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Abstract

Music is one of the core elements of human culture. As ubiquitous as language and as fundamentally important, music is not neatly partitioned into one corner of the cultural framework of a society. It is impossible to fully understand a historical period and culture without understanding how music functioned and what music meant to the adherents of that culture. England in the seventeenth century is no exception, and the centrality of seventeenth-century English culture in shaping the modern world makes understanding the ideas and historical events of the period important not only for our understanding of that time, but also for our understanding of our own time.

Though many works have documented musical culture over the course of the seventeenth century in England, scholars have yet to consider broadly how music influenced the political climate of the century. Therefore, this dissertation gathers all extant printed sources from early modern England that include, relate to, or discuss music and analyzes them for propagandistic content. In doing so, it proves that music functioned as political propaganda consistently throughout the seventeenth century in England to advance numerous political causes for diverse political groups. Musicians defended their profession and reputations with it. Parliamentarians attacked the Church of England and Royalists with it. Supporters of the Commonwealth used it to defend and establish a Puritan orthodoxy, while Royalists used it to maintain their cultural identity. Music served as public-image propaganda for the Restoration monarchies, and the
Church of England used music to market their denomination to a post-Toleration Act marketplace of religious consumers who were no longer legally required to be members of the Anglican congregation.

By exposing the intimate and consistent connections between music and political activity across the seventeenth century in England, this work offers new insights into the meaning and function of music in early modern England. Music could serve devotion and praise, it could entertain and provide solace, but it could also be used to manipulate readers and listeners, a fact that this dissertation proves was well known and consistently utilized by propagandists in early modern England.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

I. Introduction

Music was everywhere in seventeenth-century English daily life. From broadside ballads on the street, unison psalm singing in Calvinist-influenced Protestant services and private recreation, instrumental and choral music in the cathedrals and in any parish that could afford them, and music of all kinds at the theatres, to the private music of the educated upper-class and nobility, music was universally enjoyed (with a few notable exceptions, e.g. the Quakers) and served important functions within early modern English society. At the same time, seventeenth-century England was anything but unified politically, and numerous groups fought with the pen and sword for domination of the kingdom. Though many works have documented how music, and ideas about music, changed over the course of the seventeenth century in England, scholars of music and politics have largely focused on how the politics of the century influenced the practice and production of the music of the period rather than on how music was specifically used to influence the politics of the time.

Another significant limitation of the current scholarship on music and politics in early modern England is that almost all of the current secondary sources address localized examples, such as the music and politics of the Elizabethan court, or the political content of *The Triumphes of Oriana*, which has resulted in a fragmented perspective of the century.¹ At this early stage in the development of scholarship on this topic, however, such a fragmented perspective is perhaps unavoidable. At the same time, these unavoidable gaps in our perspective have left many

---

opportunities for synthesizing and expanding the scholarly literature on music and politics in early modern England.

Indeed, fundamental questions remain to be answered: 1) how extensive and consistent was the practice of using music publications as political propaganda in seventeenth-century England? 2) how did music publications function as propaganda? 3) What types of music publications functioned as propaganda? 4) did contemporaries recognize the value/use of music as propaganda? 5) which political groups or movements utilized the propagandistic potential of music publications? 6) when did this practice begin, and when, if at all, did it end? The answers to these questions will provide a strong foundation on which future research may be based. Doing so will also help to establish the study of music and politics/propaganda in early modern England as a significant subfield of musicological research.

In an effort to address these questions, I argue five main points in this dissertation: 1) that music publications served extensively and consistently as political propaganda from the beginning of earnest music publication in England (ca. 1580s) and throughout the seventeenth century; 2) that in addition to being used simply as a means of conveying propagandistic messages to readers or audiences, music eventually developed political significance itself and became a valuable symbol that could be utilized propagandistically; 3) that no type of music publication was exempt from service as a vehicle for propaganda; 4) that contemporaries did recognize the propagandistic value of music; and 5) that music functioned as propaganda for a variety of political groups, especially educated musicians, Parliamentarians, Puritans, Royalists, and Anglican clergymen. By proving these points, this dissertation also adds an entirely new dimension to our understanding of the works in question, both those that are well known
(treatises and published art music) and those that are presently almost completely unknown (pamphlets on music), and to our understanding of early modern English politics in general.

Specifically, I examine the six main types of printed musical sources from seventeenth-century England (broadside ballads, pamphlets about music, sermons, treatises, masque and opera libretti, and published music) in a variety of contexts throughout the century. Chapter two argues that music was used during the Puritan anti-music movement of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries to defend educated musicians against unwanted associations with minstrels. Chapter three argues that music was used as political symbolism for both sides of the English Civil Wars. Chapter four argues that music served as a means to support the commonwealth government of the Interregnum and as a means of maintaining the cultural identity of the Royalist community during that period. Chapter five argues that music was used during the Restoration to support the reestablishment of the monarchy and the Church of England during the Restoration and maintain the public’s opinion of the monarch. Finally, chapter six argues that music was used as a means of supporting the Church of England in the wake of the Glorious Revolution and the Toleration Act.

Furthermore, this work is also intended as a means of collecting, discussing, and connecting apparently dissimilar sources according to their use as propaganda. While broadsides are primarily seen as having been intended for the entertainment of the lower classes (servants and artisans) and printed music as having been primarily for the entertainment of the upper classes (citizens, the gentry, and the nobility), these sources, along with opera libretti and pamphlets, circulated to varying degrees among all of the classes. Shorter pamphlets of all kinds could have been read to illiterate members of the lower classes, but treatises, by virtue of their
length and their requirement that one be literate to appreciate them, were mostly targeted at the upper classes (those who could afford musical instruments and music books) and would most likely have been inaccessible to the servants and artisans of the less-educated classes. By examining works that addressed the entire spectrum of society, this work also adds to the growing and sizable scholarly literature on early modern English propaganda in addition to laying a foundation for further studies of music and propaganda specifically.

The number of published primary sources from early modern England that contain music or discuss music is substantial, including pamphlets about music (approximately sixty including published sermons, as listed in Appendix B), broadside ballads (over 1,000 related to politics in this period), songs (over a hundred collections), libretti (approximately twenty), published music dedications and prefaces (approximately 100), and treatises (approximately forty-five). This dissertation discusses in detail only those sources that contain language that might qualify as propaganda relating to one of the main topics mentioned above. In addition to addressing these sources on their own terms, I also examine them in light of the overtly propagandistic texts of their time to expose the similar themes, arguments, and styles used across these musical and non-musical genres. Only published sources have been evaluated, as they would be most likely to reach the largest audience and therefore would be most likely to serve as propaganda. For all sources, textual analysis is the primary mode of examination, but for sources that include music, I have also examined, where relevant, the propagandistic potential of melodic interrelations/allusions, both within and across collections.

Finally, it is worth stating that the lack of supporting documents related to the creation of almost all of the sources discussed in this work, the covert nature of propaganda, and the
difficulty inherent in attempting to assign authorial intent or define the primary meaning of a work makes definitively describing almost all of the works discussed in this dissertation as primarily intended to function as propaganda an impossible task. Indeed, I have deliberately avoided making definitive statements about the propagandistic intentions of authors and instead have tried to show how these works could have functioned as propaganda. Indeed, it is largely out of this difficulty in definitively ascribing propagandistic intention that I have developed the concept of secondary propaganda, discussed below, which allows for the discussion of works that could have functioned like propaganda and contain the requisite contents and contexts of propaganda without having to prove that their authors were deliberately trying to manipulate their readers. In some cases I have been able to present a more convincing case than in others, but the amount of information this is not and never will be available from this period and concerning the works in question has nevertheless and necessarily left much of this work an exercise in educated speculation.

The remainder of this chapter frames the specific discussions of music and propaganda in later chapters by defining and discussing “propaganda,” presenting a brief overview of the historiography of seventeenth-century England from the late seventeenth century to the present, and discussing the history of printing and propaganda in early modern England. These sections are not meant to be exhaustive—each of these topics could easily fill a dissertation of its own. For this reason, more recent scholarship, from the late 1980s to the present, has been given preference over earlier scholarship unless that scholarship remains an important part of the scholarly debate surrounding propaganda, historiography, and the history of printing and propaganda in early modern England.
Finally, the editorial practices used throughout this dissertation aim to retain as much of the original content and appearance of quoted texts as is practically possible. Original punctuation, capitalization, and spellings have been retained in all cases where modern equivalents exist. In some instances, period song texts use “ij.” to indicate text repetitions; these repeat signs have been retained. The only editorial change that has been made to any of the texts quoted in this dissertation involves standardizing v/u and i/j to conform to intended pronunciations and increase readability. Typos and grammatical oddities have not been corrected, but confusing instances have been marked with “sic” and clarified with glosses.

II. Discussion of the Term “Propaganda”

Before any discussion of propaganda in seventeenth-century England can begin in depth, we must first come to terms with nearly a century of rather lengthy and complex scholarly debate over the actual definition of “propaganda.” In spite of how common the term is in modern discourse, the scholarly community has yet to settle on a single primary definition of the word. Since the beginning of scholarly investigation into propaganda at the end of World War I, over a hundred definitions of the term have appeared in the scholarly literature on propaganda.² Although many of these definitions share some elements in common, they are just as likely to differ fundamentally because scholars have yet to agree on what essential elements a work must possess for it to be considered propaganda and on how exactly propaganda functions. Authors continue to debate whether or not propaganda is immoral or morally neutral, whether or not propaganda is a form of communication or pseudo-communication, whether or not the term

² Stanley B. Cunningham, The Idea of Propaganda (Westport: Praeger, 2002), 60. Cunningham’s discussion of the history of how “propaganda” has been defined by scholars over the past eighty years is the most detailed and extensive treatment yet given to the subject. For that reason, I use his work as the main source of background information in this section.
“propaganda” can be applied to discourse before the twentieth century, whether or not propaganda must be intentional, whether or not propaganda is distinguishable from information in theory and in practice, and whether or not “propaganda” can even be defined at all. Before I present the definition of “propaganda” that I intend to use throughout this dissertation, I will first provide a brief outline of the history of the term and discuss each side of the fundamental disagreements mentioned above.

The earliest use of the word “propaganda” comes from the attempts by the Catholic Church during the Counter-Reformation to organize and regulate the missionary activities of the Church. Originally, the term applied to a commission of three cardinals that was formed in 1568, but in 1622 Pope Gregory XV expanded the commission into a separate congregation, the Congregatio de propaganda fide. Stanley Cunningham has argued that although the Congregatio functioned in some ways like a modern propaganda department (in its goal of uniformity and control and its utilization of a printing press toward that goal from 1626 onwards) and although the term “propaganda” implies the growing or planting of something (in this case the faith), the organization itself was nevertheless designed to manage the active propagation of the Church’s missionary activities rather than to engage in persuasion itself, thereby marking a discrepancy between the original, positive meaning of the term and the modern, negative connotation of the word. Other scholars, however, have implied a link between the Congregatio and the modern conception of propaganda, not only in the pejorative nature of the word, but also in the intended purpose of the organization.

