

Part One

Understandings of the nature and purpose of music in worship

Introduction

In the Introduction, it was argued that the historiography of Stuart church music to date has tended to ascribe coherent theologies of the role of music to opposing church parties, particularly in the 1630s. It is the intention of Part One of the thesis to explore the extent to which this was the case. Initially, it will explore the misleading nature of the polemical context in which these debates are located, and the complex of wider debates in which discussion of music must be placed. It will then proceed to discuss the various sources of justification, precedent and guidance available to early Stuart thinkers; the legacy of the Bible, the early church, and broader philosophical and mystical understandings of the musical nature of the cosmos, of man himself and the effects that music could have on the individual. It will become clear that no distinctive theologies of worship, and of music's role in it, attributable to the theological systems current in historiographical discussion can be discerned. It will be argued rather that the debate was characterised by a general assent to a number of broad but ambiguous principles, with little clarity on the manner in which this was to be realised in practice. It will also consider the legislative position of the church within this ideological atmosphere, and conclude that little aid was available from any of these sources to theorists and practitioners of church music on the detailed production of music in worship.

Chapter One

The Polemical Context of the Personal Rule

In later parts of the thesis, it will be argued that the patterns of views on the use of musical instruments in church are not clearly divided between Laudians and Puritans. As has already been suggested, there were also no clear theological distinctions on the use of music generally either. In the light of this, if there was no disagreement over the use of organs *per se*, it necessarily seems somewhat odd, and in need of some explanation, why organs should then have become a target of uncontrolled, spectacular and well documented acts of iconoclasm between 1642 and 1644, and of officially sanctioned removal under Parliamentary legislation of May 1644.¹ It is my concern here to demonstrate that the answer to this conundrum is to be found in the polemical context of the 1630s and the years of the Long Parliament.

Peter Lake has brilliantly revealed the manner in which perceived divisions between ‘Puritans’ and ‘Laudians’ hardened during the 1630s into two opposed and mutually reinforcing conspiracy theories of a socially subversive, populist Puritanism ranged against a crypto-Catholic fifth column, seeking to restore Popish tyranny and arbitrary, non-parliamentary monarchy by stealth.² There was not, in Lake’s view, any room left between these binary opposite positions for neutral understandings of particular aspects of doctrine or worship, as all the trappings of Laudian innovation became tainted in popular understandings as irredeemably and intrinsically popish and in need of uprooting. Work by Anthony Fletcher, Robin Clifton and Caroline Hibbard, amongst others, has demonstrated the power of the fear of popery in motivating both elite and popular opposition to the Personal Rule, and the formation of sides for war thereafter.³ Julian Davies has also traced the role of the Caroline style of government in radicalising the terms in which opposition to the Personal Rule

¹ C.H. Firth/R.S. Rait (eds), *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum; vol. 1; 1642 - 1649* (London, 1911); pp. 425 – 426.

² ‘Anti-Popery: the structure of a prejudice’ in Cust and Hughes (eds), *Conflict in Early Stuart England* pp.72-106.

³ Fletcher, *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (London, Arnold, 1981) pp.407-19.; Clifton, ‘Fear of Popery’ in Conrad Russell (ed.), *The Origins of the English Civil War* (London, Macmillan, 1973) pp. 144-167; Hibbard, *Charles I and the Popish plot* (Chapel Hill, Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1983) pp.20-27.

was articulated. Under Charles, the Laudian programme of recatholicisation of the church was elided in public perceptions with Charles' vision of his kingship. This led to an indelible association in the popular mind of popish religion with tyrannical government.⁴

In this context of heightened sensitivity to the hint of popish innovation, it is possible to discern its effect on individuals. William Lamont has charted the development of William Prynne from a conservative defender of the Elizabethan church polity throughout the 1630s into an advocate of root-and-branch reform by 1641. The provincial figure Robert Woodford was an example of a provincial Puritan with a similar sense of the clear and present danger of the Personal Rule. Tom Webster has anatomised in detail the varying trajectories of response among the godly, responses of flight, conformity and tactics of evasion, in a situation where 'the middle ground was becoming increasingly difficult to defend without offending even the mildest of the godly'. Those of the godly putting forward a moderate position on ceremonies and the nature of *adiaphora* found themselves increasingly marginalised.⁵

