince, for Peace’.

Table 1.24 – Royal/ caesaro-sacramentalist anthems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anon.</td>
<td>Arise, shine, for thy light is come (v)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Byrd</td>
<td>Behold, O God with thy all-prospering eye (v)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cobb</td>
<td>Give the King thy judgements, O Lord (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 72: 1, 2, 4, 6-8, 11-14</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cranford</td>
<td>O Lord, make thy servant Charles (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 21: 1, 3, 5; 132: 19</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cranford</td>
<td>O Lord, make thy servant Charles (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 21: 1, 3, 5; 132: 19</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

341 Cust, Charles I and the Aristocracy, 1625-1642, 75.
342 Rawl. Poet. 23, 163.
343 Ibid., 170.
344 Ibid., 130.
Amongst this list are Byrd’s and William Cranford’s anthems, ‘O Lord, make thy servant Charles’. The set text asks God to ‘grant him [King], his heart’s desire, and deny not the request of his lips’, ‘for thou… shalt set a crown of pure gold upon his head’ and ‘glorie and great worship shalt thou lay upon him’. Byrd’s work was written during Elizabeth’s reign. He likely composed this work shortly before he was invited to become a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal in 1570 to secure this appointment, or soon after in thanks. Although it is a short work, the vocal lines in Byrd’s anthem are extensively contrapuntal. Several five-voiced arrangements, likely not by Byrd himself, were later produced to increase the clarity of the text. More homophonic sections are only included to paint certain lines of the text such as the unified prayer, ‘give him, his heart’s desire’. Byrd’s work again demonstrates how royalist sentiments in anthems were not a Laudian innovation but also how anthems could be repurposed to appeal to successive monarchs’ more extreme views. Cranford’s setting, composed near the start of Charles I’s reign, is a simple, semi-polyphonic verse anthem. The solo and duet verses usually clearly present the set text. Although the choruses are more polyphonic, they repeat the text from their preceding verses. Homophonic chorus sections are likewise used to emphasise certain lines of the text such as ‘his [King] honour is great’. Other word painting techniques are also included. For example, shorter rhythms are used to illustrate the joy of statements such as ‘rejoice in thy strength’ and ‘upon himself let his crown flourish’. These works would have greatly appealed to James’ and Charles’ beliefs in their God-given rights to rule.

Whilst only the texts of the other anthems in table 1.24 have only survived, two works especially appear to present Charles as a divine prophet, even in the role of the Messiah. John Cobb’s anthem ‘Give the King thy judgements, O God’ sets Psalm 72. This was originally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nathaniel Giles</th>
<th>O Lord of hosts (v)</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walter Porter</td>
<td>See brethren what a pleasing bliss (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 133: 1-3</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tallis</td>
<td>The simple sheep that went astray (v)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

346 Ibid., 13; Monson, ‘Authenticity and Chronology in Byrd’s Church Anthems,’ 287, 304.
supposedly written by King Solomon in anticipation of the Messiah’s reign. When this setting was performed however, it would have sounded like it was Charles and his progeny who ‘shall he judge the people according unto right’ and whom ‘all kings shall fall downe before him, all nations shall doe him service’.\textsuperscript{348} It is noted in the Rawl. Poet 23 wordbook that the anonymous anthem ‘Arise, shine, for thy light is come’ was used during the ‘New Year’s Day’ procession ‘to the church’.

Figure 1.12 – Anon. ‘Arise, shine, for thy light is come’ (Rawl. Poet. 23, fol. 184)\textsuperscript{349}

Although we do not know when this anthem was originally composed, as this anthem’s text describes the Palm Sunday procession, it is ironic that it would have been sung during Charles’ reign whilst he was progressing to church. The instructions that ‘with olive strew his pathes with palme, and thus we see him crown’d with wreaths of glorie’, would therefore have been directed toward Charles.\textsuperscript{350}

\textsuperscript{348} Rawl. Poet. 23, 236.
\textsuperscript{349} Ibid., 184.
\textsuperscript{350} Ibid.
The Chapel did face criticisms that its practices were idolatrous and even blasphemous. Anti-ceremonialists drew comparisons between bowing towards the altar and the sacrament, and bowing before the monarch in his chair of state at court. Through sermons ‘published by his Majesties command’ however, Robert Skinner emphasised the difference between bodily and spiritual worship to highlight the distinctions between bowing before the King and God. Thomas Lawrence observed that when bowing to the altar, ‘the derivation of God’s honour upon any beside God’ was ‘damnable idolatry.’ There are also several anthems that appear to oppose caesaro-sacramentalist views in the Chapel’s sources.

Table 1.25 – Anthems that appear to oppose caesaro-sacramentalist views

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lawes</td>
<td>The Lord is King</td>
<td>Psalm 97: 1, 9, 11; 107: 8, 31; Isaiah 24: 15; Isaiah 42: 10; Psalm 107: 23, 24; 97: 10</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Thou art my King O God</td>
<td>Psalm 44: 5-9</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ojc 180, Lambeth 764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These include ‘The Lord is King’ by Henry Lawes and ‘Thou art my King O God’ by Thomas Tomkins; only the music for Tomkins’ work has survived. The set texts maintain that ‘thou Lord art higher than all that are on earth’ and that ‘I will not trust in my bow: it is not my sword that shall help me; but it is thou that savest us from our enemies’. Tomkins’ verse anthem features clear solo verses that are followed by imitative and polyphonic choruses which usually repeat the text from their preceding verses. Unusual vocal textures can be heard in the final section of this anthem as it features alternating highly short solo verses and homophonic choruses. These emphasise the final message of the text, ‘and we will praise thy name for evermore’. Both anthems’ texts and the compositional techniques

351 Cust, Charles I and the Aristocracy, 1625-1642, 74-76.
354 Thomas Lawrence, A Sermon Preached Before the Kings Majesty (London, 1637), 58.
in Tomkins’ work display the glory and power of God. They remind listeners that God should be praised over all on earth. These therefore seemingly oppose the Chapel’s royalist practices that many more conservative figures objected to. These anthems may of course have been intentionally included in the Chapel’s repertoire to dismiss the accusations that the Chapel’s practices were idolatrous or blasphemous.

Almost all the composers of these royalist and nationalistic anthems worked in the Chapel Royal during their lifetimes. Chapel Royal musicians would of course have selected texts that supported and praised their employer, the monarch. Performances of these works would presumably have been especially encouraged during services that the monarchs attended. It is therefore notable that many of these works were seemingly exclusively included in the Chapel’s repertoire. These compositions and performances could therefore have been produced to gain the monarchs’ approval and favour. Only William Cranford and Thomas Weelkes were not Chapel Royal employees. Cranford was a lay vicar at St Paul’s Cathedral during Charles I’s reign, another important central religious institution in London. Weelkes was the Master of the Choristers and Organist at Chichester from around 1602. In his fourth volume of madrigals (1608), he describes himself as a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal, though there are no records of this appointment. At most, it is possible that he was a Gentleman Extraordinary, filling in until a permanent replacement for a Gentleman was found. In his later years, Weelkes was often in trouble at Chichester for heavy drinking and swearing, even whilst he was playing during services.\(^{357}\) It is therefore possible that Weelkes hoped that his royalist anthems would gain him the King’s approval and lead to a permanent Chapel Royal position.

**Honouring Other Court Figures**

Aside from the monarch and royal family, other important nobles and divines are prayed for and honoured through the Chapel Royal’s anthems. It would also have been important for the royal court and its employees to demonstrate their loyalty to these figures. They were integral to the running and protection of England.

Around the time of the Gunpowder conspirators’ trial in January 1606, James I passed the Thanksgiving Act. This instructed that services and sermons to commemorate the foiling

of the Gunpowder plot were to be delivered annually on November 5; this act continued until 1859. Several anthems in the Chapel Royal’s collections appear to have been composed and performed to commemorate this occasion.

Table 1.26 – Anthems to celebrate the deliverance from the Gunpowder Plot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Bull</td>
<td>O God, best guides, sure guard (v)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>Thou God of wisdom and of might (v)(^{359})</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Hooper</td>
<td>Hearken ye nations (v)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

They ask ‘God… sole king of kings’ to ‘preserve… our King, Queen, Prince, Peers’\(^{360}\) and ‘defend him [King] from all trecherie, let his escaped dangers past’\(^{361}\) that ‘no unhallowed arme, touch his anointed, nor his prophets harme’\(^{362}\) when ‘fierce hands, false hears, sly heads of monstrous men, plotted, conspired’.\(^{363}\) These works prayed for the King and all ‘prelates, senate, judges, peers, men, women, children of all years’\(^{364}\) who could likewise have been gravely affected by the Gunpowder Plot. Edmund Hooper’s ‘Hearken ye nations’ is the only known surviving work that was copied with an ascription that it should be used ‘for Gunpowder Treason Day’ (Clifford).\(^{365}\) Nevertheless, from observing their texts, Bull’s and Gibbons’ anthems could also have been used to commemorate this day. Hooper’s anthem is highly elaborate with polyphonic, multi-voiced verses throughout. Whilst the opening chorus contains more homophonic vocal lines, these too become more imitative and polyphonic throughout the piece. There are also some effective word painting techniques. In

\(^{358}\) An Act for a Public Thanksgiving to Almighty God every Year on the Fifth Day of November, [Thanksgiving Act], 1605, HL/PO/PU/1/1605/3J1n1, Parliamentary Archives, London.

\(^{359}\) Paul Vining, ed., *Thou God of Wisdom – Orlando Gibbons* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989). Whilst only the organ part for Gibbons’ work has survived, Paul Vining has reconstructed this work from the organ book.

\(^{360}\) Rawl. Poet. 23, 171.

\(^{361}\) Ibid., 173.

\(^{362}\) Ibid., 175.

\(^{363}\) Ibid., 171.

\(^{364}\) Ibid.

the opening verse, the two medius voices imitatively pass the text ‘all come see and hear’ between them before joining in homophony to emphasise this universal instruction. A dotted fanfare-like figure is used to illustrate ‘our honourable Senate’ and a longer note/ rhythm for the word ‘touch’ during the phrase ‘touch our anointed’ depicts this action. These anthems consequently demonstrate the importance of this thanksgiving celebration. As these works are found in the Chapel’s surviving sources, it is probable that similar services were conducted throughout Charles I’s reign. It is however notable that the Puritans used this day to warn others about the growth of England’s Catholic factions and criticise the expanding ceremonial practices; Laud himself even ignored this day’s celebrations.

A parliamentary order in 1552 banned commemorations of minor saints and removed St George from the Anglican calendar of feast days. This ban was lifted by Mary I, but then reinstated under James I in 1604. Because of the links between St George and the Order of the Garter, and as St George was England’s patron saint, the Garter Knights were still permitted to celebrate this day. An exclusive royal procession was supposed to take place annually on 23 April, but could be held ‘at such other tyme and tymes as yerely shalbe thought convenyent’.

Two anthems in the Chapel Royal’s collections were copied with ascriptions that they were written for St George’s Day.

Table 1.27 – Anthems for St George’s Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Giles</td>
<td>O how happy a thing it is (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 133 (S &amp; H) Subtitled ‘Anthem for St George’s Feast’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

369 Ibid. The date of the St George’s day procession was changed several times to avoid clashes with other feast days (in 1614 it was moved to 28 April to avoid Easter Eve), urgent parliamentary business (in 1628 it was moved to September), and in times of plague (in 1625 it was moved to November). Cust, Charles I and the Aristocracy, 1625-1642, 133; Richard Cust, ‘Charles I and the Order of the Garter,’ Journal of British Studies 52, vol. 2 (2013): 343-369; Elias Ashmole, The History of the Most Noble Order of the Garter (London, 1715).
Most of the music for Giles’ ‘O how happy a thing it is’ has unfortunately not survived. Tomkins’ ‘Who is he that commeth out’ is listed as a verse anthem in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook and Ojc 181. However, the same bass part is found in a full anthem setting in several domestic sources. It is therefore probable that this work was accidentally written into the wrong section in the Chapel’s sources. Tomkins’ anthem contains highly contrapuntal vocal lines. Brief homophonic sections are featured to emphasise certain sections of the text, such as ‘everyman hath his sword upon his thigh’.  

Investitures into the Order of the Garter often took place on St George’s Day. Records that royal wind players were paid for their services during Garter instalments have survived. It is therefore apparent that extensive musical performances were encouraged to heighten these occasions.

To Andrew Bassano and eleven other Majs Musycons and servauntes for the wynde Instruments for their extraordinary service at Windsore at the Installment of the duke of York in the moneth of May 1611. 60s.  

To Andrew Bassano, Edward Bassano, Samuel Garshe, Jeronymo Bassano, John Lancer and seaven other his Majs Musicons to give their attendance at Windsore at the Installment of the Elector Palatine and Count Maurice... £6 [Feb., 1613] 

To Andrew Bassano an d13 of his fellowes for waiting at Windsor at the Installment of the Knights of the most noble order of the Garter. 22. 10s [Nov., 1623]  

For this study, perhaps the most significant Garter Investiture was Frederick, the Duke of Wirtemberg’s. This took place at Windsor in November 1603. It is recorded that during this event...

---
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service, the ‘sermon ended, the Musick was again renewed, which consisted of the voices of two Youths standing opposite one another; so after a Tenor, an Altus, and a Base was sung, the Organ and other instrumental Musick, together with vocal, went together in consort.’

John Bull’s consort anthem ‘How joyful and how glad a thing it is’ very closely matches this description.

Table 1.28 – Anthem for Order of the Garter investitures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Bull</td>
<td>How joyful and how glad a thing it is (v)</td>
<td>Unknown Subtitled ‘An Antheme for the Garter’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This work is recorded in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook as ‘An Antheme for the Garter’ and is filled with praise for the ‘good King long time may reign in Health & Unitie’. It was even noted that the opening verse of this anthem was ‘for 2 children & a Meane’.

Figure 1.13 – John Bull ‘How joyful and how glad a thing it is’ (Rawl. Poet. 23, fol. 178)

These works would have further demonstrated that it was highly important to honour these crucial court figures. They would also have exhibited the splendour and power of England’s ‘prelates, senate, judges, [and] peers’ to important and foreign visitors. Having works performed at these prestigious events would have greatly benefited the composers.

376 Ibid.
377 Ibid.
These events would have advertised the composers’ works and could have potentially encouraged the honoured court figures to patronise them.

**Demonstrations of England’s Power to Protect Against Domestic and Foreign Powers**

The Chapel’s practices could also have been heightened to demonstrate England’s political and militaristic power, and therefore warn Englishmen and foreign enemies against revolting and attacking England. Set texts and compositional techniques could have been used as deterrents.

**Table 1.29 – Anthems that demonstrate England’s political and militaristic power**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusiv e to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Bull</td>
<td>Deliver me O God (v)</td>
<td>John Rhodes' <em>The Countrie Mans Comfort</em> (1588) – Queen Elizabeth I</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Byrd</td>
<td>O God the proud are risen (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 86: 14-15</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How long shall mine enemies triumph (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 13: 2b-5</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cobb</td>
<td>The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 20: 1-6</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Holmes</td>
<td>The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 20</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Mundy</td>
<td>Save me, O God, for thy name’s sake (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 54: 1-4</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Porter</td>
<td>Consider mine enemies, how many there are (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 25: 18-20</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliver me, not over unto the will (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 27: 14-16</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tomkincs</td>
<td>The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 20</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The text in Byrd’s ‘O God the proud are risen’ asks for God’s protection from the proud and violent men who ‘are risen up against me’. This desire would surely have been

---

felt by Elizabeth I, Byrd’s employer at the time of this work’s composition, as she had been faced with the Northern Rebellion in 1569 and the Babington Plot in 1586. This anthem could also have reflected Byrd’s religious convictions as England’s Catholics were increasingly being persecuted. He also often clashed with the Puritan authorities at Lincoln Cathedral during his work there.\(^{379}\) ‘How long shall mine enemies triumph’ contains similar pleas. This full anthem is highly polyphonic and features characteristic word painting techniques. For example, descending figures illustrate the text ‘that I sleep not in death’ and ‘if I be cast down’.\(^{380}\)

Extract 1.15 – William Byrd ‘How long shall mine enemies triumph’ (bars 24-27, 32-36)\(^{381}\)

Whilst Robert Reeve’s research has demonstrated that it is not possible to conclusively determine William Mundy’s religious allegiances, it is possible that Mundy likewise remained a Catholic throughout his life.\(^{382}\) Similar political and religious sentiments could therefore have inspired Mundy’s anthem ‘Save me, O God, for thy name’s sake’. The set text asks God to ‘hearken to my words… for strangers are risen up against me, and tyrants, which have not God before their eyes, seek after my soul’.\(^{383}\) The appearance of


\(^{381}\) Ibid., 28-29. (Transposed up a tone and original note values)


\(^{383}\) Rawl. Poet. 23, 15.
these works in the Chapel’s repertoire again demonstrate how anthems could be repurposed and the original composers’ motivations altered and disregarded. The views that both Byrd’s and Mundy’s anthems expressed would have been universal to the political struggles and religious conflicts that were faced throughout James I’s and Charles I’s reigns.

Two of Walter Porter’s anthems display comparable beliefs that England’s militaristic powers were divinely given. The consecutively featured works in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook ‘Consider mine enemies, how many there are’ and ‘Deliver me not over unto the will’ ask God to provide protection against the ‘false witnesses risen up against me and such as speak wrong’ that ‘bear tyrannous hate against me’.\(^{384}\) Unfortunately, only the texts for these anthems have survived. The three settings of ‘The Lord hear thee in the day of trouble’, which trust that ‘the Lord helpeth his Anointed’\(^{385}\) and ‘will hear him from his holy heaven’,\(^{386}\) would likewise have demonstrated that the King was divinely protected. Performances of these anthems would have consequently provided warnings to religious and political enemies.

Several specific political conflicts and victories are commemorated through anthems. John Bull’s ‘Deliver me, O God’ prayed that England would be saved from the Spanish Armada. The set text comes from John Rhodes’ 1588 collection *The Countrie Mans Comfort*. In Rhodes’ collection, the poems ‘Deliver me, O God’ and ‘Look and bow down thine ear’ are ascribed as ‘Two most excellent songs or Ditties, made by Queene Elizabeth, as it is credibly reported (and as it is very likely by some words in it) in the yeare 1588. When the Spaniard came to possess this land and is in manner of a prayer to God.’\(^{387}\) As previously discussed, the anthems that celebrated the defeat of the Gunpowder Plot would have cautioned others against similar treasonous endeavours.

James I’s previously discussed 1617 visit to Scotland is also relevant to these investigations. James had attempted to suppress the Scottish Kirk throughout his reign. He

\(^{384}\) Ibid., 38.

\(^{385}\) Ibid., 203.

\(^{386}\) Ibid., 225.

\(^{387}\) John Rhodes, ed., *The Countrie Mans Comfort* (London, 1637), D6-6v. This first prayer appears to have been answered as the second poem, ‘in manner of thankses giving to God for her and our deliverance from the invincible Navie of the Spaniard’, notes, ‘he made the winde and waters rise: and did destroy mine enemies’. During the Armada’s return to Spain, they were caught by the Gulf Stream near the coasts of Scotland and Ireland. They were pushed closer to the coast and a series of powerful winds drove many of the ships into the rocks. Philip II is reported to have stated, when he heard of the fate of his fleet, that ‘I sent the Armada against men, not God’s winds and waves’.
remarked at the 1604 Hampton Court conference that a Scottish presbytery ‘as wel ageeth with a Monarchy, as God and Devill.’\textsuperscript{388} After years of turmoil, James resolved in 1617 to bring the two nations’ religions together and demonstrate the correctness of the Church of England’s ceremonial practices through a visit to Scotland. An Anglican service was held in Holyrood’s chapel during this visit. The English Chapel Royal’s musicians performed during this service, probably because the Scottish Chapel Royal had declined since James’ departure in 1603. In preparation, as recounted in this chapter’s introduction, Holyrood’s chapel was architecturally enhanced and a Dallam organ was installed. It is recounted that ‘the English service was begunne in the Chappell Royal, with singing of quiristours, surplices and playing on organs.’\textsuperscript{389} Many of the attending Scots were dismayed at being made to kneel during communion, ‘staining and polluting the house of religion by the dregs of popery.’\textsuperscript{390} Anthony Welden noted that ‘I am persuaded that yf God & his angells should come downe in their whitest garments they would run away and cry, ‘The Children of the Chappell are come agayne to torment us; let us fly from the abomination of these boys, & hide ourselves in the mountaynes.’\textsuperscript{391}

As it is noted in Och 21 that Gibbons’ ‘Great King of Gods’ was composed ‘for the King being in Scotland’, we know that specific sacred music was written for this visit.\textsuperscript{392}

Table 1.30 – Anthem for James I’s 1617 visit to Scotland (and the reopening of Holyrood Palace’s Chapel)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>Great King of Gods (v)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{388} William Barlow, ‘Sum and Substance of the Conference which it pleased his Excellent Majestie to have with the Lords Bishop, and others of his Clergie (at which the most of the Lords in the Councill were present) in his Majesties Privie-Chamber, at Hampton Court Jan. 14 1603,’ in A History of Conference and other Proceedings connected with the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer: From the year 1558 to the Year 1690, ed. Edward Cardwell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1849), 202.

\textsuperscript{389} David Calderwood, The True History of the Church of Scotland From the Beginning, Unto the End of the Reign of James VI, 1678, ed. Thomas Tomson, 8 vols. (Edinburgh, 1842-1849), 7: 246.

\textsuperscript{390} Robert Jonston, Historia Rerum Britannicarum (Amsterdam, 1655), 518.

\textsuperscript{391} Nichols, The Progresses, Processions, and Magnificent Festivities, of King James the First, his Royal Consort, Family, and Court, 3: 340.

\textsuperscript{392} Oxford, Christ Church Library Mus. 21, fol. 230.
This work prays that angels would be the King’s ‘guardian and his guide’ in ‘the place where first our bliss was bred’. Mostly solo and simple duet verses and more homophonic choruses add to the stately feel of this anthem. A quintet of instruments also accompanied the voices; viols presumably performed these parts. It is not recorded when this anthem was performed during James’ visitation. Phillip Brett has however proposed that the English Chapel Royal’s choir would likely not have been welcome outside of Holyrood. Whenever during James’ visit this anthem was performed, it is highly likely that Gibbons’ anthem was encouraged to remind the Scottish Presbyterians of their obligations to the King and the Church of England. An anthem with instrumental parts, probably sung by an ensemble in full choral vestments, would have demonstrated to the Scots how ceremonial practices could benefit their worship. This performance would additionally have heightened the splendour of James’ entrance.

To Warn and Compete with Catholic Counterparts

There was a growing Catholic influence in England which was particularly fuelled by Henrietta Maria and her Catholic chapel at Somerset House. This Chapel included highly extravagant architectural decorations and encouraged physical and musical ceremonial practices. The exact design of this chapel is difficult to ascertain from the surviving eighteenth-century plans and drawings, as by this time the House had been demolished and rebuilt. Nevertheless, the building appears to have been built as a double cube. It did not have a distinct choir, but there was a royal closet at the west end and a vestry behind the altar. There were also transepts that led off into side chapels and above these there was an organ loft and a choir gallery.

---

393 Rawl. Poet. 23, 168.
The first High Mass was celebrated and led by Capuchin friars on 8 December 1636. Over the altar, a 40ft high monstrance by the Flemish sculptor François Dieussart was placed. In this, the host was held in a large oval, surrounded by prophets and supported by two pillars. These went through clouds that reportedly contained 200 angels, seraphim and cherubim, lit by 400 lights. As the choir would have been positioned behind the monstrance, the illusion that any singing was coming from the angels in the sculpture would have been created. When the curtain was pulled back as the congregation entered, it was reported that Henrietta Maria wept with joy. Charles also attended this service, and afterwards, is accounted to have spent an hour and a half examining Dieussart’s creation.\footnote{398 Thomas Birch, The Court and Times of Charles I (London: Henry Colburn, 1848), 311-314; Margaret Whinney, Sculpture in Britain 1530-1830 (Bloomsbury: Yale University Press, 1992), 37-38.}

It can therefore be proposed that the heightened ceremonial practices in Charles’ Chapel Royal were partly encouraged to compete with the Queen’s Catholic practices. These could have demonstrated that people in England did not need to venture beyond the Church of England ‘in order to see that art and ritual might add a dimension to worship.’\footnote{399 Newman, ‘Holiness in Beauty?’, 305.}

If visitors from Catholic countries or Henrietta Maria attended a service in the Chapel, elaborate musical practices could have been included to heighten the Chapel’s devotions and demonstrate the skill of its Gentlemen. There are unfortunately no surviving written records that describe the ratification ceremony between Prince Charles and the Spanish Infanta. As various singers and instrumentalists were depicted, the engraving (given previously on page 62) nevertheless seems to demonstrate that when Catholic visitors were entertained, the Chapel’s musical practices were enhanced.\footnote{400 Wainwright, ‘Precedents for the Symphony Anthem,’ 12.}

There are several anthems in the Chapel’s sources that could have enabled its musicians to compete with their Catholic counterparts.

Table 1.31 – Anthems that could have been produced to compete with Catholic practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Hunt</td>
<td>O light, O blessed Trinity (v)</td>
<td>Latin of the Hours (Sunday Vespers, second and fourth)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On an open page spread in Rawl. Poet. 23, an English and Latin version of the text ‘O Light, O blessed Trinity’ were copied. These were both titled as a ‘Hymnus ad Trinitatem’. It is recorded that the English verse anthem was written by Thomas Hunt. Although the composer of the Latin version is not noted, it is possible that this work was also by Hunt. These anthems to the Trinity tell that ‘to thee we’ll sing... with hymnes we wi thy glorie raise’. Hunt’s anthem and its Latin counterpart are exclusively found in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook. The inclusion of a Latin anthem in the Chapel’s repertoire is especially unusual, even though many people who attended the Chapel Royal’s services would have understood Latin. In accordance with the Church of England’s directives, Latin anthems would have been discouraged. This Latin setting was probably copied into the wordbook as it was used during an important but unusual service; English contrafacta anthems were far more common. It is possible that ‘O lux beata Trinitas’ was performed at a service when a foreign Catholic court, or indeed Henrietta Maria, was in attendance. This anthem would have demonstrated the rivalling splendour of the Church of England.

Richard Portman’s verse anthem ‘How many hired servants’, which features pseudodramatic techniques, could have been composed and performed to compete with Catholic musical practices. Portman’s work is listed in Ojc 181 as the ‘Anthem of the Prodigall Childe’. Only the organ and decani bass parts have survived for this anthem. The different

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Text (v)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Anthemic?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Portman</td>
<td>How many hired servants (v)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>O lux beata Trinitas (v)</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

401 Rawl. Poet. 23, 220-221.
402 Ibid.
403 The only other occasion where Latin appears in Rawl. Poet. 23 occurs at the end of Walter Porter’s anthem ‘Ponder my words’ where the ‘Gloria patri’ is noted at the end; only the text from this anthem has survived. It is of course most likely that the Latin title of the minor doxology was merely used as a shorthand, and that it would have been sung in English. Alternatively, if the Latin was sung, then any assembled congregations would have been able to easily identify the sung text. Rawl. Poet. 23, 187.
404 Ojc 181, 143.
parts of ‘The Prodigal Sonn’, ‘The Father’, and ‘The elder sonne’ are nevertheless marked in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook before the verses which contain dialogue for these characters. It can therefore be presumed that these were solo verses.

Figure 1.14 – Richard Portman ‘How many hired servants’ (Rawl. Poet. 23, fol. 145)

The two choruses feature different sections of text and thereby narrate and comment on the action of the verses. There are interesting links between this anthem and Giovanni Francesco Anerio’s 1619 *Teatro Armonico Spirituale*. Anerio was an Italian composer and priest and he composed *Teatro* for St. Philip Neri’s *Oratorio Vespertino* series. Through devotional madrigals with alternating obbligato instrumental and vocal passages, *Teatro* told the stories of the Prodigal Son and the Conversion of Saul. As Portman’s work was composed after Anerio’s, it is possible that Portman was influenced by *Teatro*. Performances of Portman’s

---

405 Rawl. Poet. 23, 145.
406 Ibid.
407 Victor J. Matthews, *Saint Philip Neri: Apostle of Rome and Founder of the Congregation of the Oratory*, orig. published 1934 (Charlotte, NC: TAN Books, 2009); ‘Concert – Oratorio Vespertino,’ *Douce Memoire*, accessed March 25, 2021, www.doulcememoire.com/en/programme=oratorio-vespertino. Philippe Neri, the founder of the Oratorians, followed the Council of Trent’s Counter-Reform recommendations; music must seduce, convince, edify the faithful. *Oratorio Vespertino* was a service that was conducted on feast days after Vespers. During this, ‘a sermon was delivered by heart by a child, lauds were sung by the congregation, and Italian spiritual madrigals were sung by professional musicians.’
anthem were therefore possibly encouraged in the Chapel Royal to heighten and
demonstrate the splendour of the Church of England to visitors to rival practices from the
continent and Catholic Church.

Settings for the Purification and Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary can be found in
the Chapel’s sources.

Table 1.32 – Anthems for the Purification and Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Feast Source</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Tomkins</td>
<td>We beseech thee, O Lord, pour thy grace (v)</td>
<td>Annunciation of the BVM Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘Antiphona’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Almighty and everliving God, we humbly beseech thy majesty (v)</td>
<td>Purification of the BVM (Candlemas) Collect</td>
<td>Subtitled ‘For Candlemas Day’</td>
<td>Rawl. Poet. 23 Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitudes towards the Virgin Mary drastically changed with England’s Reformation. The Church of England promoted the belief that only Jesus Christ could mediate between humanity and God. The Church consequently focussed on celebrating Mary’s role in the incarnation of Christ. Anthems that marked the Annunciation and Purification would therefore have been acceptable. Thomas Tomkins’ ‘Almighty and everliving God, we humbly beseech thy majesty’ sets the Purification Day collect. This work begins with solo and duet verses, though the vocal lines never overlap during these. The choruses are also quite homophonic with some imitative entries. More imitative and polyphonic techniques are only used in the later verses and choruses after the text has been fully recited. Congregations would still have been able to hear the set text. Whilst these feast days were legal, the

---

appearance of specific anthems to enhance their celebrations was unusual. It can therefore be proposed that these feast days could have been musically enhanced to compete with the undoubtedly elaborate celebrations in Henrietta Maria’s Catholic chapel.

Primers were private devotional books that developed from the *Book of Hours*; this collection was used by the laity in the Catholic Church. When the Church of England was established, it still retained elements of Catholicism. To enable England’s people to understand the word of God, a new Church of England Primer was produced in 1545; this was entitled the King’s Primer and was later reissued in 1547 and 1559.

William Mundy drew on metrical hymn translations from this Primer’s Hours for two of his anthems. These are ‘O Lord the world’s saviour’\(^{411}\) and ‘O Lord the maker of all things’.\(^{412}\)

Table 1.33 – Anthems that include texts from the King’s Primer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Mundy</td>
<td>O Lord the maker of all things (f)</td>
<td>King’s Primer: Hymns to the Hours: Compline, Rerum Creator Omnium</td>
<td>Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Lord the world’s saviour (f)</td>
<td>King’s Primer: Hymns to the Hours: Evensong, Salvator Mundi Domine</td>
<td>Ojc 181</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Tye</td>
<td>I will exalt thee (f)</td>
<td>King’s Primer: Psalm 30: <em>The Dirige or the Remembrances of the Dead</em></td>
<td>Ojc 181</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘O lord the maker of all things’ was one of Mundy’s most widely distributed and therefore seemingly popular works. The British Library MS Harley 7339 manuscript, dating from 1716, claims that this piece was ‘composed first in Latin by Henry VIII and sung in his own Royall Chappell’.\(^{413}\) Although it is unlikely that Henry VIII composed this work, the ascription to him could have made the work more popular. Alternating homophonic and polyphonic sections

\(^{411}\) ‘Salvator mundi domine’ from Evensong.

\(^{412}\) ‘Rerum creator omnium’ from Compline.