---

3 Cunningham, 15-16.
According to the *OED*, the first use of the word in English appeared in 1790 and meant approximately “An organization, scheme, or movement for the propagation of a particular doctrine, practice, etc.,” and the first use of the term to mean approximately “The systematic dissemination of information, esp. in a biased or misleading way, in order to promote a political cause or point of view,” which is closer to the meaning that we colloquially ascribe to the term, appeared in 1822.\(^5\) When scholarly investigations into propaganda began in earnest after World War I, prominent authors, such as Edward Bernays and Harold Lasswell, emphasized an attempt on the part of the propagandist to alter the propagandee’s opinion as the defining characteristic of propaganda.\(^6\) From the 1960s through the 1990s, the most prominent works on propaganda have stressed its use as an incitement to action, its moral neutrality, its natural, unavoidable nature in society, its classification as a form of communication, and a requirement that propaganda be produced intentionally for it to be considered true propaganda.\(^7\) Though these perspectives on propaganda have been more popular during some decades than others, with definitions of propaganda as incitement to action being common in the 60s through the 80s, intentionality

\(^5\) *OED Online*, s.v. “propaganda, n.”

http://www.oed.com.proxycu.wrlc.org/view/Entry/152605?rskey=17Bixb&result=1 (accessed June 03, 2015). It is worth noting that neither of these definitions has gained widespread acceptance in the scholarly community, though, as with all definitions of propaganda, they do share some elements in common with other definitions.


being a common theme in the 80s and 90s, and definitions that focus on propaganda as a form of communication and as unavoidable appearing since the 60s, the scholarly literature overall does not follow a clear chronological progression regarding what propaganda is and is not. This may be a result of the difficulty in encompassing the many facets of propaganda into one brief definition. In any case, the result has been an abundance of definitions that focus on one aspect of the concept that the author finds most relevant to or convenient for his/her research rather than a systematic investigation into the concept of propaganda itself. Furthermore, because no single definition has been adopted as the default among scholars, the scholarly community continues to disagree about fundamental elements of the concept.

Authors who consider propaganda to be morally neutral, for example, argue from the pragmatic perspective that “propaganda is not necessarily an evil thing. It can only be evaluated within its own context according to the players, the played upon, and its purpose.”8 From such a perspective, propaganda that aims to promote peace could be considered good and propaganda that aims to incite violence could be considered bad. Authors such as Cunningham who disagree with this assessment argue instead that propaganda is always unethical because “propaganda and its agents prefer the lesser epistemic values of credibility and actual belief to those of, say, knowledge and understanding. Truth, at best, is only a strategy, a tool, but it has no special value apart from its utility.”9 According to this argument, because the goal of propaganda is the inducement of belief rather than understanding or the discovery of truth, it is inherently dishonest and therefore unethical regardless of the outcome.

---

8 Jowett and O’Donnell, 367.
9 Cunningham, 117.
Similarly, authors have disagreed about whether or not propaganda can be considered a true form of communication or is instead a form of pseudo-communication. According to Terence Moran, in true communication “the thinking tends to be individual and critical” with both parties practicing “independence and choice in their reasoning and analysis,” and overall the discourse is “rational, with an emphasis on a clear relationship between the message and supporting data.” One party conveys information to another in a rational manner, and both parties are free to accept, reject, question, and analyze that information. Pseudo-communication, however, is one-sided in that “the sender exercises control over both the information flow and analysis. Appeals are now largely emotional, not rational.” Because the propagandist’s main goal is to convince the reader to believe his message rather than to simply share information or engage in a rational discourse, he attempts to bypass rational thought with emotional appeals and encourages the reader to follow a prescribed thought process rather than to follow his own. In doing so, the propagandist is attempting to manipulate rather than to communicate, and thereby engaging in pseudo-communication.

On the other hand, Jowett and O’Donnell define communication as “a process of exchange in which sender and receiver, either through mediated or nonmediated means, create, acquire, transmit, and use information.” They then divide communication into informative communication and persuasion, with the former being “communication about subject matter that

---

11 Cunningham, 107-108.
12 Jowett and O’Donnell, 31; they are careful to point out that scholars “nearly always recogniz[e] propaganda as a form of communication.” Ibid., 6.
has attained the privileged status of being beyond dispute”\textsuperscript{13} and the latter as “a subset of communication [that] is usually defined as a communicative process to influence others.”\textsuperscript{14} Propaganda lies somewhere between these two forms of communication in that it often masquerades as informative communication while at the same time trying to persuade the propagandee covertly. The difference between propaganda and persuasion, however, is that “persuaders, however, do not try to appear as informers. An effective persuader makes the purpose as clear as possible [...] the propagandist may appear to have a clear purpose and certainly an explicitly stated conclusion, but the true purpose is likely to be concealed.”\textsuperscript{15} Whether or not propaganda is defined as a form of communication or pseudo-communication, both sides agree that the propagandist is attempting to control (or as I would say, manipulate) the propagandee rather than simply convince him/her through honest discourse.

Indeed, the propagandist is a significant factor in determining what propaganda is and is not. especially for scholars who view the intentions of the propagandist as the deciding factor in whether or not a work is propaganda. Scholars such as Qualter argue that

\begin{quote}
the crucial point is that propaganda is something done consciously or deliberately done to achieve certain results. Doob had attempted to introduce a principle of unintentional propaganda, but it is the central proposition of my own conception that the one thing that marks propaganda from non-propaganda is its deliberate character because there is no other element of propaganda that is common to all pieces of propaganda.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

Likewise, Jowett and O’Donnell assert that propaganda is a “deliberate, systematic attempt” to achieve the goals of the propagandist because “propaganda is carefully thought out ahead of time

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., 31.
\item Ibid., 32.
\item Ibid., 45.
\item Qualter, \textit{Opinion Control in Democracies}, 121-122.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
to select what will be the most effective strategy to promote an ideology.”

Cunningham, Ellul, Thompson, and Combs and Nimmo, however, argue that intention and whether or not propaganda is deliberate are difficult to discern, and they question how important it is in the process of labeling a work as propaganda. When dealing with propaganda, one can argue convincingly that a given work is functioning as propaganda toward a given goal, but one can rarely be certain of the propagandist’s intentions. The author of a patriotic song, for example, might intend it to serve as propaganda or might not. Nevertheless, that same song could be used as propaganda by a third party or could have a propagandistic effect on its listeners even if the author did not intend it to.

Regarding the scope of the term, scholars agree that the term “propaganda” can and should be applied to media from WWI to the present, but the scholarly community has yet to agree on whether or not the term should be applied to earlier works. Cunningham, for example, argues that the term “propaganda” cannot be applied in general to media that were produced before the twentieth century because modern media and the ways societies receive and interpret them are fundamentally different from their pre-twentieth-century manifestations, and “while we can indeed discern messages and symbolism in former times having an influential function, it is not readily apparent that we are dealing with anything like even our notional understanding of modern propaganda.” Therefore, the difference between these past and present forms and interpretations renders any retrospective use of the term anachronistic. Although he does allow that there were antecedents to modern propaganda before the twentieth century, he cautions

---

17 Jowett and O’Donnell, 7.
18 Cunningham, 51.
19 Ibid., 18-19.
against applying the term “propaganda” to them; at the same time, however, he offers no substitute term that might be used instead of “propaganda.” Authors who do apply the term to pre-twentieth-century works often do so with little or no justification. Jowett and O’Donnell, for example, say simply that “the use of propaganda as a means of controlling information flow, managing public opinion, or manipulating behavior is as old as recorded history.”

One might argue, however, for the application of the term “propaganda” to earlier works in several ways. First, no equivalent contemporary English term was applied consistently to works that functioned as propaganda before the twentieth century, although evidence suggests that contemporaries did understand that some works were focused on influencing public opinion in a propagandistic way. The fact that no contemporary term exists to identify propagandistic works does not, however, mean that they did not exist or that we should not be allowed to apply a modern term to an earlier phenomenon. Using a modern term retrospectively is only contestable when a contemporary term exists that may be used instead and/or when the definition of the modern term contains elements that are not applicable to earlier technological, social, or scientific understanding or practices. Second, although Cunningham asserts that modern media and society are too fundamentally different from their earlier iterations for the term “propaganda” to be applied to earlier propagandistic works, he provides no evidence to support such a claim. Although culture and technology have changed, people still engage with media by viewing them and hearing them, and there is no concrete evidence to suggest that human cognitive function has changed significantly throughout history. Therefore, even though media technology and

20 Ibid., 17-18.
21 Jowett and O’Donnell, 52.
22 See Jason Peacey, Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004), 2.
accessibility have changed, the human elements that lie at the heart of propaganda, the propagandist and propagandee, have remained the same. Moreover, because so many definitions of “propaganda” exist and authors continue to redefine the term, there is no reason why an author could not simply create a definition of “propaganda” that is general enough to be equally applicable to works from throughout recorded history.

The last two points of contention concerning the definition of propaganda that have appeared consistently in the scholarly literature relate to whether or not propaganda can be distinguished from information and whether or not it can be defined at all. The debate over the relationship of propaganda to information centers around a claim made by Ellul in 1957 that “information and propaganda ... cannot be separated from one another.” Some authors have taken this statement at face value and argued against it, saying that in “extending the concept to cover such a range of social phenomena that the specificity of the term is all but lost” and that “Ellul’s magnitude [is] ... troublesome because we believe that to analyze propaganda, one needs to be able to identify it.” Cunningham, however, attempts to defend Ellul by arguing that “Ellul is not saying that the concept of information is the same as the concept of propaganda. What he is saying is that in practice it is difficult, if not impossible, for the average person to distinguish between the two.” If we accept Cunningham’s explanation of Ellul’s statement, then no prominent scholar has actually attempted to argue that information and propaganda are one and the same conceptually and this contention in the scholarly community amounts to nothing more than a misunderstanding.

26 Cunningham, 102.
Finally, some scholars have argued that propaganda is undefinable because of its complexity and scope in practice. The first author to make such a claim was Leonard Doob, who claimed in 1989 that the diversity of historical and cultural contexts for propaganda usage make “a clear-cut definition of propaganda ... neither possible nor desireable.” Cunningham supports Doob’s claim and expands upon it, saying that “it will be evident to the reader by now that propaganda is too broad a phenomenon to compress into a definition, and that approaching it frontally as a ‘what’ may simply be the wrong way to go about understanding it.” Instead, Cunningham suggests we focus on describing how propaganda functions, and he provides several lists of the characteristic features of propaganda throughout his monograph. One of the most succinct descriptions he offers states that “propaganda is originally constituted by one or more of several recognizable epistemic defects: it poses as truth and genuine information when, in point of fact, it only uses them; it values credibility and actual belief over the higher moralities of understanding and knowledge; while it prefers to work with true beliefs and facts for purely strategic reasons, it is profoundly indifferent to the values of truth, knowledge, and understanding; it settles for underground assurances and certainties; it short circuits higher cognitive processes such as reflection, rigorous reasoning, and informed discourse ... thereby propagating the climate of illusion.” Cunningham’s longest summary description of

28 Cunningham, 154.
29 Ibid., 176.
30 Ibid., 156-157.
propaganda encompasses two and a half pages and consists of eleven items that relate to the multiple ways in which propaganda functions.31

Although I find many of Cunningham’s arguments compelling, and I will incorporate many of them into my own definition of propaganda, I disagree that propaganda cannot or should not be defined. Propaganda as a phenomenon is indeed complex, but no phenomenon is so complex that it cannot be defined. Lying is a phenomenon that is similar to propaganda; both lying and propaganda are communicative phenomena, and lying is similarly diverse in its manifestations and purposes. If it is possible to describe what lying is and to define it as well then it should be equally possible to define what propaganda is.

