

Introduction

One of the privileges of working at the intersection of one academic discipline with another is the realisation that the two disciplines have evolved in quite different directions, and that new developments in one can engender fruitful work in the other. This thesis is concerned with ecclesiastical music and religion in early Stuart England, and is thus located within and between history and musicology. Its objective is to discover how people in early Stuart England understood the place of music in worship, how music could affect the hearer and how one was to determine what was appropriate music for the task. We shall discover that previous suppositions about how such understandings mapped onto categories of theological analysis current in the historiography are inadequate. In the realm of musical practice, through an examination of the available evidence of practice in selected cathedral and collegiate churches, we will find that variations in practice equally do not match our patterns of liturgical variation. It will also become clear that scholars' current tendency to take particular cases as exemplary of more general patterns is one that presents more problems than it solves.

It would be fair to say that the dominant trend in early Stuart scholarship for the first half of the twentieth century was to look for continuities and evolutionary progression in the politico-religious events of the period, and to stress the stability and harmoniousness of the Stuart polity. The key factor in the outbreak of war for figures such as S.R. Gardiner and Charles Firth was the emergence of an agitational Puritan minority with designs on the overthrow of the whole structure. The economic, class based analyses of the Civil War, following the seminal work of R.H. Tawney, and latterly most associated with Christopher Hill, were a valuable corrective to the Whiggish tendencies of previous interpretations. However, they also dealt with the Puritans as prime movers in the outbreak, ranged against a relatively homogenous Anglican establishment.¹

¹ R.C. Richardson, *The Debate on the English Revolution* (London, Methuen, 1977). See chapter 5 on Firth, and chapter 6 on Tawney and Hill. See also Howard Tomlinson, 'The Causes of War: A Historiographical Survey' in Tomlinson (ed.), *Before the English Civil War* (London, Macmillan,

Since the early 1970s, against the backdrop of dominant socio-economic analyses, the role of religion in shaping the events of the 1630s and 1640s has firmly been reasserted, leading John Morrill to describe the cataclysm as the last of Europe's wars of religion.² One of the lynch-pins in this continuing debate of definition among English churchmen has been the distinctiveness or otherwise of those clergy associated with the ascendancy of Archbishop Laud, variously known as 'Laudians', 'Arminians' or 'Anti-Calvinists'. Firth had interpreted Laud and his group as of a continuum with the broader English church, ranged against a distinctive and agitational Puritan minority.³ Nicholas Tyacke on the other hand has sought more to stress the distinctiveness of the 'Anti-Calvinists' in theological terms, and took the doctrine of grace as a touchstone of a fundamental division between Calvinists (encompassing both Puritans and moderate conformist figures) and 'Anti-Calvinists'. The Jacobean church for Tyacke was characterised by a general consensus between nonconformist and conformist figures over certain touchstones of Calvinist theology, a balance fatally disturbed by the Arminian group, which found its genesis in the 1590s but achieved hegemony under the patronage of Laud and Archbishop Richard Neile.⁴

Since Tyacke's thesis was first advanced, much work has been done on locating both 'Puritanism' and 'Arminianism' in the spectrum of the church, and within a line of continuity of development. It has been demonstrated that Puritanism was in some senses doctrinally of a kin to the Tyackean 'Calvinist consensus' (as it is termed) of the Jacobean church, and that one of the achievements of James' rule was to bind the majority of the most nonconformist clergy into the church by a heterogeneous policy of patronage to the episcopal bench, and by a light hand of enforcement of ceremonial uniformity. At the same time Puritanism has been shown to have been at the very least in the vanguard of Calvinist theology, with a more marked personalisation of the doctrine of election, and with an imperative for

1983) pp.7-26; Ann Hughes, *The causes of the English Civil War* (2nd edition, London, Macmillan, 1998).

² 'The religious context of the English civil war' in Morrill, *The Nature of the English Revolution* (London, Longman, 1993) pp. 45-68; p.68. This essay was first published in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 23 (1984) 155- 178.

³ Richardson, *Debate* pp.74-78.