\(^{413}\) A Score in the Hand of Thomas Tudway, Forming Part of his Anthology for Edward, Lord Harley, 1716, MS Harley 7339, British Library, London, fol. 4.
with imitative phrases are featured throughout.\textsuperscript{414} Christopher Tye’s ‘I will exalt thee’ sets a metrical translation of Psalm 30 from the Primer’s ‘The Dirige’ section, or the ‘Remembrances of the Dead’.\textsuperscript{415} This substantial anthem features polyphonic and imitative vocal parts throughout. Word painting techniques are also used. For example, downwards falling figures accompany the text ‘from them that descend into the pit’. Homophony is used to emphasise lines such as ‘the Lord hath heard me and hath taken mercy upon me’. The phrase ‘give thanks to thee for evermore’ is also extensively repeated.\textsuperscript{416} It is additionally possible that this anthem was performed during Charles I’s 1633 visit to Durham Cathedral,\textsuperscript{417} probably making it a royally favoured anthem.

\textsuperscript{414} William Mundy, \textit{O Lord, the maker of all things}, ed. Jacob Narverud (Doral, FL.: JN Music, 2020).


\textsuperscript{417} Ormsby, ed., \textit{The Correspondence of John Cosin}, 1: 212-217.
After around 1564, the Primer became less popular as the Book of Common Prayer was more widely used. During Charles I’s reign however, Queen Henrietta Maria’s French ladies mocked their English counterparts for not having a collection of private devotions. Francis White of the Durham House group advised the King to commission John Cosin to produce such an anthology. Cosin’s 1627 *A Collection of Private Devotions in the Practice of the Ancient Church, Called the Hours of Prayer* was consequently published; this took the 1560 Latin Elizabethan Primer *Orarium, seu libellus precatiōnum, per regiam majestatem et clericum latine editus* as its model. Although not explicitly entitled as such, Cosin’s collection

---

418 Tye, ‘I will exalt thee,’ 133, 138. (Transposed up a minor third and note values halved)
revived the primers’ traditions by providing set private devotions. Edmund Hooper used ‘The Hymn’ from the Prayers for the Ninth Hour in his full anthem ‘O thou God almighty’; it is presumed that Cosin wrote this hymn text.

Table 1.34 – Anthem that includes a text from John Cosin’s 1627 A Collection of Private Devotions in the Practice of the Ancient Church, Called the Hours of Prayer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Exclusive to CR?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Hooper</td>
<td>O thou God almighty (f)</td>
<td>‘The Hymn’ from the Prayers for the Ninth Hour - John Cosin’s 1627 A Collection of Private Devotions in the Practice of the Ancient Church, Called the Hours of Prayer</td>
<td>Ojc 180</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Polyphonic vocal textures can be heard throughout Hooper’s anthem. The imitative vocal lines for the text ‘grant we beseech thee, of thy great clemency, on us to have mercy’ effectively paint these collective and urgent pleas. Descending melodic figures also illustrate the ‘fountain of all pity’. Hooper however died in 1621, six years before Cosin’s collection was published. It is therefore probable that Cosin’s text was in circulation before it was published in his Collection of Private Devotions.

Cosin’s Collection of Private Devotions was widely criticised. For example, Peter Smart called it a ‘base begotten bratt... that painted fardel.’ Between March and June 1628, Prynne and Burton published pamphlets which highlighted the popish perversions that they believed Cosin’s work contained; these especially included the set prayers to the Blessed Virgin Mary. Hooper’s setting would have demonstrated that he supported the Church of England’s evolving ceremonial practices and Cosin’s devotional writing skills. The fact that Cosin was an influential divine in the Church of England at this time would surely not have been lost on Hooper either. By including Hooper’s anthem in the Chapel Royal’s repertoire, performances would have further confirmed that Cosin’s collection was royally endorsed.

---

421 Ornsby, ed., The Correspondence of John Cosin, 1: 195.
Elaborate settings of these collections’ texts would have demonstrated that the Church of England could deliver high-quality sacred writings and private devotional texts to rival Catholic collections. The Chapel’s musical practices consequently appear to have been heightened to prove that the Church of England was just as glorious as the Catholic Church. By demonstrating the glory and prowess of the Church of England, as with the Gunpowder Plot anthems, these could also have served as warnings to Catholics in England and abroad against opposing the country and its Church.
Conclusion

Through analysing the texts and compositional techniques that are featured in the Chapel Royal’s early seventeenth-century repertoire, I have been able to re-examine the Chapel’s musical practices and what motivated these. A lot of these motivations are of course speculative, though I have always been careful throughout this chapter to provide relevant contextual information and analyses to support the proposed conclusions.

This chapter has demonstrated that there were of course religious motivations behind the Chapel Royal’s musical practices and anthem repertoire choices. The Chapel was primarily a religious venue where prayers were offered up to God. Nevertheless, the works that the Chapel’s Gentlemen performed were not merely another part of the ceremonial practices that the Chapel promoted. Works also often appear to have been composed and performed to support specific ceremonial and Laudian religious policies. Anthems with appropriate texts could also have been repurposed to support the advancing ceremonial practices. These included celebrations of important feast days, the physical practice of bowing, and the performance of choral and instrumental works themselves. These works would have been politically important as they would have demonstrated the Chapel’s support for these ceremonial religious policies. By showing that such practices were royally endorsed, these works would have deterred more conservative figures from raising complaints.

It was important in this chapter to firstly address why the musicians themselves included certain texts and compositional techniques in their works. It has been revealed that practical considerations, such as how easy texts were to set, whether previous works could be used as compositional models, and if musicians already had a working relationship with a poet, would have motivated composers. It was even shown that some composers appear to have set certain texts as they featured a pun on their name as a ‘publicity stunt’. This consequently led me to examine further personal political and economic motivations.

As texts by important court figures and divines were often included in anthems, it was proposed that composers could have firstly chosen these to demonstrate that they believed and trusted in the authors’ sacred writings. Many works were also composed on the instruction of, or to honour, such figures and their associated establishment at important celebratory services. These works often include more elaborate compositional techniques.
Composers could have selected such texts and techniques to demonstrate their political allegiances to these important court figures and divines. This is of course understandable as musicians relied on patronage and therefore could have composed these works in the hopes that they would gain further economic and employment support from these men. All members and employees of the royal court were required to demonstrate decorum and respect to high-ranking court and church members, including when they were in the Chapel Royal. These efforts to honour writers could even have overruled religious concerns with the sincerity of the poet’s beliefs.

It was also demonstrated that composers and the Chapel’s employees often appear to have considered the needs of their intended listeners and singers. Opposing previous scholars’ conclusions, this chapter has continually revealed that the Chapel’s repertoire contained a plethora of compositional techniques. Composers would have altered their compositional techniques, and the Chapel would have selected different repertoire, depending on what type of an occasion works were required for. There are of course more elaborate works that would have been performed to ornament and enhance prestigious and public services. There are nevertheless also those that include authorised texts that most of the populace would have been familiar with and techniques that would have improved the clarity of the sung texts for congregations. Works that were originally published in domestic collections naturally contained simpler techniques to ensure that these could be performed by amateur singers. It was additionally proven that simpler repertoire would have been necessary as during normal midweek services, only half of the singingmen would usually have been working and various other reasons could have caused drops in attendance. Although there is no surviving evidence that details how often, or if, the Chapel’s musicians rehearsed, it can be conjectured that the Gentlemen would not have attended regular rehearsals. This could also explain why the Chapel’s musical sources contain such a high percentage of verse anthems. With more solo lines, these would have required fewer performers and rehearsals.

This variety of different compositional techniques that can be found in the Chapel’s sources also demonstrates that the Chapel’s musical practices were not enhanced as extensively as their architectural, liturgical, and other physical ceremonial practices. Amongst William Laud’s ‘Orders for the Attendance of the Gentlemen of his Majesties Chapell’, he noted what fines that the gentlemen were made to pay for missing services.
9. The check for absence from morning prayers, holy dayes, festivall
tymes, and sermon dayes, shalbe 4d., from evening prayer uppon
such dayes and their festivall eves 3d., for absence from morninge
prayer uppon workyng dayes 3d., from evening prayer 2d.\textsuperscript{423}

As the fines for missing Sunday or feast day services were highest, this further demonstrates
that the Gentlemen’s duties were not as extensive or important during the normal mid-week
services. This evidence highlights a conclusion that will be drawn throughout this thesis, that
musical practices were not necessarily a centrally important ceremonial practice for the
Laudians.

It is undeniable that the Chapel’s musical sources still contain many works that
feature elaborate compositional techniques. It certainly appears that the Chapel’s musical
practices were heightened more than any other institutions’. But this was not a new practice;
ceremonial enhancements were not exclusively encouraged during the height of the
Laudians’ influence in the 1620s and 1630s. The Chapel Royal was the public face of the
Church of England and was therefore extremely politically significant. There were many
political and economic reasons why the Chapel would have ceremonially heightened its
practices, including its musical ones.

This chapter has proposed and evidenced that more elaborate works would have
been used to demonstrate the splendour of the English Church, court, and monarchy. The
need for high quality music consequently often appears to have overruled many concerns
that could have been raised about certain works’ texts. The inclusion of works in the Chapel’s
repertoire that featured pseudo-dramatic techniques would have enabled the Chapel to
compete with the court’s secular entertainments. There were consistently problems with
attendance in the Chapel Royal, therefore works could have been included to entertain and
draw people into the sacred services. Such works would have been particularly required
during important ceremonial court celebrations.

This chapter also examined the records of musical works that were performed at
occasions such as church festivals, weddings, and coronations. Records demonstrate that
these were often elaborate services that were filled with music. The Chapel could have
chosen to augment its prayers to ask for God’s blessing during these occasions through using

\textsuperscript{423} Ashbee and Harley, eds., \textit{The Cheque Books of the Chapel Royal}, 1: 112.
enhanced ceremonial practices. It was additionally highlighted that many important nobles and foreign dignitaries would have attended such services. The Chapel’s musical practices at these events would consequently have heightened displays of the splendour and talents of the English Church, court, and monarchy.

It was further evidenced that the Chapel’s repertoire contained a large collection of royalist and nationalistic anthems. Royalist works appear to have been copied into specific, significant places in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook. As well as general repertoire, there were works that celebrated the King, commemorated important royal occasions, and honoured members of the royal court. These works could principally have been performed due to religious motivations as it would have been important to England’s subjects to pray for God’s blessing for the King, the royal family, and the court. It appears to have been especially important to express these prayers during times of illness. This was not a new practice, as several of these royalist and nationalistic works had been repurposed from Elizabeth’s reign. These works could also have been chosen and performed for political reasons. Most of the composers of these nationalistic and royalist works were members of the Chapel Royal, or were closely linked, and many of these works were seemingly exclusive to the Chapel Royal. It would have been important for the Chapel’s composers and musicians to demonstrate their loyalty to their employer, the King, and his favoured subjects. These attitudes were vital to express in all religious spheres, even if the writer and honoured person did not see eye to eye; as with Laud and his works that prayed for the safety of Henrietta Maria during childbirth. The anthems that commemorated the deliverance from the Gunpowder plot were especially controversial. As previously discussed, the Puritans used this day to warn against the rise of popery and criticise the growing ceremonial practices. Laud himself and his supporters consequently often ignored this day of celebration. These anthems demonstrate how the political functions of the Chapel could even overrule its dominant religious factions. The Chapel was not completely under the thumb of the Laudians. The Chapel also selected works that supported the early Stuart’s efforts to incorporate royalist texts into the Church of England’s official liturgy, especially to commemorate the monarch’s accession day. Some compositions would have supported James I’s and Charles I’s beliefs in their divine right to rule. These beliefs nevertheless do not appear to have been completely

424 Achinstein, ‘Milton and King Charles,’ 145.
accepted as there are also works that were included in the Chapel’s repertoire that would have reminded congregations that no one was above God.

As large numbers of important and foreign dignitaries attended the Chapel’s services, certain repertoire and practices appear to have been included to warn domestic and foreign enemies not to attack England. These pieces demonstrated that the country had God on their side. It is also possible that more elaborate compositions were promoted in the King’s Chapel to compete with its Catholic counterpart, Henrietta Maria’s Chapel. Early seventeenth-century England was a politically and religiously tumultuous place. With complaints and conflicts being raised from the Scottish Kirk, Catholics, and Puritans, it is understandable that the Chapel would have worked to protect and demonstrate its support for the Church of England’s enhanced ceremonial practices.

Even though this chapter has examined all the available musical sources from the early seventeenth-century Chapel Royal, it is still possible that we do not get the full picture of the Chapel’s musical practices. It must firstly be remembered that only the texts for many of the works in the Rawl. Poet. 23 wordbook have survived. It should also be reiterated that the Chapel Royal was the public face of the Church of England. The devotional musical practices that were encouraged in the King’s privy chamber would probably tell us more about James I’s and Charles I’s true religious preferences. Whilst we do know some information about the musicians who performed in the privy chamber, records of domestic sacred music practices are very scarce. It has nevertheless been suggested, by scholars such as Jonathan Wainwright, that due to the royal favour that they were afforded, Henry Lawes’ settings of George Sandys’ psalms could have been performed in the Privy Chamber alongside the other ‘secular songs (in English and perhaps Italian), instrumental music, and devotional anthems.’ Repertoire such as Lawes’ symphony anthem settings of Thomas Carew’s psalms could even have been performed here. It can tentatively be proposed that away from the public eye in the King’s privy chamber, even more elaborate musical practices would have been promoted.

We also do not have much evidence that describes the Chapel’s every-day practices. The Chapel’s sources do not tell us how often and when works were performed. Records of
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427 Wainwright, ‘Precedents for the Symphony Anthem.’
specific musical performances are often only available from significant celebrations. From the collated compositional evidence and records of the Gentleman’s duties, it can nevertheless be presumed that the Chapel’s everyday musical practices, particularly when the King was not in attendance, would have been simpler.

By analysing all the available texts and compositional techniques from the Chapel’s anthem repertoire, this chapter has unearthed a plethora of motivations behind the Chapel’s musical practices. It is only natural that composers, in particular those who were employed in the Chapel, and the Chapel’s other musical employees and divines, would not have been solely religiously motivated. To support and enhance the varying functions of the Chapel Royal, practical, economic, and political motivations would also have influenced the Chapel’s repertoire choices and musical practices.
Chapter 2 – The Sacred Music Practices, Preferences, and Prejudices in Early Seventeenth-Century Durham Cathedral

Introduction
Many early seventeenth-century music partbooks were destroyed during the Interregnum or have been lost over the years. Scholars are therefore fortunate that Durham Cathedral still holds one of the largest surviving collections of early seventeenth-century music. The disputes between the conservative Peter Smart and ceremonial John Cosin regarding Durham’s sacred practices have also provided a wealth of information about the Cathedral’s musical performance practices. As Durham’s partbooks have extensively survived, and with the associated political controversies, many past historical and musicological studies have concentrated on the Cathedral’s early seventeenth-century practices. However, authorities on this period of music history such as Peter Le Huray, Brian Crosby, Kenneth Fincham, Nicholas Tyacke, and Nicholas Temperley, amongst others, have perpetuated several myths. Studies have disregarded the political hyperbole that Smart and Cosin probably employed in their testimonies. Durham’s sacred music practices and the surrounding debates have often been over-generalised. As a result, there is a general perception that other establishments and wider religious factions emulated Durham’s practices and shared its divines’ beliefs. Evidence that Durham’s musical practices developed gradually, were highly individualistic, and were not solely influenced by theological motivations is also often ignored. This chapter will compare compositional, testimonial, historical, and theological evidence to reveal the complexities that surrounded Durham’s sacred music practices. The opening section will present contextual information regarding how Durham’s ceremonial and musical practices were gradually enhanced throughout the early seventeenth century. An introduction to Durham’s early seventeenth-century manuscripts and the affiliated controversies will also be provided.

428 For more information about these scholars’ conclusions, please see this thesis’ introduction (pages 44-46).
This chapter will principally investigate the opinions that were voiced both for and against Durham’s musical practices alongside relevant compositional evidence. Categories of anthems and eucharistic music will be addressed to examine the veracity of testimonies. The analysed repertoire is taken from Durham Cathedral’s 1620s and 1630s partbooks; more information on these can be found in the following section.

Works by composers who were employed at Durham during the height of the Laudians’ influence in the 1620s and 1630s will be primarily concentrated upon. These composers’ practices were presumably encouraged by Durham’s leading ceremonial divines and can therefore reveal their musical preferences. Building on Crosby and Heppel’s studies, these investigations will not only include composers’ most ‘famous’ or musically excellent works but will examine their full repertoires. Throughout this chapter, tables that provide contextual information about the discussed musical works will be provided. These will note down the name of the composer, the title of the work, the text source (if known), which sources the work can be found in, and any other relevant information. It should be reiterated that these tables primarily contain works by composers who were working at Durham during the 1620s and 1630s. Other examples of these types of works can be found in Durham’s partbooks but are not necessary to the research aims of this chapter. By examining works’ text choices and compositional techniques, this chapter will refute several of the objections that were raised by more conservative figures against Durham’s practices. This evidence will also challenge previous scholars’ conclusions that early seventeenth-century compositional practices were extensively elaborate.

The identified musical practices and preferences from Durham Cathedral will be compared to countrywide practices and Puritan and Laudian theological beliefs. These will include other ceremonial divines’ sacred music preferences, attitudes during the Civil War, and parish church practices. Through these evaluations, this chapter will prove that Durham’s practices were not solely religious motivated and that its practices, preferences, and prejudices should not be over-generalised.
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430 For example, see: Gant, O Sing Unto the Lord, 151-179.
The Development of Durham Cathedral’s Ceremonial and Musical Practices

Durham Cathedral extensively encouraged and incorporated the Laudians’ ceremonial practices. These policies developed from Arminian theological beliefs that the Durham House group promoted. The Durham House group was named after Richard Neile’s London abode where he resided when he was Bishop of Durham (srv. 1617–28). Here, Neile welcomed, and encouraged discussions between, many leading contemporary divines. These included William Laud, John Buckeridge, John Cosin, Augustine Lindsell, Richard Montague, Francis White, and Thomas Jackson. Drawing on Elizabethan theologians such as Lancelot Andrewes, Richard Hooker, and Herbert Thorndike, these men aimed to restore the Church of England to ‘resemble by sensible means that hidden dignity and glory wherewith the church triumphant in heaven is beautified.’

Due to Neile’s influence and with James I’s support, the Durham House theologians became highly influential. Opposing the Puritans’ beliefs in simple worship practices and the contemporary focus on extemporary services, these men aimed to restore the true ‘grandeur of Christian truth’. They believed that this had been eradicated by the reformers through their hatred of Catholicism. With a renewed focus on the sacraments, the Durham House divines followed the Book of Common Prayer as ‘so lovely and ravishing, that, like the purest beauties, it needs no supplement of Art and Dressing, but conquers by its own attractives.’

These men also believed that the liturgy should edify congregations and guide them towards heaven. As previously quoted, they held that this could be achieved through enhanced ceremonial practices as God ‘hath framed that body of yours, and every member of it, let Him have the honour both of head and knee, and every member else.’ As ‘the external worship of God in his church is the great witness to the world that our hearts stand right in the service of God’, architectural church decorations, enhanced altar policies, and various physical ceremonial practices were encouraged as they enabled people to worship God with their whole being.
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433 Comber, A Companion to the Temple, A3.
436 Laud, A Relation of the Conference Between William Laud, Late Archbishop of Canterbury, and Mr Fisher the Jesuit, xvi.
Although Neile continued this work after his Durham appointment, the leading theologians of the day had begun to gain guidance and leadership from another, William Laud. Laud moved away from the Durham House group in 1626 to become the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and in September that year became Dean of the Chapel Royal. Laud acceded to the positions of Bishop of London in 1628 and then Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633. With Charles I’s support, ceremonial sacred practices were further encouraged in the Church of England during the 1620s and 1630s. These most controversially included the easterly placement and railing in of the altar.\(^{437}\) The practices that were promoted during this period often stemmed from the Durham House movement and were not always directly influenced by Laud. Nevertheless, due to Laud’s leadership, the divines and other leading political figures who supported these ceremonial practices have become known as Laudians.\(^{438}\)

Several Durham House and Laudian divines encouraged Durham Cathedral to adopt further ceremonial practices. These included the prebendaries Augustine Lindsell, Eleazor Duncon, Gabriel Clarke, and, of course, John Cosin. Dean Richard Hunt (srv. 1620-38) also supported Durham’s ceremonial augmentations, though he was not extensively involved with the Durham House group. The Cathedral’s architecture and artefacts were also enhanced during the early seventeenth century. To promote the theological beliefs in hierarchy, order, and the sanctity of the altar, the prebendary Francis Burgoyne moved the communion table to the east end of the Cathedral and into an altarwise position in 1617. This repositioned wooden communion table was replaced by Dean Hunt in 1620 with a black and pink marble altar. Cherubim heads were carved into the altar’s pillars and a gilded screen was placed behind. The altar was furnished with silverware that cost £112 (m.e.) and a rail was erected around it in 1626. The font was moved out of the chancel to the west end of the Cathedral and given an elaborate cover. The choir ceiling was painted with 50 scarlet and gold angels and an image of Christ.\(^{439}\) The prebendaries are also recorded to have worn ‘sumptuous’ new copes.\(^{440}\)

\(^{437}\) Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*.


\(^{439}\) Fincham and Tyacke, *Altars Restored*, 139.

\(^{440}\) Smart, *The Vanitie & Downe-Fall of Superstitious Popish Ceremonies*, 25.
As demonstrated in Brian Crosby’s research, Durham’s enhanced musical practices developed gradually; they were not novel to the 1620s and 1630s.\textsuperscript{441} As previously discussed, the anthem style emerged during Elizabeth I’s reign. In Elizabeth’s Chapel Royal, and later in other cathedral foundations, more elaborate anthems were encouraged. The most noteworthy works were by composers such as Thomas Tallis and William Byrd (a known recusant Catholic). William Whittingham, the Calvinist/conservative Dean of Durham (srv. 1563-79), was recorded to have been ‘very carefull to provide the best songs and anthems that could be got out of the Queen’s chappel to furnish the quire with all, himself being skilfull in musick.’\textsuperscript{442} Several of Durham’s Organists and Masters of the Choristers also greatly improved the Cathedral’s musical practices throughout Elizabeth’s reign. These include John Brimley (srv. 1541-76),\textsuperscript{443} William Browne (srv. 1576-88, 1598-1607),\textsuperscript{444} and William Smith (srv. 1589-99).

As Durham’s main organ ‘hath not been played upon these many years for lack of mending’, William Smith repaired and tuned it in 1589 so that ‘now they will much delight both the auditory and the player because they will yield the principalest and imperial sound of all the rest’.\textsuperscript{445} The Cathedral’s two monastic quire organs were presumably also tuned and repaired around this time. The main organ was completely renovated in 1593; this cost £10.\textsuperscript{446} Smith also copied a new set of partbooks for the choir in 1596.\textsuperscript{447} The move to improve sacred music practices at Durham had already begun.

\textsuperscript{442} Mary Anne Everett Green, ed., Life of Mr William Whittingham, Dean of Durham (London: Camden Society, 1870), 22-23.
\textsuperscript{443} Crosby, ‘The Music Across the Centuries,’ 340. It is to Brimley’s credit that, under him, several choristers went on to succeed him as Durham Cathedral’s Organists and Masters of the Choristers: Edward Smith (srv. c. 1608-12), Francis Dodshon (srv. 1612-13), and Richard Hutchinson (srv. 1613-46). Cuthbert Byers became York Minster’s Organist (srv. 1597-1604) and George Sheffield was a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal (srv. 1610-41). Several became composers whose works are featured in Durham’s partbooks: George Ruter, William White, William Smith, and Richard Hutchinson.
\textsuperscript{444} Crosby was described as ‘an excellent Master of Musick, a severe man’. Joseph Thomas Fowler, ed., Rites of Durham, Being a Description or Brief Declaration of all the Ancient Monuments, Rites, & Customs Belonging or Being Within the Monastical Church of Durham Before the Suppression. Written 1593 (Durham: Andrews & Co., 1903), 162.
\textsuperscript{445} Records of the Dean and Chapter of Durham, Miscellaneous Charters, 3198, Durham Cathedral, Durham.
\textsuperscript{446} Muniments of the Dean and Chapter of Durham, Miscellaneous Charters, 3311, Priors Kitchen, Durham Cathedral, Durham.
\textsuperscript{447} Crosby, ‘The Music Across the Centuries,’ 340.
The records of Neile’s work during his pre-Durham appointments demonstrate his passion for improving sacred music practices. During his tenure as Dean of Westminster from 1605-10, he oversaw work that provided an organ for Henry VII’s chapel in 1606 and ensured that anthems were regularly sung in this chapel during morning services. Neile also augmented the singers’ salaries, split the posts of Organist and Master of the Choristers, and even improved the choir’s diet. These changes were presumably all designed to encourage better quality singing and playing. Neile continued his efforts at Durham Cathedral. Most significantly, a new Dallam organ, costing £700, was installed in 1621-22. From 1620, Durham’s Dean and Chapter also decided that the organist and lay clerks would join the list of employees whose salaries could be augmented.

Heightened musical practices were even more prolifically promoted in the Cathedral through the work of John Cosin; Cosin became a prebendary at Durham in 1624. It is firstly likely that he was responsible for establishing two cornett and two sackbut player positions in the Cathedral. Without any cheque book records that reference instrumentalists and as there are no surviving instrumental partbooks, it is as yet unclear how extensively these instruments were used. It is nevertheless probable that they doubled the vocal parts and played over the shoulders of, or next to, the singers.

In the 1620s and 30s, Durham’s Elizabethan partbooks were all replaced. These partbooks contain the music for each individual vocal part, or the organ, and would have been used by Durham’s musical employees. Twenty-five vocal partbooks, from six sets, and
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452 Records of the Dean and Chapter of Durham, Treasurer’s Records Accounts, DCD/L/BB/25, Durham Cathedral, Durham, fol. 49r.
453 Bishop Cosin’s 1665 Primary Visitation Articles, MS Hunter 11, Durham Cathedral Library, Durham Cathedral, Durham, fol. 83. In 1663/4, when four choristers’ voices broke, they were appointed as cornett and sackbut players. In response to Cosin’s 1665 visitation, Durham chapter wrote ‘the Bishop likes them very well having been established when he was a Prebendary heretofore.’
454 Research into sacred instrumental practices during this period is being conducted by Helen Roberts at the Royal Birmingham Conservatoire. Roberts’ PhD thesis is entitled ‘Wind Instruments in Provincial English Cathedrals, c. 1580–c. 1680: Towards a Performance Practice’.
five organ partbooks have survived; these manuscripts can be seen in tables 2.1 and 2.2 below. These are the sources that were consulted during my investigations for this chapter as they doubtlessly contain the repertoire that the early seventeenth-century complaints and defences were referencing. As the Peterhouse partbooks were produced at Cosin’s instance, and by Durham copyists during the 1630s (see page 202) it is probable that Cosin was one of the primary figures who greatly encouraged this decision. Cosin was likely motivated by a desire to introduce evolving sacred music trends to Durham. As will be demonstrated throughout this chapter’s investigations, these included the developing verse and full anthem styles and the importance of festal hierarchies.455

Throughout this chapter, further information about the manuscripts that have been consulted for my investigations will be presented when appropriate. As this chapter is primarily focusing on works composed by Durham-local composers, broader investigations into the global contents of these sets are not pertinent to the included arguments. If the reader does wish to explore these partbooks and their overall contents in greater detail, further information about these manuscripts can also be found in this thesis’ prefatory material (pages 17-20).

Table 2.1 – Durham Cathedral’s vocal partbooks from the 1620s and 1630s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Copying Dates</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>C4, C5, C6, C7 (2nd fascicle), C9, C10</td>
<td>Anthems</td>
<td>1620s-1630s</td>
<td>Durham Cathedral Choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>Services and Festal Psalms</td>
<td>1620s-1630s</td>
<td>Durham Cathedral Choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>c. 1630</td>
<td>Durham Cathedral Choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>E4-E11</td>
<td>Preces and Responses, Festal Psalms, and Services</td>
<td>c. 1630</td>
<td>Durham Cathedral Choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>C2, C3, C7 (1st fascicle), C14</td>
<td>Anthems</td>
<td>1630s</td>
<td>Durham Cathedral Choir</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2 – Durham Cathedral’s organ books from the 1620s and 1630s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Copying Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>c. 1633-1638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>1620s-1630s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>1630s (mainly in the 1660s and 1670s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>1638-1639 with some later additions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>1638</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peter Smart served as a prebendary in Durham Cathedral from 1609 (sixth stall). In July 1614, he was promoted to the fourth stall, and he was present for James I’s 1617 visit. Smart notes that for this service, by royal order, there was to be no chanting or organ and other instrumental playing. Additionally, only two plain copes were worn. Smart’s years at Durham were untroubled and industrious until the appointment of Bishop Neile in 1617. Due to the ceremonial changes, he refused to attend communion. Smart’s complaints against Durham Cathedral’s musical innovations can be found in five pages of his 1628 sermon, *The Vanitie & Downe-Fall of Superstitious Popish Ceremonies*, nine points of his twenty-pointed
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456 Smart, *A Short Treatise of Altars*. 
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Short Treatise, and three paragraphs of his A Briefe, but True Historicall Narration. Due to his actions and complaints, he was sequestered in 1628. Smart’s accusations are supported by the testimonies of Nicholas Hobson, one of Durham Cathedral’s singing-men, and Richard Hutchinson, Durham Cathedral’s Organist (srv. 1613-44) and Master of the Choristers (srv. 1613-28). Hobson was first employed at Durham as a chorister in 1576 and then became a lay clerk in 1588 (later listed as a lay singingman, though these positions were synonymous) until his death in 1642; how useful Hobson’s singing contributions were in his later years is of course questionable. Hobson testified against Durham Cathedral’s practices before Parliament in 1642 when he was recorded to have been ‘aged about 92 years’. Hutchinson started out as a chorister at Durham in 1600/1, became the Cathedral’s Master of the Choristers and Organist in 1613, and a lay clerk in 1615. Whilst at Durham, Hutchinson was often chastised for his excessive drinking. During a disagreement in one of Durham’s taverns, he even struck the lay clerk and music copyist Toby Brooking with a candlestick, ‘wounding him verie dangerously’ (3 April 1627). For this, Hutchinson was sent to jail as records show that William Smith was paid ‘forty shillings for his painstaking in the time Mr. Hutcheson, organist, was in the gaol.’ On 7 May 1628, Henry Palmer replaced Hutchinson as Master of the Choristers. Hutchinson was presumably not allowed to reattain this position because of his misconduct, and even possibly due to his anti-Laudian views; he testified to Parliament against Durham’s practices in 1628. He nevertheless retained his position as Durham’s Organist and was required ‘to teach the Quiristers to play upon the virginalls or orgaines’. Caution will be exercised throughout this chapter when Hutchinson’s testimony is considered.

457 Smart, The Vanitie & Downe-Fall of Superstitious Popish Ceremonies; Peter Smart, A Short Treatise of Altars, Altar-Furniture, Altar-Cringing, and Musick of All the Quire, Singing-Men and Choristers (Durham, 1629); Peter Smart, A Briefe, but True Historicall Narration of Some Notorious Acts and Speeches of Mr. JOHN COSENS, and Some Other of his Companions Contracted into Articles (Edinburgh, 1628), iv-v.
458 Members of Ecclesiological Late Cambridge Camden Society, eds., Hierurgia Anglicana, or Documents and Extracts Illustrative of the Ritual of the Church in England After the Reformation (Cambridge, 1848), 37-38. It is probable that Hobson was actually younger at the time of giving this testimony, as if he was 92, he would have been born in 1550. This would mean that he would have been 26 when he was appointed as a chorister in 1576 and therefore very unlikely to have had an unbroken voice.
459 Crosby, The Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral, c. 1350 – c. 1650, 2: 24. Toby Brooking had himself been suspended for disorderly conduct at his previous place of employment, Bristol Cathedral.
461 Crosby, The Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral, c. 1350 – c. 1650, 93.
462 Members of Ecclesiological Late Cambridge Camden Society, eds., Hierurgia Anglicana, 38.
as it is possible that he inflated his descriptions of Durham’s practices in an attempt to seek revenge on the Cathedral’s authorities.