Along those lines, I propose, and will subsequently utilize, the following definition of propaganda, which draws most prominently from Jowett and O’Donnell and Cunningham (with some input from Moran) and may be seen mainly as a synthesis of those two perspectives on propaganda. Propaganda is fundamentally dishonest and manipulative; it is therefore a form of pseudo-communication (as discussed by Moran). Unlike rational discourse, which clearly states its goals or claims and argues logically from verifiable evidence to support them, propaganda manipulates consumers by bypassing their rational thought processes with covert/unclear arguments and/or appeals to their fears, desires, faiths, identities, or emotions generally. This process of manipulation can be intentional (what I call primary propaganda) on the part of the author, or unintentional (what I call secondary propaganda) as the result of unclear and/or irrational argumentation. In either case, once disarmed of their reason, consumers become

31 Cunningham, 176-178.
passive resources, fields of soil in which to propagate the covert or unclearly presented ideas conveyed via propaganda, rather than equal partners in a rational discourse.

Furthermore, I apply the designation of propaganda strictly, meaning that we may classify any apparent attempt at communication (music, visual art, speech, or writing) that partakes in illogical argumentation, subtext, or otherwise ambiguous intention, even in a single sentence, as propaganda. I suggest this application because intentional propaganda is always disguised as informative or persuasive communication, i.e. as reasonable discourse. As a result, propaganda works best when it appears least to be propaganda. In practice, propaganda may include false information, but it more often attempts to cloak itself in true facts. Some additional elements that are often associated with propaganda, but are not necessarily always present in propaganda, include logical fallacies, fabrication or the stretching of the truth, downplaying or ignoring contrary arguments, disguised authorship, disguised source material, and a higher premium placed on being believed and accomplishing its goals then on presenting or searching for the truth.

Broadside ballads, for example, are almost always propagandistic because they rarely state the reason for their publication or present their argument(s) explicitly and reasonably, relying instead on appeals to emotion, identity, faith, and fear. Newspaper articles from all periods of history can also often be shown to be propagandistic because of intentional or unintentional writing practices that mix authorial opinion into what is presented as factual, informative discourse and therefore misrepresent the intended function of the work. Likewise, songs and poems in general are susceptible to being identified as propaganda because they frequently deal in emotional subject matter and rarely state a main purpose or argument overtly.
III. Overview of the Historiography of Seventeenth-Century England

Having discussed and defined propaganda, we will now turn to a brief overview of the historiography of seventeenth-century England. England during the seventeenth century saw what was perhaps the most concentrated period of intellectual and societal change in the history of that nation to the present day. The proliferation of movable-type printing increased the speed and reach of communication in the same fundamental way that the proliferation of internet access has in the twentieth century, with the end result being an accelerated rate of social change in both cases (whatever the causes of that change may have been). Likewise, the break with Rome in the mid-sixteenth century set England on a path that saw an ever growing struggle for and against religious freedom slowly transform the nation by the end of the century into one that tolerated (though uneasily at first) Protestant nonconformists such as members of the Society of Friends (Quakers) and had begun to move toward toleration for Catholics as well.

As is common with the histories of monarchies, scholars traditionally divide the seventeenth century in England into five main periods according to the accessions of kings and queens, or other major shifts in rule (as in the case of the Interregnum), and by periods of war. Therefore, most discussions of England in the seventeenth century begin in 1603 with the accession of James I to the throne following the death of Elizabeth I and continue with the early Stuart period (1603-1642), which includes the reigns of James I and Charles I and the beginning of the civil wars; the civil war period itself (1642-1649); the Interregnum period (1649-1659), during which the country was governed by Parliament (later alongside the Lord Protector Oliver Cromwell); the Restoration (1660-1688), which marks the re-establishment of the monarchy with the return of the Stuarts and the reigns of Charles II and James II; the Glorious Revolution (1689)
that deposed James II and installed William of Orange and Mary Stuart as rulers of England; the
reign of William and Mary, which lasted until 1702, and finally the reign of Queen Anne, which
ended in 1714 with her death and the end of the Stuart line.

Though the events that make up the history of this period are well documented, the
causes of these events and the factors that motivated those who participated in them have been
continually (and sometimes hotly) debated over the past century. In the course of these debates,
four main schools of historical thought have emerged: the Whigs (represented by scholars such
as Thomas B. Macaulay), the Marxists (represented by authors such as Christopher Hill), the
Revisionists (represented by scholars such as Kevin Sharpe), and the Post-Revisionists or Anti-
Revisionists (represented by scholars such as Peter Lake). 32 Though the summary of these
scholarly schools of thought that follows will, of course, generalize and overlook the nuances
and internal conflicts of each scholarly tradition, I can at least say that I am not the first to
present these schools in such a way; indeed, the general comments I will make about them are in
turn based on general comments made by well-respected historians who have come before me.33

Chronologically, the first and longest-running scholarly perspective has been that of the
Whigs, so called because of their association with and sympathy for the Whig political party.
From the Glorious Revolution in 1688 until approximately the 1950s, Whig historians were a

32 Kevin Sharpe, Remapping Early Modern England (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 4-20; Kevin
Sharpe, Reading Revolutions: The Politics of Reading in Early Modern England (New Haven: Yale University Press,
2000), 3-6.

33 Kevin Sharpe, Reading Revolutions and Remapping Early Modern England; J.C.D. Clark, Revolution And
Rebellion: State and Society in England in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries (New York: Cambridge
University Press, 1986); Barbara Shapiro, Political Communication and Political Culture in England, 1558-1688
(Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012); Jason Peacey, Print And Public Politics In The English Revolution
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Nicholas Tyacke, The English Revolution (Manchester:
Manchester University Press, 2007); David Underdown, A Freeborn People: Politics and the Nation in Seventeenth-
significant, if not dominant, force in the shaping of English historical thought. The Whig perspective was a teleological one that sought to show the clear historical progress of the English people toward representative government and personal liberty. To Whig historians, the change that occurred in seventeenth-century England was the result of religious and social undercurrents that began with the *Magna Carta* and the English reformation and progressively increased, through social unrest and increased political engagement by common people, toward Parliament’s assertions of political power in the English Civil Wars and Glorious Revolution.

From the 1950s until the 1970s, Marxist historians represented a significant facet of English historical thought. Like the Whigs, Marxist historians saw the seventeenth century teleologically. Unlike the Whigs, however, Marxists saw the social change of the seventeenth century in England as being part of a progression from feudal society toward capitalism, the rise of the bourgeoisie, and revolution. Accordingly, Marxists emphasized the study of seventeenth-century English economics and social change and growing unrest at the lower end of the English social spectrum.

Revisionist historiography emerged in the 1970s in opposition to both Marxists and Whigs. Revisionists took issue mainly with the teleological perspective of their predecessors, not only because it caused Whigs and Marxists to dismiss and disregard evidence that contradicted their concept of historical progress toward a particular goal but also because such a position required them to emphasize in excess the level of unrest in the period and to anachronistically ascribe desires for liberty or revolution to contemporaries and contemporary events. Revisionists reacted against these elements in their predecessors’ works and instead chose to emphasize consensus and hopes for reconciliation among all parties involved in the civil war and the
various other conflicts (whether political, religious, or otherwise) of the century. They also argued that religious tensions, rather than political ideology, along with short-term political miscalculations and mistakes were a main instigator of the civil war and the other moments of political tension in the century.\textsuperscript{34} In the words of Kevin Sharpe, one of the leading figures of Revisionist thought, “We questioned the model of escalating conflict between crown and parliament; calling for closer study of more evidence, we criticized the selective narrative constructed around high points of conflict; and we rejected teleological determinism as a historical philosophy.”\textsuperscript{35}

Most recently, the Anti/Post-Revisionists have leveled some of the same types of criticisms against the Revisionists as the Revisionists leveled against the Whigs and Marxists. The Revisionists, they say, de-emphasized printed texts, especially those from the government, in an effort to downplay the aggressive, divisive language that was being used by both the crown and Parliament.\textsuperscript{36} Anti/Post-Revisionists have accepted the criticism of teleology that was posed by the Revisionists, but have combined that with an emphasis on the role of ideology in the changes and events of the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{37}

In the discussions of history that appear throughout this work, I will rely on a Post-Revisionist perspective that accepts many elements of Revisionist scholarship but at the same time adopts a more inclusive explanation of seventeenth-century English historical cause and effect. Accordingly, I will draw upon the recent work of several scholars who acknowledge the

\textsuperscript{34} Underdown, 6.
\textsuperscript{35} Sharpe, \textit{Remapping}, 9.
\textsuperscript{36} Sharpe, \textit{Remapping}, 15, 20-23; Underdown, \textit{A Freeborn People}, 6; Sharpe, \textit{Reading Revolutions}, 4.
\textsuperscript{37} Sharpe, \textit{Remapping}, 10; Sharpe, \textit{Reading Revolutions}, 4. Although a leading member of the Revisionist school, Sharpe in his recent writings accepted many of the Post-Revisionist criticisms of the Revisionists and appeared to be sympathetic to Post-Revisionist ideology and methodologies.
influences of religion, human error, and ideology on the historical events and societal changes that occurred in seventeenth-century England. Scholars such as Austin Woolrych, Craig Rose, Edward Vallance, and Scott Sowerby, rather than discussing the century as a whole, have published monographs that focus on individual periods within the century, and it is to these close examinations of the history and politics of seventeenth-century England that I will resort when discussing the five periods that are covered by the five main chapters of this dissertation.\textsuperscript{38} Although I will return to the topic of history often in the following chapters, and therefore have little reason to discuss it further in this introduction, it is worth discussing background information on the printing and propaganda practices of seventeenth-century England before proceeding any further.

\section*{IV. Print and Propaganda in Seventeenth-Century England}

The print industry in England developed slowly during the first century after the introduction of the printing press to England in 1476 by William Caxton. Throughout the sixteenth century, print output and demand grew steadily, thanks in no small part to the eruption of sustained social division that surrounded the Protestant Reformation and the break with Rome.\textsuperscript{39} Output in 1588 was approximately 250 separate items. That number did not double until 1613, when output reached approximately 500 separate items for the first time. It took almost twenty additional years for output to reach approximately 700 separate items for the first time,

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
which occurred in 1630. There is evidence to suggest, however, that output would have been consistently much higher if not for the impact of a number of forces that combined to keep print output low, including censorship, regulation, and centralization of the trade in London.

Printing in England was subject to many attempts at regulation and censorship beginning in the reign of Henry VIII in the early sixteenth century and continuing throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries with only brief interruptions or relaxations between 1640 and 1642, 1660 and 1662, 1679 and 1685, and from 1695 until 1710. The first regulation and censorship of printing came in the form of a royal proclamation from 1538 that required printed works, especially those on religion, to be licensed and also outlawed the import and sale of English works from other countries. The English government was continually dissatisfied with its ability to silence political and religious discourse, however, and continued to pass new legislation throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries that was aimed at increasing the efficiency of print regulation and thereby the reach of censorship. One of Elizabeth I’s first acts as queen in 1559 was to grant the Stationers’ Company the right and responsibility to oversee the licensing of print and to search for seditious and unlicensed literature. Furthermore, the Injunctions issued to the Court of High Commission in the same year made the Bishop of London and the archbishops of Canterbury and York responsible for making sure that “heretical, seditious, or unseemly” works would not be published. An Ordinance in 1566 extended the same responsibilities to the Privy Council and the Chancellors of Oxford and Cambridge. In the 1580s, the government enacted new measures to restrict the expression of opinions that were
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40 Raymond, 164-167; this passage contains excellent graphs of print output from 1588 to 1688.
41 The 1559 Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, quoted in Raymond, 8.
42 Peacey, 133.
contrary to those endorsed by the government and to promote the expression of ideas that supported the agendas of the government by regulating the number of printing presses allowed to operate in the realm, restricting printing to specific towns and authorized stationers, and by pursuing legal action against those who printed libels and seditious materials (keeping in mind, of course, that the government was the entity that decided what did and did not constitute seditious material).  