⁴ Tyacke, 'Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter Revolution in C. Russell (ed.), *The Origins of the English Civil War* (London, Macmillan, 1973) pp.119-143; idem. *Anti-Calvinists* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1987). This view of Arminianism as the innovatory force is broadly supported by Patrick Collinson, *English Puritanism* (London, Historical Association, 1987) pp.32-8.

personal renewal and reform of society and the visible church by the saving remnant of the godly.⁵

Likewise, much work has been done exploring the nature of Arminianism. Ken Fincham and Andrew Foster, *inter alia*, have sought to demonstrate the radicalism and coherence of Arminianism, specifically in styles of episcopal government and in attitudes towards the relationship between the church and secular government, but also with regard to ceremonial conformity and the attention paid towards church fabric and the altar.⁶ At the same time Kevin Sharpe, Peter White and George Bernard have sought to demonstrate the continuities between Arminian thought and that of conformist figures, and that Laud's policies in the 1630s were nothing more than a more rigorous enforcement of policies inherent within the Jacobean church. Sharpe has also cast doubt on how much Laud was in fact the prime mover in these policies, emphasising the role of Charles.⁷

Alongside these analyses, significant work has been done on the middle ground of the English church. The work of Peter White and Judith Maltby, amongst others, have drawn attention to a significant constituency of those who were neither intransigent Puritan nonconformists, nor supporters of Laudian innovation, but rather had grown attached to the ideal of the church as settled under Elizabeth and James. Maltby's analysis of petitions to the Long Parliament in support of episcopacy and the Book of Common Prayer reveals a body of opinion opposed to perceived Laudian

⁵ See, *inter alia*, on James's episcopate, Kenneth Fincham, 'Episcopal Government, 1603-1640' in Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-42* (London, Macmillan, 1993) pp.71-92, and his *Prelate as Pastor* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1990). For an extremely skilful summary, see Richard Cust and Ann Hughes, 'Introduction: After Revisionism' in Cust and Hughes (eds), *Conflict in Early Stuart England* (London, Macmillan, 1989) pp.1-46: pp.21-23.

⁶ Fincham, 'Episcopal Government'; 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. See the tracing of the pre-history of Laudianism in Peterborough diocese in John Fielding, 'Arminianism in the Localities: Peterborough Diocese, 1603-42' in Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church* pp.93-114. See also David M. Hoyle, 'Near Popery yet no Popery'. Theological debate in Cambridge 1590-1644' (Cambridge, Ph.D., thesis, 1991).

⁷ Bernard, 'The Church of England c.1529-c.1642' *History* 75 (1990) 183-206; Sharpe, 'Archbishop Laud' *History Today* 33 (1983) 26-30; White, 'The rise of Arminianism reconsidered' *P & P* 101 (1983) 34-54 and note 8 below; Cust and Hughes, 'Introduction' pp.23-5. On the respective roles of Charles and Laud, see Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 'The ecclesiastical policies and James I and Charles I' in Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church* pp.23-49; Fincham, 'William Laud and the exercise of Caroline ecclesiastical patronage' *JEH* 51 (2000) 69-93.

innovations (in direct counter to the work of Christopher Haigh) but supportive of the reform rather than the uprooting of the English church.⁸

In the last decade, the debate on how to define religious ‘types’ has undergone a further refinement, with increasing attention being paid to religious ‘styles’ or ‘cultures’, loose concatenations of forms of religious behaviour, some or all of which a ‘Puritan’ or ‘Arminian’ might display. Christopher Durston and Jacqueline Eales have recently identified Puritanism not as simply a coherent doctrinal system, but as a ‘common spiritual and cultural outlook’, a ‘highly distinctive cast of mind or *mentalite* which displayed itself ... as an unique and dynamic religious culture’⁹ Puritanism is then a ‘culture’, some or all of the aspects of which a ‘Puritan’ may or may not display at various times and places, and evidence of one or more such behaviours does not necessarily add up to one being a Puritan.¹⁰