In this polarised context the narratives of ritualised purification of the cathedrals in the 1640s by Parliamentary troops become psychologically explicable. Bishop Joseph Hall recalled some time later of the scene at Norwich:

... 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

⁴ Julian Davies, *The Caroline Captivity of the Church: Charles I and the Remoulding of Anglicanism 1625-41* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1992) pp.288-315. See also Esther S. Cope, *Politics without Parliament 1629-1640* (London, Allen & Unwin, 1987) pp.45-53.

⁵ Lamont, *Marginal Prynne, 1600-1669* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963) pp.13, 30, 55-7: John Fielding, 'Opposition to the Personal Rule of Charles I: the Diary of Robert Woodford, 1637-41' *HJ* 31 (1988) 769-788; p. 783-4: Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England. The Caroline Puritan Movement c.1620-1643* (Cambridge, CUP, 1997), in particular chs. 7, 8, 10. For this broad interpretation of the development of Puritan self-definition, see also Jacqueline Eales, 'A Road to Revolution: The Continuity of Puritanism, 1559-1642' in C. Durston and J. Eales (eds), *The Culture of English Puritanism* pp.184-209; p.203-8: Patrick Collinson, *English Puritanism* (London, Historical Association, 1987) pp.37-8. On godly life under the Personal Rule more generally, see J.T.Cliffe, *The Puritan Gentry. The Great Puritan Families of Early Stuart England* (London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984) pp. 146-68.

formerly in the church. All these monuments of idolatry must be sacrificed to the fire.⁶

The several narratives of these desecrations are peppered with such descriptions, repeatedly reporting usurpation and inversion of the previous functions of areas and contents of the churches, and the ritual humiliation and demonstration of the powerlessness of cultic objects.⁷ The royalist newsletter the *Mercurius Rusticus* related the scene in Westminster Abbey, where the troops

To shew their Christian liberty and that all Consecration ...under the Gospel, is but a Jewish or Popish Superstition, and that they are no longer to be accounted holy, than that holy use, to which they serve, shall by the actual use only, impart a transient holiness to them, they set Forms about the Communion Table, there they eat, and there they drink Ale, and Tobacco; Nor was this done once ... but the whole time of their abode there, they made it their common Table.⁸

At Canterbury, Richard Culmer triumphantly reported that the soldiers ‘began to play the tune of the “Zealous Soldier” on the organs or case of whistles, which never were in tune since’. After leaving the church, the Parliamentary troops ‘sung cathedral pricksong as they rode over Barham Down towards Dover, with pricksong leaves in their hands, and lighted their tobacco pipes with them: such pipes and cathedral pricksong did consort well together.’⁹

At Exeter, the musical equipment of the church received similar treatment, as the troops

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 surpluses they had stolen before, and employed them to base servile Offices, scoffingly told them, Boys we have spoiled your trade, you must go and sing hot Pudding Pyes.¹⁰

It is clear that at a popular level amongst the uncontrolled elements of the parliamentary forces, the physical manifestation of cathedral music were a part of the whole corrupt edifice of cathedral worship, which had to be removed, root and branch.

⁶ “Bishop Hall’s Hard measure, written by himself” (1647), quoted in Frank L. Huntley, *Bishop Joseph Hall, 1574 - 1656; A biographical and critical study* (Cambridge, Brewer, 1979) p. 138.

⁷ For such ritual activity in France, see Natalie Zemon Davies, ‘The Rites of Violence: Religious Riot in sixteenth century France.’ *Past and Present* 59 (1973) 51-91.

⁸ Ryves, *Mercurius Rusticus; Or, The Countries Complaint* (London, 1685) p.154.

⁹ *Cathedrall Newes from Canterbury* (London, 1644) pp.19-20.