These men most extensively voiced their disapproval against the Cathedral’s choral anthem repertory. They objected to how frequently these works were sung, how elaborate and polyphonic compositional techniques were regularly encouraged, and how these works emulated Catholic practices. Through analysing and comparing Smart’s, Hobson’s, and Hutchinson’s accounts, three distinct grievances regarding the Cathedral’s anthem repertoire emerge. These relate to Durham’s general use of anthems and the contained compositional techniques, anthems with non-biblical and non-Book of Common Prayer texts, and collect anthems. These men also protested that music was excessively encouraged during the Eucharist. Through exploring evidence from these men’s testimonies and Durham’s partbooks, settings of the responses to the ten commandments, Nicene Creed, gospel response, Gloria, Sanctus, and Agnus Dei will be investigated. Anthems and eucharistic settings found in Durham Cathedral’s manuscripts and composed by Durham-local and other relevant composers will be analysed alongside broader historical, testimonial, and theological evidence in this chapter. These examinations will be used to reveal the complexities that surrounded this establishment’s and countrywide sacred music practices during the early seventeenth century.
**Anthems**

The anthems in Durham Cathedral’s 1620s and 1630s partbooks can be divided into two categories. These are full anthems which were sung by the full choir, and verse anthems which featured alternating sections for soloists and the full choir. Both types often included organ accompaniments. The texts for anthems were chosen by the composer, but works that were appropriate to the occasion that they were performed at would then have been selected. With the Reformation, the Church’s official recommendations were that the words had become of the upmost importance in choral settings. Compositional techniques to ensure clear text declamation and to paint the words were consequently promoted.\(^{464}\) To contextualise the forthcoming analyses, it is important to firstly provide a brief description of the compositional techniques that we can find in early seventeenth-century anthems and therefore in Durham’s repertoire.

In both full and verse anthems, composers often made use of the full choir and therefore usually included one medius, two contratenor, one tenor, and one bass parts. The splitting of the contratenor voices was important as this technique often made the highest voice, which frequently contained the main melody, even more prominent and therefore made the text more intelligible. The harmonies in both types of anthems were often vertically constructed and then dotted rhythms and some imitation was used to create more contrapuntal textures. It is important to briefly mention that English anthems during this period very rarely reflected the Italian *stile nuovo*. They nevertheless did often feature a characteristic elaborate ‘Amen’ ending section.

Some early seventeenth-century full anthems were highly similar to the short service style with note-against-note, homophonic textures; this style had been favoured during Elizabeth’s reign. Such works were highly useful for establishments with less capable choral foundations. Alternatively, in establishments such as Durham, such works would have valuable as they required fewer rehearsals and could have been performed during less important services. Such full anthems were certainly preferred by more conservative figures and Puritans. Some composers did aim to recreate the polyphonic and complex pre-Reformation style in their full anthems. Most commonly though, composers during the early seventeenth-century evolved to find a middle ground in their works. Sections of the texts

\(^{464}\) These word painting techniques stemmed from the Madrigal tradition.
were not often repeated, and the words were largely set in a note-against-note style. The vocal textures however were often not homophonic. They were more contrapuntal with imitative phrase entries or varying dotted rhythms. The clear declamation of the text was nevertheless often seemingly still highly important.

The antecedents to the verse anthem style were metrical psalms or prayer and consort songs. When verse anthems were first produced during Elizabeth’s reign, the solos were often written for boys; contratenor solo lines later became most common. Into the seventeenth-century, in line with ceremonial worship preferences, a more varied range of sonorities in the both the verses and choruses became used. Composers were able to employ more imaginative compositional techniques and concentrate on the expressive qualities that could be included during the solo voice lines. When verses for two or more voices were written, fugal, imitative entries were commonly used. The choruses would be sung by the whole choir, and these often repeated words and thematic material from their preceding verses, though they could also be independent.465

Whilst slightly more elaborate anthem compositional techniques developed in the early Stuart period alongside the rise in ceremonialism, as this chapter will demonstrate, composers still often produced a great mix of works with different compositional techniques. ‘Latin motets in the older style, motets and anthems which might be described as “sacred madrigals”, elaborate verse anthems to English texts, and simple homophonic full anthems might all be produced by the same composer.’466 These varying styles can be found in Durham’s anthem repertoire.

**General Performances of Anthems and Their Compositional Techniques**

Smart raised several objections in his writings against the singing of full and verse anthems in Durham Cathedral. His 1628 sermon bitterly questioned, ‘how dare they in stead of Psalmes, appoint Anthems, (little better then prophane Ballads some of them) I say, so many Anthems to be sung, which none of the people understand, nor all the singers themselves.’467 Nicholas Hobson’s testimony supports Smart’s statement as he recounted

---


466 Pike, ‘Church Music I: Before the Civil War,’ 68.

467 Smart, *The Vanitie & Downe-Fall of Superstitious Popish Ceremonies*, 20.
that for above thirteene or fourteene yeeres last past, there were no
Psalms in the vulgar meeter tunes suffered to be sung by the
Congregation...D. Cosins commanded the Choristers and Singing men
to come to church in their habits, and the Organs to play after the
Commination where an Anthem was solemnly sung. So as I
understood no more then mine owne part, and therefore verily
beleeve that the people did not understand it.468

Richard Hutchinson also testified that ‘before and after Sermons and Lectures we have had of
late no Psalmes but all Anthems.’469 Although Durham Cathedral’s Laudians were
championing a movement that greatly supported musicians and composers, they did not all
agree that their practices should be enhanced. Smart defended such musicians by noting that
‘I blame not the singers, most of which mislike these prophane innovations, though they be
forced to follow them?’470

These descriptions and testimonies imply that Durham’s sources should contain a
multitude of elaborate and polyphonic anthems. 200 anthems are recorded in the
Cathedral’s partbooks and the works in these sources are often organised according to their
liturgical rank. For example, the third set of partbooks’ preces and festal psalms are grouped
around the six major festivals in the Church’s year. Both the third and fourth sets arrange
their services into liturgical groupings for Matins, Communion, and Evensong. In the fifth set
of partbooks, the festal anthems for Advent and Lent are copied first and then those for the
cycle of saints’ days. Blank manuscript pages are additionally found in between the days,
presumably to accommodate future anthems.471 The external ferial anthems in the
Dunnington-Jefferson manuscript are grouped under the subtitles ‘praise’, ‘prayer’, and
‘penitence’.472

468 Members of Ecclesiological Late Cambridge Camden Society, eds., Hierurgia Anglicana, 37-38.
469 Ibid., 38.
470 There are no further accounts from Durham’s musicians that describe the Cathedral’s musical practices. However, given that several other Durham-local musicians were composers whose works seemingly supported the Laudians’ ideals, it is unlikely that many others objected to the enhanced practices. Smart, The Vanitie &
Downe-Fall of Superstitious Popish Ceremonies, 20.
472 York Minster Library, MS 29 S, Dunnington Jefferson MS, fol. 389. The Dunnington-Jefferson MS was
The Laudians believed that the church should maintain certain sacred hierarchies. They enforced this viewpoint through decorating and railing in the altar, venerating towards the altar, and making the sign of the cross to Jesus’ name during baptism. The clergy were also encouraged to wear costly copes to demonstrate that they were God’s appointed officers.\textsuperscript{473} Durham’s copying practices, and subsequent anthem performances, would have promoted the Laudians’ edification doctrines that order should be maintained in religious institutions. The Laudians also held that the church should closely follow the Book of Common Prayer, including the ritual and calendrical observances. Durham’s partbook inventories depict the significance and hierarchy of the Church’s feast days, and performances would have enforced the importance of celebrating these.\textsuperscript{474}

The Cathedral’s extensive collections appear to support the complaints that anthems were regularly sung, though the partbooks do not specify when or how often works were performed. Because of the derogatory accusations that anthems were frequently performed, Cosin defended the Cathedral’s practices. During Cosin’s 1641 reply to the High Commission articles that Smart levied against him, he declared that

the singing of the metre psalms was never forbidden, by him or any other (that he knoweth) in that church, where he used daily toosing them himself (as in other places his custom is to do)\textsuperscript{475} with the people assembled at six o’clock morning prayer. But as to the singing of them before and after the sermon (which is always there preached in the quire) the use was long before him coming thither [my emphasis], and is so still afore the sermon to sing the Creed, (as the Book of Common Prayer by law doth appoint), and after the sermon to sing an anthem or hymn [my emphasis], which that the people might the better know what was at any time sung, was always publicly declared by one of the quire-men, out of which psalm (being

\textsuperscript{473} Lane, \textit{The Laudians and the Elizabethan Church}, 55-57.
\textsuperscript{474} Heppel, ‘Cosin and Smart,’ 130-132.
\textsuperscript{475} Willis, \textit{Church Music and Protestantism in Post-Reformation England}, 155-7. Willis provides evidence from the Elizabethan period that several Cathedrals encouraged congregational metrical psalm singing. These practices could of course have been continued in similar establishments into the seventeenth-century, though evidence for or against these is highly limited.
many times a metre psalm) or other part of Scripture, or the Book of
Common Prayer, the same was taken.\footnote{W. G. Longstaffe, ed., The Acts of the High Commission Court Within the Diocese of Durham (Durham: Surtees Society, 1858), 224-225.}

If Cosin’s statement is true, anthems do not appear to have been performed as often as the complaints suggested. It also does not seem to have been Cosin who instigated these practices. Cosin’s account therefore further demonstrates that Durham’s musical practices developed gradually; they were not a new Laudian innovation in the 1620s and 1630s.

Cosin’s statement also declares that congregational metrical psalms were still encouraged in Durham. Nevertheless, when Bishop John Howson succeeded Neile in 1628, he attempted to alter the Cathedral’s practices as he believed that congregational singing was being discouraged. Howson seemingly endeavoured to act as a mediator in the Smart/Cosin controversy. Despite his own Arminian views, he does not appear to have sided with Cosin. In a letter from Howson to Laud in October 1630, he stated that the innovations that Smart had cited were ‘superstitiously urged, and displeasing to other men well affected’. Smart had therefore been driven ‘into the most intolerable actions’.\footnote{Bruce, ed., Calendar of State Papers Domestic: Charles I (1635-36), 4: 363.}

Cosin and Augustine Lindsell record the results of Howson’s 1631 visit to Durham Cathedral in a letter to Eleazar Duncon.\footnote{Both these men also worked as prebendaries alongside Cosin.} They write that

we understand well what the difference is betwixt an Anthem sung by the Quire (when it is part of a singing psalme) and the singing psalmes themselves, as they be sung by the whole multitude of people in the common tunes of parish churches. After this manner is our practice now, and not after that other… Upon the fourth Sunday he [Howson] sent a messenger to the Chantor… commanding him so to order the service… that after the Creed so read, he should begin a psalme for all the people to sing before the Sermon, and after Sermon sing another, as they use to do in parish churches… because 2 psalmes, one before and another after Sermon, seemed to take up too much time, it was then ordered, that the common psalme shold only be sung after the Sermon (in stead of the Anthem before in use).\footnote{Ornsby, ed., The Correspondence of John Cosin, 1: 200.}
Correspondence from Cosin to Laud reveals that Howson had apparently threatened to publicly declare Cosin’s and Lindsell’s ‘supposed malace’ against Smart. Charles I consequently ordered Howson ‘to desist with meddling with the said Augustine Lindsell and John Cosens, or any other of the prebends of that church.’

Congregational metrical psalm singing was presumably once again repressed. Howson’s actions demonstrate that not all Arminian and more ceremonial divines believed that sacred music practices should be enhanced. (The diverging opinions that supposed ceremonialists expressed will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter.)

Cosin and Lindsell’s letter supports Cosin’s previous statement that anthems were only sung after the sermon and therefore only on Sundays and Feast days. The partbooks do contain a high percentage of festal anthems, though many ferial anthems can also be found. Although these ferial anthems could still have been reserved for Sunday services, as Durham held such an extensive repertory, it is possible that they were sung at multiple times during services and even on other days.

To address the complaints against the polyphonic techniques and multitudes of voices that were purportedly prolifically heard in Durham, it is essential to explore the compositional techniques in the Cathedral’s anthem repertory. The following investigations will primarily focus on works by Durham-local composers as the Cathedral’s ceremonial factions presumably encouraged their compositional techniques. It is therefore likely that their anthems would have inspired the conservative complaints.

Table 2.3 – A selection of anthems from Durham Cathedral’s partbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Geeres</td>
<td>O praise the Lord of heaven (f)</td>
<td>Psalm 148: 1-5, 12 (adapted from the Book of Common Prayer)</td>
<td>Durham Peterhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Hutchinson</td>
<td>Lord I am not high-minded (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 131</td>
<td>Durham Peterhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Palmer</td>
<td>Almighty and everlasting God, who of thy tender love (v)</td>
<td>Palm Sunday Collect</td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some Durham-local composers’ anthems do exhibit more elaborate compositional techniques which, as previously accounted, were typical of the early seventeenth-century verse anthem style. For example, several feature extensive fugal, imitative entries. These appear in Henry Palmer’s Palm Sunday verse anthem ‘Almighty and everlasting God, who of thy tender love’, and the eight-part opening of his Ash Wednesday verse anthem ‘Almighty and everlasting God, which hatest nothing’.

---

482 Ibid., 2: 92.
Palmer was a lay clerk at Durham Cathedral from 1627 until his death in 1640. He also worked as the Cathedral’s Master of the Choristers from 1628 following Richard Hutchinson’s removal due to his debauched behaviour. Palmer’s surviving works indicate that he was one of the Cathedral’s most prolific pre-Civil War composers. He is additionally responsible for a large proportion of the copying work in the Cathedral’s partbooks.\footnote{John Morehen, ‘Palmer, Henry,’ in Oxford Music Online: Grove Music Online, article last modified January 20, 2001, accessed November 28, 2019, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/}

Contrapuntal verse sections appear in several works, which had also become more typical in the early seventeenth-century. William Smith’s verse anthems ‘Almighty and everlasting God, we humbly beseech thy majesty’ for the Purification and ‘My heart is set to laud the Lord’\footnote{In this anthem, Smith replaced the word ‘praise’ with ‘laud’, probably to pay homage to Archbishop William Laud. Crosby, ‘The Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral, c. 1350 – c. 1650,’ 1: 191.} feature polyphonic duet, trio, and quartet verses.\footnote{Anderson, ‘Music by Members of the Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral in the 17th Century,’ 2: 189-192, 206-212.} Smith became a chorister at Durham Cathedral in 1613 and ascended through the ranks to the position of minor canon in 1627. In addition to his extensive compositional work, he also served at

\footnote{Anderson, transc. Hannah Rodger, ‘Music by Members of the Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral in the 17th Century,’ 2: 92.}

\footnote{Anderson, ‘Music by Members of the Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral in the 17th Century,’ 2: 189-192, 206-212.}
Durham as sacrist, precentor, and deputised on the organ for Richard Hutchinson when he was in jail.\textsuperscript{487} Smart even criticised ‘Smyth’s’ enhanced practices (though did not make any specific comments) in his notebook, though not in any of his printed tracts.\textsuperscript{488}

With the official recommendations that words were of the upmost importance in choral settings, Durham’s anthems unsurprisingly also feature elaborate word-painting techniques. In Palmer’s full anthem ‘O God whose nature and property’, he uses longer rhythms that disrupt the tempo and mimic the sung text ‘tied and bound’. The harmony is also stationary for 16 minims whilst the line ‘of thy great mercy loose us’ is sung. Only with the last iteration of the text ‘loose us’ is the harmony also released.\textsuperscript{489}

\textbf{Extract 2.2 – Henry Palmer ‘O God whose nature and property’ (bars 12-15)}\textsuperscript{490}

\textsuperscript{488} Peter Smart Notebook, MS Rawl. D. 1364, Rawlinson, Bodleian Library, Oxford, fols. 8f-9v.
John Geeres similarly attempted to include more elaborate techniques in his anthems, with varying degrees of success. Geeres served as a lay clerk at King’s College, Cambridge, before becoming a lay clerk at Durham Cathedral sometime between 1626 and June 1630; he held this position until his death in 1642.491 Whilst the opening of his full anthem ‘O praise the Lord of heaven’ demonstrates some successful counterpoint skills, this work mostly features homophonic sections interspersed with short crotchet runs. His word-painting skills are also more rudimentary. For example, the text ‘young men and maids’ is sung by the medius and contratenor parts and ‘old men and children’ is sung by the tenor and bass parts.492 Geeres’ writing consequently demonstrates that complex compositional techniques were not consistently used.

Palmer included solo and duet verses and more homophonic chorus sections in some of his works, which were compositional techniques that were more typical of the earlier Elizabethan verse anthem style. These were seemingly used to improve the clarity of the text. These textures can be found in his Palm Sunday verse anthem ‘Almighty and everlasting God, who of thy tender love’ and verse anthem ‘Lord what is man’.493 In many of Smith’s verse anthems, he includes homophonic chorus sections that repeat the closing text of the preceding polyphonic verse (this is again a common compositional technique in verse anthem from this period). In ‘Grant we beseech thee’, the choruses include homophonic repeats of the text from the preceding verses, which were also sung by solo voices.494 Richard Hutchinson extensively uses similar techniques in his anthems. His verse anthem ‘Lord I am not high-minded’ features short and largely homophonic choruses which repeat text from their preceding verses. Although the verses are more expressive and ornamented, they are largely scored for just one solo voice. These techniques are typical of the earlier, initial Elizabethan verse anthem compositional style, and would have ensured that any assembled congregations would have been able to clearly discern the set text. In keeping with Hutchinson’s testimony against the Cathedral’s musical innovations, this anthem also appears to feature an intentional pun in the title. It pitches Hutchinson against Durham Cathedral’s

491 Ibid., 1: 177.
492 Ibid., 1: 180; 2: 46.
493 Ibid., 93-94, 106-112.
494 Ibid., 2: 193-196, 197-200, 218-223. Smith’s anthems ‘O God which hast taught’ and ‘I will preach’ also feature this technique, but alongside multi-voiced verse sections.
more elaborate, ‘high-church’ musical practices. Hutchinson’s compositional techniques also reflect his attitudes.\textsuperscript{495}

The preceding evidence has demonstrated that several of Durham’s anthems include more elaborate compositional techniques. These therefore support the accusations that the Cathedral was encouraging elaborate and polyphonic music for multitudes of voices, which would have masked the contained texts. Expanding on previous scholarship however, these were not universally used. Many works include textual repetitions, clear solo and duet verses, and more homophonic chorus sections. These works consequently exemplify the variety of compositional techniques that were employed in early seventeenth-century anthems.

Cosin also still defended the use of polyphonic choral anthems over congregationally sung metrical psalms when he lamented how more conservative religious factions had thrust out the solemn music of David’s own psalms, and other glorious hymns of holy men, from the Church, and to give us songs of their own altering and composition to be sung instead of them, by a company of rude people, cobblers and their wives and their kitchen maids and all, that have as much skill singing as an ass has to handle a harp.\textsuperscript{496}

Cosin thereby voiced the belief that bad singing could have an adverse effect on people’s devotions. Listening to well sung and ornate music could far more effectively raise congregations’ affections closer to God. Cosin’s High Commission defence states that ‘after the sermon to sing an anthem hymn, which the people might the better know what was at any time sung, was always publicly declared by one of the quire-men, out of what psalm (being many times a metre psalm) or other part of Scripture, or the Book of Common Prayer, the same was taken.’\textsuperscript{497} Even if works featured more complex compositional techniques, congregations would consequently still have been able to understand and be edified by the contained text.

In opposition to more conservative factions’ ideals, the Laudians’ edification practices were not limited to sermons and scripture readings. They involved ‘whatsoever is a fit means

\textsuperscript{495} Ibid., 61-64; Heppel, ‘Cosin and Smart,’ 151-152.
\textsuperscript{497} Longstaffe, ed., The Acts of the High Commission Court, 224-225.
to train and guide us in the way of godliness."\textsuperscript{498} Music could therefore be ‘an ornament to God’s service and an help to our own devotion.’\textsuperscript{499} Whilst it could therefore be presumed that music would have been a widely promoted Laudian edification tool, examinations of wider ceremonial beliefs and musical practices later in this chapter will reveal a different story. Moreover, whilst Cosin’s preferences align with the Laudians’ edification ideals, his stated aversions to congregational singing appear to express more personal interests. He is seemingly more concerned with ensuring high-quality singing, rather than supporting the theological belief in the sacred power of choral singing.

\textsuperscript{498} Thorndike, \textit{The Theological Works of Herbert Thorndike}, 1: 222.
Anthems with Non-Biblical or Non-Book of Common Prayer Texts

Smart raised a more specific objection that Durham’s anthems included texts that were not from the scriptures or Book of Common Prayer. He wrote that Cosin ‘hath brought meere ballads and Jigs into the Church, and commanded them to bee sung for Anthems’. 500 Hutchinson likewise noted in his testimony that ‘many of the ditties’ were ‘neither in the Bible nor communion book.’ 501

Smart emphasised ‘among many other, the three Kings of Colen, JASPER, MELCHIOR and BALTHASER.’ 502 Hobson supported Smart’s accusation by stating that ‘as for the three Kings of cullen, I have several times sung my part thereof in the said Church among the rest of the Quire’. 503 This anthem was probably highlighted as its text supported the practice of praising shrines. The Puritans strongly objected to such devotions and associated them with what they believed were the idolatrous practices of the Catholic Church. 504 There is however no record of an anthem about ‘The three Kings of Cologne’ in Durham’s or any other establishments’ partbooks. A text can be found in Elias Smith’s (Durham Cathedral minor canon srv. 1628-76) private notebook which could refer to this anthem. The notebook reads, in Latin and then in English,

three kings unto the king of kings 3 gifts did bring Myrrhe, incense, 
gold, as unto man god king Three holy gyftts be like wise given by 
thee To Christ, even such as acceptable bee. For Myrrhe bring teares, 
for Frankincense impart submissive prayers, for pure gold a pure hart.

Alongside, it is noted that ‘these verses are extant in ye principall church of ye citty of Collon’. The text of the anthem ‘The blessed lambe’ (a setting by Edmund Hooper appears in Durham’s partbooks) can also be found in Smith’s notebook. As other anthem texts are contained in Smith’s notebook, it is consequently further likely that the noted ‘The three Kings’ text was drawn from a sung anthem. 505 Cosin nevertheless denied that this anthem had ever been performed in Durham when it was stated in his 1641 trial that

500 Smart, A Briefe, but True Historicaall Narration, iv-v.
501 Members of Ecclesiological Late Cambridge Camden Society, eds., Hierurgia Anglicana, 38.
502 Smart, A Briefe, but True Historicaall Narration, iv-v.
503 Members of Ecclesiological Late Cambridge Camden Society, eds., Hierurgia Anglicana, 37-38.
the anthem the Kings of colen (as in the impeachment it is called) was never sung, since defendant came to be prebendary, nor (as he hath been informed) in the memory of man before, and it is not like to be sung hereafter, for at his first coming to be chosen treasurer (about 14 years ago)[i.e., c. 1627] he caused the said anthem to be razed and cut out of the old song book belonging to the quire, and the common school of the choristers, where it had remained all the time Mr. Smart had been both schoolmaster and prebendary before. Defendant hath frequently shewed his dislike of singing any anthem which is not part of the Scriptures or a hymn publicly allowed by authority.\textsuperscript{506}

On further investigation, 13\% of the anthems that were composed between 1549 to 1660 also use non-biblical and non-liturgical texts.\textsuperscript{507} Several can be found in Durham’s partbooks; some are detailed below in table 2.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Byrd</td>
<td>Alack when I look back (v)</td>
<td>William Hunnis</td>
<td>Barnard, Batten\textsuperscript{508} Durham (C) Lambeth 764 (C) Och 1001 (C) Ojc 180 (C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{506}\ Longstaffe, ed., \textit{The Acts of the High Commission Court}, 225. It is possible that Cosin was merely using ‘hymn’ as a different word for ‘anthem’. It can also be conjectured that the hymns could have been congregational metrical psalms that the choir also sang in parts. It is highly unlikely, given the partbook evidence and as there are no recorded complaints against Latin works in Durham Cathedral, that this held the same meaning as in John Playford’s \textit{Cantica Sacra} (1674) where hymns were Latin works and anthems English works. It is important for the reader to remember that there is no concrete evidence to confirm or dismiss any of these suggested definitions.

\textsuperscript{507}\ Morehen, ‘The English Anthem Text, 1549-1660,’ 64.

The appearance of these anthems in Durham’s partbooks supports the complaints that such works were sung in the Cathedral. However, as can be seen even in table 2.4’s short list, such anthems were found in more ceremonial and conservative religious institutions alike. For more information about these sources and their establishments, please see this thesis’ prefatory material (pages 15-27). It is therefore implausible to associate these anthems with an exclusive Laudian desire to bring ‘meere ballads and Jigs into the Church’\textsuperscript{509} as Smart suggested. Their widespread use demonstrates that Smart’s prejudices were not universally held by non-Laudian and more conservative divines.

\textsuperscript{509} Smart, A Briefe, but True Historicall Narration, iv-v.
The use of these texts initially appears to correspond with the Laudians’ religious beliefs. To fulfil the Laudians’ aims of recovering purer forms of worship, extra-devotional, contemporarily written texts were encouraged. However, through examining who the authors of these anthems’ texts were, alternative motivations behind their inclusion in Durham’s repertoire can be proposed. The most popular non-biblical and non-Book of Common Prayer anthems feature texts by figures such as William Hunnis and Henry King. Hunnis was the Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal from 1566 to 1597. King was a royal chaplain, the Dean of Rochester, and later Bishop of Chichester. Further contextual information about these figures was presented in chapter 1 (pages 104-105). These texts could therefore have been set and performed to demonstrate the composers’ and Durham’s loyalty to these important ceremonialist religious and Chapel Royal authority figures. The composers and musicians could also have hoped that through honouring these poets, they would have been inclined to help provide, and support, further employment opportunities.

Amongst this list is Byrd’s verse anthem ‘Thou [O] God that guidest’ which was for ‘The King’s Day’. The Dunnington-Jefferson manuscript records the names of two full and six verse anthems under the subtitle ‘The King’s Day’. This list appears first in ‘the table of full anthems’ and contains more works than any other feast day. This list is even followed by a verse anthem that was written specifically for ‘The Fift of November’ to celebrate the deliverance from the Gunpowder plot; ‘If the Lord himselfe’ by William Smith. These and other anthems in Durham’s collections would have reflected the composers’, singers’, and Cathedral’s royalist loyalties. Charles I was of course the Supreme Governor of the Church of England, though desires to gain his economic and political support could also have influenced Durham’s repertoire choices. Charles greatly endorsed the Laudians’ practices. As he personally intervened against Bishop Howson in favour of Durham’s heightened musical practices, the presence of such anthems is further unsurprising. Anthems with texts and compositional techniques that display loyalties to the monarch, important divines, and musical authority figures reveal how political and economic motivations also governed

Durham’s sacred music practices. The expressed sentiments in these anthems would have been practically essential as musicians and religious establishments relied on patronage and political support.

**Collect Anthems**

In Smart’s 1641 ‘Articles of Impeachment against Dr. Cosin’, he also protested that Cosin had ‘converted divers prayers in the book of common-prayer into hymns, to be sung in the choir, and played with the organ, contrary to the ancient custom of that church.’ These prayers are more commonly known as collects (season-specific prayers that were written for particular occasions in the Church’s calendar). The complaints relating to collect anthems were principally concerned that these sung works were replacing the minister’s spoken text.

**Table 2.5 – Selected festal collect anthems from Durham Cathedral’s partbooks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Collect Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Batten</td>
<td>Turn thou us, O good Lord (v)</td>
<td>Commination</td>
<td>Barnard Durham Peterhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tomkins</td>
<td>Turn thou us, O good Lord (v)</td>
<td>Commination</td>
<td>Batten Durham Lambeth 764 Ojc 180 Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Smith</td>
<td>Almighty and everlasting God, we humbly beseech thy majesty (v)</td>
<td>Purification of the BVM</td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Palmer</td>
<td>Almighty and everlasting God, we humbly beseech thy majesty (v)</td>
<td>Purification of the BVM</td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Almighty and everlasting God, we humbly beseech thy majesty (v)</td>
<td>Purification of the BVM</td>
<td>Batten Durham Ojc 180 Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Smart specifically noted that ‘on the fast day after Easter last, he commanded the last prayer at the end of the Communion, to be sung with the Organ as an Anthem, so that no man could understand one word.’ This account presumably refers to the Commination service collect ‘Turn thou us, O good Lord’. Hobson’s testimony also mentioned this collect when he reported that

at a Fast about fifteene yeeres agoe, D. Cosins commanded the Choristers and Singing men to come to church in their habits, and the Organs to play after the Commination, &c, Turne us, O Lord, &c being turned into an Anthem was solemnly sung. so as I understood no more then mine owne part, and therefore verily beleeeve that the people did not understand it.

Whilst we do not know which specific setting these complaints were referring to, two verse anthem settings of ‘Turn thou us, O good Lord’ by Adrian Batten and John Tomkins can be found in Durham’s partbooks. Tomkins’ work contains largely homophonic chorus sections and Batten’s piece features mostly clear solo and duet verses. Batten’s chorus sections however often include polyphonic vocal parts with extensive imitative entries. Batten’s work therefore appears to match Hobson’s testimony more closely. It is of course possible that these complaints were referring to another, now lost, setting.

This service was not an isolated incident as collect anthems for 22 feast days appear in Durham’s partbooks. Multiple collect settings for some of the most important feast periods in the Church’s calendar, most especially throughout Easter and Advent, can be found. Many are also by Durham-local composers; collect anthems make up nearly half of William Smith’s and Henry Palmer’s surviving compositional output, though notably none by Richard Hutchinson. These settings would have supported the Laudians’ theological beliefs in the importance of feast days. A full list of the collect anthem settings in Durham Cathedral’s surviving partbooks and their associated feast days can be found in Appendix 2 (pages 297-298).

---

515 Smart, A Briefe, but True Historicaill Narration, iv-v.
516 Members of Ecclesiological Late Cambridge Camden Society, eds., Hierurgia Anglicana, 37-38.
517 John Tomkins, Turn thou us, O good Lord, ed. Hannah Rodger (Unpublished transcription, 2020); Adrian Batten, Turn thou us, O good Lord, ed. Hannah Rodger (Unpublished transcription, 2020).
The feast of the Purification, also known as Candlemas, caused a lot of controversy in Durham Cathedral. Smart reported that

fourthly, On Candlemas day last past: Mr. COSENS in renewing that Popish Ceremonie of burning candles to the honour of our Lady, busied himselfe from two of the clocke in the afternoone till foure, in climbing long ladders to sticke vp wax candles in the said Cathedrall Church: The number of all the Candles burnt that euening, was 220. besides 16. Torches: 60, of those burning tapers and torches standing vpon, and neare the high Altar (as he calls it) where no man came nigh.518

It is therefore significant that three verse anthem settings of this feast day’s collect, ‘Almighty and everlasting God, we humbly beseech thy majesty’, survive in Durham Cathedral’s partbooks; these are by Smith, Palmer, and Thomas Tomkins.519 All of these works feature characteristic early seventeenth-century verse anthem compositional techniques. As previously described, Smith’s version features polyphonic duet, trio, and quartet verses.520 Palmer’s verse anthem setting is incomplete (lacking medius and organ parts). This nevertheless seems to have featured multi-voiced verse sections with shorter and more homophonic choruses. The choruses also repeated text from their preceding verses.521 Tomkins’ anthem begins with solo and duet verses, though the vocal lines never overlap during these. The choruses are also quite homophonic with some imitative entries. In a piece lasting 65 bars however, the last line of the text, ‘by Jesus Christ our Lord’, is notably set in a highly extensive 25-barred section. This ending unusually features alternating verse and chorus sections for two separate groups of voices, elaborate imitative entries, and highly polyphonic vocal lines.522

518 Peter Smart, A Briefe, but True Historicall Narration, ii; Members of Ecclesiological Late Cambridge Camden Society, eds., Hierurgia Anglicana, 37-38. This report is also supported by Hobson’s testimony.
519 Thomas Tomkins worked as the Master of the Choir at Worcester Cathedral from 1596 until the Civil War brought an end to the Cathedral’s services in 1646. He also served as a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal, became one of the Chapel’s Organists in 1621, and became the Senior Organist from 1623-28. Boden, Thomas Tomkins.
521 Ibid., 2: 90-91.
522 Tomkins, ‘Almighty and everlasting God, we humbly beseech thy majesty,’ 47-52. (Transposed up a minor third and note values halved)
Extract 2.3 – Thomas Tomkins ‘Almighty and everlasting God, we humbly beseech thy majesty’ (bars 49-65)523

In Cosin’s *A Collection of Private Devotions*, ‘The Purificacion of Saint Mary the Virgin’ (2 February) and ‘The Annunciacion of the Virgin Marie’ (25 March) are listed as major church feast days.524 The appearance of multiple settings for this feast day therefore possibly reflected Cosin’s personal preferences, revealing the influence that he exerted over Durham Cathedral’s musical repertoire.