Similarly, Peter Lake has identified a ‘Laudian style’, which despite having no *summa* (rather being a patchwork of responses to individual problems) represented ‘a coherent, distinctive and polemically aggressive vision of the Church, the divine presence in the world and the appropriate ritual response to that presence’.¹¹ Lake however denies the existence of a list of shibboleths, the presence of one of which

⁸ Maltby, ‘By this Book’: Parishioners, the Prayer Book and the Established Church’ in Fincham (ed.) *Early Stuart Church* pp. 115-38 and also her *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, CUP, 1998) and her edition of ‘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 7, Woodbridge, Boydell, 1999) pp.103-67. See also Peter White ‘The *via media* in the early Stuart Church’ in Fincham (ed.) *Early Stuart Church* pp.211-230. On the polarisation of the Long Parliament over the extent of reform, see John Morrill, ‘The attack on the Church of England in the Long Parliament’ in Morrill, *Nature of the English Revolution* pp.69-90, originally in D.Beales and G. Best (eds), *History, Society and the Churches* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1985).

⁹ *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700* (Macmillan, 1996) ‘Introduction : The Puritan Ethos, 1560-1700’ pp.1-31; p.9. On the problem of defining Puritanism, see John Spurr, *English Puritanism 1603-84* (London, Macmillan, 1998) pp.2-8. Peter Lake, ‘Defining Puritanism – again?’ in F. Bremer (ed.), *Puritanism: trans-atlantic perspectives on a seventeenth-century Anglo-American faith* (Boston, 1993) pp.3-29.

¹⁰ In a similar vein both Patrick Collinson and Tom Webster have explored the social and communal nature of the Puritan experience – as Collinson put it, ‘Puritanism is not adequately described as a body of doctrine or as a set of religious and moral principles, It was also a social experience.’; *English Puritanism* p.20; Webster, *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England. The Caroline Puritan Movement c.1620-1643* (Cambridge, CUP, 1997) chs. 1-4, and pp.333-5.

¹¹ ‘The Laudian style: Order, uniformity and the pursuit of the Beauty of Holiness in the 1630s’ in Kenneth Fincham (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642* (London, Macmillan, 1993) pp.161-185; p.162.

betrays the presence of ‘Laudianism’. The distinctiveness of Laudianism lies in ‘not so much any of the individual opinions that made up the whole, but the overall package, the ideological synthesis, and the resulting style, the polemical orientation and aesthetic and argumentative tone of the whole position.’¹² Lake has elsewhere stressed the danger of stressing one element of the synthesis over others, and taking one element as the ‘hallmark’ of a Laudian. In this view, Laudian polemic has maximum and minimum positions, capable both of extreme positions on the authority of the Old Testament and of patristic precedent, and of a conformism to the power of the prince over *adiaphora* indistinguishable from Whitgift. The coherence of Laudian aesthetics ‘was not underpinned by an equally coherent argumentative or epistemological foundation.’¹³

Much work has been done in recent years on investigating these components of Puritan or Laudian style. The varying attitudes to ‘church art’ whether it be the altar or altar furniture, or public crucifixes, or depictions in stained glass have attracted much scholarly attention over recent years, as has the question of church building, and the altar policy itself.¹⁴ Much of this work has pointed to a distinctive Laudian view on both the permissibility and the usefulness of the visual image in worship. Thus Jacqueline Eales has referred to a ‘revival of church art’ in the 1620s and 1630s which was ‘spearheaded by the King and the Court and was endorsed by the religious grouping headed by Archbishops Neile and Laud, who were widely dubbed “Arminians” by contemporaries’. This was part of a wider debate over religious imagery and its symbolic significance, waged between ‘on one side the Crown and its advisers [who were] alarmed by what they perceived as a Puritan threat to political order and hierarchy; [and] the Crown’s critics [who] feared that traditional English liberties, including right religion, were being sacrificed in pursuit

¹² Ibid., p.163.

¹³ ‘The Laudians and the Argument from Authority’ in B.Y.Kunze, D.D. Brautigam (eds), *Court, Country and Culture: Essays in Early Modern British History in Honor of Perez Zagorin* (Rochester, Rochester University Press, 1992) pp.149-175; pp.170, 175, 173.