Within this context, very few writers on church music are to be found reflecting in a systematic or exegetical fashion on the historic use of music in church, or the possibility of a neutral way of using it. With the possible exception of Charles Butler's *The Principles of Musick* (1636), whose work we shall examine shortly, much of the debate is conducted in terms of the wholesale identification of church music with popish infection. Apart from Butler, few substantial discussions of music from first principles were written or published during the 1630s, much of the discussion being found in short sections in other works, or in short polemical writings such as the anonymous *The Organs Funerall or the Quiristers Lamentation* of 1642. The anonymous quirister laments

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 Idolatrous rags of Popery, the originall whereof they say came from the Pope, which is called Antichrist.

These innovations had been introduced by the 'Patriarch at Lambeth' (Laud), a man so confident that 'if Augustus Cesar had been now to warre against him, he could not be vanquished.' The pamphlet ends with a triumphant poem:

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 marke o'th Beast
And powder'd now for a Lent Feast
Which made hime seeme a regulus
Alas poore regulus

Let Ceremonies then deplore
Their Fortune greater then before
Downe Idols, Crosses, Ceremonies

¹⁰ Ryves, *Mercurius Rusticus* pp. 156. 160.

Alas poore Ceremonies¹¹

A similar note of triumph was heard from the Parliamentary polemicist John Vicars, surveying the scene at Westminster Abbey

whereas 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 thereof, 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 !¹²

Similarly, when John Cosin was attacked for having introduced in Durham Cathedral “organs, sackbuts and cornets and all other instruments of music, which were used at the Consecration of Nabuchadonozer’s image”, this was only one in a long list of innovations. Peter Smart, Cosin’s critic, also attacked Popish ceremonies such as the standing at the Nicene Creed, officiating at the Communion at the East end of the table, as well as the presence in the church at Candlemas of some 220 candles, 16 torches and 60 tapers. Cosin was accused of making “Popish Antichristian speeches” on the nature of the Mass, as well as indulging in “speculative and theoretical popery” in his *Collection of Private Devotions*, published in 1628.¹³ Smart’s sermon does not contain any extended discussion of the nature of music and its role, or how its better estate might be restored. It is, in common with much of the discussion of the period, in fact tainted by association with a larger set of abuses.

It is also worth noting the pedigree of Smart’s identification of musical accoutrements as relics of Rome in the rhetoric of radical separatist figures from Elizabeth’s reign onwards. Henry Barrow, writing in 1591, had included amongst

¹¹ (London, 1642) pp. 1,2,6 (my pagination). The ‘Wren’ referred to is Matthew Wren, Laudian bishop of Norwich and finally Ely. ‘Little Pope Regulus’ was one of the main targets of pamphleteering after 1640. On Wren see Peter King, *Matthew Wren, Bishop of Hereford, Norwich and Ely 1585 -1667* (Bristol University, Ph.D., 1967) .

¹² *God’s Ark overtopping the World’s Waves* (London, 1646) p.184. *DNB* ‘John Vicars’ lviii.299.

¹³ ‘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’, affixed to the front of *The vanitie and downfall of superstitious popish ceremonies* (Edinburgh, 1628, no pagination.) The *Collection* also attracted written censure from both William Prynne and Henry Burton. In a similar way, a 1641 report on the ministry of Herefordshire, drawn up for presentation to Parliament, argued that the church should be purged of ‘the trash and trumpery of massing ceremonies, altars, images, crucifixes, copes, surplices, organs etc., instead of which to make God’s worship as plain and decent as may be.’: Jacqueline Eales, *Puritans and Roundheads: The Harleys of Brampton Bryan and the outbreak of the English Civil War* (Cambridge, CUP, 1990) p.110.

‘sundry popish, idolatrous, and blasphemous abuses in their worship and ministration’, as well as the celebration of Easter, Pentecost and Christmas, ‘these popish idolatrous reliques of fonte, bells, organs, musicke, surplices, coapes, vestiments, habites, hoodes, cappes, tippetts, tires etc. [attires]¹⁴ Similarly, the Genevan exile Anthony Gilby listed ‘An hundred pointes of Poperie, yet remaying, which deforme the English reformation’, which included the whole of the staff of the cathedral churches, with the chorister at number 15, ‘singing Clearkes’ at 17 and the organist at 18.¹⁵

Music in Parliamentary debate

Given the fate of organs and the other equipment of church music, it is perhaps surprising to note the paucity of attention given to musical issues within the discussions of religion in the Parliaments of 1629, and Short and Long after 1640.