The censorship practices that were instituted and developed under the Tudors were continued under the Stuarts, and both James I and Charles I sought to suppress debate to maintain unity—even if only the illusion of it. Though James I did not increase the level of censorship that was placed on the print industry, he did nothing to decrease it either. Charles I, however, oversaw several expansions of press and print censorship, expansions that to at least some extent contributed to the beginning of the English Civil War. In light of the growing religious division in the country, Charles I issued a proclamation in 1629 that forbid the “making [of] bookes, either pro or contra” a particular religious position. In 1632, Charles I again moved to suppress dissenting opinions by prohibiting the publication of corantos, which were news publications. The last, and most significant, increase in print censorship during Charles I’s reign occurred between 1633 and 1640, with the rise and fall of William Laud as the Archbishop of Canterbury.

43 Shapiro, 28; Peacey, *Politicians*, 133.
45 *By the King. A Proclamation, for the suppressing of a Book, intituled, Appello Caesarem, or An Appeal to Caesar* (17 January, 1629), quoted in Raymond, 166.
46 Raymond, 149.
As Archbishop, Laud was partially responsible for the oversight of print licensing, which he used as a means by which to advance his religious agenda and silence voices of dissent. Licensing, from the beginning, was a process of not only rejecting specific works in whole, but also of rejecting them in part and of altering them to make them acceptable for publication. Such a process allowed for the illusion of debate but assured that the side favored by the licensers would always present the more convincing argument. In response to Laud’s strict ideological censorship, Parliament abolished the High Commission and the Star Chamber, which temporarily suspended Laud’s licensing system and all print censorship in England. It is important to note, however, that Parliament (or at least the majority of its members) was not in favor of establishing a free press in England; their goal in suspending the licensing system was to affect an ideological shift that favored Parliament and a Calvinist religious perspective in all future printed materials.

After the suspension of licensing, print output grew sharply and suddenly. Scholars disagree on exactly how many works were printed in 1640, but estimates range from 848 to around 1,000. To put it another way, output in 1640 increased by approximately 36% over the average output in the 1630s, output increased by 140% in 1641 over the output of 1640, and the output in 1642 increased by approximately 550% over the average established in the 1630s, with approximately 4,000 printed items. These numbers give us some idea of how effective licensing was at preventing authors from publishing their works before 1640. Though the
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charged atmosphere of the time makes it difficult to say how much higher the average would have been if licensing and censorship had not been in effect since 1538, they at least give us some idea of the discrepancy.

With licensing suspended in 1640, Parliament undertook two activities related to printing. First, they held hearings to address the grievances of authors who had had their works rejected or altered by Laud’s licensers. Concurrently, they began the process of reorganizing and reestablishing the licensing system in a manner that would be favorable to Parliament and its prevailing religious perspective. The system that Parliament instituted in 1641, however, proved insufficient for restricting print output and was unequipped to handle the volume of print that was being produced by the printers and publishers who had tasted an unrestricted publishing system in 1640. As a result, the new licensing system collapsed in early 1642 and was not reestablished until August of 1642. This relapse to an unrestricted press resulted in the highest single-year print output of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Over the next sixteen years, Parliament and the Commonwealth government made nine major attempts to increase the effectiveness of its regulation, and by extension censorship, of printing in England. In October 1642, the committee for printing was ordered to sit daily in an effort to gain greater control over the industry. This was followed by the appointment by the Committee of Examinations in March 1643 of searchers that were tasked with destroying unauthorized presses and arresting unlicensed printers. An ordinance was passed in June of 1643 to reinstate licensing of individual works because previous orders by Parliament against seditious
and libelous works “had taken little or no effect.” Legal action was further extended to those who published and sold libelous literature, through a Parliamentary ordinance issued in November of 1643. In 1647, a press ordinance was issued that added additional punishments for individuals across the print production chain, from authors to printers to merchants. This same ordinance encouraged average citizens to assist in the regulatory process by offering monetary rewards, as much as £100, for information that would lead to the apprehension of sedition works. In search of greater control over licensing, Parliament also began consolidating power in government offices, which resulted in a diminished role in the process of licensing for the Stationers’ Company. The press act of 1649 confirmed that the Stationers’ Company was authorized to search for unlicensed works and seditious material, but at the same time it limited the ability to license to those appointed by the Council, to the secretary of the army, and the Clerk of Parliament. In 1653, the press act of 1649 was revised to make enforcement more successful, to replace the secretary of the army with an individual appointed by the Council, and to reaffirm the Council’s right to oversee licensing and printing activities. The last attempts by the Commonwealth government to increase its control over printing activities came in the form of an order in 1655 to suspend the licenses of all but two of the newspapers operating at the time, and on 22 June, 1658 the Council sent a draft warrant to Cromwell “for executing the Acts against unlicensed books” and reiterated their expectations to the Stationers’ Company that they would “put into execution the Acts of 14 June 1643, 28 Sept. 1649, and 7 January 1652-3.”

53 United Kingdom, Calendar of State Papers Domestic, June 1658, vol. 181, p. 71.
15 June, 1659 they made a final order that “scandalous books and pamphlets” were to be suppressed.\

Although there are two notable anomalies in the print output of this period, Parliament was successful overall at steadily decreasing the print output from 1643 to 1659. In 1643, output dropped from over 4,000 the previous year to approximately 2,000 items. Output continued to decline until 1648 when the second phase of the war (or the second civil war depending on whether one considers the conflict to be one whole war that lasted from 1642 until 1651, or three separate wars lasting from 1642 to 1646, 1648 to 1649, and 1649 to 1651) brought with it an increase in print output from approximately 1,800 works in 1647 to over 3,000 works in 1648. Parliament regained control over the presses in 1649, however, and output declined again to a low of approximately 1,500 works in 1651. In 1653, output made the last sharp increase of the Interregnum, rising to approximately 1,700 works published that year. Print output continued to decline until it reached its lowest point in nearly twenty years with approximately 1,300 works published. Although these statistics are approximate and based on what has survived rather than what was actually printed (which in any case we will never know), they nevertheless not only reveal a correlation between print output increases and relaxation of government regulation but also show a correlation between increased print regulation and censorship and the gradual decrease in print output. They also corroborate the assertion made in much of the recent scholarship on the matter that censorship worked reasonably well and had both an active (in stopping works that were already written) and passive (in preventing and discouraging authors

54 United Kingdom, Calendar of State Papers Domestic, June 1659, vol. 203, p. 374; Peacey, Politicians, 133-161. 55 Raymond, 164.
from attempting to write in the first place) effect on print throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.  

1660 brought the restoration of the monarchy and a reorganization of the English government. It did not, however, bring an end to print licensing or press censorship. The first legal action taken by the Restoration government to regulate and censor printing appeared in 1662 in the form of the Act for Preventing the Frequent Abuses in Printing Seditious, Treasonable, and Unlicensed Books and Pamphlets. This Act was intended as a means to reduce and limit the number of printing presses in use and to prevent any individual from printing, buying, selling, publishing, or importing “any heretical seditious schismatical or offensive Bookes or Pamphlets wherein any Doctrine or Opinion shall be asserted or maintained which is contrary to Christian Faith or the Doctrine or Discipline of the Church of England or which shall or may tend or be to the scandall of Religion or the Church or the Government or the Governers of the Church State or Common wealth or of any Corporation or particular person or persons whatsoever.” To accomplish these goals, the Act instituted twelve regulations, many of which had already been a part of previous Acts relating to printing. They are as follows: 1) all books that are to be printed must first be entered into the register of the Stationers’ Company; 2) all works to be published must be licensed by an individual who has been approved by the state to perform that duty; 3) no English books or books containing a significant amount of English text may be imported into the realm; 4) texts may only be imported through the port of London; 5) All works must bear the name(s) of their author(s) unless otherwise allowed by the licenser; 6)
the Stationers’ Company must be notified of all locations where printing is to take place and of the production of any printing presses or printing type; 7) only twenty master printers may be allowed to operate in the realm at any one time; 8) the number of Stationer apprentices operating in the realm is to be regulated; 9) work must be provided for unemployed printers; 10) government officials have the right to search for unlicensed works, to seize them, and to imprison their printers, owners, or anyone associated with them; 11) those found guilty of transgressing against this Act will be barred from practicing their trade for three years, and those convicted a second time will be barred from practicing their trade permanently and subject to other punishments not to include life and limb; 12) after a work has been printed, three copies of the finished product will be set aside and deposited with various government officials as specified in the Act.\(^58\) In addition to this Act, which was in effect from 1662 to 1695 (with the exception of a period of lapse between 1679 and 1685), the government also had constant recourse to legal action against libel and seditious literature, the search and seizure of books, and monetary incentives offered for information leading to the discovery of such literature.\(^59\)

Turning again to print output, the approximate numbers available to us again suggest that government regulation and censorship influenced the number of works produced during the second half of the seventeenth century. Between 1660 and 1665, print output dropped sharply from over 3,000 works to just over 1,000. Print output in this period was also negatively impacted by the Great Fire of 1666, which brought output down below 1,000 items for the first time since 1640. Output then fluctuated but slowly rose to around 1,500 individual works produced between 1674 and 1679, at which point the lapse of the 1662 printing Act and the

\(^{58}\) Ibid., 1662.
\(^{59}\) Raymond, 337.
combination of the Popish Plot of 1678 and the Exclusion Crisis of 1679 brought print output back up to approximately 3,000 items. Between 1679 and 1685, output fluctuated between 3,000 and 2,500 works per year. In 1686, output declined to approximately 1,500 items, which became the print output of an average year between 1686 and 1699. Two final periods saw sharp increases and steep declines in print output in the seventeenth century; the period between 1688 and 1690 saw an increase from 1,500 to approximately 2,500 items, which almost certainly was (at least in part) the result of the Glorious Revolution and the passage of the Toleration Act. The last spike in output occurred in 1695 as a result of, at least in part, the government’s failure to renew the 1662 Press Act. Although there was no licensing act in place from 1695 until 1710, it is worth mentioning again that the government still had recourse to prosecution for seditious literature and libel as a means to censor print and public discourse. In addition to showing the impact of regulation and censorship, these numbers also show, as one might expect, the extent to which printing in seventeenth-century England was influenced by, or driven by, current events: much of the print output during the seventeenth century was either descriptive of current events (i.e., news) or participatory (i.e., polemic/propagandistic).