Whilst more polyphonic vocal lines can be found in Durham’s collect anthems, techniques that would have improved the clarity of the set texts were also used. The most elaborate works are by external composers such as Batten and Tomkins. Those by contemporary Durham-local composers are generally simpler and their texts can be more clearly discerned. Unlike previous studies have suggested, these demonstrate that Durham’s

523 Ibid., 51-52.
Laudians and ceremonialists seemingly encouraged more uncomplicated sacred music settings. As so many collect settings can be found in Durham’s sources, and as there are multiple settings of individual collects, it becomes further likely that more than one anthem was sung during a service. Such practices would contradict Cosin’s defence that only one anthem was sung in a service after the sermon.

Durham’s collect anthem repertoire however does not appear to have been as extensive as some of the accusations suggested. For example, Hutchinson testified that the ferial collect was also sung every day.

6. Then for our ten a clock Service we were commanded to begin with the ten Commandements, and with the Epistle and Gospel, Creed and Anthem, with the collects after, and so an end, for Munday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Saterday.

7. On Wednesday, Friday, and Sunday, to begin with the Letany, the ten Commandements, the Epistle and Gospel, Creed.

8. Then the Sermon, and after an Anthem, the Collect, and an end.\textsuperscript{525}

However, only two ferial collect settings can be found in Durham’s partbooks.

Table 2.6 – Ferial collect anthems from Durham Cathedral’s partbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Collect Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Almighty God, the fountain of all wisdom (f)</td>
<td>Post-Communion</td>
<td>Durham Lambeth 764, Loosemore, Merro, Ojc 181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{525} Members of Ecclesiological Late Cambridge Camden Society, eds., \textit{Hierurgia Anglicana}, 38.
These are two full anthems, Byrd’s ‘Prevent us, O Lord’ and Thomas Tomkins’ ‘Almighty God, the fountain of all wisdom’; they are both post-communion collects; descriptions of these anthems and their compositional styles can be found in chapter 1 of this thesis (pages 76-78). There are no settings of the two fixed collects from Matins and Evensong that were recited after the seasonal collect. It is consequently likely that collect settings were used as anthems instead of replacing the spoken collect. In support of this theory, there is some interesting evidence in the Peterhouse, Cambridge partbooks. This institution is significant to Durham Cathedral as in 1635, Cosin was appointed as the College’s Master. To aid the nascent choral tradition at Peterhouse, Cosin brought copies of works from Durham’s partbooks with him. There is graphological evidence in Peterhouse’s Former Caroline Set of partbooks that eight of Durham’s singing men were employed as copyists. This was clearly therefore a vast undertaking. Peterhouse’s partbooks contain several collect anthems that feature designations beside them; a selection of these can be seen in table 2.7 below.

---

526 It is possible that there were settings of these two fixed collects which were standard, memorised responses that were sung by the choir during every service. It would therefore not have been necessary for these to have been copied into the partbooks. Nevertheless, as no organ parts for such works have survived, this seems unlikely.

527 Crosby, ‘The Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral, c. 1350 – c. 1650,’ 1: 290-332. When Cosin became the Master of Peterhouse, he also brought the Durham chorister, Thomas Wilson, with him to be the College’s organist.
Table 2.7 – Collect anthem designations in Peterhouse College, Cambridge’s partbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Collect Text</th>
<th>Peterhouse Source Designation</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Giles</td>
<td>God, which as on this day (v)</td>
<td>Whitsunday</td>
<td>Anthemm for Whitsunday</td>
<td>Batten Durham Loosemore Ojc. 181 Pembroke Peterhouse Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Hooper</td>
<td>Almighty God, which madest thy blessed Sonne (v)</td>
<td>New Years Day</td>
<td>Anthem for New Yeares Day</td>
<td>Durham Ely 1 Lambeth 764 Ojc. 180 Peterhouse Rawl. Poet. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Ramsey</td>
<td>Almighty and everlasting God, we humbly beseech thy majesty (f)</td>
<td>Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary</td>
<td>Collecta Purificationis</td>
<td>Peterhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almighty God, which hast knit (f)</td>
<td>All Saints’</td>
<td>Mr Ramsey Collecta in festis omnium sanctorum</td>
<td>Peterhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant, we beseech thee, almighty God, that like (f)</td>
<td>Ascension Day</td>
<td>Collecta in festum Ascensionis</td>
<td>Peterhouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The works by Hooper and Giles that are recorded as anthems can also be found in Durham’s partbooks. Peterhouse’s designations of course do not clarify what role these settings played at Durham. They do nevertheless imply that many of Durham’s settings could have been sung as anthems instead of replacing the spoken collect, refuting Smart’s and Hutchinson’s accusations. In support of the complaints however, there are no collect settings by Hutchinson. In accordance with his religious beliefs, it is probable that Hutchinson avoided setting collects as they could have been used to replace the spoken text.
Eucharistic Music

Both Smart and Hutchinson also testified that music was extensively used during the Eucharist. Smart protested in his *Briefe Narration* that Cosin will not suffer so much as the holy Communion to bee administred without an hideous noyse of vocall and instrumentall Musicke, (the tunes whereof are all taken out of the Masse-booke whereby the peoples mindes are wholly withdrawne from the holy duty which they are about, and from the meditation of Christs bitter death and passion.  

He also wrote in one of his notebooks that if the house of God were ever made a theatricall stage for the people to heare and see playes acted therin, the Cathedral church of Durham is such an one at this tyme, especially when the sacraments are administred wch if St Jerome were now alyve to heare and see, when Mr. Burgoyne, Mr. Cosyn, Smyth, and Leonards in theire Babalonish and pybald vestments are the Actors with theyr glittryng picturs, and histronicall gestures, with all the confused voyces of the singing-men and quoristers with a multitude of melodious instruments, no doubt but Jerome would say, that the wicked spiritt cast out of Saule is entred into Cosyn and his fellow-singers, pipers, tobacoonists and drunkards.

Hutchinson recorded in his testimony which specific parts of the eucharistic liturgy Durham’s musicians were instructed to perform:

6. Then for our ten a clock Service we were commaundd to begin with the ten Commandements, and with the Epistle and Gospel, Creed and Anthem, with the collects after, and so an end, for Munday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Saterday.

---

528 Smart, *A Briefe, but True Historickall Narration*, iv-v.
529 Crosby, ‘The Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral, c. 1350 – c. 1650,’ 2: 79-80. Leonard was a minor canon who had transferred from Windsor to Durham due to the quality of his voice.
530 Peter Smart Notebook, MS Rawl. D. 1364, Rawlinson, Bodleian Library, Oxford, fols. 8f-9v.
7. On Wednesday, Friday, and Sunday, to begin with the Letany, the ten Commandments, the Epistle and Gospel, Creed.\footnote{531}

The Laudians believed that the Eucharist was ‘the crown of public service, and the most solemn and chief work of Christian assemblies’,\footnote{532} this view originated in the Arminians’ sacramental beliefs. Cosin himself explained in his annotated copy of the Book of Common Prayer how through receiving Holy Communion, ‘we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion.’\footnote{533} Cosin’s views reflected the Laudian ideal that the church was a living organism. The Communion sacrifice consequently benefitted all the past, present, and future members of the church. In Cosin’s \textit{A Collection of Private Devotions}, he emphasised the importance of preparing for the sacrament through instructive prayer, contemplation, and even prescribed hymns.\footnote{534}

The Laudians maintained that the bread and wine became the body and blood of Christ during Communion, though they distinguished themselves from the Catholic Church’s transubstantiation beliefs. Whilst in exile in Paris during the Interregnum, Cosin published a thirteen chaptered declaration in response to the Jesuit pamphlet \textit{Transubstantiation Maintained} (1647). Cosin asserted that the elements are changed, not that it loseth its former substance and essence, or the substantiall properties and conditions that it had before; but that it receiveth a new supernaturall condition, and a new superadded dignitie, which it had not before, to become the mysticall symbole, and the Blessed Sacrament of Christ’s Body.\footnote{535}

If ‘the Eucharist is despised, neglected, or misunderstood’, the Laudians believed that the act of Communion would not be able to unite all Christians within the body of Christ; ‘the liturgy disintegrates into an individual and impersonal thing.’\footnote{536} It is firstly pertinent to say that most of the following Eucharistic settings can be found in Durham’s fourth set of partbooks (E4-E11). These books were extremely lavish and far larger than the usual partbooks (500mm tall by 300mm wide). Their designs were likely inspired by music manuscripts from Durham’s

\footnote{531} Members of Ecclesiological Late Cambridge Camden Society, eds., \textit{Hierurgia Anglicana}, 38.
\footnote{532} Thorndike, \textit{The Theological Works of Herbert Thorndike}, 2: 51.
\footnote{533} Cosin, \textit{The Works of... John Cosin}, 5: 351-352.
\footnote{534} Cosin, \textit{A Collection of Private Devotions}.
\footnote{535} Ormsby, ed., \textit{The Correspondence of John Cosin}, 1: 223.
\footnote{536} Addleshaw, \textit{The High Church Tradition}, 52.
monastic period; whilst none of these sources survive today, some were probably still in the Cathedral in the seventeenth-century. This set includes festal psalms for the Church’s six major feast days (Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Whitsunday, All Saints’ Day), with space left in between for additional works to be copied. The following services were also divided into Matins, Communion, and Evensong groupings. The construction of this set therefore further reflects Durham’s ceremonial preferences and desires to demonstrate the hierarchical importance of feast day and the centrality of the Eucharist. The following sections will demonstrate that by providing this new set of partbooks, Durham’s evolving ceremonial figures, including Cosin, were able to encourage further, more unusual Eucharistic settings to be produced and performed.\textsuperscript{537} Whilst the use of enhanced eucharistic musical practices in Durham would therefore be unsurprising, it is important to question the truth of the conservative complaints to determine just how extensive such usages were.

\textbf{Responses to the Ten Commandments}

Hutchinson firstly reported that settings of the responses to the ten commandments were sung. Smart similarly recounted that ‘the second Service at 10 of the clocke hee calls Masse, which consists of Epistles, and Gospels, the 10. Commandements and the Nicene Creed, which are onely to be read on Son\textbar|\textbar dayes and Holydayes, by the order in the Common Prayer Booke.’\textsuperscript{538} Before the ten commandments in the 1559 Book of Common Prayer, there is an instruction that ‘then shal the Priest rehearse distinctly all the Ten Commandments: and the people knelyng, shal after every Commandment aske Gods mercy for theyr transgression of the same, after thys sorte.’\textsuperscript{539} This statement implies that the ten commandments could have been spoken or intoned by the priest. The two responses are ‘Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law; Lord, have mercy upon us, and write all these thy laws in our hearts, we beseech thee.’ The first response was listed after the first nine commandments, and the second response after the final tenth commandment. Although it is not noted whether the responses should have been said or sung, at the very least, congregations should have participated in their recitation.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{538} Smart, \textit{A Briefe, but True Historicall Narration}, iii.
\textsuperscript{539} Booty, ed., \textit{The Book of Common Prayer 1559}, 248.
\end{flushright}
There are several settings of these responses by Durham-local composers in the Cathedral’s partbooks. These settings are also known as the Kyrie but should not be confused with the traditional *Kyrie Eleison* text.

**Table 2.8 – Settings of the responses to the Ten Commandments in Durham Cathedral’s partbooks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Composer</strong></th>
<th><strong>Associated Service</strong></th>
<th><strong>Sources</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Brimley</td>
<td>John Sheppard’s Second Service (Creed)</td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Palmer</td>
<td>Communion Service</td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Smith</td>
<td>First and Second Communion Services</td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Kyrie “ten several ways”</td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the beginning of Henry Palmer’s Communion Service, the two responses are each set once. The vocal lines are mostly homophonic with some limited imitative entries. In William Smith’s First and Second Communion Services, the same highly homophonic Kyrie setting is featured. Congregations would have been able to clearly discern the set text in both Palmer’s and Smith’s settings. Many other settings in Durham’s partbooks feature similarly simple compositional techniques.

There are two notable exceptions to these. The first is a slightly earlier setting by John Brimley. This was produced to complete John Sheppard’s Second Service Creed. Brimley’s composition is primarily unusual as instead of setting each response only once, he provided the choir with four settings. There are three for the first response, which were sung after the first to third, the fourth to sixth, and the seventh to ninth commandments, and a setting of the second response for use after the tenth and final commandment. Brimley’s settings feature imitative entries and highly competent displays of counterpoint throughout. These complex compositional techniques are unsurprising as Sheppard’s Second Service is a highly

---

541 Ibid., 2: 272-287.
elaborate work; a pre-cursor of the ‘great service’ style. It is consequently likely that Brimley’s setting and Sheppard’s Second Service would have been reserved for important feast days. William Smith’s ‘Kyrie “ten: several ways”’ can also be found in Durham’s partbooks. As the title suggests, this includes ten distinct settings, instead of the usual two. This work features an eclectic collection of compositional styles, including some more elaborate and polyphonic techniques. There are extensive imitative entries, decorative melismatic figures, and the fourth response is a small-scale verse anthem. There are even times when Smith’s writing appears to imitate Brimley’s settings. Smith’s eighth setting and Brimley’s third feature highly similar phrase entries, and the melodic movement in the opening phrase of Smith’s ninth and Brimley’s second settings is identical. Whilst Smith was not able to match Brimley’s mastery of counterpoint, by providing ten highly distinct and elaborate settings, it is likely that Smith’s work would also have been reserved for important feast days.

Extract 2.4 – The openings from the third section of John Brimley’s Kyrie setting (bars 12-15) and the eight section of William Smith’s Kyrie setting (bars 36-39)

Although performances of these settings would have gone against the Book of Common Prayer’s rubrics, most of the settings of these responses in Durham’s partbooks feature simple compositional techniques and are largely homophonic. Refuting Smart’s complaints concerning Durham’s ‘confused voyces’, such settings would not have masked the set text. It is therefore likely that more elaborate settings, such as Brimley’s and Smith’s, would have been reserved for very particular and important feast days. These could have been used to heighten the Laudians’ beliefs in the importance of feast days. The inclusion of these settings nevertheless appears to have been quite an individualistic Durham practice;

546 Ibid., trans. Hannah Rodger, 2: 6, 293.
547 Peter Smart Notebook, MS Rawl. D. 1364, Rawlinson, Bodleian Library, Oxford, fols. 8f-9v.
many were by Durham-local composers and are often exclusively contained in Durham’s and Peterhouse’s partbooks.

**Nicene Creed**

Hutchinson also recorded that the choir sang the Creed during Communion. Smart specifically complained that Cosin had replaced the congregationally spoken Nicene Creed with choral versions by recording that,

> eighthly, hee enjoynes all the people to stand up at the Nicene Creed which he commands to bee sung with Organs, Shackbuts, and Cornets, and all other instruments of Musicke, which were used at the Consecration of Nabuchodonozor’s golden Image, (unfit Instruments for Christian Churches where men come for to pray, and not for to chaunt, or heare a sound or consort of they know not what).

All settings of the Creed in Durham’s partbooks use the Nicene Creed’s text. The table below lists settings of this Creed by Durham-local composers.

**Table 2.9 – Settings of the Nicene Creed in Durham Cathedral’s partbooks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Associated Service</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Henry Palmer</td>
<td>Communion Service</td>
<td>Durham, Peterhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Smith</td>
<td>First Communion Service</td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>Second Communion Service</td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two settings by William Smith and one by Henry Palmer have survived. Smith’s Creed from his First Communion Service includes very short, largely solo or imitative duet verses, and some polyphony in the choruses. Smith also split the music between the decani and cantoris sides of the choir by giving them alternating verses and choruses.\(^{548}\) This work therefore supports Smart’s complaints that Durham was encouraging complex, antiphonal performance practices. These objections are perhaps even better expressed by the

\(^{548}\) Ibid., 2: 272-282.
Elizabethan separatist Robert Browne. Browne wrote that in many cathedrals, the choirs’ ‘tossing to and fro of psalms and sentences’ was like ‘tenisee plaie whereto God is called a judge who can do best and be most gallant in his worship.’ Smith dispensed almost altogether with chorus sections in the Creed from his Second Communion Service. The text is set in two solo verses with a chorus section only for the ending ‘Amen’. Although the voices in this final section are split into ten parts, as it only lasts ten beats, the counterpoint techniques are limited. It can be theorised that Smith responded to the lack of textural clarity in his first Creed setting by including much simpler vocal lines and textures in his second.

Solo verses are interspersed with short, antiphonal quartet verses in Palmer’s Creed setting from his Communion Service. The full chorus sections are largely homophonic with some imitative phrases. Several effective word painting techniques can also be heard. The decani medius voice sequentially repeats the text ‘he rose’ in ascending intervals ($4^{\text{th}}, 3^{\text{rd}}, 4^{\text{th}}$). Three rising sequential figures similarly accompany the text ‘the resurrection’. The line ‘and I believe in the Holy Ghost’ is sung by a solo upper voice (decani contratenor), seemingly exhibiting the celestial nature of the Holy Ghost. Two different voices (cantoris medius and decani tenor) then continue with ‘who proceedeth from the Father and Son’, seemingly portraying God and Jesus. All three voices, who represent the holy trinity, then join together to sing ‘who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified’.

---

549 Robert Browne, A True and Short Declaration (London, 1581), B3v.
550 Ibid., 2: 283-287.
551 Ibid., 2: 130-141. All of these settings use the French Latin translation ‘Ponce Pilate’ instead of the English Latin ‘Pontius Pilate’. This translation was likewise used in preceding sixteenth-century choral repertoire, but it is unknown why this practice was originally encouraged or continued at Durham. Scot, ‘Text and Context: The Provision of Music and Ceremonial in the Services of the First Book of Common Prayer (1549),’ 54-56.
Performances of these settings would again have contradicted the Book of Common Prayer’s rubrics as it was directed that ‘the Epistle and Gospel being ended, shall be said the Crede.’\textsuperscript{553} Smith’s second setting, and some parts of the other two settings, would not have masked the set text. Imitative, antiphonal, and polyphonic compositional techniques, which

\textsuperscript{552} Ibid., transcr. Hannah Rodger, 2: 138-139.

\textsuperscript{553} Booty, ed., The Book of Common Prayer 1559, 250.
would have greatly reduced any congregations’ comprehension of the Creed, are nevertheless also used by some composers. It is also notable that an annotation by Cosin in his copy of the Book of Common Prayer reads, '[then] shall be said [or sung this] the Creed'. As these settings can only be found in Durham’s and Peterhouse’s partbooks, they could have been composed on Cosin’s instruction due to his personal beliefs and preferences.

**Gospel Response**

A setting of the gospel response, ‘Glory be to thee, O Lord’, appears in Durham’s partbooks, though settings of this text were not specifically mentioned or complained against. This response appeared in the 1549 Book of Common Prayer with the instruction, ‘the Clearkes and people shall aunswere’. As the clerks were the singing-men, this implies that the response was meant to be sung. The response and corresponding instruction were omitted from the 1552, 1559, and 1662 editions of the Book of Common Prayer. Settings and performances of this response nevertheless still appear to have been encouraged in Durham Cathedral.

Table 2.10 – Setting of the Gospel Response in Durham Cathedral’s partbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Associated Service</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Smith</td>
<td>First Communion Service</td>
<td>Durham</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only surviving setting appears in Durham’s A1 organ book amongst William Smith’s First Communion Service. If the clerks and people were supposed to sing this text together, as per the Book of Common Prayer’s directive, the same setting would have been sung every week. As Smith’s setting is in a different key from the rest of his service and absent from the vocal part-books, this suggests that it was a standard, memorised response that was used in every service.

---

554 This instruction was added into the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. Cosin, *The Works of... John Cosin*, 5: 514.
556 Anderson, ‘Music by Members of the Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral in the 17th century,’ 1: 134-139; 2: 272-282. There is also a setting of these responses by Henry Palmer in Peterhouse’s partbooks. This is the only setting of these responses at Peterhouse. It is therefore likely that Palmer’s setting was produced under
Cosin strongly urged the Church of England to reinstate the Gospel Response. An annotation by Cosin in his copy of the Book of Common Prayer reads, ‘and the people all standing up shall say, Glory be to Thee, O Lord’.\textsuperscript{557} He also voiced this recommendation at the 1661 Savoy Conference, though this addition was not accepted into the 1662 Book of Common Prayer. Whilst his recitation method preferences may have changed, Cosin could have personally encouraged Smith to produce a setting of this response that congregations would have been able to sing.

**Gloria and Sanctus**

There are also anonymous settings of the Gloria and Sanctus that appear alongside a communion anthem in the Dunnington-Jefferson manuscript.\textsuperscript{558} As Hutchinson does not mention the Gloria in his detailed testimony, it is probable that Gloria settings were not regularly performed. Hutchinson did nevertheless record that the Sanctus was sung when he wrote that,

17. And another sitting on his knees at the middle of the Table, and after the prefaces the priest begins, Therefore with Angels and Archangels, until he come to the three holies, and then the quire singeth untill the end of that: so in order hee doth administer the communion.

The instruction before the Gloria in the Book of Common Prayer reads, ‘then shall be sayde or songe’.\textsuperscript{559} This was the only communion text that was permitted to be sung in the 1559 Book of Common Prayer. This would have promoted the Laudians’ beliefs in the importance of the Eucharist. It is therefore surprising that no other pre-Interregnum settings exist.\textsuperscript{560} Despite Hutchinson’s testimony, settings of the Sanctus were presumably rare as the Book of Common Prayer reads, ‘therefore with Aungelles and Archangelles, and wyth all the

\textsuperscript{557} Cosin, *The Works of... John Cosin*, 5: 513-514.
\textsuperscript{558} MS 29 S, *Dunnington Jefferson MS*, fols. 337r-339v.
\textsuperscript{560} Heppel, ‘Cosin and Smart,’ 140. George Jeffreys produced settings of the Gloria and Sanctus, presumably during the Interregnum, before the Restoration. These settings can be found in GB-Lbl Add. 10338 (score) and GB-Lcm 920A (parts). There are also settings of the Communion Gloria in Durham’s partbooks by William Child, John Foster, and Henry Loosmore. However, through graphology studies, these settings appear to have been copied during the Restoration. Jonathan P. Wainwright, *George Jeffreys English Sacred Music (Musica Britannica 105)* (London: Stainer & Bell, 2020), forthcoming.
company of heaven, we laude and magnify thy glorious name, evermore praising thee, and saying: Holy, holy, holy, lord god of hostes, heven and earth are ful of thy glory, glory be to the, O Lord most hyghe.’ The verb ‘saying’ effectively prohibits musical settings of the Sanctus. This instruction may explain why this group of settings was copied and recorded anonymously; though this was not the case for other eucharistic settings that went against the Book of Common Prayer’s directives. The existence of these Gloria and Sanctus settings suggests that they were a part of Durham’s early seventeenth-century repertoire.

Table 2.11 – Settings of the Gloria and Sanctus alongside William Smith ‘I will wash mine hands’ in the Dunnington-Jefferson manuscript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?William Smith?</td>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Durham (D-J MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?“</td>
<td>Sanctus</td>
<td>Sanctus</td>
<td>Durham (D-J MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Smith</td>
<td>I will wash mine hands (v)</td>
<td>Psalm 26: 6, 8</td>
<td>Durham Peterhouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

William Smith’s anthem ‘I will wash mine hands’ was copied alongside the Sanctus and Gloria settings in the Dunnington-Jefferson manuscript with the subtitle, ‘The Communion Day’. The text reads ‘I will wash mine hands in innocency, O Lord, and so will I come to thine altar.’ The use of the word ‘altar’ is itself highly significant as many conservative figures, including Smart, vehemently objected to this term; many preferred the title ‘communion table’.\textsuperscript{561} This anthem is polyphonic throughout, though the five voices during the first chorus join in homophony to sing the word ‘altar’.

\textsuperscript{561} Fincham and Tyacke, Altars Restored; Smart The Vanitie & Downe-Fall of Superstitious Popish Ceremonies; Smart, A Short Treatise of Altars; Smart, A Briefe, but True Historicall Narration.
This is consequently one of the most audible moments in the whole piece.\textsuperscript{563} It is highly likely that Smith purposefully emphasised this word to support the Laudians’ altar policies.\textsuperscript{564} As

\textsuperscript{563} Ibid., 2: 201-205.
\textsuperscript{564} Heppel, ‘Cosin and Smart,’ 150-151.
Smith’s anthem was copied alongside the Gloria and Sanctus settings in the Dunnington-Jefferson manuscript, it has been speculated that Smith also composed these. Given Smith’s extensive and diverse compositional output, his authorship is likely.

As settings of the Gloria and Sanctus are so scarce, it is likely that they were not regularly sung. It is instead probable that these works were copied together into Durham’s partbooks as they were then used during an important feast day or celebratory service in the Cathedral.

Agnus Dei

In the 1559 Book of Common Prayer, the Agnus Dei text is featured in full as a prayer during the litany, and part of the text appears during the Gloria. The text is not included in full at any point during the Communion service. Although no settings of this text can be found in Durham’s partbooks, Cosin strongly encouraged the Church of England to reinstate the sung communion Agnus Dei. In his annotated Book of Common Prayer, Cosin wrote that ‘in the Communion-time shall be sung, (where there is a quire,) “O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us,” &c. “O Lord, grant us Thy peace,” together with some or all the sentences of the holy Scripture following’. It is of course possible that there were settings that were sung in Durham which have now been lost.

565 Ibid., 143.
566 York Minster Library, MS 29 S, Dunnington Jefferson MS, fols. 333r-334v. An anonymous setting of the full Agnus Dei prayer can be found in the Dunnington-Jefferson manuscript.
Comparing this Evidence with Broader Theological and Personal Preferences

Through examining compositional techniques, further testimonies, and historical attitudes towards music, neither side of the controversies at Durham Cathedral appears to have been wholly truthful. Smart, Hutchinson, and Hobson likely coloured and enhanced their testimonies due to their political and conservative religious prejudices. Moreover, when Cosin defended himself against the High Commission Articles, he would have naturally recounted that Durham encouraged more conservative musical practices to protect the Laudians and avoid being found guilty. Connections between these complaints and defences and the Puritans’ and Laudians’ religious beliefs can often be drawn. More individualistic, personal, and non-religious objectives nevertheless also appear to have influenced Durham’s musical practices. To further investigate these motivations, it is important to compare broader conservative and ceremonial musical preferences, prejudices, and practices more extensively with those of Durham Cathedral’s diverging factions.

It will firstly be questioned whether Smart’s, Hutchinson’s, and Hobson’s complaints reflected broader Puritan attitudes. It should initially be reiterated that Durham Cathedral’s Calvinist/conservative Dean Whittingham (srv. 1563–79) was known to have promoted musical practices that emulated Elizabeth I’s elaborate Chapel Royal. Copying records prove that non-biblical and non-Book of Common Prayer anthem texts were used in both ceremonial and conservative establishments during the early seventeenth-century. Several surviving seventeenth-century partbooks from more conservative institutions, such as Chirk Castle, included repertoire with more elaborate compositional techniques. It is consequently clear that more conservative and Puritan factions did not solely promote congregationally sung metrical psalms; several supported more enhanced choral practices. The contextual historical evidence that has been provided throughout this chapter also demonstrates that Durham’s musical practices developed gradually. These evolved throughout the Reformation

---

568 Hoffman, ‘The Arminian and the Iconoclast,’ 298-300. The Long Parliament deprived Cosin of his positions after this trial, but he was never found guilty by the House of Lords. Following a series of further Parliamentary actions, Cosin exiled himself in Paris from 1643 until his return to England at the Restoration in 1660.

569 Peter Le Huray, ‘The Chirk Castle Partbooks,’ Early Music History 2 (1982): 17-42. This set of partbooks was prepared when Thomas Myddleton renovated his private chapel at Chirk Castle; £270 was spent on the new chapel and an organ. It is surprising that these partbooks exist as it was recorded that Myddleton had ‘a strong Puritan temperament’, and later represented Denbighshire in the House of Commons from 1640-48. For more information on the theological allegiances of surviving partbooks’ establishments, see: Webster, ‘The Relationship Between Religious Thought and the Theory and Practice of Church Music in England, 1603 — c. 1640,’ 116-143.
into the tenures of Neile and Cosin. It is therefore initially unclear why Smart seemingly exploded with rage as late as 1628. It can be theorised that Smart’s complaints were designed to be used as propaganda during the 1629 parliamentary committee hearings against Laud, Neile, and Cosin, and later Long Parliament trials, rather than reflecting wider theological beliefs or Durham’s true practices.

Despite the prominent complaints that were voiced in the early seventeenth century by figures such as Smart and William Prynne, objections to sacred music practices were actually very infrequently raised. Protestations against musical practices were also notably scarce during the outbreak of the Civil War. No comments on music were made during both the 1629 parliamentary meeting to investigate ‘the belly and bowels of this Trojan horse, to see if there be not men in it ready to open the gates to Romish tyranny and Spanish monarchy’ and the 1640 Short Parliament investigations into various ‘Innovations in Religion’. The Parliamentary ordinances of August 1643 gave orders ‘for the utter demolishing, removing and taking away of all Monuments of Superstition or Idolatry’ included ‘altars, tables of stone, communion tables, tapers, candlesticks and basons, crucifixes and crosses, images and pictures’. It was not until May the following year however that a further command was given for ‘copes, surplisses, superstitious vestments, Roods or Roodlons, or Holy Water fonts’ and ‘all Organs, and the frames and Cases wherein they stand’ to be ‘taken away and utterly defaced’. Surviving accounts concerning the fate of cathedrals during the Civil War most often recorded musical equipment destructions, rather than eradications of the preceding musical practices. Moreover, whilst several pamphlets and personal accounts joyously recorded how musical artefacts were being destroyed, the associated performance and compositional practices were barely mentioned. Only two Long Parliament petitions from parish churches featured grievances regarding musical practices, even though parish churches made up 99% of the Church of England’s religious

571 W. Notestein and F. H. Reif, eds., Commons Debates for 1629 (Minneapolis, 1921).
574 Anon., The Patriarch at Lambeth (London, 1642); Anon., The Organs Funerall or the Quiristers Lamentation of the Abolishment of Superstition and Superstitious Ceremonies. In a Dialogicall Discourse Between a Quirister and an Organist (London, 1642); Richard Culmer, Cathedrall Newes from Canterbury (London, 1644), 19-20; John Vicars, God’s Ark overtopping the World’s Waves (London, 1646); Frank L. Huntley, Bishop Joseph Hall, 1574-1656: A Biographical and Critical Study (Cambridge: Brewer, 1979), 138.
establishments. These were likely rarely recorded as most establishments were financially unable to support or attract musical equipment and personnel. A more detailed study of Civil War and Interregnum attitudes to sacred musical artefacts and practices can be found in chapter three of this thesis.

The lack of objections, combined with the compositional evidence that this chapter has provided, also proves that musical practices in general were far less elaborate and widespread than previous studies have suggested. Many conservative figures appear to have been more concerned with eradicating the control that cathedral establishments had exerted and the physical idolatry of musical artefacts, rather than the music that they and the choirs produced.

This chapter has demonstrated that Durham’s anthem and eucharistic repertoire appears to have been compiled to promote several Laudian edification ideals. These include the beliefs that people in the church should worship God with their whole bodies, view the Eucharist as the central part of the liturgy, recognise the hierarchical importance of feast days, utilise extra devotional texts, and aim to promote the ‘beauty of holiness’ (Psalm 96: 9). The eucharistic settings that went against the Book of Common Prayer’s directives appear to oppose the Laudians’ beliefs that the Book of Common Prayer should be stringently followed. It was nevertheless often argued that congregations did not have to physically participate in singing to be edified by it. They could still listen and sing in their ‘hearts to the Lord’. Simple compositional techniques are also often found in settings of these texts. Congregations would consequently still have been able to clearly discern the set texts during performances of these works. The Book of Common Prayer’s instructions regarding which parts of the liturgy the congregations should recite would thereby not have been contradicted. It is also probable that several of these settings, certainly the most compositionally elaborate ones, would have been reserved for significant services and important feast days. It is especially likely that the Sanctus and Gloria settings and William Smith’s anthem in the Dunnington-Jefferson manuscript were copied as a group because

---


they were used together during an important, specific service. They would probably not have been part of the choir’s everyday repertoire. Select performances of settings with more unusual texts and elaborate techniques would have promoted the Laudians’ beliefs in the importance of feast days.