The Parliament of 1629, in the course of an inquiry into ‘the belly and bowels of this Trojan horse [the newly emergent Arminianism], to see if there be not men in it ready to open the gates to Romish tyranny and Spanish monarchy’ drew up a list of articles of those Arminian abuses abroad in the church. These included ceremonies such as lights and images, praying to the east, the crossing of oneself at the name of Jesus and changes in the position of the communion table, but not any of the musical aspects of the service.¹⁶

John Morrill has suggested that in the early stages of the Short and Long Parliaments, there was a broad consensus on the need to pare away the accretions of

¹⁴ *A Plaine Refutation of M. G. Giffardes reprochful booke* (Dort, 1591) in Leland H. Carlson (ed.), *The writings of Henry Barrow 1590-1* (London, Allen, 1966) pp.41-84. See the introduction on Barrow more generally.

¹⁵ *A Pleasaunt Dialogue betweene a Souldior of Barwicke and an English Chaplaine. Wherein are largely handled & laide open such reasons as are brought in for maintenaunce of popishe Traditions in our Eng. Church* (London, 1581). The list is appended at the end, without pagination. On Gilby’s time in Geneva and Frankfurt, and his involvement in the 1570 ‘Admonition to Parliament’ see *DNB* xxi.339-40.

¹⁶ W. Notestein, F.H. Relf (eds), *Commons Debates for 1629* (Minneapolis, 1921). The phrase is of Francis Rous (p.12), and the articles are given in full at pp. 95-101. John Cosin’s activities at Durham also attracted attention in this Parliament, and two specific musical matters appeared in one petition against him – the use of the organ during a baptism, and the use of a secular tune ‘3 Kings of Cullen’. For now it will be sufficient to note that more interesting to Parliament was the report that Cosin had suggested that the king had no more power to excommunicate ‘than his man that rubs his horse heeles’ pp.124, 44, 130.

the Laudian experiment. It was only as the Parliament progressed that a broader polarisation occurred between those committed to the restoration of the pre-Laudian church, and those seeking a more radical reshaping of the whole of the English church polity.¹⁷ Within this context, it is the case that musical issues are conspicuous by their absence from the first wave of activity in dismantling the Laudian regime. It was not until August 1643 that an Ordinance “for the utter demolishing, removing and taking away of all Monuments of Superstition or Idolatry” made provision for all “Altars, Tables of stone, Communion tables, Tapers, Candlesticks and Basons, Crucifixes and Crosses, Images and pictures” to be “utterly taken away and demolished... and none of the like hereafter permitted in any such Church or Chappel.” In May of the following year were added to the list “Copes, Surplisses, superstitious vestments, Roods or Roodlons, or Holy Water fonts” as well as “all Organs, and the frames and Cases wherein they stand”, all to be “taken away and utterly defaced.”¹⁸

On April 29th 1640 a report was presented to the Commons on ‘Innovations in Religion’. It dwelt in depth on the position of the communion table and the administration of the sacrament, as well as crosses, images, and bowing to the altar. Musical issues, however, are absent from this report. In fact, the Short Parliament seems not to have concerned itself with musical matters at all.¹⁹ The proceedings of the Long Parliament have a similar profile. In the period to March 1641 the House spent much time on charges laid against Laudian figures such as Cosin and Matthew Wren, and Laud himself. The charges against Cosin centre on his supposed intrusion of images at Durham cathedral, and the use of candles and bowing to the altar.²⁰ No

¹⁷ ‘The Church in England, 1642-9’ in Morrill (ed.), *Reactions to the English Civil War 1642-1649* (London, Macmillan, 1982) pp. 89-114; p.89; ‘The attack on the Church of England in the Long Parliament’ in Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution* (London, Longman, 1993) pp.69-90; see in particular pp.69-71. This essay was first published in D. Beales and G. Best (eds), *History, Society and the Churches* (Cambridge, C.U.P., 1985).