Whatever perspective it took on current events, print output could not have continued to grow in spite of harsh regulation and censorship if the audience/readership for printed works had not grown as well. Exact counts of what percentage of the population could read during any given decade of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are, given the available evidence at the present, impossible to achieve. Some scholars have accepted the statistics presented by David Raymond, 164; Alan Veylit, “Some Statistics on the Number of Surviving Printed Titles for Great Britain and Dependencies from the Beginnings of Print in England to the year 1800,” English Short-Title Catalog (1473-1800), accessed August 29, 2015, http://estc.ucr.edu/ESTCStatistics.html.
Cressy in *Literacy and the Social Order*, while others are skeptical of his method’s accuracy, especially because he bases his conclusions in large part on the number of individuals that could sign their names on wills, contracts, etc., which does not take into account the reality that writing and reading were not pedagogically synonymous in the early modern world; women were sometimes taught to read but not write, many individuals could have known only how to write their own names but otherwise been functionally illiterate, and others could have been completely literate but been forced through infirmity or personal preference to sign their legal documents in a manner that appears illiterate (such as with an X). Rather than be forced to wrestle with the mystery that is literacy, however, it is possible to argue that literacy numbers (whatever they may be) are not as important for understanding print’s place in seventeenth-century English society as information concerning how individuals, regardless of whether or not they could read, engaged with print, who bought print, and to what types of readers print was marketed.

Moreover, literacy only represents a potential to consume print, while the answers to these questions of what, who, and how represent actual societal interactions with print in England during the seventeenth century. Literary culture in seventeenth-century England was still in the process of transitioning from the older practice of reading as an external vocalization (reading aloud) to an internal one (silent reading, which is now the norm). Individuals read aloud to themselves and to others, which thereby expanded the potential audience for printed works.
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beyond the ranks of literate society.\footnote{Tim Harris, \textit{London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II} (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 98-100.} In addition to being read aloud, broadside ballads were sung and often contained woodcut pictures that were, albeit loosely, often related to the topic of the ballad. Because print was relatively affordable, especially short works like broadsides and pamphlets, all but the poorest members of society (beggars, the unemployed, the chronically infirmed, etc.) could participate as readers and sometimes even as authors.\footnote{Peacey, \textit{Print}, 251.} While long and/or scholarly works were always part of the regular print output of established presses, the quick turn-around and low initial cost of printing short works (mainly broadside ballads and pamphlets), which would appeal to and be accessible to the widest possible readership, offered printers the profit that both sustained the industry and allowed it to grow.\footnote{R.A. Houston, \textit{Literacy in Early Modern Europe} (New York: Pearson, 2002), 196; Harris, 98-100; Raymond, 26.} Indeed, rather than thinking of seventeenth-century English print as high class or low class, it would be more accurate to conceptualize the industry as one divided between a mass market and a specialty market. Mass-market works to which nearly all members of society had access drove the industry, while specialty works (treatises, scholarly works, and the equivalent of vanity publication) served as a supplement and often reached a considerably smaller audience. We know, for example, that members of the upper class collected broadside ballads and pamphlets and that members of the artisan class discussed and debated politics, so there are at least records that contradict such a clean delineation of print consumption along class lines.\footnote{Harris, \textit{London}, 29; Raymond, 6; Pepys’s Broadside Collection.}

When individuals in early modern England consumed, discussed, and debated the products of this ever growing marketplace of ideas that printing represented, they did so in reference to their own ideas about what constituted truth and how one can practically designate a
Skilled propagandists in turn needed to know the most efficient pathways to convincing their propagandees to think or act in the manner they desired. While propagandists often do not lie outright, because obvious lies can be easily disproved, they do take the quickest path to their goal(s), which can involve lying and distorting or misrepresenting the truth. Therefore, having some idea of how individuals in this period determined trueness will help us to understand how propagandists and propagandees approached the propaganda works that will be discussed in the remainder of this dissertation.

In general, anatomically modern humans of average or higher cognitive ability have always used their own experiences and logical thought processes (via formal logic or informal common sense) to judge trueness. Indeed, human civilization could not have developed without the intellectual abilities to distinguish between the reality and falsity of ideas and create new knowledge by synthesizing existing facts through recourse to experience and logical deduction/induction. Because these two means of determining the truth are universal and essentially constant, we need not discuss them in further detail here. There remains, however, a third means of judging veracity that is just as fundamental as experience and logic. Though universal, its constituent parts are not constant, and it encompasses a variety of approaches to judging the truth that are time, place, and culture specific: the appeal to authority constitutes this third means.66

At the beginning of Western thought, the Ancient Greeks (as exemplified by Plato and Aristotle) placed authority in the realm of opinion rather than true knowledge and therefore
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rejected its use in determining the truth.\textsuperscript{67} This perspective continued through the early Middle Ages. In the \textit{Summa Theologica}, however, Thomas Aquinas argued that appeals to authority are valid determinants of truth when that authority comes from divine revelation rather than from human reason.\textsuperscript{68} It follows from this position, and Aquinas’s own statements on the infallibility of the Church, that divine authority extended to divinely mandated/sanctioned offices, such as those of the pope, kings, and the clergy/scholars licensed by the Church. This allowed holders of these offices to appeal to their authority as evidence of their truthfulness and for others to use the same appeal when citing them.\textsuperscript{69} Indeed, this divine authority led to the rise of the Medieval complex of sacred, scholarly, and secular power that was vested in the clergy, scholars, and rulers respectively. This system of divine mandate not only gave the clergy, scholars, and rulers political and moral authority over those not endowed with similar divine mandates, but also gave them the final say in determining what was true in both the sacred and secular realms.\textsuperscript{70} Catholic scholars of the Renaissance, such as Toletus in his \textit{Summam Theologicae S. Thomas Aquinatis Enarratio}, even codified the relationship between the lay person and the truth as being mediated by members from this authoritative class.\textsuperscript{71} Two examples of how this system applied to music theory specifically can be seen below in the discussion of the treatises by Thomas Morley and Charles Butler. Both authors co-opt this traditionally Catholic authority of the divine mandate to make moral pronouncements to their readers.

\textsuperscript{67} Rivka Feldhay, “Authority, Political Theology, and the Politics of Knowledge in the Transition from Medieval to Early Modern Catholicism,” \textit{Social Research} 73, no. 4 (Winter 2006): 1068.
\textsuperscript{68} Ibid., 1070.
\textsuperscript{69} Ibid., 1071.
\textsuperscript{70} Ibid., 1073.
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., 1078-1079.
Until approximately the middle of the seventeenth century, this “intellectual establishment” was commonly accepted as a reliable source of truth across Europe. As this establishment started to break down under prolonged pressure from the Reformation and the rise of empiricism in England, however, a new standard began to develop for appeals to authority. Rather than divine revelation through divine mandate, disinterestedness and personal virtue/reputation became the prime marks of a trustworthy authority in English society. This not only includes personal virtue in general, but also the evaluatee’s history of truthfulness, the evaluatee’s reputation for intellectual rigor, the evaluator’s emotional relationship to the evaluatee, and even elements of the evaluatee’s identity. Members of the same religious sect or political party were (and still are) often more likely to believe the truth claims of members of their own group(s) than they were the claims of outsiders. Having a reputation as a good Quaker, a faithful Protestant in general, or as a loyal Whig, for example, could thereby increase one’s trustworthiness. It is also worth pointing out that multiple evaluative techniques are often applied simultaneously when determining trueness. A truth evaluator may decide a statement is true because he/she likes the person making the statement, holds a similar political/religious identity as the speaker/author, and has some experience with the matter about which the truth is to be determined.

The appeal to authority is therefore a valuable technique for convincing readers/listeners that a statement is true, because it does not require the addressee to know anything about the
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topic and it does not require them to be able to correctly reason about the evidence given. Indeed, no evidence need be given for the appeal to authority beyond the assertion of the authority of the source or speaker/author. The appeal to authority can also be said to encompass both ethos and pathos and therefore plays a large part in the traditional techniques of rhetoric.

For all of the reasons mentioned above, appeals to authority are frequently used by propagandists. Propaganda is also necessarily allied with political authority, because propaganda enables one of the main functions of political authority. As Paul Griffiths, Adam Fox, and Steve Hindle argue, the “principal purpose [of political authority in early modern England] was to perpetuate existing ideologies and structures of power by which rule was preserved.”

Propaganda helps to support political authority and in turn is able to draw on political authority to support its other goals.

Accordingly, propaganda was both a constant facet of and driving force behind the print industry. While the government was eager to suppress propaganda that ran contrary to its aims, it at the same time freely disseminated propaganda in pursuit of its own agendas. Some of the earliest propaganda printed in England was sanctioned, commissioned, or produced by the government itself. In the 1530s, for example, government officials, like Thomas Cromwell, oversaw the production of works that sought to legitimize and defend the break with Rome and encourage obedience. These investments by the government in propaganda and counterpropaganda served only to fuel religious debate, whether legally sanctioned or not, and curious/concerned readers were happy to pay for the privilege of observing the debate via print.
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Indeed, as Joad Raymond has argued, “religious controversy brought printed propaganda which helped to create readerships, who subsequently turned to secular media.”

Although the English government produced some of the first English propaganda, it was not until the English Civil War that the government, or at least one side of it, began to consistently and enthusiastically attempt to speak to the common people through printed propaganda. Even before war was officially declared between Parliament and Charles I’s Royalists, Parliament turned to print as a means to garner popular support and air its grievances. Royalists, on the other hand, were by all accounts reluctant to fully commit to propagandizing, or at least not to the same degree that Parliament was. Some scholars have also argued that Royalists targeted a predominantly high-class audience with their propaganda, which may account for their lower propaganda output overall. In addition to employing in-house propagandists, both sides used their licensing systems to approve sympathetic works and commissioned propaganda covertly so as to benefit from the anonymity that both processes provided them.

After the war, the Interregnum government continued its propaganda campaign in an effort to establish its legitimacy, advance its agenda, and maintain social order. In concert with its biased use of licensing, the government also employed a mix of scholars and popular writers for the purpose of crafting propaganda that would reach and influence the largest possible audience through a balance of serious, scholarly writing with simple, plain language and

---
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78 Peacey, *Politicians*, 32 and 36.
79 Ibid., 36-37.
80 Ibid., 41 and 307.
81 Ibid., 318.
82 Peacey, *Politicians*, 6, 185.
moments of humor. The civil war and the Interregnum forever changed the scope of governmental involvement in the production of propaganda, and the restoration of the monarchy therefore did not bring with it a return to the “reluctant,” “episodic” nature of governmental propaganda. Indeed, propaganda, be it governmental, religious, moral, or economic, remains to the present day an integral facet of political/public discourse.

Indeed, contemporaries, at least, believed that propaganda was in use and that it was effective at manipulating the public, as when D’Avenant discusses the “...anciently been, and may be now, by heightening the Characters of Valour, Temperance, Natural Justice, and Complacency to Government.” Contemporaries also identified a number of specific uses for propaganda; although many of these were identified during the civil war period, they nevertheless apply equally well to the remainder of the century. They include: addressing criticism, countering opposition propaganda, convincing people to serve in the military, convincing people to willingly pay their taxes, teaching people what is right (at least from the propagandist’s perspective), undeceiving the people, and stirring up/inflaming the people.