Ceremonial divines drew on biblical texts, past theologians’ and philosophers’ views, continental practices, and legal directives to support their sacred music practices. Leading figures however, including Laud, very rarely expressly encouraged enhanced musical practices. Whilst Laud did install a ‘new beautifull paire of organs’ at Lambeth, he is only known to have voiced recommendations regarding musical practices twice, both in 1639. He instructed that singers were no longer allowed to be jointly employed at the Chapel Royal and St Paul’s Cathedral (presumably to support the Chapel Royal’s heightened practices). He also questioned the suitability and skill of Salisbury Cathedral’s choir and organs. Even in cathedrals that were dominated by Laudian divines, sacred music practices were not always supported. As previously recounted, Gloucester Cathedral for example identified that their organ needed to be replaced in March 1614. Laud appealed during his tenure as Dean of Gloucester in 1618 that the organ should be replaced as it was ‘in greate decay and in short time likely to be of noe use’. The organ was nevertheless not replaced until 1640/41.

A distinction between important central religious establishments and parish church musical practices can also be revealed. There are very few surviving records that Laud or any other ceremonial divines directed parish churches in London to maintain their organs. Sir John Lambe, a Laudian jurist and commissioner, did order the parishioners of several London churches to restore their organs in 1637. Many nevertheless protested these orders. St Michael, Crooked Lane in 1637 for example recorded a list of ‘Reasons against the organ’. There are also very few references to organs or musical employees in parish church records. This is presumably because they lacked the funds and personnel. The few complied by Nicholas Temperley largely centre away from London in the north and south-west of England; these include Houghton-le-Spring and St Oswald in Durham. The lack of complaints

---

579 Eward, “’No fine but a glass of wine’,” 4.
concerning musical practices from parish churches to the Long Parliament also suggests that they were not extensively encouraged in these establishments. Other ceremonial Laudian policies such as the placement and railing in of the altar, the practice of bowing to the altar, making the sign of the cross to Jesus’ name during baptism, and the direction to kneel at communion, would not have required such extensive resources. These were consequently far more widely enforced, and more controversial. Beyond the Chapel Royal and cathedral foundations, and select colleges, enhanced musical practices do not seem to have been extensively encouraged. The Laudians therefore do not appear to have seen music as a centrally important ceremonial practice.

Durham’s musical practices also do not wholly correlate with the Laudians’ other heightened architectural, liturgical, and physical ceremonial practices. In accordance with evolving early seventeenth-century anthem compositional styles, Durham does possess some more elaborate and polyphonic repertoire. A preference for the verse anthem style and the subsequent opportunities to feature a more varied range of sonorities, textures, and word painting techniques can be seen amongst the Durham composers. The new seventeenth-century partbooks were also largely meticulously copied, with space left for illuminated initials, and feature elaborate bindings (particularly the E4-E11 set). Nevertheless, many of the anthems by early seventeenth-century Durham composers feature simpler compositional techniques. These would have ensured that the set texts could be clearly understood by any assembled congregations. These composers’ techniques were presumably encouraged by Durham’s dominant Laudian faction. As Durham’s partbooks contain an expansive collection of anthems, it is possible that these were performed more often than Cosin suggested. However, a significant proportion are festal anthems which were probably largely reserved for Sundays and Feast Days. It is additionally likely that collect anthems did not always replace the spoken collect. Moreover, if anthem texts were announced, even more complicated settings would not have hindered congregations’ devotions. As there are so few settings of many of the texts from the Eucharist, it is probable that some were set, habitual responses, or were mainly reserved for important feast day services. A highly controversial, but certainly much simpler, picture of Durham’s musical practices therefore emerges.

---

582 Fincham and Tyacke, Altars Restored.
Although the Puritans do not appear to have especially concerned themselves with the Church of England’s musical practices, we cannot ignore that complaints were raised against Durham’s musical practices from more conservative figures. Objections even came from ceremonial, Durham-local divines such as Howson and Hunt. Durham’s musical practices consequently appear to have been highly individualistic. It is therefore necessary to further question whether non-religious motivations also influenced Durham’s musical practices.

Brian Crosby, Stephen Bicknell, Ian Payne, and James Saunders have demonstrated that Durham’s musical practices and countrywide organ building projects gradually increased. These were not wholly new Laudian innovations from the 1620s and 1630s. It is undeniable nevertheless that Durham’s musical practices were especially enhanced during Neile’s later tenure and Cosin’s prebendary appointment. It is therefore prudent to further investigate the possibility that Durham’s practices were extensively influenced by the personal preferences of the Cathedral’s ceremonialists, and in particular, Cosin.

It should firstly be noted that there are no surviving pre-1600 examples of collect anthems. Moreover, no other establishment holds such a large collection of collect anthems, and many of these are by Durham-local composers. These consequently appear to have been composed to contribute to Durham-specific liturgical preferences and needs. It should also be reiterated that a relatively high number of Purification Day collect settings exist in Durham’s partbooks. This was a feast day that Cosin personally fervently promoted. This suggests that these settings could have been produced and performed more to satisfy Cosin’s individual preferences. Cosin’s noted personal dislike of congregational singing and his work to encourage Peterhouse’s musical scene also makes it likely that he was a leading influence behind the changes to Durham’s musical practices. Further evidence to support this theory can be found in the Holy Communion section of Cosin’s annotated Book of Common Prayer. These aforementioned annotations demonstrate that settings of the Nicene Creed and Gospel responses, and possibly lost ones for the Agnus Dei, may have been composed and


\[585\] Cosin, The Works of... John Cosin, 5: 513-514, 518. As previously discussed, Cosin’s annotation in his Book of Common Prayer alongside the Creed reads ‘[then] shall be said [or sung this] the Creed’. Regarding the Agnus Dei, Cosin noted, ‘in the Communion-time shall be sung, (where there is a quire,) ‘O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us,” &c. “O Lord, grant us Thy peace,” together with some or all
performed due to personal instructions from Cosin. This theory becomes even more probable as many of these settings are by Durham local composers and are exclusively found in Durham’s and Peterhouse’s partbooks. Whilst these would have reinforced the Laudians’ beliefs in the central importance of the Eucharist, they would have gone against the Book of Common Prayer’s directives; the Laudians strongly aimed to uphold the Book of Common Prayer’s instructions. Nevertheless, as previously discussed, they could have maintained that congregations could still participate in these choral recitations through singing in their ‘hearts to the Lord’.\textsuperscript{586} It should be noted that there is no evidence that Cosin improved the musical practices at Elwick and Brancepeth’s parish churches where he was Rector. However, enhanced musical practices were very rarely incorporated into parish churches.

During the Civil War and the Interregnum, whilst Cosin answered the charges regarding Durham’s musical activities that Smart had levied against him, he did not attempt to defend these in his further writings. Other divines who defended the ceremonial practices that they had encouraged during these tumultuous years similarly did not mention their musical preferences. Once again, music does not seem to have been a centrally important ceremonial practice for the Laudians as a whole.

At the Restoration, after his exile in France, Cosin became Bishop of Durham in October 1660. At his inauguration on 2 December of that year, it is recorded that two boys played cornetts during this service. Crosby has noted that such instruments were not used at Dean Barwick’s installation on 1 November 1660 and cornett and sackbut players were only appointed when four choristers’ voices broke in 1663/64.\textsuperscript{587} It is therefore probable that these instruments were played to personally please the new Bishop, rather than to re-establish their usage so soon after the Restoration. It can be evidenced that Cosin voiced his approval when these instrumental practices were fully revived as in the Chapter’s reply to their 1665 Articles of Visitation, they note that ‘the Bishop likes them very well having been established when he was a Prebendary heretofore.’\textsuperscript{588} In June/July 1661, Cosin also obtained the sentences of the holy Scripture following’. These changes were incorporated into the 1662 Book of Common Prayer.

\textsuperscript{586} Ephesians 5: 18-19 KJB; Colossians 3: 16 KJB.
\textsuperscript{587} Elias Smith’s Notebook, MS Hunter 125, Durham Cathedral Library, Durham Cathedral, Durham, fols. 221, 223, 225, 232-233.
\textsuperscript{588} Bishop Cosin’s 1665 Primary Visitation Articles, MS Hunter 11, Durham Cathedral Library, Durham Cathedral, Durham, fol. 83.
a small organ for Durham from London;\textsuperscript{589} this was a temporary measure to allow choral practices to quickly resume. It could be presumed that it would have been necessary for all Bishops to make similar improvements to reinstate their establishments’ choral practices. The musical practices in Cosin’s private chapel however, which were very rare during this period, further reveal his personal musical preferences. At his palace at Bishop Auckland and Durham Castle, records of payments for singing boys, sacred music copying projects, and organ repairs with architectural decorations have survived.\textsuperscript{590} These accounts evidence that Cosin continually endeavoured to improve sacred music practices and personally augmented the music of his bishopric and private houses far more than other divines.\textsuperscript{591} It is consequently likely that Durham Cathedral’s musical innovations before the Interregnum were far more influenced by, and reflected, Cosin’s personal preferences, rather than wider Laudian ideals.

Durham’s sacred music practices and the opinions expressed during the Smart/Cosin controversy should consequently not be over-generalised. They did not always represent wider Puritan, Laudian, and Church of England practices, nor were they solely religiously motivated.

\textsuperscript{589} Fowler, ed., \textit{Rites of Durham}, 163-164.
\textsuperscript{590} Ormsby, ed., \textit{The Correspondence of John Cosin}, 2: 53, 332-338.
\textsuperscript{591} Crosby, ‘John Cosin and Music,’ 164-184.
Conclusion

In past studies, the desire to celebrate and encourage the most contemporarily famous and musically excellent works has caused important testimonial, theological, and compositional evidence from the early seventeenth century to be obscured. As Durham Cathedral’s partbooks form one of the most extensive surviving collections, and through focusing on and believing the evidence from figures who “shouted the loudest”, studies have overgeneralised Durham’s practices. Scholars have believed that the Laudians’ musical and other architectural, liturgical, and physical ceremonial practices were comparatively enhanced. It has likewise been assumed that the Cathedral’s more conservative figures’ prejudices reflected wider Puritan preferences.

It is unfortunate that we do not possess detailed records of when works were performed or what everyday duties the Cathedral’s musicians undertook. As many other institutions’ records have not survived, it is consequently likely that we will never be able to produce a fully accurate picture of Durham’s musical practices or know how commonly these were emulated in other English establishments. Nevertheless, through cross-examining newly presented compositional evidence with wider testimonials, historical practices, and broader theological musical attitudes, this chapter has further questioned some of the conclusions that have for so long been perpetuated in previous studies.

The beliefs and integrity of figures who played a key role in past historical and musicological studies of sacred music practices in this period, most especially Cosin and Smart, have been challenged. It has been shown that in line with evolving seventeenth-century compositional techniques, Durham’s musical practices were far simpler than previous studies have proposed. Durham and other establishments, especially parish churches, continually focused on edifying their congregations. This reveals that different establishment groups in the Church of England had varying functions and therefore practices. It has also been proven that ceremonial and conservative divines expressed less disparate theological beliefs, especially regarding musical practices. The work of the Durham House Group, and musicians’ and divines’ historical musical activities, demonstrated that enhanced musical practices gradually developed in England. They were not a wholly new innovation that the Laudians introduced in the 1620s and 1630s. Through establishing how individual Durham Cathedral’s practices and the associated divines’ preferences and prejudices were, it
has been further revealed that sacred music was not at the forefront of the Puritans’ or the Laudians’ theological concerns. Comparative analyses of compositional techniques, text choices, and broader theological beliefs also revealed how non-religious personal preferences and political desires could greatly influence sacred practices.

Whilst this chapter may appear to have confused the picture of sacred music in the early seventeenth century, this is because past studies have often over-generalised evidence and therefore oversimplified this image, largely through drawing on Durham Cathedral’s disputes. The deeply complex and controversial nature of musical practices, preferences, and prejudices from Durham Cathedral and the wider Church of England has begun to be revealed.
Chapter 3 – The Fate of Sacred Musical Artefacts During the Civil War and Interregnum

Introduction

When the Civil War commenced, the Parliamentarians began to destroy various religious establishments’ architecture, artefacts, and vestments to eliminate the previous ceremonial practices. As discussed in this thesis’ introduction, through over-generalising early Stuart musical practices and destruction records, past studies have often led readers to believe that an age of general musical splendour gave way to total destruction in the 1650s (apart from congregationally sung metrical psalms). However, the early Stuart Church did not exclusively promote elaborate musical practices and the Civil War was not a completely dark period for sacred music.

To begin this chapter, records of musical artefact destructions (organs, partbooks, and choral surplices) will be exemplified and examined. The legitimacy of these accounts and whether they were exaggerated for propaganda purposes will be considered. These will primarily be examined alongside documented theological opinions, parliamentary proceedings, and Interregnum musical practices to determine the true fate of sacred musical artefacts. These investigations will prove that musical artefact destructions were certainly not prolifically recorded and therefore probably not as widespread as previous scholars have suggested.

It is important to contextualise these destruction accounts by including investigations into earlier attitudes towards sacred music artefacts. Historical records will reveal that organs and choral foundations had faced decades of neglect throughout the Reformation and the Tudors’ reigns. The turning point, as first proposed by Peter Le Huray, arguably firstly came in the 1590s, though countrywide practices continued to be highly variable.592 Consequently, unlike many previous studies, this chapter crucially differentiates between cathedral and parish church foundations. Organs were built and certain musical practices were heightened in cathedrals throughout James I’s and Charles I’s reigns. Parish church practices however were far simpler as these establishments did not have the finances or personnel to support

the upkeep of musical equipment and employees. It is consequently demonstrated that musical artefacts were not particularly prevalent before the Civil War. Throughout this chapter’s investigations, it has also been essential to distinguish musical artefacts from musical practices. Just because an establishment was furnished with musical equipment, this does not necessarily mean that it encouraged elaborate, ceremonial musical practices. This chapter will additionally draw on research from this thesis’ previous case studies. It will be reiterated that musical practices were not as elaborate as previous scholars have proposed. As musical equipment and practices were not extensively prevalent in the wider Church of England, there were not as many musical artefacts for the Parliamentary forces to destroy in the first place.

The research of Jonathan Willis into the concept of Elizabethan sacred music as a part of the doctrine of *adiaphora* is highly important to this chapter’s investigations. *Adiaphora* were ‘indifferent things’ that were neither forbidden nor encouraged by scripture. There was very little concrete, official guidance in the Elizabethan period about correct sacred music practices. Music was completely optional, and if it was used, the musical practices that were allowed could vary depending on the venue, presiding divines, and time. Music was not a practice, like clerical vestments, that could be categorised as simply ‘good’ or ‘bad’. These attitudes, as this thesis has and will continually demonstrate, continued into the early Stuart’s reigns.

Early seventeenth-century complaints against sacred music practices will be examined alongside official Parliamentary orders. Both before and during the Civil War, whilst certain figures ‘shouted the loudest’, their objections were not especially prevalent. Apart from a minority of radical figures, all agreed that there was a place for sacred music in the Church of England. ‘Debates about music centred not on the principal of its use, but the nature of its practice.’ Previous protestations were then not often reflected in the official Parliamentary orders that were issued during the Civil War. It will be shown that the Parliamentary Puritans were far more concerned with the physical idolatry and cost of musical artefacts, rather than the associated compositional and performance practices. Eradications of other physical ceremonial practices and objects (e.g. altars, rails, fonts, and statues) were far more extensively carried out.

---

Accounts of musical artefacts being saved by both ceremonial Royalist and Parliamentary forces will be exemplified. This chapter will also demonstrate how sacred musical artefacts were continually used throughout the Interregnum. An important distinction between public and private worship practices, and how both royalists and Parliamentarians exploited this loophole, will be revealed. Examinations of how organs were used for both sacred and secular purposes will therefore be presented. Published domestic psalters that included more elaborate vocal lines and instrumental parts will also be investigated.

This chapter will continually consider what these records tell us about Laudian and Puritan theological attitudes to sacred music practices. Building on this thesis’ previous conclusions, it will be demonstrated that musical practices continually fell into the category of adiaphora; they were seemingly not a primary concern for either the Laudians or the Puritans. Evidence that personal, practical, and economic motivations influenced destructive actions will be provided. Whilst English sacred music undoubtedly regressed throughout the Civil War and Interregnum, to paint this period as a completely dark time for musical artefacts and practices is not justifiable.
**Destruction Records**

**Destructions of Organs**

Organ accompaniments would often have decreased the clarity of any sung texts and therefore congregations’ understanding of the word of God. It is therefore seemingly unsurprising that these musical artefacts were especially targeted. This chapter will nevertheless later explore whether these were targeted because of their associated performance practices, or their physical idolatry. The Chapel Royal was predictably targeted by the Puritans. In the ‘Reports of Commissioners’ there are receipts and bills that detail organ removals from the royal chapels. In September 1644, Whitehall Chapel’s organ was removed by Robert Harley. In November 1644, Greenwich’s organ was removed, and the loft bricked up. Then in September 1645, Hampton Court’s organ was removed.\(^\text{594}\) In St Paul’s Cathedral, the organ was also ‘broken all to peeces’ in 1643.\(^\text{595}\) ‘The body of the church was converted to a horse-quarter for soldiers; and part of the quire, with the rest of the building east-wards from it, was by a new partition wall, made of brick, anno 1649, disposed of for a preaching place’.\(^\text{596}\) The most extensive surviving collection of records that detail organ destructions can be found in Bruno Ryves’ *Mercurius Rusticus: Or the Countries Complaint of the Barbarous Outrages committed by the Sectaries of the Late Flourishing Kingdom*. Ryves’ accounts were initially published in a series of 19 periodicals, beginning in August 1642. These were then issued as a set in 1646, 1647, and after the Restoration in 1685.\(^\text{597}\) Ryves was the rector of Stanwell in Middlesex and one of Charles I’s chaplains. In July 1642 however, his parishioners petitioned against him, and he was subsequently dispossessed. After Charles I’s execution, Ryves collected money from loyal Royalists and took it to Charles II. He was rewarded for his loyalty at the Restoration as he was made the Dean of Chichester.

---

\(^{594}\) Historic Manuscripts Commission, Portland, III (1894), 132-3.


\(^{597}\) Bruno Ryves, *Mercurius Rusticus: Or the Countries Complaint of the Barbarous Outrages Committed By the Sectaries of the Late Flourishing Kingdom* (London, 1685).
and Winchester and chaplain to the new King. He was also given two rectories and several other valuable positions.\textsuperscript{598}

Due to Ryves’ royalist loyalties, we must be mindful that his lamenting records of these destructions may have been elaborated for propaganda purposes. The relevant passages from \textit{Mercurius Rusticus} can be seen below.

\textit{Westminster - July last, 1643.} some Soldiers of Weshborne, and Catwoods Companies (perhaps because there were no Houses in Westminster) were quartered in the Abby Church, where (as the rest of our Modern Reformers) they brake down the Rail abut the Altar, and burnt it in the place where it stood: they brake down the Organ, and pawned the Pipes at several Ale-houses for Pots of Ale: They put on some of the singing mens Surplesses, and in contempt of that Canonical Habit, ran up and down the Church, he that wore the Surpless, was the Hare, the rest were the Hounds.\textsuperscript{599}

\textit{Exeter -} They brake down the Organs, and taking two or three hundred Pipes with them, in a most scornful, contemptuous manner, went up and down the street, Piping with them: and meeting with some of the Choristers of the Church, whose surplesses they had stoln before, and imploied them to base, servile Offices, scoffingly told them, \textit{Boys we have spoild your trade, you must go and sing hot Pudding Pyes.}

\textit{Peterborough –} When their unhallowed toylings had made them out of wind, they took breath afresh on two pair of Organs, piping with the very same about the Market place, lascivious Jiggs, whilst their Comrades daniced after them, some in the Coaps, others with the Surplices, and down they brake the Bellows to blow the coals of

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{599} As stated by Merritt, the reform at Westminster was ‘not an iconoclastic fury: the activity took place over the course of two years, and was a coll and clinical dismantling of decoration... not simply promoted by iconoclastic zeal, but was intended to prepare it for regular use by the parliamentarian regime.’ For more information about Westminster’s fate, please see: Merritt, ‘Monarchy, Protestantism and Revolution: 1603-1714,’ 193-206.
their further mischief, and left any should ring auke for the fire they had make, they left the Bells speechless, taking out their clap[pers, which they sold with the Brass they flaied from the graven stones, and the Tin and Iron from other parts of the Church and Chappels belonging thereto.

*Canterbury* - violated the Monuments of the Dead, spoyled the Organs, brake down the ancient Rails, and Seats, with the brazen Eagle which did sup[ort the Bible, forced open the Cupboords of the Singing-men, rent some of their Surplices, Gowns and Bibles, and carryed away others, mangled all our Service-books, and Books of Common-Prayer; bestrewing the whole Pavement with the leaves thereof: a miserable spe[ctacle to all good eyes.600

*Chichester* – *innocents day after 1642* - they leave the destructive and spoyling part to be fil[nished by the Common Soldiers: brake down the Organs, and dashing the Pipes with their Pole-axes, scoffingly said, *hark how the Organs go.*

*Winchester* – *12 dec 1642* - The doors being open, as if they meant to invade God himself, as well as his possession, they enter the Church with Colours flying, their Drums beating, their Matches fired, and that all might have their part in so horrid an attempt, some of their Troops of Horse also accompanied them in their march, and rode up through the body of the Church, and Quire, until they came to the Altar, there they begin their work, they rudely pluck down the Table and break the Rail: and afterwards carrying it to an Ale-house, they set it on fire, and in that fire burnt the Books of Com[on-Prayer, and all the Singing Books belonging to the Quire: they throw down the Organ, and break the Stories of the Old and New
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Testament, curiously cut out in carved work, beautified with Colours, and set round about the top of the Stalls.\textsuperscript{601}

Comparable imagery is presented in Sir Thomas Browne’s \textit{Repertorium, or Some Account of the Tombs and Monuments in the Cathedral Church of Norwich in 1680}.\textsuperscript{602} Browne was a physician and author whose best-known works include his \textit{Religio Medici} (1643); this concerned the ‘mysteries of God, nature, and man’.\textsuperscript{603} Browne was also a fervent royalist; his writings and loyalty earned him a knighthood during Charles II’s 1671 visit to Norwich.\textsuperscript{604} We should therefore again consider that Browne’s royalist loyalties may have coloured his account. His report reads that

there was formerly a fair and large but plain organ in the church, and in the same place with this at present... That in the late tumultuous Time was pulled down, broken, sold, and made away.... There were also five or six Copes belonging to the Church; which tho’ they look’d somewhat old, were richly embroider’d. Organ pipes before them, and were cast into a Fire provided for that purpose, with shouting and rejoicing.\textsuperscript{605}

Symon Gunton, a royalist divine and the first prebend of Peterborough,\textsuperscript{606} provided a similar account in his \textit{A History of the Church of Peterborough} (1686). Gunton even recorded that Colonel Cromwell was involved with the assault on Peterborough.\textsuperscript{607} He wrote how the first that came was a Foot-Regiment under one Colonel Hubbart’s command: upon whose arrival, some persons of the Town, fearing what happen’d afterward, desire the Chief Commander to take care

\textsuperscript{601} Ryves, \textit{Mercurius Rusticus}, 154, 160, 215, 119, 139, 146.
\textsuperscript{602} Thomas Browne, \textit{Repertorium, Or Some Account of the Tombs and Monuments in the Cathedral Church of Norwich in 1680} (London, 1712).
\textsuperscript{603} Thomas Browne, \textit{Religio Medici} (London, 1642).
\textsuperscript{605} Browne, \textit{Repertorium}, 26.
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the Souldiers did no injury to the Church: This he promises to do, and gave order to have the Church doors all lockt up. Some two days after comes a Regiment of Horse under Colonel Cromwell, a name as fatal to Ministers, as it had been to Monasteries before. The next day after their arrival, early in the morning, these break open the Church doors, pull down the Organs, of which there were two Pair. The greater Pair that stood upon a high loft, over the entrance into the Quire, was thence thrown down upon the ground, and there stamped and trampled on, and broke in pieces, with such a strange furious and frantick zeal, as can’t be well conceived, but by those that saw it.608

Alike actions are presented in a satirical Cavalier ballad from Francis Quarles’ 1646 *The Shepherd’s Oracles*. Originally from a prominent Puritan family, Quarles retained anti-Catholic views but displayed more of a moderate Protestant outlook during his life. He was also a strong royalist and believed in the divine right of kings.609 His poem mocks the radicalism of the Puritan fanatics during the Civil War by voicing that

What’er the Popish hands have built
Our hammers shall undo;
We’ll break their pipes and burn their copes,
And pull down their churches too.610

These accounts all sorrowfully expressed how several cathedrals’ organs were pulled down and broken, sold on, and even mockingly played throughout the streets. They contain highly animated language, painting these destructions as frenzied and senseless. The soldiers’ bawdy language and behaviour also do not present them as men of God. Theological desires to reform sacred music practices do not appear to have fuelled their actions.

Records that celebrated these destructions have also survived. Several pamphlets rejoiced that the previous ceremonial musical artefacts, employees, and practices had been eradicated from churches. In an anonymously published pamphlet entitled the ‘Patriarch at Lambeth’ (1642), the author recounts that due to Laud’s power, ‘if Augustus Cesar had been
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now to warre against him, he could not be vanquished’. This concludes with a poem that praises how many ceremonial divines, ceremonies, organs, and choristers had been driven from England’s churches.

We may abjure our singing
For Ceremonies bringing
Into the Church, and ringing
For the downfall of the Organs
Alas poore Organs;

A Quirister may hang himselfe
For wanting his diviner selfe
He’s ta’en now for a Clergy Elfe
Being drown’d in superstition
Alas fond superstition;

The Wren is now defil’d in’s nest
And signed with the markeo’th Beast
And powder’d now for a Lent Feast
Which made himeseeme a regulus
Alas poore regulus;$$^611$$

Let Ceremonies then deplore
Their Fortune greater then before
Downe Idols, Crosses, Ceremonies
Alas poore Ceremonies.\(^612\)

The Organs Funerall or the Quirsters Lamentation was anonymously published in 1642. This mockingly expresses sorrow for the Laudians’ downfall and the abolishment of their heightened musical practices. In the guise of a chorister, the author cried, woe and alas, the day of absolution is at hand whereby wee shall be freed from sinnes of superstition and worshipping of God in his Service with superfluous Ceremonies, which is now termed by many
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\(^{612}\) Anon., *The Patriarch at Lambeth*. 
Idolatrous rags of Popery, the originall whereof they say came from the Pope, which is called Antichrist.  

The choristers themselves are ridiculed, being called drunkards and cowards. The author also wrote that as many sacred choirs had been disbanded, these singers had to find alternative jobs. They could, for example, have become freelance music teachers. However, ‘I was too much given to the Taverne and Ale-house, yea and to play now and then at Venus Game with loving Citizens wives...the best policie to serve the times, and change with the wind, for by that meanes I may be safe when others are questioned.’

Several Puritans, Parliamentary supporters, and even just more moderate divines joyfully recounted the destructions that were carried out in several cathedrals. Many of these accounts included descriptions of how establishments’ organs were removed. Joseph Hall chronicled with admiration how many ‘monuments of idolatry’ were removed from Norwich Cathedral in the early 1640s. Hall had served as the Bishop of Norwich from 1641 and occupied a religious middle ground as he expressed both anti-Laudian and anti-Puritan sentiments. He recorded,

Lord, what work was here! what clattering of glasses, what beating down of walls! what tearing up of monuments! what pulling down of seats!... what tooting and piping upon the destroyed organ pipes! what a hideous triumph on the market-day before all the country, when, in a kind of sacrilegious and profane procession, all the organ pipes, vestments, both copes and surplices, together with the leaden cross which had been newly sawed down... and the service books and singing books which could be had, were carried to the fire in the public market place: a lewd wretch walking before the train in his cope trailing in the dirt, with a service book in his hand, imitating in an impious scorn the tune, usurping the words of the litany used formerly in the church. All these monuments of idolatry must be sacrificed to the fire.
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Richard Culmer, a despised Puritan preacher and curate of Canterbury Cathedral, jubilantly recounted in 1644 how the Parliamentary soldiers had destroyed Canterbury’s organs. They then ‘began to play the tune of the “zealous soldier” on the organs or case of whistles, which never were in tune since.’

In the 1646 publication *God’s Ark overtopping the World’s Waves*, the Parliamentary writer John Vicars approvingly recorded that Westminster’s altar, organ, and choir had been driven away. Vicars recounted that there was wont to be heard nothing almost but Roaring-Boyes, tooting and squeaking Organ pipes, and the Cathedral Catches of Morley, and I know not what trash; now the Popish altar is quite taken away, the bellowing Organs are demolish’t, and pull’d down, the treble or rather trouble and base singers, Chanters and Inchanters driven out; and instead therof, there is now a most blessed Orthodox Preaching Ministry... O our God! what a rich and rare alteration? What a strange change is this indeed?

**Destructions of Partbooks**

Partbooks were also ruined during Parliamentarian raids and the Interregnum. These manuscripts provide musicologists with the greatest clues as to what music was performed during the early seventeenth century. As there were relatively few establishments who held secure choral foundations, new compositions were being continually produced, and due to divines’ and choir/organ masters’ diverging musical preferences, the majority of these were handwritten. Through studying fragmentary surviving partbooks and records of cathedral
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621 Some notable exceptions include: *Sacred Hymnes* (1615) by John Amner (c. 1579-1641); *The First Book of Selected Church Music* (1641) by John Barnard (b.?1591- fl. c. 1641).
musical activities, we know that many manuscripts have been lost. A large portion of repertory has probably therefore been eradicated. For example, from observing Chichester Cathedral’s 1621 inventory of songbooks, of which none now survive, it can be estimated that the number of choral partbooks that have been lost from this establishment will easily reach four figures.

A Catalogue of all the Song-books for the performance of Divine Service; appertaining to the Cathedral Church of the Holy Trinity in Chichester: taken January 18 Annoque Domini 1621

- Ten new books in folio for Men and M[eanes]
- Eight new books in folio for Men only
- Eight books in a long quarto, of Mr. Weelkes his pricking
- Eight books of Mr William Cox his Service
- Eight books without covers, of Anthems
- Eight Scrolls in royal paper of Mr. William Cox his Anthem
- Eight scrolls of the Anthem: “Thou art my king, O God”
- Eight scrolls of Mr. Jurden’s Anthem
- Eight books in a long quarto of “Christus resurgens”
- Eight scrolls of the Anthem, “The Lord hath granted”
- Six books in a long quarto: “A poor desire I have to amend mine ill”
- Ten books of the Gunpowder treason
- Eight books of Mr. Strogers Service, called As
- Ten long Anthem books, called Bs
- Eight books of Mr Tallis his Service, called Cs
- Mr Farrant’s Service in books called Hs
- Eight books in quarto, of Mr. Shepherd’s Service
- Eight books in quarto, of Mr. Bird’s Service

A handwritten note in a draft copy of John Barnard’s The First Book of Selected Church Musick mourns that ‘of this noble, matchless, and judicious selection of our Church Music no perfect copy is known to exist in consequence of the total dispersion of choirs, and disruption
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not only of organs, but also of music books both in manuscripts and printed, by the Puritans in 1643.\textsuperscript{624}

Very few accounts from during the Civil War specifically detail partbook destructions however. One such record does appear in Ryves’ account concerning Winchester Cathedral. He documents that ‘in that fire burnt the Books of Common-Prayer, and all the Singing Books belonging to the Quire.’\textsuperscript{625}

Accounts celebrating the demise of these partbooks likewise exist. Joseph Hall recounted how ‘in a kind of sacrilegious and profane procession... the service books and singing books which could be had, were carried to the fire in the public market place. All these monuments of idolatry must be sacrificed to the fire.’\textsuperscript{626} The eradication of Canterbury Cathedral’s partbooks is also joyfully reported by Richard Culmer. Culmer recorded how the Parliamentary soldiers ‘sung cathedral pricksong as they rode over Barham Down towards Dover, with pricksong leaves in their hands, and lighted their tabacco pipes with them, such pipes and cathedral pricksong did consort well together’.\textsuperscript{627} It can therefore be presumed that the soldiers in Ryves’ Canterbury Cathedral account who ‘mangled all our Service-books, and Books of Common-Prayer’, similarly dealt with Canterbury’s musical manuscripts.\textsuperscript{628}

There are no other known surviving records that detail partbook destructions. We should therefore not always assume that establishments’ partbooks were lost at the hands of the seventeenth-century Puritans. This chapter will later demonstrate how such manuscripts were lost and destroyed right up to the twentieth century. It should also be noted that these records consistently only contain general comments about the cathedrals’ books and papers. They do not detail how extensive establishments’ music collections were, what repertoire they encouraged, or what musical personnel they employed. Despite the prominent complaints against choral musical practices by figures such as Smart, Prynne, and the anonymous author of \textit{The Holy Harmony} (1643), the Parliamentary soldiers appear to have primarily viewed the partbooks as physical idolatrous artefacts. This evidence supports the

\textsuperscript{625} Ryves, \textit{Mercurius Rusticus}, 146.
\textsuperscript{626} Huntley, \textit{Bishop Joseph Hall}, 138.
\textsuperscript{627} Culmer, \textit{Cathedrall Newes from Canterbury}, 19-20.
\textsuperscript{628} Ryves, \textit{Mercurius Rusticus}, 119.
theory that actual compositional and musical practices were not a primary concern for the Puritans.