¹⁴ On the complexities of motivations surrounding the building and beautifying the physical building of the church, see Julia Merritt, ‘Puritans, Laudians, and the phenomenon of church-building in Jacobean London’ *Historical Journal* 41 (1998) 935-960: A recent doctoral thesis has pointed to a ‘novel appreciation of the aesthetic and devotional value of ornament and image’; James Cannon, ‘The poetry and polemic of English church worship c.1617-40 (Cambridge, Ph.D. thesis, 1998) p.204. However, Dr Cannon does not examine the role of music within this movement (p.10.)

of Catholic-inspired authoritarian rule.’¹⁵ Margaret Aston has also referred to royal endorsement of a policy of setting up images and altars under Charles I. Aston mentions ‘Laudian’ figures such as Laud himself, Samuel Harsnett, John Bridgeman and John Cosin, as well as more ambiguous figures such as John Williams, Bishop of Lincoln, and Godfrey Goodman of Gloucester.¹⁶

It will be clear that the scholarship relating to the cultures of early Stuart religion has so far tended to stress the distinctiveness of the clusters of religious behaviours designated as ‘Laudian’ or ‘Puritan’. The state of understanding relating to the place of music in these syntheses is less clear.

The research done on music in the early Stuart church has tended to fall into two (albeit not mutually exclusive) categories: that done by historians, and that by musicologists. Perhaps not surprisingly, given the specialist nature of the analytical tools needed, the treatment of church music by historians has tended to eschew issues of performance practice, style and composition, and has dealt more with the tangible aspects of music: traditional forms of historical evidence such as the incidence and use of the organ, the mode of dress of the choir and the behaviour and numerical strength of singers and organists. Hence Stanford Lehmborg, in his work on English cathedrals deals with numbers, remuneration and behaviour of musicians, and also with the use of organs and instruments, but only at the level of noting the existence of such. Issues of repertoire and performance practice are not treated. A similar set of priorities inform the work of Claire Cross on opposition to the perceived abuses of cathedral establishments.¹⁷

An examination of the historiographical treatment of Cosin’s activities at Peterhouse is instructive in this regard. T.A. Walker, the historian of the College pauses only to note the installation of a new organ under Cosin’s mastership.¹⁸

¹⁵ ‘Iconoclasm, Iconography and the Altar in the English Civil War’ in Diana Wood (ed.), *The Church and the Arts* (SCH 28, Oxford, Blackwell, 1992) pp.313-327; pp.315, 314.

¹⁶ ‘Puritans and Iconoclasm, 1560-1660’ in C. Durston, J. Eales (eds), *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700* (Macmillan, 1996) pp.92-121; pp.106-7. The picture of a resurgent ‘Laudian’ interest in religious art is broadly supported by John Phillips, *The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England, 1535-1660* (London, Univ. of California, 1973) pp. 146-180.

¹⁷ Lehmborg, *Cathedrals under siege: Cathedrals in English Society 1600 - 1700*

(Exeter; Exeter U P 1996) pp.157-186: see also his *The Reformation of Cathedrals: Cathedrals in English Society, 1485 - 1603* (Princeton, UP, 1988) pp.183-224: Cross, “Dens of Loitering Lubbers”: Protestant Protest Against Cathedral Foundations, 1540 – 1640’ *SCH* ix. 231-7

¹⁸ *Peterhouse* (Cambridge, Heffer, 1935) p.57

Similarly, F.J. Varley restricts any consideration of musical activity in Cambridge in the years preceding the Civil War to those passing comments contained in the documents he transcribes.¹⁹

More recent work has been equally unforthcoming on the subject. John Twigg has suggested that the introduction of organs at Jesus, St John's and Christ's indicates 'an increased musical component in religious worship', although he did list Christ's as one of those colleges whose 'Laudianisation' occurred late and through a recognition of the necessity to conform, rather than from enthusiasm. Twigg does not discuss the actual use of these organs, and whether this pattern of apparent musical expansion was repeated across Cambridge.²⁰ Finally, John G. Hoffman, in an otherwise admirable treatment of the work of Cosin and his predecessor Matthew Wren at Peterhouse, relies in his account of music in the college (one of the fullest such accounts in the literature) almost entirely on the work of the musicologist Peter Le Huray (discussed below) and the cataloguer of the Peterhouse music manuscripts, Anselm Hughes.²¹ The judgement that 'in these choir-books we see the High Church revival of the reign of Charles I translated into terms of music' is that of Hughes, and it is one which I shall examine fully in Part 2.²²