If an individual wanted to use propaganda for one of the purposes mentioned above, he had two choices regarding how to proceed; he could either write the propaganda himself or he could hire a propagandist. For politicians, the second choice was by far the most common, but many individuals who possessed the skills to write propaganda or otherwise lacked the resources to hire a propagandist also tried their hands at public discourse. In either case, propagandists themselves were motivated by a number of personal and/or professional desires. The most

84 Harris, 96; Peacey, *Politicians*, 36.
85 Harris, 96; William D’Avenant, *The Siege of Rhodes* (London: Henry Harringman, 1670), A3r.
common assumption regarding propagandists is that they were driven by a desire for profit and were willing to write for the highest bidder. This must have been true for some propagandists, and they certainly had financial responsibilities that they would have considered when accepting propaganda commissions, but the available evidence suggests that profit was not always their primary goal. Authors have always written to share and express their opinions, and propagandists were (are) no different in that respect. Likewise, propagandists wrote, as authors in general do, to show off their literary and rhetorical skills. Some authors of propaganda wrote to defend themselves personally from ideological opponents, to defend their chosen ideology, or to defend their friends and allies against rumors or professional criticism. Some propagandists also wrote out of a desire to advance the common good or to further the search for truth. Finally, some authors printed their works to gain the favor and protection of a patron or to satisfy other individuals who may have encouraged them to share their work with the general public.

Having briefly discussed the history of printing/publication and propaganda in seventeenth-century England and sketched the human components of its creation and reception, this section will conclude with a discussion of the style of seventeenth-century English propaganda, the most common forms that it took when printed, and a discussion of the genres discussed in this work. If the purpose of propaganda is to reach and convince the largest possible audience, then the most popular print genres would logically be the most natural and successful vehicles for propaganda. Indeed, the scholarly interest in seventeenth-century English propaganda that has continued to grow over the past twenty years has identified three main genres that were responsible for conveying the majority of printed propaganda to the public.

87 Ibid., 300-302.
88 Ibid., 67-70, 75.
during this period. These genres, the broadside ballad, pamphlet, and sermon also happened to be the most popular print genres that were cultivated in early modern England.

Broadside ballads were the cheapest, fastest to produce, and most numerous form of print in early modern England. Each average broadside consisted of a single sheet of paper printed on one side with verse text in columns and usually (but not always) a woodcut image placed above the text with an indication of the tune to which the ballad would be sung. Ballads were one part news, one part entertainment, and one part social commentary. Furthermore, broadside ballads were often printed in black-letter font (which was the default font in the sixteenth century but was gradually replaced in the early seventeenth century with white-letter font—the forerunner of the most common fonts in use today) even after it fell out of use as the default font for standard book and pamphlet printing. Some ballads were printed in white-letter font, and this type of ballad has been identified as being directed at a more educated audience than black-letter ballads and more consistently connected to political discourse. Because broadsides were so numerous and of an ephemeral nature, only a fraction of the ballads that were originally printed have survived to the present day. Angela McShane’s bibliography of political broadside ballads in seventeenth-century England, as mentioned above, is the first major work to address the use of broadside ballads as political commentary/propaganda and forms the foundation on which the discussions of broadside ballads in this dissertation are based.

Like broadsides, pamphlets in general were often very reasonably priced, but unlike broadsides, “pamphlet” as a term applied to a more diverse range of possible page lengths,
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90 McShane, xxiii-xxiv.
writing styles, and contents. In retrospect, we can say that a pamphlet was in most cases a quarto-sized book that consisted of between eight and ninety-six pages.\textsuperscript{91} An average pamphlet was likely to be written in an accessible, nontechnical, uncomplicated style, but if the author wished to address a scholarly audience, then a scholarly, technical discussion (complete with extensive marginalia) was possible.\textsuperscript{92} Likewise, pamphlets were often political, either strictly relating to society in general or including discussions of religion, but pamphlets could nevertheless focus on any topic, including poetry, travel, or fantastic stories.\textsuperscript{93} Joad Raymond offers a definition of the pamphlet in his \textit{Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain} that is worth reproducing here. According to Raymond, a pamphlet is “a short, vernacular work, generally printed in quarto format, costing no more than a few pennies, of topical interest or engaging with social, political or ecclesiastical issues.”\textsuperscript{94} Perhaps because there were so many of them or perhaps because they were so easy to produce, pamphlets developed a negative reputation as untruthful, fleeting, and popular, yet it was their popularity that ensured that society not only accepted pamphlets as the primary mode of public discourse in print, but also eventually embraced them.\textsuperscript{95}

The sermon, both in spoken and print forms, was consistently used as a vehicle for propaganda throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. During this period, the sermon was a natural choice for presenting propaganda because it carried with it a level of trust and authority that would have been unrivaled for some readers and considerable in any case. Indeed,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{91} Raymond, 5.
\item \textsuperscript{92} Ibid., 44.
\item \textsuperscript{93} Ibid., 26.
\item \textsuperscript{94} Ibid., 8.
\item \textsuperscript{95} Ibid., 10-11, 26.
\end{itemize}
as Barbara Shapiro attests, “published sermons sold well and reached a larger portion of the population than most publications.”96 Sermons were also the most common work to be produced upon request, and many were published by or for the government.97 Even those that did not bear the mark of official request would have nevertheless been sanctioned through the licensing process.98 From Henry VIII’s reign throughout the seventeenth century, the government not only used sermons, such as the *Homily on Obedience* and the *Homily against Disobedience and Willfull Rebellion*, to convey propaganda to the public, who were required by law to attend religious services that were presided over by ministers chosen and employed by the government, but they also regulated those who were allowed to preach to prevent unapproved messages from being conveyed to the people.99 When sermons were printed, especially from the civil war period onward, they were often simplified to make them more accessible to a wide audience and thereby increase their effectiveness as propaganda.100 Although sermons were not used to convey propaganda related to music until the 1690s, their use during that decade, as I will argue, was both coordinated and numerically substantial.

Music treatise publication was fundamentally identical to pamphlet publication, though licensing restrictions for music publication would apply. Indeed, many music treatises would fit within the definition of a pamphlet as given above and were relatively short, concisely worded manuals that focus strictly on musical instruction aimed at beginner amateurs of at least a high enough social class to afford music books and instruments. Early examples of this type include
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William Bathe’s *A Brieve Introduction to the Skill of Song* and William Barley’s *The Pathway to Musick*; examples from mid-century include John Playford’s *A Brieve Introduction to the Skill of Musick* and Thomas Campion’s *The Art of Setting or Composing of Musick in Parts*; and examples from the end of the century include Robert Carr’s *The Delightful Companion: or, Choice New Lessons for The Recorder or Flute* and William Gilbert’s *A Compendium, Containing Exact Rules to be Observed in the Composing of Two or more Parts.*

Music treatises of more substantial size (both in terms of length and format) were also published, including Thomas Morley’s *Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practicall Musick* from the turn of the century, Charles Butler’s *The Principles of Musik* from around the middle of the century, and Thomas Mace’s *Musick’s Monument* from the end of the century. These larger works often include considerable amounts of authorial commentary on the musical culture of the time, and it is in this commentary that the potential (and realization as I will argue in future chapters) for propagandistic content lies. Morley, for example, writes that

> There have also been some, who (knowing their own insufficiencie, and not daring to disallow, nor being able to improve any thing in the booke) have nevertheless gone about to discrédite both mee and it another waie, affirming that I have by setting out thereof maliciously gone about to take awaye the livings from a number of honest poore men, who live (and that honestly) upon teaching not halfe of that which in this booke may be found. But to answere those malicious caterpillers, [...] this booke will be so farre from the hinderance of anie, that by the contrarie, it will cause those whome they allged to be thereby damned, to be more able to give reason for that which they do:

---


Whereas before they either did it at hap-hazar’d, or for all reasons alledged, that they were so taught [. . .] And as for those ignorant Asses, who take upon them to lead others, none being more blinde then themselves, and yet without any reason, before they have seene their workes, wil condemne other men, I overpasse them, as being unworthy to be nominated, or that any man should vouchsafe to aunswere them: for they be in deede such as doing wickedly hate the light for feare they should be espayed.\textsuperscript{103}

In this passage, Morley encourages his readers to see his critics and unethical musicians in general as unreasonable, “ignorant Asses” who are unworthy of even a reasonable refutation by using the propaganda tactics of emotional appeal and authoritative dismissal. Likewise, Charles Butler uses emotive language and unsupported assertions to encourage government officials to reform the music of the nation by “rebuking” minstrels:

\begin{quote}
 it is their [ballad and dance makers] sordid Agents (the mercenary Minstrels) that put the stratagems of them bothe in execution: they ar the Instruments, to publish the filthy Songs of the one; and to teach the filthy fashions of the other. And these, it is in your pouer [power] that are but inferior Magistrates, or otherwise men of woorth, to reform.... if you sharply rebuke them; (knowing in what case the Law has left them) doubtles they will fear to offend eftsoones [again] in that kinde.\textsuperscript{104}
\end{quote}

Both of these works, which are discussed in more detail in chapter 2, contain numerous examples, like those given above, of propaganda aimed at defending what we might call educated, high-class musicians from negative associations with minstrels.

Beyond treatises, the music publication industry in general began relatively late in England in comparison with the rest of Europe. Although music was printed in England before the 1570s, it was only from this decade onward that music printing showed signs of becoming a consistent facet of the printing industry in England. The majority of music printed in the seventeenth century in England was vocal, though instrumental music publication became more

\textsuperscript{103} Morley, vi.
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common after the Restoration. Printing formats varied by printer and period, but partbook and tablebook formats were the most common printing arrangements used during the pre-civil wars era, with the tablebook format being the default for lute song publications, while score format or a hybrid of score and tablebook became the dominant format from the 1650s onward, with the occasional and decreasing use of tablebook format. 105

The number of pieces in and the length overall of any given collection varied widely, as did the level of attention paid to the quality of the print. In the instance of printed music, however, level of education and amount of leisure time available were most likely larger determinants of initial audience than the cost of the print and the level of care taking in its printing. The beauty of the human capacity to memorize a surprising amount of text with great accuracy when it is set to music, however, would have made subsequent transfer of music from collections to other members of society after it was initially learned from the printed music easy enough that we cannot rule out a much larger audience for some of these works beyond their printed forms.

As I will argue subsequently in this dissertation, music publications served as vehicles for propaganda through the content of their prefatory material and through the content of the texts set within them. The dedication and preface to the reader, which most publications contained in some form and combination, offered composers an opportunity not only to explain their work or garner favor with a patron/court a new patron but also to speak to their readers and manipulate

105 Compare for example Thomas Morley, Madrigalls to Foure Voyces (London: Thomas Est, 1694) to Thomas Morley, The First Booke of Ayres (London: William Barley, 1600). For an early example of score format from after the English Civil Wars with instances of tablebook format, see John Playford, The Second Booke of Ayres (London: John Playford, 1652). For an ornate copperplate print with a choirbook format (not in terms of size, only in terms of format) see Henry Bowman, Songs, for One, Two, & Three Voices to the Thorow-Bass (London: Thomas Bowman, 1678).
their opinions. Thus, John Hilton took the opportunity to encourage sympathy for and greater support of musicians from his readers by asserting that “Musicke, but especially the *Patrones* thereof, are in their declining age.” Likewise, composers could and did take the opportunity to set propaganda texts and include them in their collections, thereby disguising them among their non-political songs. Take, for example, “Liberty breeds Presumption” by John Gamble, which disguises a criticism of Parliament and the Commonwealth government in an innocuous fable about the ocean and the rivers:

> When the unfetter’d subjects of the Seas,  
> the Rivers, found their silver feet at ease;  
> no sooner summon’d, but they swiftly went,  
> to meet the Ocean at a Parliament:  
> Did not the pretty Fountains say, their King,  
> the Ocean, was no Ocean but a Spring?  
> As now some do the power of Kings dispute;  
> and think it less, ‘cause more is added too’t.