**Destructions of Choral Surplices**

Strong debates regarding sacred vestments raged throughout the seventeenth century. Many conservative figures believed that the Church of England had insufficiently reformed its practices and that surplices were remnants of the previous popish practices. For example, Smart disdainfully recorded that Durham’s prebendaries wore new ‘sumptuous’ copes. Although no specific accounts exist, choristers’ and singingmen’s surplices would presumably have been similarly contested. Records that choral vestments were destroyed by the Parliamentarians have survived.

Turning firstly again to Ryves’ *Mercurius Rusticus*, several of his records describe these garments’ fates. At Westminster, the soldiers ‘put on some of the singing mens Surplesses, and in contempt of that Canonical Habit, ran up and down the Church, he that wore the Surpless, was the Hare, the rest were the Hounds.’ As the soldiers seemingly believed that it was acceptable to play raucous games in Westminster, their contempt for similar sacred buildings is demonstrated. After the soldiers had pillaged Exeter Cathedral, they met ‘with some of the Choristers of the Church, whose surplices they had stoln before, and imploied them to base, servile Offices, scoffingly told them, Boys we have spoild your trade, you must go and sing hot Pudding Pyes.’ Then at Canterbury, the soldiers ‘forced open the Cupboords of the Singing-men, rent some of their Surplices, Gowns.’

Joseph Hall’s account demonstrates that Norwich Cathedral’s surplices met a similar fate. Hall recorded that

in a kind of sacrilegious and profane procession, all the organ pipes, vestments, both copes and surplices...were carried to the fire in the public market place: a lewd wretch walking before the train in his
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cope trailing in the dirt, with a service book in his hand, imitating in an impious scorn the tune, usurping the words of the litany used formerly in the church. All these monuments of idolatry must be sacrificed to the fire.  

The accuracy of Hall’s account is seemingly confirmed through Browne’s description. Browne likewise recorded that ‘there were also five or six Copes belonging to the Church; which tho’ they look’d somewhat old, were richly embroider’d. Organ pipes before them, and were cast into a Fire provided for that purpose, with shouting and rejoicing.’

The destructions of these surplices once again demonstrate how the Parliamentary soldiers primarily focussed on physical musical artefacts. No early seventeenth-century choral vestments are known to have survived.

It is important to address how reliable these surviving destruction accounts are. Royalists and ceremonialists, who encouraged enhanced sacred practices, may have embellished their accounts through a disgruntled desire to paint the Puritans in a derogatory light. For example, Ryves was a stringent royalist and had been dispossessed by his own parishioners. It is therefore natural that he would have strongly resented the Puritans. There are however similarities between the accounts from writers who supported the destructions and the lamenting accounts. Most especially, the soldiers’ actions are consistently painted as ‘zealous’ and frenzied. It can be stated with some surety that the recorded destructions of Norwich Cathedral’s musical artefacts are accurate as both Joseph Hall and Thomas Browne’s accounts corroborate one another. It is consequently possible that the royalist figures accurately recorded these experiences and did not over-elaborate their accounts as much as might be expected. It should nevertheless be considered that Puritans and more conservative figures could equally have inflated their accounts to demonstrate to the populace how fervently they condemned the previous ceremonial practices. Colourful accounts would have demonstrated the lengths that they would go to, to eradicate these from the Church of England.

Organ and partbook destructions would have, by extension, eradicated sacred music practices and performances in cathedrals. The aforementioned accounts however
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infrequently mention actual instrumental or choral compositional and performance techniques. They seem to demonstrate that the Parliamentarians were primarily concerned with ridding these establishments of idolatrous artefacts, rather than the associated musical practices. This theory that actual musical practices were not a primary concern will be continually explored throughout this chapter.
Examinations of How Extensive These Destrucions Were and Why They Occurred

These accounts demonstrate that the Parliamentarians appear to have primarily targeted musical artefacts, rather than the associated compositional and performance practices; though of course these would, by extension, have been reduced. Destructions of other church artefacts such as altars, baptismal fonts, and statues are recorded far more frequently. It is therefore important to reassess how extensive objections to, and destructions of, sacred musical equipment and practices during the Civil War actually were.

Musical Practices, Preferences, and Prejudices Before and During the Outbreak of the Civil War

It is firstly important to reassess how extensively enhanced musical practices, and especially musical artefact installations, were promoted before the outbreak of the Civil War. The Parliamentary Puritans were not the first reformers to make official moves against the Church of England’s sacred musical artefacts and practices. In 1536, only a few years after the Reformation began, the Lower House of Convocation included organ playing amongst its ‘84 Faults and Abuses of Religion’.  

Edward VI’s Lincoln Cathedral Injunctions (April 1548) stated that they shall fromhensforthe synge or say no Anthemes off [sic.] our lady or other saints but onely of our lorde And them not in laten but chosyng owte the best and most soundyng to cristen religion they shall tune the same into Enlglishe setting thereunto a playn and distinct note, for every sillable one, they shall singe them and none other.  

Organ playing was further repressed and several organs were dismantled during Edward VI’s reign. The Injunctions of Edward VI that were passed on 26 October 1550 instructed that the organists of St George’s Chapel, Windsor Castle, should receive their salaries ‘during their lyves if they continue in that College, in as large and ample a manner as if organ plaing had
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still continue in the Church.’

In 1550 to 1551, Worcester Cathedral’s three organs were taken down. In 1552, St Paul’s Cathedral and York Minster’s organs were also silenced; these were restored when Mary I ascended to the throne in 1553. Further evidence that demonstrates how organs were neglected and removed during Edward VI’s reign can be observed in Stephen Bicknell’s publication, *The History of the English Organ*.

Scholars such as Charles Burney, Edward Dent, and Edmund Fellowes have promoted the belief that music reached a “golden age” during Elizabeth I’s reign. Their conclusions however are largely based on evidence from the Chapel Royal and works by famous composers such as Byrd, Tallis, and Gibbons. In Elizabeth’s 1559 Royal Injunctions, it was instructed that there should be a modest distinct songue, so used in all partes of the common prayers in the Church, that the same may be as playnyly understood, as yf it were read without syngyng, and yet nevertheless, for the comfortyng of suche as delyght in musicke, it may be permitted that in the beginynng, or in the ende of common prayers, eyther at morning or evenyng, there may be song an [sic.] Hymne, or such like songue, to the praise of almightie god, in the best sort of melodie that may be conveniently devised, having respect that the sentence of the Hymne may be imderstanded and perceived.

In 1563, the *Second Book of Homilies* was published to deter ‘a residual perhaps nostalgic, affection for Roman ritual and music’; this book contained detailed expanded
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explanations of Elizabeth’s Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion. In the ‘homilie of the place and time of Prayer’, it was exclaimed,

see the false religion abandoned, and the true restored, which seemeth an unsavoury thing to their unsavoury taste, as may appear by this, that a woman said to her neighbour: ‘Alas Gossip, what shall we now do at church, since all the saints are taken away, since all the goodly sights we were wont to have are gone, since we cannot hear the like piping, singing, chanting and playing on the organs, that we could before? But dearly beloved, we ought greatly to rejoice, and give God thanks, that our churches are delivered out of all those things which displeased God so sore, and filthily defiled his Holy House and his place of prayer.

This homily rejoiced that such ‘superstitious and idolatrous maners’ were now ‘utterly abolished’. On 13 February 1563 at the Canterbury Convocation, a proposal to remove all of the Church of England’s organs was rejected by merely one vote (59 to 58). Bicknell has discovered evidence that several organs were still sold and dismantled during Elizabeth’s reign, particularly in London where Puritan factions were strongest. Elizabeth did make concessions to ensure that the quality of the music that was performed in her Chapel Royal was not diminished. The clarity of the word of God nevertheless remained of the utmost importance during official sacred music recommendations.

Across the country during Elizabeth’s reign, due to the flexibility surrounding interpretations of official recommendations and attitudes regarding sacred music practices, choral and organ usages varied greatly. It is pertinent to again refer to Willis’ argument regarding the Elizabethan attitude that music was a form of adiaphora. Often therefore, musical practices were not actively promoted and musical artefacts were not fastidiously maintained. Organs and choral foundations during Elizabeth’s reign largely suffered due to
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neglect. *The Praise of Musick* notes that ‘the first occasion of the decay of musick in Cathedral Churches and other places where musick and singing was hosed and had yearlye allowance began about the nynthe year of Queene Elizabeth.’\(^{651}\) Then around 1567, ‘not so few as one hundred organs were taken down and the pipes sold to make pewter dishes.’\(^{652}\) Alan Smith has likewise evidenced that around 1570, almost 40 major establishments’ choirs were disbanded.\(^{653}\) Inflation rates increased rapidly during the later sixteenth century, and with decreased Crown spending, many religious foundations’ finances were dramatically reduced. Many establishments, particularly parish churches, did not have the finances to support the upkeep of their organs or employ musical personnel;\(^{654}\) this musical “golden age” was not countrywide.

By the end of the sixteenth century, ‘music had completed an Elizabethan transformation, from the unseen elephant in the 1559 Book of Common Prayer, through the status of worthy but optional extra, to become an integral part of the Conformist vision of the attendant rites and ceremonial of the Church of England, prescribed on the basis of the Church’s own institutional authority.’\(^{655}\) Into the early seventeenth century, with the rise of Arminianism, the desire to return organs to a usable condition and encourage their playing re-emerged. Cathedral and college organs were especially revived through the work of Thomas Dallam. A detailed account of Thomas Dallam and his family’s work can be found in Bicknell’s study.\(^{656}\) For this chapter, it will suffice to say that Dallam’s major projects included organs for King’s College, Cambridge (1605-6), Westminster Abbey (1606-7), Norwich Cathedral (1608-9), St George’s Chapel, Windsor (1609-10), Worcester Cathedral (1613), Eton College (1613-14), the Palace of Holyrood (1616), Wells Cathedral (1620), and Durham Cathedral (1621-22). Thomas’ son Robert Dallam is also known to have built organs for Magdalen College, Oxford (c. 1631); York Minster (1632-34); St John’s College, Cambridge
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Lichfield Cathedral (1639-40); and Gloucester Cathedral (c. 1641). Although this movement that promoted organ building is often labelled as a Laudian revival, these dates demonstrate that efforts to improve organs began long before the Laudians’ heights in the 1620s and 1630s. There were of course also those who worked against this organ revival. For example, during his tenure as Archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot (srv. 1611-33) removed the organ and choir from Lambeth Palace’s chapel.

In past musicological and historical studies, the view that most major religious establishments in the early seventeenth century encouraged extensive musical practices has often been perpetuated. When studying organ building records however, it is important not to assume that the associated establishment also supported a prolific and elaborate musical foundation. Researchers have also often focussed their investigations on institutions with extensive surviving partbook collections. They have then presumed that other similar, now destroyed or lost, cathedral and college sources existed. As so few accounts recorded partbook destructions, it can conversely be theorised that many institutions did not possess significant partbook collections as they could not afford the upkeep of their musical equipment or employees. Even if establishments owned partbooks, we additionally do not know how regularly, or of what quality, performances were.

For example, because musicians’ wages were so low, they often held multiple positions. Thomas Tomkins was Worcester Cathedral’s organist (srv. 1596-1646) and one of the Chapel Royal’s organists (srv. 1621-28). Tomkins’ half-brother, Giles Tomkins, served as Salisbury Cathedral’s organist from 1629, was appointed as a Musician for the Virginals in the King’s Musick in 1630, and attended Charles I’s 1633 Scottish tour as the Chapel Royal’s organist. Later in 1641, he was also listed as one of the musicians for lutes, viols, and voices. When Laud enquired about the state of Salisbury Cathedral’s practices in 1634, ‘the clergy criticized Tomkins bitterly as a lax choir trainer who left the boys unattended to make
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appearances at court.¹⁶⁶² Church musicians were also not always diligent in their duties, even if they were employed at only one institution or in one role. Through discussions with singingmen from St Paul’s Cathedral in 1598, Richard Bancroft¹⁶⁶³ recounted how one said, ‘we be for the most part of us very slack in coming into the choir after the bell is tolled, and when we be there divers think the service very long till they be out of it again.’¹⁶⁶⁴ As previously recounted in this thesis, in the seventeenth century, Charles I issued orders to improve the conduct of the Chapel’s singingmen. We also know that Thomas Weelkes and Richard Hutchinson were both reprimanded at their respective institutions, Chichester and Durham, for excessive drinking and poor behaviour. It is highly likely that other institutions faced similar continual problems with discipline.

It is also pertinent to consider the conclusions from this thesis’ previous chapters. Investigations have proven that the Laudians’ musical innovations were not as elaborate as previous musicological accounts have suggested. More elaborate compositions from the sixteenth century and very early seventeenth century were retained in partbooks. However, many contemporary compositions included techniques that would have improved the clarity of the set texts. Enhanced musical practices were also often likely reserved for feast days and special occasions, rather than being part of institutions’ everyday traditions.

It should additionally be remembered that cathedrals and college chapels were not the most common worship venues. Parish churches made up 99% of England’s sacred establishments during the early seventeenth century. These parish churches still faced great economic instability during the early Stuart’s reigns. The vast majority of these did not possess the infrastructure or money to support flourishing musical foundations. They were often therefore unable and even unwilling to revive their musical traditions. For example, the London church of St Michael, Crooked Lane listed their ‘reasons why Inhabitants and Parishionrs. are not able to sett up the Organs againe and the time since they were taken downe’ in the 1640s. Sir John Lambe, on behalf of the High Commission court, had been increasingly pressuring St Michael’s to restore its organs. Their list records
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that the organs were never used in the church since Queen Maries dayes and when the roodlofte which was the place where they stood was taken downe they were also sett aside.

That they are soe old rotten and decayed that noe workeman can repaire them, there is only 37 pipes worth 9d a pound and all the rest not worth anything.

That whereas the inhabitants heretofore have bin marchants, stockfishmongers and men of great estates, now for the most parte they are poore handycrafte tradesmen and not able to maintaine a paire of orgens.

There was never noe land nor any maintenance given in our Parishe for that use as wee understande Sr. John Lambe was informed.

That consideringe that our Ordinary & necessary general collections such as must of necessity be collected as the shipp money, and for the maintenance of the poore and visited houses have been of late more than we are well able to bare wee humbly desire Sr. John Lambe not to put us to this charge but to dismisse the court of this business that wee may be no further troubled.\textsuperscript{665}

Parish churches also often lacked musical personnel as proficient and talented singers would have been more attracted to the opportunities that the Chapel Royal and cathedral foundations could offer. Complaints against altar policies, baptismal font installations, and physical ceremonial practices were far more frequently recorded as they had been more extensively disseminated outside of the confines of the Chapel Royal, cathedrals, and college chapels.\textsuperscript{666} As many parish churches did not possess an organ or choir, congregationally sung syllabic and homophonic psalms were most commonly encouraged. Their musical practices were consequently largely unchanged through the Civil War and Interregnum. Musical

\textsuperscript{665} Freeman, ‘St Michael, Crooked Lane, and Its Organs,’ 242-245.

equipment and elaborate musical practices were not extensively prevalent in the wider Church of England in the early seventeenth century.

Records of complaints against sacred music practices are nevertheless still important to investigate. It must firstly be remembered that, as with some of the complaints against Durham’s practices in the previous chapter, hyperbole could have been employed in objections to further admonish practices. Thomas Cranmer in 1544, then Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote in a letter to Henry VIII that ‘the song that should be made ... would not be full of notes, but, as near as may be, for every syllable a note; so that it may be sung distinctly and devoutly.’ Protestations that sacred music practices needed to be further reformed were also voiced during Elizabeth’s reign. In 1580, an anonymous pamphlet entitled the Request of True Christians to the Most Honourable High Court of Parliament pleaded,

let cathedral churches be utterly destroyed ... very dens of thieves, where the time and place of God's service, preaching and prayer, is most filthily abused; in piping with organs, in singing, ringing and trolling of the Psalms from one side of the choir to another, with squealing of chanting choristers ... Dumb dogs, unskilful, sacrificing priests, destroyed drones, or rather, caterpillars of the Word ... Dens of lazy, loitering lubbards.668

John Nasshe, a Puritan separatist, also felt compelled to write to Convocation from Marshalsea prison in 1581 to describe how in many churches, clergy members encouraged the
tossinge of psalmes from syde to syde in the quyer, and turning their arses and backs to the people etc. where Chrystes ministers do all but edifye both in prayer and preacheinge, and prophesying and ministring, and in Psalmes synginge together with the whole church etc., and not service readeynge, and psalmes in partes songe, nor pistlinge nor gospelinge after the Popes fashion, which is a blynde order, and a waye to kepe the people still in ignorance ... the


668 Anon. Request of All True Christians to the Most Honourable High Court of Parliament (London, 1580).
unlearned sorte .. shall never come to see or knowe the lighte of lyffe
... [but] bee still blynde and so loose their salvation.\textsuperscript{669}

Robert Browne recorded a similar observation in 1593 that worship in Elizabethan churches often involved ‘tossing to and fro of psalms and sentences’ which was ‘like tenisse plaie whereto God is called a judge who can do best and be most gallant in his worship.’\textsuperscript{670} For a more detailed discussion of the debates and defences surrounding Elizabethan sacred music practices and organ playing, the reader should refer to Willis’ \textit{Church Music and Protestantism} monograph.\textsuperscript{671}

During the early seventeenth century, figures such as Smart and Prynne complained that music had become ‘so chamted and mix sed, and mangled... as for the words and sentences, and the very matter it selfe is nothing understood at all’.\textsuperscript{672} With the ‘confusednesse of voices, some squeaking, some blating, some roaring, and thundering with a multitude of melodious instruments that the greatest part of the service, is no better understood, then if it were in Hebrew or Irish.’\textsuperscript{673}

Differing interpretations of St Paul’s letters to the Ephesians and Colossians also triggered further objections. St Paul had communicated that faithful peoples should ‘speak to your selves in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs’,\textsuperscript{674} ‘singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord’.\textsuperscript{675} George Wither, in his 1619 \textit{Preparation to the Psalter}, stated that if worshipers practised and supported over-elaborate sacred music, ‘his prayers are turned to sinne and hee makes harsh Musicke in the eares of God... God ought to bee praised, not with the voyce alone, but with heart also. And therefore as the Apostle councelleth the Ephesian Sing and make you melody unto Him in your hearts.’\textsuperscript{676} Edward Elton reiterated this view in his 1637 publication \textit{An Exposition of the Epistle of Saint Paul to the Colossians}. He here wrote that

in singing Psalmes and Hymnes, and spirituall songs, our hearts must goe with our voyces and tongues, our singing must not be only with
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the voyce, or rise onely from the throat, but it must proceed from the depth of the heart; wee must sing Psalmes and holy songs with understanding, and with an holy feeling in our hearts; our hearts must be cheerefull in singing, even possessed with heavenly joy, and affected according to the matter that wee doe sing. 677

A more detailed exploration of these controversies can be found in Peter Webster’s thesis. 678

Jeremy Taylor, a strong royalist and ceremonialist who had been Archbishop Laud and Charles I’s chaplain, noted that instruments in sacred music ‘add some little advantages to singing, but they are more apt to change religion into aires and fancies and take off some of its simplicity.’ 679 According to Taylor, instruments could not edify congregations and would not ‘make a man wiser or instruct him in anything’. They may ‘guide the voice... but they are but a friend’s friend to religion.’ 680

At the commencement of the Civil War, several Puritan loyalists were quick to admonish the ceremonial practices that Laud and his followers had promoted. A 1641 set of Puritanical Charges against the Caroline Prelates and Clergy stated to parliament that the past practices had served only to take off men’s hearts from the spiritual fervency and purity of worship (viz. the immediate direction of it to God) and to stay them and make them rest in outward actions, forms and things... Their requiring, using and observing in divine worship, such specious habits, ceremonies and formalities (in the outward state and majesty whereof the sense and fancy might be amused and the minds of the people detained from the rational part of the work) and confounding all with noise, especially in the cathedral service, which they make exemplary to all other churches. 681

Specifically regarding the preceding musical practices, The Holy Harmony’s anonymous author wrote in 1643 that

680 Ibid.
681 Members of Ecclesiological Late Cambridge Camden Society, eds., Hierurgia Anglicana, 346.
we must know, that our hearty devotions are the only musick for the 
house of God, Psalms and Prayers are not the heavenlier for Copes 
and Vestments, not the louder for wind-Instruments . Indeed, I 
observe at the dedication of Nebuchadnezzars image, the Cornet, 
Trumpet, Harp, Sackbut, Psaltery and all instruments of Musick Dan 3; 
7 were alarums appointed as Ushers to the adoration of those living 
statues to a dead image, ....... certainly that zeale is halfe dead the six 
days, that must have all that stirre to awaken his nap the seventh.682

To demonstrate obedience and properly worship God,
the soule should appear to God, as God to Moses, in a soft, and a still 
winde, the holy and sweet sighes, or silent expressions of the soul are 
most acceptable, Paul knew the sweetnesse of this still Musicke, 
these heavenly breathings, and would have preferred one of them 
before a thousand crouds of sackbutts, this is the holy harmony.683

The Parliamentarians could have destroyed musical artefacts during the Civil War to 
eradicate the enhanced sacred practices that sixteenth- and seventeenth-century 
ceremonialists, and then the Laudians, had continually encouraged. It has nevertheless been 
demonstrated that some ceremonialists discouraged certain musical practices. Complaints 
against musical practices were also actually very infrequently heard, especially when 
compared to altar policy, physical ceremonial practice, and architectural debates. Once again 
aligning with the principal of sacred music as adiaphora, compositional and performance 
practices do not appear to have been a primary theological concern for the pre-Civil War 
Puritans. There is also evidence that not all supposedly Puritan-loyal institutions in the early 
seventeenth century conformed to the stereotype of only promoting plain, congregational 
music. A particularly significant example is Thomas Myddleton’s chapel at Chirk Castle. 
Myddleton is described in The Dictionary of National Biography to have had a ‘strong Puritan 
temperament’ and later represented Denbighshire in the House of Commons from 1640 to 
1648.684 He renovated Chirk Castle between 1630 and 1635. In total, £270 was spent on a
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new chapel and a new organ.\textsuperscript{685} It is probable that Chirk Castle’s surviving partbooks were compiled during this time.\textsuperscript{686} These were prepared by William Deane, organist of Wrexham Parish church.\textsuperscript{687} The partbooks feature many contemporarily popular choral anthems and the repertoire is even similar to other institutions such as the Chapel Royal, Durham Cathedral, and Peterhouse College, Cambridge. Whilst le Huray has stated that it was highly unlikely that a Puritan would have tolerated a crucifix and cathedral style services in a private chapel,\textsuperscript{688} the evidence remains that more extensive choral music practices were encouraged. As many institutions’ musical records have been destroyed or lost, we are unfortunately unable to ascertain how widespread more elaborate Puritan musical practices were. It can nevertheless be concluded that a broad spectrum of theological sacred music beliefs existed in the early seventeenth century.

The official Parliamentary ordinances and recorded debates that arose during the Civil War also appear to demonstrate that musical practices were continually not a great concern. These again focus on the perceptions that pieces of sacred musical equipment were idolatrous artefacts, rather than on compositional and performance practices.

Even before the breakdown of Charles I’s personal rule, a 1629 parliamentary meeting investigated ‘the belly and bowels of this Trojan horse, to see if there be not men in it ready to open the gates to Romish tyranny and Spanish monarchy’. This meeting was called due to growing concerns that there would be a popish uprising in England. During these inquiries, whist practices such as the altar-wise positioning of communion tables, making the sign of the cross to Jesus’ name during baptism, and the prolific erecting of statues and tapers were admonished, musical concerns were not raised.\textsuperscript{689}

Similar investigations were heightened during the lead up to the Civil War. A meeting of the Short Parliament on 29 April 1640 investigated a report about various ‘Innovations in Religion’. Similarly to the 1629 assembly, whilst issues concerning the administration of the sacrament, altar policies, vestments, and statues were highlighted, no comments on music were made.\textsuperscript{690}
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A council of earls, bishops, and barons was appointed by the House of Lords to investigate ‘innovations in religion as were proper to be taken away’ in March 1641. Laud disparagingly reports in his diary that

this committee, will meddle with doctrine as well as ceremony, and will call some divines to them to consider of the business, as appears by a letter hereunto annexed, sent by the Lord-bishop of Lincoln to some divines to attend this service. Upon the whole, I believe this committee will prove the national synod of England, to the great dishonour of the Church, and what else may follow upon it God know.  

In an ‘Innovations in Discipline’ section, this council recorded their oppositions to various practices including the lighting of tapers, turning communion tables altarwise, bowing towards and railing in the altar, the use of elaborate altar plate, and some sacred music practices. They objected to choirs ‘singing Te Deum in prose in parish churches. Standing up at the hymns of the church; and always at Gloria Patri.’ They also recommended ‘that the music used in God’s holy service in cathedral and collegiate churches be framed with less curiosity, that it may be more edifying and more intelligible, and that no hymns or anthems be used where ditties are framed by private men, but such as are contained in the sacred canonical Scriptures, or in our liturgy or prayers, or have public allowance.’ The instruction that music should ‘be framed with less curiosity’ was presumably written to encourage simpler compositional techniques. However, these corrections focussed more on the physical ceremonial practices that accompanied musical performances and text usages, rather than on compositional styles.

The Long Parliament extensively addressed the charges against Laud, John Cosin and Matthew Wren in March 1641. However, no mention of these churchmen’s musical innovations was made. Not even Smart’s complaints against Cosin’s musical introductions at Durham Cathedral or Cosin’s responses were brought forward. The council instead addressed how Cosin had bowed towards the altar and had burnt tapers during divine services; he had

---
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supposedly even lit these himself for Candlemas.693 Nevertheless, as has been demonstrated throughout this thesis, enhanced musical practices were seemingly only promoted in select sacred institutions. It is therefore understandable that musical complaints were not included in these trials as they were not a widespread concern.

After the outbreak of the Civil War, official Ordinances from the Long Parliament were announced in August 1643. These were ‘for the utter demolishing, removing and taking away of all Monuments of Superstition or Idolatry’. All ‘altars, tables of stone, communion tables, tapers, candlesticks and basons, crucifixes and crosses, images and pictures’ were to be ‘utterly taken away and demolished... and none of the like hereafter permitted in any such Church or Chappel.’ It was not however until May the following year that a further order for ‘copes, surplisses, superstitious vestments, Roods or Roodlons, or Holy Water fonts’ and ‘all Organs, and the frames and Cases wherein they stand’ to be ‘taken away and utterly defaced’ was given.694

The Long Parliament also dealt with petitions from many smaller, rural parishes. They highlighted how their churches had been abused through the introduction of altar rails, vestments, and other “popish” practices. Sacred music practices however were only mentioned twice. Complaints from the parishioners of Waddesdon, Buckinghamshire were presented on 6 March 1641. These were against Sir John Lambe, a Laudian jurist and commissioner, and Sir Nathaniel Brent, the head of Merton College, Oxford. These men were accused of ‘imposing a yearly Stipend of Fifteen Pounds, upon the Parishioners of Waddsden in the County of Bucks, for the maintenance of a Organist there.’695 During Lambe’s personal defence, he admitted that he had ordered in September 1638 that this wage should be paid. He nevertheless maintained that the organs had been set up by Dr William Roane ‘commissarie to the Bishopp of Lincolne’ in December 1635.696 The second complaint from St Wulfram’s church in Grantham will be recounted later in this chapter. The populace’s aversions to sacred music practices appear to centre on physical musical artefacts and the

money that they cost to obtain and maintain, rather than the music that the organs and choirs produced or because of doctrinal principals. It should again be reiterated that parish churches were not often able to afford the upkeep of an organ or choir. Their music practices were far simpler than those in larger establishments and extensively involved congregational singing. It is therefore understandable that complaints against enhanced musical practices would not have been frequently raised from their parishioners.

During the Civil War and Interregnum, petitions that defended the Laudians’ practices were produced by several ceremonialists. They did not however include justifications of any previous musical practices. They were primarily concerned with protecting and reintroducing the Book of Common Prayer (1559). The Long Parliament was often entreated, even ‘on the eve of the Civil War 1641-1642’, to retain this source of ‘unspeakable joy and comfort, wherein the famous Church of England, our deare Mother, hath just cause to glory.’

Musical practices were not extensively addressed in Parliamentary sessions or legal injunctions. Complaints against musical practices were only loudly voiced by a minority of figures. These have given scholars a false impression of how widespread they actually were.

These records have revealed that more conservative musical practices, whether intentionally or accidentally, had been promoted before the Puritans and the Interregnum. Most of England’s sacred establishments did not contain strong musical foundations or extensive musical equipment due to a lack of interest, personnel, and finances, at the start of the Civil War. Compared with other church artefacts such as altars, baptismal fonts, rails, statues, and stained glass, their demolitions are very rarely recorded. With fewer objectionable items to eradicate in the first place, this could explain why musical artefact destructions were often not recounted.

Whilst complaints against musical practices were heard throughout the Reformation, they were not prevalent. Neither were musical practices a great concern in the Civil War
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697 Sinclair B. Ferguson and Mark Dever, *Westminster Directory of Public Worship* (Fearn: Christian Focus Publications, 2009). During the Civil War, in 1645, Parliament outlawed the Book of Common Prayer and replaced it with the Directory for Public Worship. The Book of Common Prayer was nevertheless restored, and a revised edition was produced in 1662, under Charles II.

Parliamentary debates and ordinances. This evidence supports this thesis’ previous conclusions that extravagant musical practices were not widely cultivated. As sacred music practices were seemingly not extensively defended during the Civil war or Interregnum, music does not appear to have been a centrally important ceremonial practice for the Laudians. For most sacred establishments, their musical practices would have been changed very little under the new Puritan control. Compositional and performance practices would consequently not have been a primary concern for the Parliamentarians. Conservative figures also exhibited a large range of musical preferences. These could therefore explain why pieces of musical equipment were targeted far less than other sacred artefacts. Musical practices would of course, by extension, have been reduced through artefact destructions. It has nevertheless been evidenced that musical artefacts were most commonly viewed as physical symbols of the previous ceremonial, idolatrous church practices that needed to be eradicated.

**Musical Artefacts That Were Saved and Used During the Civil War and Interregnum**

Although musical artefacts and enhanced musical practices were not especially prevalent in the wider Church of England, the exemplified destruction accounts may lead us to believe that similar unrecorded actions were carried out across the country. There are however records that some musical artefacts were saved and continually used throughout the Interregnum. This evidence will be used to dispel the myth that only plain, congregationally sung metrical psalms were promoted throughout the Interregnum.

Several cathedrals endeavoured to save their organs during the Civil War. In 1641 at Westminster Abbey, Dean Williams, his servants, and ‘some other gentlemen that came to them’ prevented men from entering Abbey who wished ‘to pull downe the organs and altar’; though the organ was subsequently lost according to Ryves’ records in 1643. In 1642 at Rochester Cathedral, the Parliamentary soldiers destroyed the furnishings in the choir and threatened to return and similarly deal with the organs. Rochester quickly dismantled its organ before this could occur. At Salisbury Cathedral in 1643, the Dean and Chapter
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‘deemed it prudent, in order to save the organ from destruction and in the hope of better times, to have it taken down and the material safely preserved.’

Henry Townsend records that at Worcester Cathedral on 20 July 1646, following the city’s surrender to the Parliamentary army,

the Organs were this day taken down out of the Cathedral Church.

Some parliamenters, hearing the music of the church at service, walking in the Aisle, fell a skipping about and dancing as it were in derision.

Others, seeing the workmen taking them down, said, “You might have spared that labour, we would have done it for you.” “No,” said a merry lad (about 10 years old, “for when the Earl of Essex was here, the first man of yours that plucked down and spoiled the organs broke his neck here, and they will prevent the like misfortune.”