¹⁸ C.H. Firth/R.S. Rait (eds), *Acts and Ordinances of the Interregnum; vol. 1; 1642 - 1649* (London, 1911); pp. 265 - 266 and 425 - 426.

¹⁹ E.S.Cope, Willson H. Coates (eds), *Proceedings of the Short Parliament of 1640* (London, Camden Society 4th series vol 19, 1977) p.203. See also Judith D. Maltby (ed.), *The Short Parliament (1640) Diary of Sir Thomas Aston* (London, Camden Society 4th series vol 35, 1988). Peter Smart’s petition to this Parliament of 22nd April contained similar allegations to the earlier dispute, but these were not actually debated in the House; Cope, Coates, *Short Parliament* pp.280-2.

²⁰ Wallace Notestein (ed.), *The Journal of Sir Simonds d’Ewes, from the beginning of the Long Parliament to the opening of the trial of the Earl of Strafford* (New Haven, 1923) pp. 5, 38, 57, 58, 77, 82., 86, 143-50, 171ff, 200, 221, 232, 234, 248, , 258, 261, 281, 343, 352, 399, 414; on Cosin in particular pp.270-1, 437, 447-8, 457,471. See also W.H. Coates, (ed.), *The Journal of Sir Simonds*

mention is made by Sir Simonds d'Ewes, when reporting the findings of the committee investigating Cosin, of any of the musical details given by Smart in his earlier published attacks on Cosin (and indeed duplicated in part in the 1641 articles of impeachment against him.)²¹ D'Ewes records only two mentions of musical matters, both of which relate to petitions relating to the alleged forcing of organs upon a parish. I shall deal with these two cases (of Waddesdon in Buckinghamshire and Grantham in Lincolnshire) in a later section, and will argue that neither of them can be treated as unambiguous evidence of Laudian fostering of church music. At this juncture, it will be sufficient to note the isolation of these two cases, and the paucity of specifically musical concern in the highly charged proceedings of the Short and Long Parliaments.

The Long Parliament was inundated from the outset with petitions from the localities, relating both to matters of religion and to other grievances. An examination of the content of the petitions presented against 'scandalous' ministers reveals, at least at the parish level, that musical innovations were not foremost in the minds of those petitioners reacting to Laudian innovation. Jim Sharpe's sample of Essex complaints reveal charges of the imposition of altar rails, as well as teaching of popish doctrines of grace, purgatory and good works. At the parish level, away from high debate over name and thing, the issues appear very clear, and music seems not to be among them.²² The petitions to the Long Parliament *in favour* of episcopacy and the established liturgy, while characterised by appeals to the Book of Common Prayer as a source of 'unspeakable joy and comfort, wherein the famous Church of England,

d'Ewes from the first recess of the Long Parliament to the withdrawal of King Charles from London (New Haven, 1942) which contains no specifically musical business at all.

²¹ The committee reported to the House on 22nd January 1641; D'Ewes, *Journal* p.270. The articles are given in W. Cobbett, *Parliamentary History of England* (London, 1807) vol. 2, p. 726.

²² 'Scandalous and Malignant Priests in Essex: the impact of grassroots Puritanism' in C. Jones, M. Newitt and S. Roberts (eds), *Politics and people in Revolutionary England* (Oxford, Blackwell, 1986) pp. 253-274. Petitions from Lincolnshire and Kent also display a lack of musical content, despite a similar profile of other offences named; L.B.Larking (ed.), *Proceedings principally in the county of Kent in connection with the Parliaments called in 1640* (London, Camden Society vol. 80, 1862) pp. 28-38, 101-240; J.W.F. Hill (ed.) 'The Royalist Clergy of Lincolnshire' *Lincolnshire Architectural and Archaeological Society Reports and Papers*, new series 2 (1938) pp.34-127. See also the lack of musical issues in Ian Green, 'The persecution of scandalous and malignant parish clergy during the English Civil War' *EHR* 94 (1979) 507-31.

our deare Mother, hath just cause to glory' were also devoid of specifically musical concerns.²³

It is clear then from this evidence that the use of music in itself was not foremost in the minds of those opposed to the Laudian regime, and when it was discussed, it was not generally discussed in terms of the principles of the nature of worship and of a correct use of music. The visible equipment of music was part of the cluster of practices that constituted the popish infiltration of the church.