In more general work on the period, there has been a persistent but unsystematic sense that Laudians were in some sense favourable towards music, but this is never worked out either in comparison to other churchmen, or in terms of its theological basis or stylistic distinctiveness. Hence Andrew Foster, in work on Archbishop Richard Neile, noted in passing Neile's role in providing new organs at York and Durham and, without any further development, later asserted as part of a coherent Arminian programme that 'they reacted angrily when church music was

¹⁹ *Cambridge during the Civil War, 1642-6* (Cambridge, Heffer, 1935) pp.22-6.

²⁰ *The university of Cambridge and the English Revolution 1625-1688* (Woodbridge, Boydell, 1990) p.36.

²¹ Hoffman, 'The Puritan Revolution and the 'Beauty of Holiness' at Cambridge' *PCAS* 72 (1984) 94-105; pp.98-99; Anselm Hughes, *Catalogue of the Musical Manuscripts at Peterhouse, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1953). Hoffman in his work on Durham Cathedral likewise treats of the instrumental accompaniments used, and other tangible aspects of Peter Smart's charges against Cosin, but does not address questions of repertoire and composition: 'The Arminian and the Iconoclast: the dispute between John Cosin and Peter Smart' *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1979) 279-301; pp.286-7.

²² *Ibid.* p.xv.

abused and saw ceremony as essential to true worship.’²³ In a similar fashion, Richard Cust and Ann Hughes have asserted that Laudians promoted ‘elaborate ceremonial and visual and musical images rather than the lively preaching of the Puritans’ without a full working out of the evidence for such an assertion, or references to such work elsewhere.²⁴

The most thorough-going attempt in a work of musicology to address the period is Peter Le Huray’s *Music and the Reformation in England, 1549-1660*, a work yet to be seriously challenged in the thirty-four years since its publication.²⁵ However, its analysis of the theological background to the 1630s is now significantly outdated, caught as it is in a simple oppositional model of ‘Puritan’ against ‘High Church’. The Puritan wing of the argument is represented here by William Prynne (the *Histriomastix* of 1633) and the arguments of Peter Smart, the Durham prebendary, against the innovations of John Cosin at Durham, and unfortunately their views are only illustrated by the colourful denunciations of perceived abuses within the church more generally.²⁶ No attempt is made to discern what a Puritan view might be if extracted from the polemically charged atmosphere of the 1630s.

Likewise, Le Huray posits the existence of a ‘High Church’ party, first arising during the early years of James’ reign, and embodied in Lancelot Andrewes, Laud, William Juxon and the younger Matthew Wren and Cosin.²⁷ Unfortunately for our purposes, the defining characteristic of this movement is simply described as that ‘wherever it flourished, however, especial attention was paid to the outward forms

²³ ‘Church Policies of the 1630s’ pp. 200, 216.

²⁴ ‘Introduction: After Revisionism’ in Cust and Hughes (eds), *Conflict in Early Stuart England* pp. 1-46; p.24. James Saunders has asserted that Laudian musical practice ‘was something qualitatively different from what had gone before’ (p.204.) Dr Saunders uses Cosin’s activities as indicative of ‘Laudian’ practice, whilst only citing Neile’s use of anthems at Westminster Abbey and the situation at Canterbury in the 1630s as supporting evidence. I shall demonstrate below that this evidence does not indicate a Laudian distinctiveness: ‘English cathedral choirs and choirmen, 1558 to the Civil War: an occupational study’ (Cambridge, Ph.D. thesis, 1997). Other such examples are numerous; see C. Durston and J.Eales, ‘Introduction: The Puritan Ethos, 1560-1700’ in C. Durston, J. Eales (eds), *The Culture of English Puritanism, 1560-1700* (Macmillan, 1996) pp.1-31; p.19 for a simplistic assertion that a distinctive feature of ‘Puritans’ was a rejection of church music, allowing only the ‘slow and somewhat monotonous’ use of metrical psalms. See also Diane Kelsey McColley, *Poetry and Music in Seventeenth Century England* (Cambridge; CUP, 1997) pp. 53-85.