> Pale ignorance, can the excess of store  
> Make him seem poorer than he was before?  
> The Stars, the Heavens Inferior Courtiers, may  
> Govern the Nights darkness but not rule the Day:  
> Where the Sun Lords it, though they all combine 
> with *Lucia*, in her Vulgar dress, to shine 
> Brighter than they; nor can He be subdu’d,  
> Although but one, and they a multitude.

> Say Subjects, are you Stars, be it alow’d,  
> You justly of your Members may be proud;  
> But to the Sun inferior; for know this,  
> Your Light is borrow’d, not your own, but his:  
> And as all Streams into the Ocean run,  
> You ought to pay your contribution:  
> Then do not such Ingratitude oppress,  
> To make him low that could have made you less.  

---

Finally, masque/pageant and opera libretti were printed throughout the period in question, beginning in 1604 with two printed versions of *The True Description of a Royall Masque* by Samuel Daniel (one thirteen and the other twenty-seven pages long).\(^{108}\) As with music publications, libretti from the seventeenth century in England vary in terms of length and level of care and expense taken in the printing process. As with libretti in the modern era, libretti in this period were not usually printed with the music that accompanied the production, and some contained extensive descriptions of the action and events surrounding the masque/pageant or opera, while others simply give the text as it was spoken.\(^{109}\) Libretti that do contain descriptions of the action and events surrounding the performance serve not only as publications of literature but also as news pieces describing the events of a royal function. While all libretti can serve as propaganda through the allegory contained in their texts, libretti that explain the contexts of the performance and/or contain dedications and prefaces can also present propaganda through those sections of the work. Take for example a brief excerpt from the extensive public-image propaganda that John Dryden included in his dedication to Mary of Modena, wife of James II (at this point Duke of York), in the 1677 libretto of his unperformed opera, *The State of Innocence and the Fall of Man*:

> He [God] has plac’d You so near a Crown, that You add a Lustre to it by Your Beauty. You are Join’d to a Prince who only could deserve You: whose Conduct, Courage, and Success in War, whose Fidelity to His Royal Brother, whose Love for His Country, whose Constancy to His Friends, whose Bounty to His Servants, whose Justice to Merit, whose Inviolable Truth, and whose Magnanimity in all

---


\(^{109}\) For a rare example with some music and a woodcut of one of the costumes included, see Thomas Campion, *The Discription of a Maske* (London: John Brown, 1607); for an example of a short libretto with little discussion of the action or events surrounding the masque, see Daniel, *The True Discription*; for an example of a somewhat longer libretto with a description of the action and event surrounding the masque, see *The King and Queenes Entertainment at Richmond* (Oxford: Leonard Lichfield, 1636).
His Actions, seem to have been rewarded by Heaven by the gift of You. You are never seen but You are blest: and I am sure You bless all those who see You. We think not the Day is long enough when we behold You: And You are so much the business of our Souls, that while You are in sight, we can neither look nor think on any else.\textsuperscript{110}

This example and many others will be discussed in chapters three, four, and five of this dissertation.

V. Conclusion

While it would be absurd to say that all printing in early modern England was propagandistic, it would also be absurd to deny the significance of propaganda in the development and regulation of print during the period. Propaganda, by its very nature, must be able to attract the interest of its audience, and the rise of print propaganda also contributed to the rise of an English readership and the subsequent expansion of the print industry in England. Print output certainly would have been greater in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries if the English government had not systematically sought to censor print that could in any way be seen as opposed to the government’s agendas. Zealous authors found ways to print and distribute their works, and the censorship system was never perfect (hence the continued attempts to improve it), but overall it certainly had a chilling effect on printed discourse.

\textsuperscript{110} John Dryden, \textit{The State of Innocence and The Fall of Man} (London: Henry Herringman, 1677), A2r.
Chapter 2: Music Publication as Public Image Propaganda, 1565-1639

I. Introduction

The period between 1565 and 1639 represents the first phase of music printing in England, which resulted in the production of almost one hundred music collections, regular re-printings of psalm collections (especially Sternhold and Hopkins, though others appeared periodically), and fifteen music treatises. Such an output is not large by later standards, and these numbers amount to fewer than two publications a year on average for music collections and even less than one for treatises. Part of the lack of consistent music publication during this period was likely the natural result of the process of establishing a print market for music within the still relatively new print market in England and of the cultural transition from a primarily manuscript-based transmission system for information to a primarily print-based one.

Lack of profit likely also contributed to this inconsistency, as suggested by evidence surrounding the music printing patent given to William Byrd and Thomas Tallis. This patent lasted from 1575 to 1603 and passed from William Byrd and Thomas Tallis to Thomas Morley in 1598. The patent owners—who would have benefited monetarily from consistent music publication—could not ensure a steady flow of music publication, and in 1577 Byrd and Tallis even complained that they had lost money on their patent.1

Indeed, when composers chose to explain their reasons for publishing their music they never mentioned business, profit, or other monetary reasons for their decisions. Instead, they claimed to be writing to express gratitude to a patron, correct errors in manuscripts that have
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circulated without their consent, please their audience, and/or appease friends who have encouraged them to present their work to the public. Therefore, whether or not these commonplace explanations—which are not unique to music publication in England—were a means to avoid charges of arrogance or were simply truthful representations of a composer’s intentions, they point to the use of publication as a means of communication, influence, and as a venue for pursuing personal goals that were either in addition to or beyond specifically financial concerns.

Building off of these nonmonetary uses of music publication, this chapter will argue that music publishing in England from 1565 to 1639 was used by a significant number of musicians as a form of propaganda aimed at public image control—not only in defense and maintenance of their own, individual public images but also in the defense and maintenance of the public image of their profession in general. Section II provides the social and cultural context in which musicians operated between 1565 and 1639 and focuses on exposing the anti-music climate and depressed state of the musical community in England during this period. Section III then discusses how composers used their publications to comment on and combat the anti-music sentiments and resulting infighting that they describe as a significant detriment to their profession and their livelihoods.

II. Anti-Music Opinion and its Effect on the Musical Community, 1565-1639

As much as music was a ubiquitous—if not essential—element of life in early modern England, it was also considered by adherents to two similar, but ultimately separate, philosophical perspectives to be as dangerous as it was clearly pleasurable. Educated individuals, no matter their Christian denomination, accepted as default the authority of ancient Greek texts
and authors influenced by them who wrote that “there is no greater path whereby instruction comes to the mind than through the ear” and that music can have both positive and negative influences on humans, such that changes in music “will cause a great difference and will sink down through the ears into the soul itself.” For this reason, Plato suggested the regulation of music so that only morally upright music would be allowed to be composed and practiced.

Although this perspective places some restrictions on music by designating some music as good and some as bad, it does not define musical pleasure as being inherently immoral or sinful. From this perspective, music could be immoral and a corrupting force, but the danger lies in the type rather than the quantity. This was also the perspective that was held by the Catholic Church, Lutherans, and Anglicans that adhered to the Book of Common Prayer (referred to in the remainder of this chapter as the BCP).

Jean Calvin and his followers, however, built upon this perspective by arguing that being too pleased by good music—or focusing on the pleasure rather than the devotional or therapeutic functions of music—was also a corrupting aspect of music. This made Calvinists particularly distrustful of professional musicians who they assumed had been corrupted by music and were therefore willing to corrupt others. This perspective also led to the ongoing debate in seventeenth-century England over what types of music should be allowed in church, which will become more significant in later chapters.
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2 Calvin Martin Bower, “Boethius’ The Principles of Music, an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary” (Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 1967), 33-35. Although Boethius was Roman, he derived much of his understanding of music from Greek sources, especially Plato’s discussion of music in his Republic.
3 And Aristotle to a lesser degree—see Aristotle, Politics, book 8, in Greek and Roman Aesthetics, ed. Oleg Bychkov and Anne Sheppard, 107-108 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010); Bower, 36; Plato discusses this topic throughout his Republic and Laws.
4 See the preface by Calvin in the Geneva Psalter.
Both of these Calvinist perspectives on music and musicians—that musical pleasure could corrupt and that musicians were corrupted by it—are evident in the major anti-music writings of the 1570s and 1580s (several of which were republished through the 1590s) by John Northbrooke, Stephan Gosson, Thomas Lovell, and Phillip Stubbes. Furthermore, attempts to address and perhaps even accommodate them can be seen in all of the earliest collections of music that were published in England during the late sixteenth century. Stubbes, for example, in his *Anatomie of Abuses* argues that the contemplation of Christian themes is the “only thing, wherein a Christian man ought to rejoyce, and take delight in, all other pleasures and delights of this life set aparte, as amarvult and bitter, bringing foorth fruit to eternall destruction.”

More specifically, he writes that music is a gift from God and appropriate for his praise or for personal, private solacing (as Calvin says) and that “if Musick were thus used it would comfort man wunderfully, and move his hart to serve God the better, but beeing used as it is, it corupteth good minds ... and inclined to all kinde of whordome and mischeef.” Similarly, Gosson, in his *The School of Abuse*, presents music (which he calls “piping” as a derogatory term for practical, secular music) as the second step on a slippery slope toward death and the Devil: “You are no soner entred, but libertie looseth the reynes, and gives you head, placing you with Poetrie in the lowest forme: when his skill is showne to make his Scholler as good as ever twangde, hee preferres you too Pyping, from Piping to playing, from play to pleasure, from pleasure to sloth, from sloth too sleepe, from sleepe to sinne, from sinne to death, from death to the devill.”
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Moreover, while prominent English Calvinist writers like Gosson and Stubbes admitted that music could be good or bad, they were very likely to consider all musicians as morally corrupted and willing and able to corrupt others. According to Northbrooke, “we see at this daye that they which use Musicke doe swell with pouson against God, they become hard hearted, they will have their songs yea, and what maner of songs? full of all villanie and ribauldrie.”

Likewise, Stubbes believes that “all good minstrelles, sober and chast musicions ... may daunce ye wild Moris thorow a needles eye. For how should thei bere chaste minds, seeing that their exercyse is the pathway to all uncleanes.” Here Stubbes echoes Gosson’s passage from the previous decade in which he argued that there are no musicians in England that are fit to be called true, ethical musicians: “If you inquire howe manie suche Poetes and Pipers wee have in our Age, [like Chiron, who Stubbes previously described as “a wise man, a learned Poet, a skilfull Musition, so was hee also a teacher of justice”] I am perswaded that every one of them may creepe through a ring, or daunce the wilde Morice in a Needles eye. Wo [we] have infinite Poets and Pipers, and suche peevish cattel among us in Englande, that live by merrie begging, maintayned by almes, and privily encroch uppon everie mans purse. But if they that are in authoritie, and have the sworde in their handes to cut of abuses, shoulde cal [call] an accompt to see how many Chirons, Terpandri, and Homers are in heare. [sic] they might cast the summe without pene, or counters, and sit downe with Racha to weepe for her Children, because they were not.”