From various records, we also know that Lincoln Cathedral and Christ College, Cambridge’s organs remained in place. The organ at King’s College, Cambridge was dismantled in 1643 and sold c. 1650, but the organ case was stowed away and has survived. Payment records from this college for ‘pro inflandis organis’ were still recorded throughout the Interregnum. The singers also continued to receive their board, lodgings, stipends, and gratuities until they died, chose or leave, or membership (for the choristers) expired.

701 Betty Matthews, _The Organs and Organists of Salisbury Cathedral_ (Salisbury: Salisbury Cathedral, 1972), 5.
There are even records that organs were saved by Parliamentary soldiers. In 1641 at Durham Cathedral, it is recorded that on Midsummer Day of that year, and not till then, did they use any violence or harm to the organs in this church; but then they fell on them and broke them, and tore up all the keys of the great organs...

But to prevent further mischief to the organs, the General of the Scotch army advised Mr. Blades (steward to Dean Balcanquall) to take the pipes out; and at night they did so in order to save them. But afterwards the said two cases – to wit, that of the white organ (on the South side of the church) and that of the great Organ (over the Quire doors) being standing in the church the 11th September 1650, the Scotch prisoners to the number of about 4500 taken at the fight of Dunbar, being brought into Durham and put into the Cathedral, which was now made a prison to keep them in, they, the aid prisoners, did burn all the said two cases, and all the seats and wainscot, and all the wood they could find in the said Cathedral church aforesaid.706

The army of Robert Devereux, the 3rd Earl of Essex, came to Worcester in 1642. Sergeant Nehemiah Wharton recorded that Devereux had ‘proclaimed that no soldier should plunder either church or private house, upon pain of death.’707 During this same year, Devereux presumably gave similar orders which saved Hereford’s organs as ‘Sabbath day about the time of morning prayer we went to the Minster, where the pipes played and the puppets sang so sweetely, that some of our souldiers could not forbeare dauncynge in the holie quire, whereat the Baalists were sore displeased.’708 Only the dignity and reverence of this sacred service was seemingly damaged.

There are also records that certain sacred musical artefacts, most especially organs, were continually used during the Interregnum in select religious spheres. Before the injunctions of the Interregnum were fully imposed, some Royalist and Laudian strongholds upheld their preferred musical practices. The city of York, the principal Royalist base in the
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North, was sieged by the Parliamentary armies in 1644 for three months. The desperate state that York was held in is described by Simon Ashe. Ashe wrote, ‘the Lord affect us with the sad fruits of wasting warres and speedily and mercifully end our combustions which are carried on with high sirmes and heavy desolations. Truly my heart sometimes is ready to breake with what I see here.’ Thomas Mace recounted that against the external tirades, in York Minster there was then a most Excellent-large-plump-lusty-full-speaking-Organ.... This Organ ... being let out, into all its Fulness of Stops, together with the Quire, began the Psalm. But when That Vast-Conchording-Unity of the whole Congregational-Chorus, came (as I may say) Thundering in, even so, as it made the very Ground shake under us; (Oh the unutterable ravishing Soul's delight!) In which I was so transported, and wrapt up into my whole Man, viz. Body, Soul and Spirit, for any thing below Divine and Heavenly Raptures; Nor could there possibly be any Thing in Earth, to which That very Singing might be truly compar'd.

Mace’s account should nevertheless be treated with caution as it is probably quite hyperbolic. For example, Mace later described how the Parliamentary forces constantly in Prayers time they would not fail to make their Hellish disturbance, by shooting against and battering the Church, in so much that sometimes a Canon Bullet has come in at the windows, and bounc’d about from Pillar to Pillar, (even like some Furious Fiend, or evil Spirit).

With its royalist loyalties, it is unsurprising that York Minster attempted to continually cultivate its sacred music practices. These practices however did end in 1647 when an order was given that the organs were to be sold for their iron. It is highly probable that there were other unrecorded instances where establishments similarly endeavoured to preserve their pre-Civil War music practices.
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There is even evidence that some establishments used their organs during the Interregnum to support congregational metrical psalm singing. As previously discussed, petitions from smaller parish churches to the Long Parliament very infrequently mentioned worship music; their practices were of course limited by lower finances and personnel. Complaints were heard on 11 November 1640 from St Wulfram’s church in Grantham. They appealed ‘against Dr Farmery and Dr Hurst for putting Organs upon the towne’. John Farmery served as Lincoln Minster’s Chancellor, became vicar general to Bishop John Williams, and was an avid royalist who strongly supported Laud. Thomas Hurst was the Rector of Barrowby and Leadenham before becoming Charles I’s chaplain during the Civil War until 1645. A town Corporation order, dated 30 October 1640, reveals that these organs do not appear to have been maintained to promote ceremonial musical ideals. The erection and preservation of St Wulfram’s organs was seemingly only permitted on the agreement that the parish would not incur costs from them. It was recorded that agreement made in a court held by our late Alderman Mr Richard Crawford to the persons present in that courte about the beginning of his year ... by Mr Thos Hurst and Mr Robert Sanderson ... and with the consent and appointment (as they then affirmed to us) of Mr Doctor Farmary ... that the orgaines then intended to be erected in our church by the said Chancellor sholde not in any sorte be chargeable to the parish eyther in respect of the orgaines, the setting them up, or for the present or future maintenance of them or of an organist to play upon them [and if there be any default] then the orgaines should be taken away and removed.

The organs were also allowed to be continually used to support congregational metrical psalm singing. The town councillors had agreed that we are still very willing to have an organ continued and used in our church as it has been, viz to accompany the singing of the psalms.

after the common and plain tunes appointed to be used in the church. Finding by experience that by use of it hitherto practised in our church, first in the Parish Clerk signifying what psalm is to be sung and the organist then distinctly playing the tune, all persons that can read have time to turn unto the psalms [...] And the confusion which sometimes hath heretofore happened in our church, being a very large and spacious church, in singing the psalms appointed after divers tunes, is taken away.\textsuperscript{716}

The parishioners behind this petition appear to have been more concerned with how much money they would have to contribute towards the organ. The town corporation order appears to evidence that some institutions during the Civil War still found uses for their organs during divine services. Similar practices could have been continually encouraged throughout the Interregnum.

J. R. Denny and Percy Scholes collated evidence from Christ College, Cambridge and John Evelyn’s reports from Holland which led them to conclude that organ voluntaries could have been continually performed throughout Interregnum Puritan services. Throughout the Reformation, organ voluntaries were often seen as a separate secular section outside of the main service. In Calvinist Haarlem, Holland, Evelyn wrote in August 1641 that ‘in the nave... a fair pair of organs, which I could not find they made use of in divine service, or so much as to assist them in singing psalms, but only for show, and to recreate the people before and after their devotions.’\textsuperscript{717} In private correspondence with Scholes, Denny reports that ‘though I cannot find any mention of the use or disuse of the Christ’s organ for services or for recreation during the Civil War, I think it possible that it was used for voluntaries, which would be allowed even by the strictest Puritan.’\textsuperscript{718} Denny and Scholes’ evidence that organ voluntaries were continually used during divine services is therefore quite circumstantial. As the Puritans largely opposed sacred music that did not include the word of God or involve their congregations, the performance of such voluntaries is unlikely.

Outside of public divine services, there was a loophole that many institutions exploited during the Interregnum. \textit{The Directory for Publique Worship of God} provided
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instructions regarding how public worship should be conducted, not for more private celebrations in domestic spheres. The *Ordinance for Taking Away the Book of Common Prayer, and for Establishing and Putting in Execution of the Directory for the Publique Worship of God* read,

> the Directory for publique Worship herein set forth, shall be henceforth used, pusued, and observed, according to the true intent and meaning of this Ordinance, in all Exercises of the publique Worship of God, in every Congregation, Church, Chappel and place of publique Worship within this Kingdome of England, and Dominion of Wales.\(^{719}\)

During the Interregnum, several colleges maintained their organs and used them during private music performances for the purpose of ‘recreating and composing’ the ‘travailed spirits’ of students with ‘solemn and divine harmonies of Musick heard or learnt; either while the skilful Organist plies his grave and fancied descant, in lofty fugues or the whole symphony’.\(^{720}\) On 12 July 1654, Evelyn went to Magdalen College, where we saw the library and chapel, which was likewise in pontifical order, the altar only I think turned tablewise, and there was still the double organ, which abominations (as not esteemed) were almost universally demolished; Mr Gibbon, that famous musician, giving us a taste of his skill and talents on that instrument.\(^{721}\)

John Cotton,\(^{722}\) a clergyman and later a preacher in the American colonies, recorded a seemingly widely accepted Puritan belief in his 1647 *Singing of the Psalms*. He noted that ‘nor doe we forbid the private use of any instrument of musick therewithal; so that attention to the instrument does not divert the heart from attention to the matter of song.’\(^{723}\)
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playing was more extensively allowed in domestic sacred spheres. For example, the famous Puritan lawyer and writer Bulstrode Whitelocke\textsuperscript{724} banned anthems in his private chapel at Fawley Court. He nevertheless still ‘retained the old chaplain and the old organist, Mr. Ellis, but instead of anthems (what a falling off was there!) they sang the ordinary psalms to the organ.’\textsuperscript{725}

Perhaps most notably, John Hingston possessed and utilised an organ throughout the Interregnum. Hingston served as a viol player in Charles I’s court band. During the Interregnum, he was appointed as Cromwell’s official court organist and keeper of instruments.\textsuperscript{726} The biographer Anthony Wood noted:

\begin{quote}
Hingston, John, an able Composer, and Organist; He was organist to Oliver Protector who had the organ of Magdalen College in the palace Hall of Hampton Court till his Maties Restauration; he breed up two Boyes to sing with himselfe Mr. Dearings printed latine songes for 3 voices; which Oliver was most taken with though he did not allow singing, or Organ in Chruche. He had them sung at the Cockpit in Whitehall where he had an organ, and did allow this John Hingston 100 per Annum during his usurpation.\textsuperscript{727}
\end{quote}

Cromwell had obtained Magdalen College, Oxford’s organ for Hampton Court ‘where it remained in the Great Gallery till the Restoration, when it was restored to the College’; this restoration cost £16 10s. \textsuperscript{728} With Evelyn’s aforementioned diary entry that Mr Gibbon


performed on Magdalen’s organ, this transfer must have occurred after July 1654. This removal also appears to have been an amicable, or at least an agreed upon, arrangement. This can be proven through evidence from the College’s Vice-President elections on Christmas Eve 1662. A Dr Clerke was in the running, but a senior fellow, Dr. Yerbury, raised an objection as ‘he [Dr Clerke] consented to the giving away of College organs to Cromwell.’ In John Nichols’ *The History and Antiquities of the County of Leicestershire*, it is also reported that

Stanford Church is decorated with a handsome organ that formerly belonged to the banqueting-room, Whitehall, which by order of Cromwell was taken down and sold. It was intended to be placed in the Chapel of Magdalen College, Oxford; being too small, was purchased by the Cave Family. It is possible that this organ was supposed to be a replacement for the one that Cromwell had taken.

With Gunton’s account that Peterborough’s organ was destroyed by Colonel Cromwell’s soldiers, the musical practices that Cromwell encouraged seem especially unusual. Cromwell could however have merely been acting under orders at Peterborough to eradicate public ceremonial worship practices. Only later when he became Lord Protector was he able to indulge his musical preferences in private. These included, if Wood’s account is to be believed, Latin motets by Richard Dering.

Unlike larger establishments’ partbooks, domestic sacred vocal and instrumental publications were not as vehemently criticised or destroyed. The section entitled ‘Of Singing of Psalms’ in *The Ordinance for Taking Away the Book of Common Prayer, and for Establishing and Putting in Execution of the Directory for the Publique Worship of God* reads, ‘it is the duty of Christians to praise God publiquely by singing of Psalms together in the


Congregation, and also privately in the Family. Domestic music psalters were consequently actively encouraged during the Interregnum. Repertoire from Sternhold and Hopkins’ *The Whole Booke of Psalms* would have been most prolifically used. Nevertheless, other psalters that had been disseminated before the outbreak of the Civil War were reprinted and therefore seemingly continually used during the Interregnum; a selection of the most notable publications that were reprinted throughout the Interregnum can be seen below.

- John Day, *The Whole Psalms in Four Parts, which may be song to all Musical Instrumentes, set forth for the Encrease of Vertue: and aboleshying of other Vayne and Triflying Ballades* (London: 1563).
- Thomas East, *The Whole Booke of Psalms: with their Wonted Tunes, as they are song in the Churches, composed into Four Parts: all of which are so placed that Four may sing ech one a Several Part* (London, 1592).
- Thomas Ravenscroft, *The Whole Booke of Psalmes ... Composed into 4 Parts by Sundry Authors* (London: Company of Stationers, 1621).

All these publications predominantly feature multiple-part, note-against-note harmonisations. Whilst the melodies could have been used during church services, the harmonisations would have been far more suitable for domestic, musically literate audiences.

Henry Lawes’ *Choice Psalms put into Musick For Three Voices: The Most of Which May Properly Enough be Sung by any Three with a Thorough Base* was published in 1648. Although this was produced before Charles I’s execution, England was effectively under Parliamentary control. It is therefore surprising that this collection was permitted as it contained strong royalist sentiments. The preface to this collection opens with a dedication ‘to his Most Sacred Majestie, Charles, by the Grace of God, King of great Britaine, France and

---

Ireland, Defender of the Faith." It was printed in four partbooks and there was an engraving of the King on the reverse of the title pages. It was also dedicated to Henry’s brother, William Lawes, who had died fighting for the Royalists at the Siege of Chester in 1645. It contained ‘three-voice psalm settings by William and Henry Lawes (thirty each, ten canons and “An Elegie on Mr. John Tomkins” by William Lawes, and eight “Elegies, set in Musick by sev’rall Friends, upon the death of Willam Lawes”’. Several of the Lawes’ psalms are composed in an Italianate ‘sacred concerto’ style. These works include imitative vocal lines which feature chromaticism and unconventional harmonies. An example of these techniques can be seen in extract 3.1 from ‘In the subtraction of my years’ by William Lawes below.

734 Henry Lawes, Choice Psalms Put Into Musick For Three Voices: The Most of Which May Properly Enough be Sung by any Three with a Thorough Base (London, 1648), preface.
735 Jonathan P. Wainwright, ed., John Wilson: Psalterium Carolinum (1657) (York: York Early Music Press, 2017), iii–iv; Wainwright, ed., Henry Lawes, xix–xxii; Jonathan P. Wainwright, ed., Walter Porter: Collected Works (Middleton, WI: A-R Editions, 2017). Further psalm collections that were published later in the Interregnum contained royalist sentiments. If authors expressed royalist allegiances, their publication opportunities surprisingly do not appear to have been dramatically reduced, even during the Interregnum: John Wilson, Psalterium Carolinum (London, 1657) - Wilson had been a principal composer for the King’s Men and one of the ‘lutes and voices’ in the King’s Musick from 1635-42. The dedication in this collection reads, ‘to the Glory of God, the Sacred Memory of His late Maiestie, and to the Right Reverend Clergy of the Church of England.’ Walter Porter, Motetts of Two Voyces (London, 1659) - Although no overtly royalist sentiments were written into this collection, Porter had served as a tenor in the Chapel Royal from 1618 until the Chapel was disbanded at the beginning of the Civil War. It can consequently be presumed that Porter retained royalist loyalties.
736 Wainwright, ed., Henry Lawes, xiv.
In domestic spheres, more elaborate compositional techniques were sometimes tolerated and even encouraged.

William Child’s 1650 and 1656 publications, *Choise Musick of the Psalms of David for Three Voices with a continual Base either for the Organ or Theorbo*, likewise encouraged domestic sacred instrumental playing.\(^7^3^8\) Lawes and Child’s publications once again challenge the previously promoted belief that the Puritans suppressed all sacred uses of the organ and

---

\(^7^3^7\) Andrew Robinson, ““Choice Psalms”: A Brother’s Memorial,” in *William Lawes (1602-1645): Essays on his Life, Times and Work*, ed. Andrew Ashbee (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998), 183. (Original key and original note values)

\(^7^3^8\) William Child, *Choise Musick of the Psalms of David for Three Voices with a Continual Base Either for the Organ or Theorbo* (London, 1650/1656). This collection was a republication of: William Child, *The First Set of Psalms of Ill Voyces Fitt for Private Chappels or Other Private Meetings with a Continued Base Either for the Organ or Theorbo Newly Composed After the Italian Way* (London, 1639).
other instruments. They were seemingly used throughout to Interregnum to aid psalm singing. John Playford’s 1552 collection, *A Booke of New Lessons for Cithern and Gittern*, is even more surprising as it features transcriptions of several psalm tunes for solo cittern.\(^{739}\)

Even though the Puritans believed that the word of God was of the upmost importance, Playford’s publication demonstrates that non-texted musical performances of the psalms were tolerated. These collections however could have been primarily produced for England’s royalists, who never went away, but just laid low and waited for the hoped-for Restoration.

Several organs were also repurposed and used in secular spheres. The natural philosopher Robert Hooke ‘learned to play twenty lessons on the organ’ at Westminster School.\(^{740}\) Hooke presumably became a reasonably accomplished musician as he was appointed as a chorister at Christ Church, Oxford in 1653. ‘In those dayes when the church musique was putt downe’,\(^{741}\) such employees would not have actually performed any musical duties. The positions were nevertheless still filled and presumably funded. Hooke’s experiences demonstrate that some organs were retained for teaching purposes and therefore probably for select performances.

‘After the suppression of cathedral services and the prohibition of the liturgy, some of the ecclesiastical instruments had been sold to private persons’.\(^{742}\) After returning from his studies, the poet John Milton used the organ in ‘his Father’s house in the Country’. Here, he spent some time in turning over Latin and Greek Authors and now and then made excursion into the great city to buy books, to the end that he might be instructed in Mathematicks and Musick, in which last he became excellent, and by the help of his Mathematicks would compose a Song or Lesson.\(^{743}\)

---


\(^{741}\) Ibid.


Anthony Wood, a fervent royalist and ceremonialist, recorded the details of several music clubs that held meetings in Oxford throughout the Interregnum. Wood himself extensively encouraged the Oxford University Music School meetings.\textsuperscript{744} He noted:

1. The important weekly club carried on for profit by Ellis, late organist of St. John’s College – in his house, where he had an organ.
2. A weekly club carried on in his college room by Narcissus March, M.A., Fellow of Exeter College, and moved to St. Alban Hall when March became its Principal (Marsh was afterwards Archbishop of Tuam, Ireland).
3. A weekly club carried on in his rooms by Thomas Janes, M.A., of Magdalen College; he himself ‘practiced much on the Theorbo lute’.
4. The ‘Scholastical Musicians’ meeting every Friday, in various colleges.\textsuperscript{745}

During these, certainly at Ellis’ meetings, organs could have been used. Wood also noted down who some of the most frequent members at Ellis’ club were. Amongst these are the brothers Silas and Sylvanus Taylor; their father was Silvanus Taylor, a strong Puritan supporter of Cromwell’s. Silas, a captain in Cromwell’s army,\textsuperscript{746} was very musicall, and hath composed many things, and I have heard anthemes of his sang before his majestie, in his chapel, and the king told him he liked them. He had a very fine chamber organ in those unmusicall dayes. There was a great friendship between Matthew Lock, since organist of the Queen’s chapel, and him.\textsuperscript{747}

T. Brocklebank, Bursar and Vice-Provost of King’s College, Cambridge during the nineteenth century, recounted that


the year after the Restoration [1661] the College set about reviving the Choral Service, which had been grievously interrupted by the troubles of the times, and we find Mr. Henry Loosemore, the Organist, lending his Chamber Organ for use in the Chapel, 35s. being charged for its removal thither from his room by Lancelot Pease.748

Payments for 6/8 for ‘pro in landis organis’ appear in the college’s records from 1654 to the Restoration. It is therefore probable that the college’s organ was used for secular purposes throughout the Interregnum, but needed repairing before it was again used during sacred services at the Restoration.

Several taverns also purchased and used organs from churches during the Interregnum. In Evelyn’s 1659 translation of *A Character of England as it was Lately Presented in a Letter to a Noble Man of France*, the anonymous writer records his aversion that nothing may be wanting to the height of luxury and impiety of this abomination, they have translated the organs out of the Churches to set them up in taverns, chaunting their dithryambics and bestial bacchanalias to the tune of those instruments which were wont to assist them in the celebration of God’s praises, and regulate the voices of the worst singers of the world – which are the English in their churches at present.749

In Henry Davey’s *History of English Music*, he writes that Rochester Cathedral’s organ was moved during the Interregnum to a tavern in Greenwich, though no concrete evidence for or against this account has been found.750 Samuel Pepys records that he visited Rochester Cathedral on 10 April 1661 and listened to ‘the organ then a-tuning’.751 He does not however mention whether the organ had previously been removed and reinstated. Later in Pepys’ diary on 21 August 1663, he does record a visit to ‘the musique-house’ in Greenwich ‘where we had paltry musique, till the master organist came... and he did give me a fine voluntary or

750 Scholes, *The Puritans and Music*, 244.

\footnote{John S. Amery, Maxwell Adams, E. Wineatt, and H. Tapley-Soper, eds., \textit{Devon and Cornwall Notes and Queries}, vol. 9 (Exeter, 1917), 242.}

\footnote{For further records of Restoration music rooms that contained organs, please see: John Hawkins, \textit{A General History of the Science and Practice of Music} (London, 1776), ch. 148.

\footnote{This instrument has survived and is currently in the possession of N. P. Mander Ltd. Bicknell, \textit{The History of the English Organ}, 104.

\footnote{Bicknell, \textit{The History of the English Organ}, 104; Andrew Freeman, ‘Records of British Organ Builders (Second Series),’ \textit{Musical Opinion} (1922), paragraph 151.}

In Volume 9 of the \textit{Devon and Cornwall Notes and Queries} series, an inventory ‘of the goods of Charles Rewallin of the parish of Saint Sidwells in the County of Exon virginall maker’ (5 July 1697) is given. ‘An organ at the Globe’ is appraised to have been worth £15. It was proposed that this account referred to the still standing Globe Hotel.\footnote{It is however unknown whether such performances had also occurred in these establishments during the Interregnum.}

Records of organs being built or repaired in England during the Interregnum are very rare. From 1642 until the Restoration, the Dallam family fled to France and continued their work there. Bicknell has drawn together the scattered records of organ building and repair work that was carried out during the Interregnum. These reveal that a chamber organ was built in 1643 (though it is unknown who or where this was built for),\footnote{Bicknell, \textit{The History of the English Organ}, 104; Andrew Freeman, ‘Records of British Organ Builders (Second Series),’ \textit{Musical Opinion} (1922), paragraph 151.} and John Hayward carried out repair work on Oxford Music School’s organ in 1657 and in Coventry in the 1630s and 1640s.\footnote{Thi

It has consequently been revealed that musical artefacts, most especially organs, were not all destroyed during the Civil War. Several were saved by royalists, ceremonialists, and even by Parliamentarians. Whilst it is probable that organs were merely tolerated in most sacred venues and their choral practices were dramatically reduced, there is some evidence that certain establishments used their organs during services; particularly to support congregational metrical psalm singing. It is unknown how extensive this practice was, therefore we must be careful not to over-generalise these accounts. It is also notable that church musician positions were still often filled, even if there were very different, or indeed no, duties to undertake.

With the loophole that \textit{The Directory for Publique Worship of God} provided, more elaborate musical practices were encouraged in private settings. Particularly in colleges,
performances of sacred voluntaries, amongst other works, were seemingly continually permitted. Once again however, accounts that evidence these performances are limited and should not be over-generalised. In private domestic spheres, some Puritan households sang psalms whilst being accompanied on an organ. Even Cromwell himself is recorded to have enjoyed organ music and Dering’s Latin motets (basso continuo parts were also included in these). Such musical practices were presumably permitted as long as they did not counter St Paul’s instructions and divert people’s hearts from the word of God. Secular uses for organs were also found, whether for teaching purposes, private performances, music meetings, or even in taverns.

Seventeenth-century domestic sacred vocal practices, and therefore domestic musical artefacts, appear to have changed very little during the Interregnum. Many psalm collections from the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries were continually republished throughout the Interregnum. These collections largely contained pieces with plain melodies and simple note-against-note harmonisations. Often by composers with royalist allegiances, there are also collections that were published during the Interregnum that contained more elaborate and even Italianate compositional techniques. The works in these were of course still simpler than those that had been performed in cathedrals, colleges, and the Chapel Royal. Organ and other instrumental parts were nevertheless also included in these domestic collections, and even un-texted instrumental psalm settings were disseminated.

Organs and more elaborate choral compositions were largely suppressed from public sacred services. Some musical artefacts were nevertheless continually used in domestic settings by dispossessed musicians and Puritans alike. Strong aversions to these sacred musical artefacts and to any music other than congregationally sung metrical psalms were not universally held. It has once again been proven that the Parliamentary Puritans were mostly concerned with reforming public worship practices, correcting purported cathedral authority abuses, and removing any artefacts that they believed were idolatrous.

**Alternative, Non-Religious Motivations Behind Destructions**

As the Puritans viewed musical artefacts as physical idolatrous symbols, it is understandable that they were removed from public worship venues. Actual sacred music performance and compositional practices however do not appear to have greatly concerned the Puritan
reformers. Musical artefacts and elaborate musical practices were not discouraged as extensively as previous scholars have suggested. Not all conservative figures were against more enhanced sacred music practices. Some artefacts were saved and even used throughout the Interregnum. It is therefore important to investigate whether alternative, non-religious motivations could have influenced musical artefact destructions.

Ryves’ accounts from his first periodical in August 1642 provide the earliest known records of organ destructions. Organs were therefore being removed before the 1644 Parliamentary ordinance. This was also over two years before Oliver Cromwell’s more disciplined and committed Model Army was established in 1645. Particularly before Cromwell’s Model Army was created, the Parliamentary forces contained a lot of conscripted and pressed men. These were not necessarily men who wished to strongly uphold the Puritans’ beliefs. Soldiers could have participated in destroying sacred artefacts because they had been dissatisfied with the previous cathedral rule that had been imposed upon them. Or they could merely have become swept up in the thuggery. They do not appear to have been consistently motivated by religious convictions. The exemplified accounts have attested that attacks on cathedrals were often frenzied and heavy-handed. As previously revealed, the Puritans did not universally condemn more enhanced musical practices. Especially as organs were permitted in some select public and domestic spheres, it is probable that they were demolished far more extensively than many Puritans would have liked. Moreover, not all Puritans were against more elaborate sacred artefacts in general. For example, the city of York was taken over by Parliamentary forces in July 1644. The Parliamentary commander Lord Thomas Fairfax ensured that the surrender agreement stipulated ‘that neither churches nor other buildings be defaced’. Whilst several pieces of plate, copes, and later the organ were lost from York Minster, the medieval stained-glass windows were largely unharmed. It is therefore possible that musical artefacts could merely have been swept away by overzealous soldiers’ actions.

As cathedrals were often not extensively protected by the military, they were easier targets for the Parliamentary soldiers to take over and form garrisons within. They even used

---

757 Similar numbers of conscripted and pressed men can also be observed in the Royalist armies. C. H. Firth, Soldiers of Parliament, special ed. (Leonaur, 2015).
the iron inside to make musket balls and other necessary equipment. At York in 1647, it was ‘ordered that Mr Richard Dossie shall sell the iron which has taken upp in the Minster, as alsoe such things as were about the organ loft and organs, and other trifeling things which are not fitt for anie special use’.\textsuperscript{759} Ryves’ account of Peterborough also states that down they brake the Bellows to blow the coals of their further mischief, and left any should ring auke for the fire they had make, they left the Bells speechless, taking out their clap\l pers, which they sold with the Brass they flaid from the graven stones, and the Tin and Iron from other parts of the Church and Chappels belonging thereto.\textsuperscript{760}

Organs could additionally have been dismantled, sold, and then the profit distributed to the poor. The minutes of the Kirk Session at Holyrood on 4 April 1643 note that the matter being motioned concernign that ogane which was taken down, and put into the yle, now lying idle, mothing and consuming; yea, moreover, the same being an unprofitable instrument, \textit{scandalous} to our profession, whether the same might not be sold for a tolerable pryce, and the money given unto the poore.\textsuperscript{761}

Throughout the Civil War, looting was a common activity for soldiers on both sides of the conflict. As this Cavalier Ballad expresses,

\begin{verbatim}
Now our lives, 
Children, wives, 
And estate 
Are a prey to the lust and plunder 
To the rage 
Of our age;
\end{verbatim}


\textsuperscript{760} Ryves, \textit{Mercurius Rusticus}, 215.

\textsuperscript{761} John Graham Dalyell, \textit{Musical Memoirs of Scotland: With Historical Annotations} (Edinburgh: Thomas G. Stevenson, 1849), 129. This was not the first time that such a charitable sale had been made. In 1573, the Privy Council instructed that in Aberdeen, ‘the organis, with all expeditiou, be removed the krik, and maid profite of, to the use and support of the puir.’
And the fate
Of our land
Is at hand

By destroying musical artefacts, the gathered resources could have been used to further war efforts; assist the poor; or more derogatorily, if Ryves’ account from Westminster is to be believed, soldiers could have ‘pawned the Pipes at several Ale-houses for Pots of Ale.’

762 Anon., ‘The Commoners,’ in Rump: Or an Exact Collection of the Choycest Poems and Songs Relating to the Late Times. By the Most Eminent Wits, from Anno 1639 to Anno 1661 (London, 1662), 205.
763 Ryves, Mercurius Rusticus, 154.
Conclusion

This chapter has revealed that re-examinations of the fates of sacred musical artefacts during the English Civil War are highly important as previous scholars have often exaggerated how vehemently the Puritans objected to sacred musical practices and therefore destroyed associated artefacts. It has been proven that sacred music, and certainly compositional and performance practices, were seemingly not a great concern for either the Laudians or Puritans.

It must firstly be reiterated that the Puritans and Laudians were not the first Church of England factions to debate sacred music practices. The Puritans were aiming to return to the original values of the English Reformation; they were not proposing a completely novel upheaval of music. Their preferences for plainer worship music were not radically new ideas. The Laudians’ more enhanced sacred practices likewise emulated the beliefs of the ancient church (c. 000-500AD) and previous ceremonial religious factions.

Despite the provocative language that certain figures used, musical artefacts do not seem to have been a primary concern during the Civil War’s religious campaigns. Objections and defences were not frequently raised in parliamentary audiences, complaints, trials, or literature. Many of the destruction accounts were also undoubtedly exaggerated for propaganda purposes; both sides’ accounts cannot be relied upon. The evidence that this chapter has considered has therefore allowed me to propose several reasons why music was not persecuted as extensively as other ceremonial practices.

Musical artefacts and practices had faced decades of neglect. Enhanced sacred musical practices were not extensively encouraged throughout England, especially in parish churches; this was largely due to lacking funds and personnel. The Parliamentary forces extensively targeted cathedrals and colleges where ceremonial practices and clerical control had been most extensively enforced. Parish churches nevertheless made up the vast majority, 99%, of religious venues across England. Even in larger establishments, due to the seemingly continual view that music was a form of adiaphora, practices could vary dramatically depending on the time, location, and presiding personnel. There was no straightforward right or wrong way to use sacred music or musical artefacts, unlike altar policies, structural improvements, and physical ceremonial practices. These practices were therefore far easier to implement and far more widely debated. If musical artefacts were not
extensively maintained or used in religious establishments, there would have been fewer musical artefacts to destroy in the first place. It is therefore understandable that they were not a primary concern for the Puritan reformers.

Drawing on conclusions from this thesis’ previous chapters, the ceremonial music practices that the Laudians promoted were not as elaborate as previous historical and musicological studies have suggested. Through examining Puritan and conservative sacred music practices and sources such as the Chirk Castle partbooks, a wide range of theological opinions regarding which sacred music practices were acceptable were shown to have existed. Congregationally sung metrical psalms, whilst most common, were not the only type of sacred music that Puritans and more conservative figures promoted. These diverse preferences consequently support the conclusion that sacred music was not a primary Parliamentary concern.