²⁵ (London, Herbert Jenkins, 1967; 2nd edn., Cambridge, CUP, 1978). The nearest comparable work is Peter Phillips’s *English Sacred Music 1549-1649* (Oxford, Gimell, 1991). This however eschews discussion of the theological context to the production of music after the accession of Elizabeth.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 47-53.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 46-7.

and observance of daily worship'.²⁸ Within this analysis, the work of Cosin at Durham is taken to be representative of the 'party' as a whole. Le Huray then leaves us with a view of a Puritan party simply opposed to music in general, and a High Church party generally in favour of 'music', without a clear analysis of why or how these positions were articulated and practised.

A similar interpretative framework is adopted by Nicholas Temperley in his influential study *The Music of the English Parish Church*,²⁹ a work as yet unsurpassed in scope. The Jacobean church is characterised by a 'rebellion against Calvinism', beginning in Cambridge in the 1590s, best represented by Richard Hooker, and reaching its zenith with Laud's accession to Canterbury, and the innovations of Cosin at Durham. This movement found a renewed 'appreciation of beauty as an ornament to worship' and, implicit in Temperley's account, a renewed role for music in the cathedral service.³⁰

A recent work on selected cathedrals and Cambridge colleges has also displayed a similarly limited view of the linkage between Laudianism and musical practice.³¹ Ian Payne's exhaustive examination of patterns of expenditure on music copying, work done on organs and the use of instruments first assumes an enhanced view of music in Laudian thought, and then attributes increases in expenditure on musical activity to Laudian influence. Hence all the musical innovations in Cambridge in the 1630s are a 'remarkable tribute to the influence exerted by Laud via his carefully selected heads of colleges',³² and in general the Laudian movement of the 1630s 'witnessed a general increase in musical activity on a scale that is rivalled only by the revival of Catholicism under Mary, and this was concomitant with the Arminian view that it had a vital part to play in the 'beauty of holiness proper to church services.'³³ A particular example of Payne's treatment of the processes by

²⁸ Ibid., p.47.

²⁹ 2 vols, (Cambridge, University Press, 1979). Horton Davies, in his monumental study of worship and theology in England, also discusses the debates over the function of church music explicitly in terms of a divide between 'Anglican' and 'Puritan' thought: *Worship and Theology in England 1603-1690* (New Jersey, Princeton UP, 1975) pp. 253-259.

³⁰ Ibid. p.50.

³¹ Ian Payne, *The Provision and Practice of Sacred Music at Cambridge Colleges and Selected Cathedrals, c.1547-c.1646: A Comparative Study of the Archival Evidence* (New York, Garland, 1993).

³² Ibid. p.109.

³³ Ibid. p.92.

which Laudian influence operated can be found in an earlier article on Trinity College, in which Payne notes the conformist steps taken by the college in 1636 in decorating the chapel and moving the altar to the east end.³⁴ It is then for Payne ‘perhaps surprising that there is no evidence of increased musical activity at this time.’³⁵ The work of John Twigg has suggested that it is more probable that such changes were a recognition of inevitability, rather than positive enthusiasm.³⁶ As will be demonstrated, Payne’s analysis ignores the complexities of attributing expenditure on musical activity to Laudian enthusiasm, and attributes Laudian influence to chapters where there was none, on the basis of an assumption that where there is increased musical activity, there is Laudianism.