The disputed role of the cathedrals

A related prism through which the use of music was viewed was an ongoing dispute about the role of cathedral churches in a reformed church. Claire Cross has identified agitation during the reign of Elizabeth against the perceived wastefulness of cathedral churches, both in financial terms and in their role in using valuable manpower which could more profitably have been employed in parishes desperately short of ministers. Along with these complaints was a perception of popish abuses in the worship of cathedral churches, with the pollution of copes, surplices and other popish relics.²⁴ Stanford Lehmborg has also explored the perceived need for further reform in the cathedrals, a sentiment not confined to marginal radical figures. John Jewel wrote to Peter Martyr describing the cathedrals of 1559 as “nothing else but dens of thieves, or worse, if anything worse or more foul can be mentioned”. Nineteen years later Bishop Barnes was to describe Durham cathedral as “an Augean stable ... whose stink is grievous in the nose of God and of men and which to purge far passeth Hercules' labours”. Richard Cox was clear in a 1576 letter to Grindal that “cathedrall churches would be brought to some better frame touchinge exercise of learninge, whose exercyse now is onely in singinge and very little in aedifyinge”²⁵

Polemic of this kind aimed at the degeneracy of cathedral staff is one of the constants of such literature throughout Protestant England. John Earle's caricature

²³ Judith Maltby (ed.), 'Petitions for Episcopacy and the Book of Common Prayer on the eve of the Civil War 1641-2' in Stephen Taylor (ed) *From Cranmer to Davidson: A Miscellany* (Church of England Record. Society, vol. 7, Woodbridge, Boydell, 1999) pp.103-167 ; p.110.

²⁴ Claire Cross, “Dens of Loitering Lubbers: Protestant Protest Against Cathedral Foundations, 1540 - 1640’ *SCH* ix. 231-7.

²⁵ Stanford Lehmborg, *The Reformation of Cathedrals: Cathedrals in English Society, 1485 - 1603* (Princeton, UP, 1988) pp. 268-9. The image of the Augean stable was also used in relation to Canterbury in a petition to the Long Parliament: Culmer, *Cathedrall Newes* p.2.

singing men ‘that roare deep in the Quire, deeper in the Taverne’, and whose gowns ‘are lac’d commonly with streamings of ale’ appeared in the several editions of the highly popular *Microcosmography*.²⁶ The lamenting chorister of 1642 would have been less perturbed by the prospect of ejection from his place had he made alternative provision for himself from income from singing and teaching. However, this was not the case, because ‘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’. This chorister thought it ‘the best policie to serve the times, and change with the wind, for by that meanes I may be safe when others are questioned.’²⁷

Cathedral churches then were both a visible reminder of the unregenerate origin of the church, and the wealth of certain sections of the church. Importantly, this situation was, in Cross’ view, exacerbated by the increased emphasis placed on ceremonial by the ‘Arminian movement’ in the reign of James and Charles.²⁸ This view is supported by Lehmborg, who has suggested that in 1600, the immediate heat of the Elizabethan pressure for reform had abated, but the rise of Laud, Neile and Cosin, and the renewed emphasis on the altar and ‘the beauty of holiness and the solemnity of church buildings and liturgies’ drastically altered the trajectory of debate about the cathedrals, and made the events of the 1640s if not inevitable, then at least unsurprising.²⁹ The choral service, all but unique to the cathedrals, must be seen as part of that wider debate.

‘The clerical estate revitalised’: city/church relations in the Personal Rule

The work of Andrew Foster has recently re-emphasised the role of the Arminian revitalisation of the status of the clerical estate in contributing to the

²⁶ Alfred. S. West (ed.), *Microcosmography* (Cambridge, 1920) pp. 83 – 84. The STC lists seven editions of the work between its first publication in 1628 and 1638; p.166.

²⁷ *The Organs Funerall* pp. 3, 4.

²⁸ Cross, *Dens of Loitering Lubbers* p.237.