Some organs were saved and even used in select sacred and secular spheres, though we must be careful not to over-generalise the surviving records. Objections appear to have arisen as the organs in public worship venues were symbols of the previous ceremonial control that larger establishment’s chapters had exerted over the populace. The implication that they would be used in sacred worship to mask the word of God seemingly horrified the Puritans more than the instruments themselves. They were also probably often seen as a financial burden to parishioners. The Parliamentary reformers were far more concerned with reforming public worship practices, particularly those in the central cathedral and college establishments. Parish church and private practices, including domestic secular uses of musical artefacts, appear to have changed very little. Whilst the compositional techniques found in sacred domestic collections were not as elaborate as those in pre-Civil War cathedral, college, and Chapel Royal repertoires, some more intricate part writing and instrumental usages were tolerated and encouraged. Such collections could of course have primarily been used by royalist survivors throughout the Interregnum.

As the use of church vestments was strongly debated in the early seventeenth century, it is understandable why choral surplices were targeted during the Civil War. Musical artefacts such as organs and partbooks seem to have been widely viewed by the Puritans as physical symbols of the previous religiously idolatrous practices. It is undeniable that destructions of musical artefacts had far from positive effects on England’s sacred music practices. With fewer musical artefacts, by extension, practices would likewise have been
suppressed and simplified. Actual compositional and performance practices nevertheless appear to have been far less of a concern for the Puritans. Debates, destructive actions, and ordinances centre around the artefacts themselves. As some were continually used throughout the Interregnum, even on the instruction of exceedingly high-ranking Puritans, theological beliefs do not appear to have exclusively motivated destructions. These artefacts could have been caught up in soldiers’ over-zealous attacks, used to aid war efforts, or support the poor. Both sides of the Civil War pillaged establishments to fill their coffers. It is therefore possible that royalists were also responsible for some musical artefact destructions.

Contemporary scholars are nevertheless fortunate that not all organs were destroyed and not every piece of music went up in flames. Several organs were dismantled rather than demolished and music partbooks were hidden or dispersed. For example, several of the Peterhouse College, Cambridge partbooks were found in the 1920s, in the panelling of the College’s Perne Library. They had presumably been hidden there to escape the ravages of the Civil War. We must also be careful not to assume that musical artefacts from the early seventeenth century were solely lost through the Puritans’ actions. Destructions of early seventeenth-century musical artefacts, in particular partbooks, did not just occur during the Civil War.

Shortly after the Restoration on 2 September 1666, the Great Fire of London broke out. As the fire raged, many people believed that the vaults underneath St Paul’s Cathedral would be safe and stored books and other belongings there. Around 8pm on the 4 September however, Evelyn reported that the fire ‘was now taking hold of St Paule’s Church, to which the scaffolds contributed exceedingly’. Although the contents of the vaults were lost, a minor canon named Thomas Quartermaine went back into the St Paul’s three times to recover the choir books. Many of the early seventeenth-century partbooks may have been saved, though none of these survive today. There are only fragments of later seventeenth-century partbooks that were incorporated into the existing, primarily eighteenth-century partbooks.

764 Hughes, Catalogue of the Musical Manuscripts at Peterhouse, Cambridge, xiii.  
765 Bray, ed., The Diary of John Evelyn, 2: 21. The scaffolding that Evelyn was referring to was within the Cathedral. Repair work, overseen by Christopher Wren, was then being undertaken.  
In 1829, Jonathan Martin started a fire in the choir of York Minster. Martin was a non-conformist who believed that prayers should only come from the heart, rather than being expressed through a liturgy. He had written several pamphlets citing the clergy as the ‘vipers of Hell’ and would later be found not guilty due to insanity; he claimed that God had told him to start the fire. Martin started a fire in the Minster through piling up cushions, prayer books, and music books (including the seventeenth-century partbooks) in the choir. The choir of the Minster was completely lost. The Dunnington-Jefferson manuscript, which was originally from Durham Cathedral, survived as it was on loan that night.\footnote{Anon., \textit{A Full and Authentic Report of the Trial of Jonathan Martin at the Castle of York, on Tuesday, March 31, 1829, for Setting Fire to York Minster} (York, 1829); York Minster Library, MS 29 S, Dunnington Jefferson MS.} There is also the M.13(S) set of five partbooks, copied c. 1618, which had not been associated with York Minster’s choir before the fire.\footnote{Griffiths, \textit{A Catalogue of the Music Manuscripts in York Minster Library}, xi, 78-79.}

A bassus partbook (MS 101) from Gloucester Cathedral was rescued in the early 1950s from the Cathedral incinerator where it had been consigned with other items of ‘rubbish’; the other partbooks had presumably already perished. The only other surviving pre-Civil War musical artefact from the Cathedral is a leather music binder, embossed with the date 1642.\footnote{Boden, ed., \textit{Thomas Tomkins}, 69-70.}

It is unfortunate that we will therefore never truly have the full picture of early seventeenth-century sacred music practices.
Conclusion

The primary aim of this thesis was to reveal the complexities that surrounded sacred music practices, preferences, and prejudices in early seventeenth-century England. This thesis has thereby challenged long-standing flawed and generalised conclusions about sacred music in this period. This thesis has of course concentrated on select case studies and is not claiming to provide a complete picture of this period’s sacred music practices. It has nevertheless been demonstrated that this period of music history is far more complicated than previous historians and musicologists have led readers to believe.

From examining historical, testimonial, and compositional evidence, this thesis has demonstrated that a plethora of opinions concerning sacred music were voiced in early seventeenth-century England. We can find more conservative and ceremonial figures who encouraged more elaborate sacred music, railed against further innovations, or inhabited a moderate position. These diverse opinions were especially highlighted during the third chapter where it was shown that more conservative figures did not exclusively support musical artefact destructions and congregationally sung metrical psalms. Most importantly however, neither side of the seventeenth-century theological controversies seems to have been especially concerned with sacred music. It has been demonstrated that the theory of sixteenth-century sacred music as a form of adiaphora proposed by Willis can be continued into the early seventeenth-century. Through focussing on figures and establishments who promoted the most extreme practices and who ‘shouted the loudest’, scholars have often misinterpreted how important sacred music practices were during the early seventeenth century. Through only analysing the most extensive surviving music collections and often selectively studying the music by the most contemporarily famous and musically excellent composers, it has been habitually concluded that the Laudians all supported more elaborate sacred music practices. However, these partbooks and their contained repertoires do not represent the wider country’s practices. Many Laudians very rarely voiced opinions about sacred music or actively promoted it. Complaints against musical practices were actually not frequently raised. The Puritans, particularly during the Civil War, appear to have been more concerned with the physical idolatry of pieces of musical equipment, rather than the music that these artifacts helped to produce.
This thesis has also revealed that scholars should not take testimonies at face value. For example, in Durham, both sides of the controversies appear to have coloured their accounts to either overemphasise how extreme the Cathedral’s practices were or defend themselves from prosecution. During the Civil War, accounts of musical artefact destructions could have been altered for propaganda purposes. Parliamentarians could have accentuated their accounts to demonstrate how fervently they would work to eradicate the previous ceremonial practices, and royalists could have elaborated their accounts to show how destructive and ungodly the Parliamentarians’ actions were. Through investigating how truthful such testimonies actually were, sacred music during the early seventeenth-century again appears to have been treated as a type of adiaphora. Architectural, liturgical, and physical ceremonial practices were far more important to both factions. This is, of course, something that no musicologist ever wants to write about in their field. Throughout this thesis, it has therefore been important to investigate why sacred music practices were seemingly not a highly important theological concern during the early seventeenth century and whether alternative motivations behind usages, protestations, and destructions can therefore be proposed.

It is pertinent to begin by summarising the conclusions that this thesis drew about sacred music before the height of the Laudians’ influence in the 1620s and 1630s. By drawing on historical contextual information and pre-seventeenth-century sacred music practices, it has been proven that sacred music practices were not exclusively revived by the Laudians. Attempts to continually encourage them had been made by the Arminians, the Durham House Group, and in the Chapel Royal, long before Laud assumed the position of Archbishop of Canterbury. Musical equipment provisions, in particular organs, had been encouraged throughout the later sixteenth century into the seventeenth century. We must however not assume that musical equipment provisions and voiced recommendations translated into countrywide efforts to promote elaborate sacred music practices. Prejudices against more elaborate sacred music practices and movements to eradicate these were also not new to the Parliamentary Puritans. Sacred music practices had been particularly diminished as many establishments had faced financial difficulties and were not able to support the upkeep of musical equipment or employees. Very few establishments were able to support sacred music practices in the first place and there were very few official recommendations regarding
correct sacred music practices. It is therefore understandable that neither more conservative nor ceremonial figures would have especially concerned themselves with these.

Drawing on the textual and musical analyses that have been provided throughout this thesis, it has been proven that even in institutions who were supposed to have promoted the most elaborate musical practices, a plethora of different compositions can be identified. When analysing surviving records, it is often only possible to speculate between every-day and special service practices. Whilst music collections can tell us what works were in an establishment’s repertoire, they do not tell us how often or when these were performed. The scattered records of specific services that have survived are often only for significant, politically important occasions. This is unfortunately a practice that has been repeated throughout history, even to the present day. Practitioners often do not consider that in hundreds of years’ time, scholars may want to research their normal every-day practices. Regarding Durham Cathedral, it is likely that the Cathedral’s musical practices were not as expansive as the complaints suggested. More elaborate and extensive uses of music were probably largely reserved for important feast days. However, there are no specific records of what music was sung during Durham’s early seventeenth-century services, except for the services that were conducted during Charles I’s 1633 visit.770 Regarding the Chapel Royal, just because the recorded services usually contained extensive uses of music, this does not mean that these practices were emulated every day. In particular, we can assume that the Gentlemen’s responsibilities were much simpler on the days when the King was not in attendance.

There are more elaborate choral compositions in partbooks whose techniques would have masked the contained text. There are however often more specific reasons why the most polyphonic works were performed, or more extensive musical practices were encouraged during services. For example, such works and practices were promoted to ornament particularly important feast days in the Church’s calendar or other religious celebrations; they do not appear to have been the norm. Moreover, many of the contemporarily composed works matched the evolving early seventeenth-century anthem compositional styles by containing simpler techniques that would have ensured that congregations were drawn to and could share in the word of God. Particularly in Durham,

such compositions would presumably have been encouraged by the Cathedral’s dominant ceremonialist faction. As musical practices were not as elaborate as previous scholars have suggested, this reveals that the Laudians were not intent on exclusively promoting multi-voiced, polyphonic choral works. This seemingly further explains why records of Puritans trying to reform these practices are fairly scarce.

Many musical works appear to have been sung in institutions to support specific religious practices and enhance important services. Most especially however, this thesis has revealed that there were also many non-religious motivations behind sacred music practices, preferences, and prejudices. Composers and singers themselves would have been motivated to choose certain texts because of practical reasons, to gain patronage, and support the beliefs of their employers. The Chapel Royal, as it was such a central political centre, appears to have enhanced its musical practices to demonstrate the splendour of the English Church, court, and monarchy to domestic and foreign congregations. Some of these practices even went against the Laudians’ ideals, demonstrating that political aims could overrule this dominant religious faction’s beliefs. These political aims even appear to have caused potential concerns about controversial texts, or particularly elaborate compositional techniques that would have opposed the Church of England’s official ordinances, to be dismissed. Works could likewise have been repurposed to fulfil later theological beliefs and political aims, thereby disregarding the original composers’ motivations. Expressions of loyalty, particularly to the monarch and royal court, would have been expected in the Chapel Royal and across England. Many institutions consequently appear to have included nationalistic and royalist works in their repertoires.

Personal opinions also appear to have motivated sacred music practices during the early seventeenth century. Particularly in Durham, it was demonstrated that several of the Cathedral’s musical practices did not align with the Laudians’ wider beliefs. Some musical settings even appear to have been introduced due to Cosin’s personal preferences. The Laudians were seemingly not especially interested in increasing musical practices. Smart, Hutchinson, and Hobson’s complaints did not always reflect wider Puritan or conservative prejudices. During the Civil War, musical artefact destructions were seemingly not solely religiously motivated. These organs, partbooks, and surplices could have become caught up in soldiers’ overzealous destructions, or have been used and sold by both sides to aid their war efforts or the poor.
The conclusions that have been presented throughout this thesis have established that scholars should be wary of over-generalising the surviving partbooks, records, and testimonies. There is still a lot that we do not know about sacred music in early seventeenth-century England. Institutions with less extensive surviving collections are often ignored in research studies. Whilst it should be acknowledged that this thesis has again focussed on the most well-known partbooks, it was important to begin by establishing how complex these institutions’ practices were, that have for so long dominated previous scholars’ studies, before widening investigations. Examining and comparing the full breadth of available compositional evidence from this period alongside establishments’ recorded theological preferences and prejudices will consequently be an important future area of research. This research will likely further reveal how practices could dramatically differ according to the time, establishment, influential figures, and parishioners. It should also be remembered that parish churches made up 99% of worship venues across England. Distinctions between cathedral and college, and parish church practices are essential to make.

Many organs, partbooks, and surplices have been lost from the early seventeenth century. The surviving records however do not reveal how prolifically these were destroyed during the Civil War, or whether more were saved, used during the Interregnum, and then lost at a later date. Missing records and sources unfortunately mean that it will most likely be impossible to conclusively evidence how prevalent certain sacred music practices were. As this thesis has continually demonstrated however, it is highly important to draw together all the surviving historical, testimonial, and compositional evidence to support proposed conclusions. It is hoped that this thesis has begun new discussions and revealed how complex sacred music practices during this period were. We can only hope as well that, just like at Peterhouse, there could be further partbooks and records hidden behind walls, waiting to be found and reveal further scared music practices, preferences, and prejudices.
Appendix 1 – Texts That Can be Found in the Chapel Royal’s Anthems

Psalm Texts

Most of the anthems in the Chapel’s sources, and indeed 58% of the surviving anthems from the seventeenth century, include psalm texts. The majority of these are from Myles Coverdale’s (1488-1569) translations. Coverdale’s psalms were not initially or officially bound into the Book of Common Prayer until the 1662 revision. Many printers nevertheless ensured that Coverdale’s psalms were printed on the same size paper, and bound in the same way, as the Book of Common Prayer. Coverdale produced the first full English translation of the Bible in 1535, although his publication was not given a royal licence until 1537. He also led the production of The Great Bible which was commissioned by Henry VIII and initially published in 1539. The Great Bible combined Coverdale’s and William Tyndale’s translations, though Coverdale worked to remove the theologically contentious elements of Tyndale’s work; the English Bishops had accused Tyndale of including deliberate mistranslations to promote anticlericalism and heretical Lutheran views.

Whilst Coverdale was a skilled linguist in Latin, Greek, and German, he was largely unfamiliar with Hebrew and therefore did not translate the psalms from the original Hebrew text. Due to his religious beliefs and time spent on the continent, he drew on texts such as St Jerome’s fourth-century Vulgate, Luther’s 1624 German Bible, and Sebastian Münster’s 1534 Latin translation (from Hebrew) of the Old Testament. S. L. Greenslade has remarked that ‘he knew well enough that he could not excel as a pure scholar so that his choice between authorities was frequently not determined by erudition so much as by his sense of style.’ Coverdale ‘is a self-conscious artist, forever seeking those stately rhythms that harmonise so

---

771 This appendix does not provide an exhaustive list of all the different types of texts that were used in the anthems from the Chapel Royal’s sources. It does nevertheless provide important historical and literary information about the texts that are significant to the investigations in this thesis’ first chapter.
772 Morehen, ‘The English Anthem Text, 1549-1660,’ 64.
well with Cranmer’s magisterial prose in the Book of Common Prayer.’ Musical versions of Coverdale’s psalms consequently appeared almost as soon as the Great Bible was released, and continued to be produced throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The clear syntax in Coverdale’s psalms meant that congregations could easily understand the texts. Composers would therefore have been drawn to these accessible translations as they could have, in part, excused more complicated musical settings. As the Church of England’s official printed translations, it is unsurprising that settings of these were extensively included in the Chapel Royal’s musical repertoire.

Other alternative psalm translations also appear in the Chapel’s sources. Most commonly there are settings of Sternhold and Hopkins’ metrical translations. Sternhold’s first publication, *Certayn Psalmes*, contained nineteen psalms. Although undated, this was dedicated to Edward VI and therefore must have been published during Edward’s reign. The dedication suggests that Sternhold constructed these psalms as he was dissatisfied with the royal court’s musical practices. He writes that

seeing furdre that youre tender and godlye zeale doth more deleyght
in the holy songes of veritie than in any fayned rymes of vanitie, I am
encouraged to travayle furder in the sayed boke of psalmes, trustyng
that as your grace taketh pletrue to heare them song sumtimes of
me, so ye wil also delight not onely to se and read them your selfe,
but also to command them to be song to you of others, that as ye
have the Psalme it selfe in youre mynde, so ye maye judge myne
endevoure by your eare."

---

All but two of this collection’s psalms were written in a strict abcb poetic form with consistent strong and weak textual beats; this poetic form is now commonly known as ballad metre.\textsuperscript{778}

Following Sternhold’s death in December 1549, further editions of his psalms were published throughout the following years. Genevan editions were published with additional translations by John Hopkins, William Whittingham, John Pullain, and William Kethe.\textsuperscript{779} It was not however until 1562 that the first complete psalter was published in England by John Day.\textsuperscript{780} This psalter replaced 23 of the 43 Genevan psalms to include works by twelve authors; most significantly, 43 were by Sternhold and 56 were by Hopkins.\textsuperscript{781} The language in these psalm translations was accessible\textsuperscript{782} and they were often written in simple ballad metres. Musical settings for multiple voices were included in this collection, but these always contained a strong melodic line that could easily have been followed by any congregation. Melodies from the Genevan editions, previous English sources, and even some popular ballads were adapted and used in this collection.\textsuperscript{783} As with Sternhold’s original psalter, this publication aimed to innovate and replace England’s secular musical practices with godly settings. These psalms were set forth and allowed to be Sung in all Churches, of all the People together, before and after Morning and Evening Prayer; and also before and after Sermons; and moreover in private Houses, for their godly Solace and comfort: laying apart all ungodly Songs and Ballads, which tend only to the nourishing of Vice, and corrupting of youth.\textsuperscript{784}

\textsuperscript{780} Sternhold and Hopkins, The Whole Book of Psalms.
\textsuperscript{782} Harllett Smith, ‘English Metrical Psalms in the Sixteenth Century and Their Literary Significance,’ Huntington Library Quarterly 9, no. 3 (1946): 249-271. Sternhold removed, what he perceived to be, frivolous and overelaborate words.
\textsuperscript{783}Sternhold, Hopkins, and Others, The Whole Book of Psalms Collected in English Metre.

The opening of this psalter concludes that it was allowed by ‘the Queen’s Majesty’s Injunctions’. It has often been misinterpreted that this statement was referring to Elizabeth’s 49th Injunction. It is actually referring ‘to the 51st, which established a series of authorities for licensing books before publication’. Day was seemingly summarising and publicising how he hoped that his psalter would be widely used in the future.
Elizabeth’s 1559 religious injunctions noted ‘that there be a modest and distinct song, so used in all parts of the Common Prayers in the Church, that the same may be as plainly understood, as if it were read without singing.’ Through this injunction ‘metrical psalmody was officially recognized and given a place in the vernacular worship of the English church.’ In Elizabeth’s reign alone, over 150 editions of this collection were published.

The misconception that this psalm collection was exclusively used by more conservative religious factions in the early seventeenth century has often been perpetuated as scholars have focussed on literary criticisms of the translations. These often stem from more ceremonial divines or opposing psalmists. As these translations were widely published by the Stationers’ Company, who held the psalm printing royal patent and favoured this psalter, they were used by a broad range of religious factions. As this was an official royally sanctioned psalter, and as the translations were accessible and already highly popular, it is unsurprising that settings of them can be found in the Chapel Royal’s musical sources.

Further alternative psalm translations can be found in the Chapel Royal’s musical sources. Anthems that included such texts were continually performed despite their controversial histories, associated theologies, and unofficial nature. Translations from the Genevan Bible, the Douai-Rheims Bible, and Thomas Carew were used.

Despite the conflicts between the Genevan reformers and the Church of England, the Genevan Bible remained popular in England. After the Authorised Version was published in 1611, the Church of England attempted to suppress and prohibit translations of this Bible.

---

785 Elizabeth I, *Injunctions Geven by the Queenes Majesties*, item 49.
786 Leaver, ‘Goostly Psalms and Spirituall Songs’, 240.
788 For an exploration of these misconceptions, please see: Hamlin, ‘“Very Mete to be Used of all Sortes of People”’, 37-51.
790 Ibid. For example, the Stationers Company had already objected to the unlicensed publication of Wither’s *Motto* in 1621 and had refused to comply with the royal patent granted to Wither’s *Hymnes and Songs of the Church*. The *Psalms of David* was consequently the third of Wither’s publications to face persecution and suppression.
From 1616, the Genevan Bible was banned in England and it became necessary to smuggle it in from the Netherlands; an unnamed man was even imprisoned for this crime in 1632.\footnote{Christopher Hill, \textit{The English Bible and the Seventeenth Century Revolution} (London: Penguin, 1994), 56-60.}

The Douai-Rheims Bible was produced by Roman Catholic scholars during their exile in Douai at the English College during Elizabeth I’s reign. Their translation of the New Testament was published in Rheims in 1582 during the College’s temporary migration there; the Old Testament was translated shortly afterwards but was not published until 1609/10. The aim of this publication was to provide English-speaking Roman Catholics with their own authoritative copy of the Bible. In England, the Douai-Rheims Bible was unintentionally popularised by William Fulke who reprinted the text in 1589 alongside the 1572 edition of the Bishops’ Bible to demonstrate the superiority of the Protestant Bible. Nevertheless, because of this publication, Catholics in England were able to access the Douai-Rheims Bible without fearing that they would be prosecuted for possessing a copy. Even the King James Bible was greatly influenced by the Douai-Rheims translations; it especially extensively drew on the Douai-Rheims Bible’s Latinate vocabulary.\footnote{Frederick Fyvie Bruce, \textit{History of the Bible in English} (Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 2002), 113-126; William Plater, \textit{A Grammar of the Vulgate: Being an Introduction to the Study of the Latinity of the Vulgate Bible}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).}

Thomas Carew was a court poet and playwright during the early seventeenth century and served as a Gentleman of the Privy Chamber Extraordinary in Charles I’s court. During October 1617, Sir Matthew Carew, Thomas’ father, sent a letter to Sir Dudley Carleton, then Thomas’ old patron, that his son had been ‘mispending his time’ at home with ‘a new disease com in amongst us’; it is assumed that this was syphilis. It is during this time that Carew is presumed to have written his versifications of nine of the psalms (1, 2, 51, 91, 104, 113, 115, part of 119, and 137). These are all written in tetrameters, some in rhyming couplets, and some with five-line rhyming stanzas that follow the pattern ababb. He also frequently employs the technique of enjambement, sometimes giving a seemingly endless progression to his verses.\footnote{C. L. Powell, ‘New Material on Thomas Carew,’ \textit{The Modern Language Review} 11, no. 3 (1916): 285-297; Thomas Carew, \textit{The Works of Thomas Carew} (Edinburgh: W. and C. Tait, 1824).}
Biblical Texts

The biblical texts that can be found in the Chapel Royal’s musical repertoire are drawn almost exclusively from the King James Version. When James I ascended to the throne, the most popular English translation of the Bible was an authorised version of the Genevan Bible. Whilst popular amongst more conservative figures, this was not favoured by the emerging ceremonialists. In 1604, James approved a list of scholars who then worked on producing a new translation; these men were overseen by the then Archbishop of Canterbury, Richard Bancroft. The King James Version was subsequently published in 1611.794 As the King James Bible became the Church of England’s official biblical translation, it is understandable that its translations were prolifically set in anthems.

Book of Common Prayer Texts

There are also several collect texts and select parts of the liturgy that were set in anthems; these were largely taken from the 1604 version of the Book of Common Prayer. This version was produced following the January 1604 Hampton Court conference and only minor changes were made to the previous 1559 version. These certainly did not satisfy or align with what was agreed with the petitioners at this Conference. A detailed description of the evolutionary history of the Book of Common Prayer is not need in this thesis, though more information can be found in Charles Hefling and Cynthia Shattuck’s referenced Oxford Guide.795

Texts from Devotional Primers

A small number of works also include texts from domestic devotional primers. Primers were books of devotions that evolved from the Book of Hours which was used by the laity in the Catholic Church. The Book of Hours grew in popularity in the later thirteenth century. Although the contents of this book developed and varied greatly over time, the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin largely remained the central part of this publication. It also typically contained an Office for the Dead, or Vespers; and Matins and Lauds, usually titled the

Placebo and Dirige. The 15 Gradual Psalms, the Seven Penitential Psalms, and the Litany of the Saints were also commonly included.\textsuperscript{796}

After England’s split with Rome, the Church of England under Henry VIII was reformed, but still retained elements of Catholicism. The move to ensure that all the laity could understand the word of God through using the vernacular seemingly inspired Henry VIII to authorise the creation of a new Primer. In 1545, the King’s Primer was subsequently published. The King’s Primer functioned as the Church of England’s service book during the transition from Latin to English and contained a reformed Calendar of Saints, the Ten Commandments, the Creed, the Lord’s Prayer, the Salutation of the Virgin, the Seven Penitential Psalms, a litany, and other prayers.\textsuperscript{797} The opening injunction to the King’s Primer noted that the purpose of this publication was that the English people should be the more provoked to true devotion, and the better set their hearts upon those things that they pray for: and finally, for the avoiding of the adversity of primer books that are now abroad, whereof are almost innumerable sorts, which minister occasion of contentions and vain disputations rather than edify; and to have one uniform order of all such books throughout all our dominions, both to be taught unto children, and also to be used for ordinary prayers of all our people not learned in the Latin tongue; have set forth this Primer, or book of prayers in English, to be frequented and used in and throughout all places of our said realms and dominions.\textsuperscript{798}

Texts from the 1599 Catholic Primer, edited by Richard Verstegan from Antwerp, can even be found in the Chapel Royal’s musical sources.\textsuperscript{799} Verstegan gained approval from the Pope in 1599 to produce the first English translation of the \textit{Officium Beatae Mariae Virginis}; known as \textit{The Primer, or Office of the Blessed Virgin Marie}. This publication once again

\textsuperscript{798} Burton, ed., \textit{Three Primers put Forth in the Reign of Henry VIII}, 458.
emphasised the central importance of the Office of Our Blessed Lady and included the Penitential and Gradual Psalms, the Litany of the Saints, and the Office for the Dead.\(^{800}\)

The Church of England’s official Primer was revised and republished during Elizabeth’s reign in 1559 to bring the translations in line with the more developed Protestant Church of England. A Latin version of this Primer was also published in 1560. After around 1564, the Primer fell from favour as the Book of Common Prayer became more popular. More informal, non-liturgical, private devotional texts also became more preferable.\(^{801}\)

During Charles I’s reign, Queen Henrietta Maria’s French ladies mocked their English counterparts for not having a private devotional collection.\(^{802}\) Francis White, of the Durham House group, advised the King to commission John Cosin to produce such a collection. Cosin’s 1627 *A Collection of Private Devotions in the Practice of the Ancient Church, Called the Hours of Prayer* was consequently published, taking the 1560 Latin Elizabethan Primer as its model. Although not explicitly entitled, Cosin’s work revived the Primer’s traditions of set private devotions. This collection included

- the calendar of feast days, introducing them on the lives of the saints,
- the hourly cycle of prayers and observance, and teaching them how to calculate moveable feasts. It gave guidance on the Lord’s Prayer, the Creed, the Ten Commandments, the Beatitudes, virtues and vices, and included meditations and prayers for every occasion from dressing in the morning to childbirth and death.

It also notably remained free of Marian devotions.\(^{803}\)

Musical settings and performance of texts from the King’s Primer and Cosin’s *Private Devotions* in the Chapel would have demonstrated the royalist support that these collections held and encouraged their use in wider, domestic spheres.


Domestically Produced Sacred Texts

There are works that utilise texts that were written by important divines, Chapel employees, and court poets. From Morehen’s study into the anthem texts from this period, he discovered that 14% of the texts in anthems from 1549 to 1660 are metrical prayers, freely composed prose, or as yet unidentified texts not taken from the Bible, Book of Common Prayer, or other authorised private devotional collections.\(^{804}\) Whilst the Laudians and the Church of England during the early seventeenth century emphasised the authority of the Book of Common Prayer, there were also aims to revive more ancient, purer forms of worship.\(^{805}\) To fulfil this objective, extra-devotional, contemporarily written texts were encouraged. As divines had done with the Chapel Royal’s altar policies, wider uses of these extra-devotional texts were likewise defended as their inclusion in the Chapel confirmed that they were royally supported.\(^{806}\) As recounted by Peter Webster, ‘the “Laudian” group at once stressed uniformity in worship subject to royal authority, whilst being prepared to experiment in the name of the recovery of purer, more ancient forms of liturgy.’\(^{807}\)

---

\(^{804}\) Morehen, ‘The English Anthem Text, 1549-1660,’ 64.

\(^{805}\) Ibid., 85; Webster, ‘The Relationship Between Religious Thought and the Theory and Practice of Church Music in England, 1603 – c. 1640,’ 182.

\(^{806}\) Crosby, ‘The Choral Foundation of Durham Cathedral, c. 1350 – c. 1650,’ 1: 174; Elias Smith’s Notebook, MS Hunter 125, Durham Cathedral Library, Durham Cathedral, Durham, fol. 133.

Appendix 2 – Collect Anthem Settings in Durham Cathedral’s Early Seventeenth-Century Partbooks  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>First line</th>
<th>Associated Feast</th>
<th>Full/Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Bull</td>
<td>Almighty God, who by the leading</td>
<td>Epiphany</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Dering</td>
<td>Almighty God, which through thy only-begotten son</td>
<td>Easter Day (1st communion)</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Geeres</td>
<td>Merciful Lord, we beseech thee</td>
<td>St John the Evangelist</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Gibbons</td>
<td>Almighty and Everlasting God, mercifully look</td>
<td>Epiphany 3</td>
<td>f4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almighty God, who by thy son</td>
<td>St Peter</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O God, the King of glory</td>
<td>Ascension 1</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathaniel Giles</td>
<td>Everlasting God, which hast ordained</td>
<td>St Michael &amp; All angels</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>God, which as on this day</td>
<td>Whit Sunday</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Hooper</td>
<td>Almighty God, which hast given us thy only-begotten son</td>
<td>Christmas Day</td>
<td>f5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almighty God, which madest thy blessed Son</td>
<td>Circumcision</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hutchinson</td>
<td>Grant, we beseech thee, merciful Lord</td>
<td>Trinity 21</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mudd/ Nicholas Strogers/Thomas Weelkes</td>
<td>Let thy merciful ears</td>
<td>Trinity 10</td>
<td>f4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Mudd</td>
<td>God, which hast prepared</td>
<td>Trinity 6</td>
<td>f4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Palmer</td>
<td>Almighty and everlasting God, we humbly beseech thy majesty</td>
<td>Purification of the BVM</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almighty and everlasting God, which hatest nothing</td>
<td>Ash Wednesday</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

808 This list has been created through cross examining Durham’s partbooks against the list of collect anthems presented in: Morehen, ‘The English Anthem Text, 1549-1660,’ 75-83. The anthems that used collect texts to celebrate the King’s Day have not been referenced as this feast was not officially included in the Book of Common Prayer until after the Restoration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“”</th>
<th>Almighty and everlasting God, who of thy tender love</th>
<th>Palm Sunday</th>
<th>v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“”</td>
<td>Almighty God, whose praise this day</td>
<td>Holy Innocents</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Smith</td>
<td>Almighty and everlasting God, we humbly beseech thy majesty</td>
<td>Purification of the BVM</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“”</td>
<td>God, which hast taught</td>
<td>Conversion of St Paul</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“”</td>
<td>Grant, we beseech thee, almighty God, that like</td>
<td>Ascension Day</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“”</td>
<td>O Lord, which for our sakes</td>
<td>Lent 1</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Tomkins</td>
<td>Almighty and everlasting God, we humbly beseech thy majesty</td>
<td>Purification of the BVM</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“”</td>
<td>Almighty God, which hast knit</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“”</td>
<td>Let thy merciful ears (adaptation of O how glorious art thou)</td>
<td>Trinity 10</td>
<td>f5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarrow</td>
<td>Almighty and Everlasting God, which dost govern</td>
<td>Epiphany 2</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td>Prevent us, O Lord</td>
<td>Holy Communion (post-offertory)</td>
<td>f5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Let thy merciful ears</td>
<td>Trinity 10</td>
<td>f5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomkins</td>
<td>Almighty God, the fountain of all wisdom</td>
<td>Holy Communion</td>
<td>f5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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