In the most detailed examination of the relationship between musical practice and liturgical thought to date, Lothar Bleeker, in an examination of the musical activity of John Cosin, first at Durham and then as Master of Peterhouse, portrays Cosin as a typical churchman of his type, and in doing so both implicitly and explicitly extrapolates equivalent musical practice to other Laudian figures, attributing a consistency of thought and practice to ‘Laudians’ unwarranted by his analysis.³⁷ Bleeker’s analysis is severely hampered by this concentration on Cosin as an ideal embodiment of the younger generation of Arminians, his elision of ‘Puritan’ and ‘Calvinist’ thought throughout, and by the fact that his study deals only with Durham and Peterhouse.³⁸

One study of the relationship between theological and musical thought which stands rather in splendid isolation is John H. Shepherd’s *The changing theological concept of sacrifice, and its implications for the music of the English church c.1500-1640* (Cambridge Ph.D. thesis, 1984). This seeks to demonstrate that a recovery of a late medieval sense of the sacrifice at the Eucharist as a propitiatory one was to be

³⁴ ‘The Musical Establishment at Trinity College, Cambridge, 1546-1644’ *PCAS* 74 (1985) 53-69; p.64.

³⁵ *Ibid*, p.66.

³⁶ Twigg, *The university of Cambridge and the English Revolution* p.37: see also Payne, ‘Music at Jesus College, Cambridge, c.1557-1679’ *Proc. of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 76 (1987) 97-103; pp.99-100 for the ‘Laudian’ institution of a new organ and organist.

³⁷ *Anglikanische Kirchenmusik und englischer Arminianismus c.1625-1640. Eine Untersuchung der im Wirkungsbereich von John Cosin (Durham Cathedral und Peterhouse College, Cambridge) entstandenen Kirchenmusik* (Bonn, Wehle, 1993) p.190.

³⁸ Cosin is the ‘idealtypische Verkörperung eines Vertreters der jüngeren Generation von Arminianern jener Zeit’ *Ibid.*, p.3.

found in the writings of some Jacobean divines, followed by later Caroline figures. Central to this movement were Buckeridge, Hooker and Lancelot Andrewes, as well as Laud, Cosin, Arthur Lake and Robert Sanderson. It is argued that as a direct result of this newer understanding of the dignity of human work at the Eucharist, music found a renewed status in the worship of the church. However, fascinating and stimulating though the thesis is, it is my contention that Shepherd fails to establish anything more than a coincidental link, in a small sample of writers, between a renewed sense of the character of the sacrifice, and some mostly unconnected thoughts on music in worship as a positive thing. In my opinion, none of the writers cited at any point discuss music in the terms of sacrifice that would be necessary to establish such a link in theory. I shall argue in subsequent sections that these discussions of music must be located within a wider complex of commonplaces of musical thought which were in fact were common to most, if not all, such theorists. Shepherd's work is also hampered by a lack of firm contextualisation, putting together as being of a piece figures as diverse as Cosin, Laud, the Jacobean Bishop of Bath and Wells Arthur Lake, the moderate Robert Sanderson, and Interregnum figures such as Anthony Sparrow and John Gauden.³⁹

In the light of this work, this thesis will demonstrate two related but distinct points. In Part One, by means of an examination of the printed and manuscript writings on the role, function and efficacy of music in the worship of the church, it will be argued that no clear epistemological, hermeneutic or psychological divisions can be made between 'Laudian' and 'non-Laudian thinkers on these issues. It will be argued that no coherent Laudian or non-Laudian positions can be posited, but rather that all parties assented to a number of central principles but were either unable or unwilling to apply these to specific music in specific times and places. In Part Two, by an examination of musical practice in selected and cathedral and collegiate churches, it will likewise be shown that there can be no necessary mapping of theological standpoint onto musical practice.

³⁹ Shepherd's evidence is often made to bear more weight than it will stand. Laud at no point in the writings cited (pp. 273-6 - and indeed, to the best of my knowledge, at no other point) engaged with the issue of church music at any level other than enquiring in particular places about the maintenance, numbers and standards of the choir. Likewise, the passages in Cosin's manuscript *Notes on the Book of Common Prayer*, which I shall address below, will not support an assertion that 'Cosin made it clear that it was the beauty of musical sound as created by voices and by instruments which was to be offered to God, not merely an understanding of the faith derived from the meaning of the words with which man worshipped.' *Ibid.*, p. 246.