²⁹ Lehmborg, *Cathedrals under siege: Cathedrals in English Society 1600 - 1700*

(Exeter; Exeter U P 1996) pp.2-22: p.21. This view is also supported by David Marcombe, ‘Cathedrals and Protestantism: the search for a new identity. 1540-1660’ in Marcombe, C.S.Knighton (eds), *Close Encounters; English Cathedrals and Society since 1540* (Nottingham, University Department of Adult Education, 1991) pp.43-61: pp.55-58.

tensions between Arminian clergy and Puritan laity.³⁰ A particular strand of this tension is to be taken into account in our consideration of cathedral cities. Anthony Fletcher has identified patterns of tension repeated in several cathedral cities, involving disputes over issues of jurisdiction and relative statuses between Calvinist elements of a city corporation and a chapter attempting to implement Laudian thought in worship and in the dignity of the clerical estate. This manifested itself in both disputes over the legal relationship between city and close, as in Salisbury, and over the relationship between aldermanic and cathedral ritual in cathedral services, as was the case in Norwich, and over a combination of the two, as in York.³¹ Thomas Pury, MP for Gloucester, argued during the Root and Branch debate in the Commons in 1641 that

it is notoriously knowne to the city of Gloucester and country there abouts, That not one of the said Statutes before mentioned, are, or ever were, during my remembrance, kept, or the matters contained in any of them performed by any one of the Deanes, or Prebends of the said Cathedrall.³²

Although none of the cases cited above contained any explicitly musical issues, this complex of polemical conditions surrounding the role of cathedral churches must be borne in mind when assessing the broader theological debates regarding worship as the Personal Rule progressed. The work of Kenneth Fincham has traced the instances of such disputes in the Jacobean church, identifying serious tension in nine, and perhaps eleven of the twenty-two cathedral cities, and suggests that the situation was exacerbated rather than improved by policies, adopted under Charles, of appointment of clergy as magistrates, and the enforcement of ceremonial conformity.³³ This can be

³⁰ Foster, 'The clerical estate revitalised' in Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church* pp.139-160 and his 'Church policies in the 1630s' in Cust and Hughes (eds), *Conflict in Early Stuart England* pp.193-223

³¹ Anthony Fletcher, 'Factionalism in town and countryside: the significance of Puritanism and Arminianism' D. Baker (ed.), *The Church in Town and Countryside* (SCH 16, Oxford, Blackwell, 1979) pp. 291-300: on Salisbury, see Paul Slack, 'Religious Protest and Urban Authority: the case of Henry Sherfield, iconoclast, 1633' *SCH* 9 (1972) 295-302: on Norwich, R.W.Ketton-Cremer, *Norfolk in the Civil War. A Portrait of a Society in Conflict* (London, Faber, 1969) p.84: on York, Claire Cross, 'Achieving the Millennium: the church in York during the Commonwealth' *SCH* 4 (1967) 122-42, and her 'Conflict and Confrontation: the York Dean and Chapter and the Corporation in the 1630s' in Marcombe and Knighton (eds), *Close Encounters* pp.62-71. See also Wallace T. MacCaffrey, *Exeter, 1540-1640: The Growth of an English County Town* (Cambridge, Harvard UP, 1958) pp.199-200.

³² Suzanne Eward, 'No fine but a glass of wine': *cathedral life at Gloucester in Stuart times* (Worcester, Russell, 1985) p.66; also, Fletcher, *Factionalism* p.298. For the Jacobean history of chapter/city relations, see Fincham, *Prelate as Pastor* pp.91-6.

³³ *Ibid.* p.92.

seen as of a piece with the general polarisation of religious policy and discussion in the 1630s.

Conclusion

In this context the reaction against the cathedral service and its physical accoutrements becomes explicable in terms of the peculiar polemical temperature of the Personal Rule and Long Parliament. Church music was only one component of larger clusters of issues concerning the King and court, the threat of popery and the place of cathedrals both in a reformed commonwealth and in their civic environment. It is the task of the following sections to examine the extent to which discussion of the role and nature of church music was arranged along clearly defined lines of principle.