If Calvinists were likely to be wary of musicians in general because of the corrupting powers of music, they were outright hostile to those they described as minstrels, and evidence
suggests that they were reasonably successful at turning the government and populace (at least the learned elite) against minstrels and branding them as rogues and disruptors of the peace. As Christopher Marsh attests, the term “minstrel” was used generically to refer to any musician before the first act against minstrels was passed in 1572. After that point, the term “minstrel” developed negative connotations and the term “musician” began to be used more consistently as the neutral alternative. Lovell, Northbrooke, Gosson, and Stubbes all make direct statements against minstrels, but given their adherence to Calvinism such statements are not surprising. It is surprising, however, that authors who write in opposition to their arguments for a highly regulated, restricted use of music not only make no attempt to defend minstrels but also openly condemn them as outside of the music and practices that they are attempting to defend. The author of The Praise of Musicke, for example, states that “Duralehouse, vagabond, and beging minstrelsie I defend not, liberal sciences are for liberall men.” Likewise, Lodge in his Protogenes can know Apelles, writes that, “but as I like musick so admit I not of thos that deprave the same your pipers are as odius to mee as your selfe, nether alowe I your harpinge merye beggers.” Such statements against minstrels by otherwise pro-music authors may be an indication that minstrels were seen as clearly immoral and therefore indefensible, but it may also be in part or in whole the result of the legal implications of minstrelsy during this period.

11 Christopher Marsh, 76.
12 Northbrooke, 51; Gosson, 16-19; Thomas Lovell, A Dialogue between Custom and Veritie (London: John Allde, ca. 1580s), vi-vii, D3r-Fv; Stubbes, O5r.
13 The author of this work is contemporarily referred to as John Case but the authorship of the pamphlet is still questioned by some scholars. I follow the contemporary tradition of assigning the work to Case. John Case, The Praise of Musicke (London: Joseph Barnes, 1586), 30.
14 Thomas Lodge, Protogenes can Known Apelles (London, 1579), 31.
Indeed, Marsh argues that minstrels “were subjected to a degree of legal and moral pressure that was unprecedented in its force.”\textsuperscript{15} The legal side of this pressure came from two Elizabethan acts that sought in the first case to heavily regulate minstrels and in the second case to essentially outlaw them altogether. In 1572, the statute 14 Eliz. I, c. 5 (the Vagabond Act) commands that minstrels (whom the statute categorizes along with beggars and frauds as “roges vagabonds”) either be licensed to travel the country as beggars or be certified members of a nobleman’s household employ. If they could not provide proof of this legitimacy, then they were to be whipped until bloody and burned through the ear on the first offense and eventually could be put to death as a repeat-offending felon.\textsuperscript{16} The second act, passed in 1597, made any minstrel activity—except for those in the service of a lord who were specifically players of interludes—illegal and removed the possibility for licensing. It also included an additional punishment of a year of labor in a prison.\textsuperscript{17}

Given the existence and continually harsher enforcement of government censorship on publication during this period, it makes sense that we do not have any evidence of authors opposing these acts. Censorship and a general fear of the government or crossing those in power may also explain why pro-music authors who were not professional musicians seem eager to condemn minstrels: minstrels were not only ignorant technicians as Boethius argued, but they were considered by the state to be dangerous to the peace and order of society.\textsuperscript{18} Indeed, a number of anti-music authors not only mention the laws against minstrels as justification of their

\textsuperscript{15} Marsh, 73.
\textsuperscript{16} Marsh, 74; 14 Eliz. I, c. 5.
\textsuperscript{17} Marsh, 74; 39 Eliz. I, c. 4.
\textsuperscript{18} Bower, 101-104.
wariness towards music but also call on government officials to take a tougher stance against minstrelsy and enforce the law more efficiently.

Northbrooke, for example, argues that “If these and such lyke lawes were executed justlye, truly, and severely (as they ought to be) without any respect of persons, favour or friendshippe, this dung and filth of ydlenesse woulde easily be rejected and cast oute of thys Common wealth.”19 At the end of his School, Gosson includes a letter to the lord mayor of London and urges him frankly to “sette to your hand to thrust out abuses, as shewe your selfe willing to have all amended.”20 Lovell also urges continued action toward removing the vice of minstrelsy, because although there are places where “GOD by good Magistrates hath quite thrown down this Idole, ... and justly banished thamnos (I mean vain minstrilles) The women mourn & lament for him, so that of all sorts to to many conspire to maintain this wanton and fleshly Idolatrie.”21 Fetherston is certain that those who grant licenses to minstrels will make sure that they will be able to revoke the licenses of minstrels who play on the Sabbath or incite licentious dancing “if they do graunt any” at all.22 Though the authorities above are restrained in their calls for better enforcement or harsher restrictions, Stubbes is frankly critical of minstrels being licensed at all but directs his frustration at the legal mechanism itself saying, “Cursed be those licenses, which lycense any man to get his lyving, with the destruction of many thousands.”23

19 Northbrooke, 51.  
20 Gosson, F4v.  
21 Lovell, A6v.  
22 Fetherston, B7r.  
23 Stubbes, O6v.
Even some musicians and pro-music authors argue that minstrels deserve the punishments that they are receiving under the statutes. Thomas Ravenscroft (a prominent Jacobean musician and author of treatises and music collections), for example, writes in his 1614 *A Briefe Discourse*—a treatise combined with a collection of music—that “I make no question, but in good time it [the degradation that they have caused to music] may returne upon their owne necks, and their Desert be rewarded, as Statute in that case hath already (most worthily) provided.”\(^{24}\) Charles Butler makes a similar statement in his *The Principles of Musick* from 1636: “it is their [ballad and dance makers’] sordid Agents (the mercenary Minstrels) that put the stratagems of them bothe in execution: they ar the Instruments, to publish the filthy Songs of the one; and to teach the filthy fashions of the other. And these, it is in your pouer [power] that are but inferior Magistrates, or otherwise men of woorth, to reform. ... if you sharply rebuke them; (knowing in what case the Law has left them) doubtles they will fear to offend eftsoones [again] in that kinde.”\(^{25}\)

Furthermore, while direct causation is impossible to prove, the correlation between the appearance of these works from the 1570s and the 1580s and the passage of harsher restrictions on minstrels in the 1590s is worth pointing out. It is possible that these works, some of which were popular enough to warrant multiple printings,\(^{26}\) influenced members of Parliament and Elizabeth I’s administration to such a degree that they resolved to further restrict minstrel activity. It is also possible that the government was already predisposed to restrictions on minstrels and


\(^{26}\) Gosson’s *School* was printed in 1579 by two separate printers and then reprinted in 1586 and 1587 by both original printers respectively; Stubbes’ *Anatomie* was published by two separate printers in 1583 and reprinted in 1584, 1585, and 1595; Northbrooke’s *Spiritus* was printed in 1571 and reprinted in 1573, 1575, 1577, 1579, 1582, 1600, and 1606.
that these authors were exploiting that fact to support their own arguments but had no actual effect on the legislative process. If nothing else, the combination of private and public forces exerting pressure on minstrels and asserting the dangers of music is proof that the musical community through association with minstrels had been forced into a defensive position during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

Indeed, the musicians of the time attest to a generally negative opinion of music and the negative effects of that opinion on their musical community. As early as 1571, Whythorne—one of the first composers to publish music in England—identified “these sorts, who I speak of, are one[s] that barb’rous be,/ Who though of cre’atures reas’nable, all their fourms shaped be,/ Yet they so deep infected ar, either with ignoraunce,/ Grosnes of wit, cruell nature, fransi [frenzy], or els perchance/ With sum, or altogether of those diseases in sort/ As inwardly they never felt, or tasted, (to be short)/ The secret working of the concordant sounds of Musick,/ And therfore they with taunting terms, against it spurn and kick.”27 In the printer’s dedication to The Praise of Musicke, Joseph Barnes writes that the study of music “laie, as dead, for a time” and that he hopes music will “continue in good credit and liking after it is once revived,”28 which implies that at the time of writing Barnes believed that music had not yet been revived and continued to “laie, as dead.” Likewise, the author of The Praise argues that music is “an Arte of more use than credit, more knowen than acknowledged” and he hopes that the eye, through reading his work, will “teach her ungratefull neighbour the eare to thinke better of so comfortable a treasure.”29

This perspective on music’s condition in society endured uninterrupted in this period until music

27 Thomas Whythorne, Triplex, of Songses, for Three, Fower, and Five Voyces (London: John Daye, 1571), AAA4v.
29 Case, 1.
publication was interrupted in the early 1630s. From 1597 until 1629, eleven authors mention the low appreciation of music and a state of decline in the profession. John Hilton, writing at the end of the 1620s, states that “Musicke, but especially the Patrones thereof, are in their declining age,” and Edward Filmer in the preface of his 1629 collection of French airs argues that although music was at one time considered one of the “Touchstones of a Gentleman,” musicians “are held now [to] but Lowe and Illiberall Conditions” if they do not have advanced degrees to prove their quality.

At the same time that musicians and pro-music writers were commenting on the presence of opposition to music and the decline of music as a discipline and profession, they also mention fighting within the musical community as an impediment to the health of the community and as a reason for its decline. Six musicians dedicate significant space in the prefaces, dedications, and main texts of five music collections and three treatises to exposing and addressing fellow musicians who have created a negative, divisive atmosphere in the musical community and/or to calling for an end to infighting and a turn towards unity within that community. The first author to address this infighting, Thomas Morley, points out the petty nature of the criticism he has

---

already endured and will endure as a result of publishing his treatise, as evidenced in the passage quoted at the end of chapter one. Morley’s critics are arrogant, ignorant musicians who are unwilling to give praise to others, even though they have no reasonable criticisms to make against them. In addition to criticizing these negative members of his community, Morley also comments on the state of his community in general and encourages his readers to be more like Italian musicians, who Morley claims are generous and loving to each other, rather than contributing to the divisive atmosphere of the English musical community:

[Master Gnorimus:] so much bee they [the Italians] by nature inclined to love, and therein are they to be commended for one musicion amongst them will honor and reverence another, whereas by the contrarie, we (if two of us bee of one profession) will never cease to backbite one another so much as we can.34

One of Morley’s student characters from the dialogue (Polymathes, the brother of the main character Philomathes) then reiterates his point in favor of a more loving, unified community and against the current state of the English musical community:

[Polymathes:] but whereas one musicion amongst them will reverence and love one another, that is in deede praiseworthie, and whereas you justly complaine of the hate and backbiting amongst the musicians of our countrey, that I knowe to bee most true, and speciallie in these young fellowes, who having no more skill then to sing a part of a song perfectlie, and scarselie that will take upon them to censure excellent men, and to backbite them too, but I would not wish to live so long as to see a set of bookes of one of those young yonkers compositions, who are so ready to condemne others.35

Similarly, John Farmer states that he does “so much love perfect harmony, as I earnestly entreat all the professed in Musicke to fly discord amongst themselves: though in composing of songes, it may be well taken, beseeching them so farre to fly自我-opinion also, that ayming all

34 Ibid., 150.
of them at their Countries honor, not their owne glory”36 they may make English musicians as famous as English soldiers. For Farmer, infighting and self-glorification is preventing the English musical community from achieving its full potential. Echoing Farmer’s sentiment, John Dowland writes in the dedication of his Third and Last Booke of Songs from 1603 that “As in a hive of bees al labour alike to lay up honny opposing them selves against none but fruitles drones; so in the house of learning and fame, all good indeavourers should strive to ad somewhat that is good, not malicing one an other, but altogether bandying against the idle and malicious ignorant.”37 Dowland also writes in the dedication of his 1609 translation of Ornithoparcus’ Micrologus that “in my travailes (for the common good of our Musitians) I have reduced [Ornithoparcus’ work] into our English Language.”38 While he goes on to say in the preface that “as I have made it familiar to all that speake our Language, so I could wish that the rest in this kinde were by the like meanes drawne into our knowledge, since (I am assured) that there is nothing can more advance the apprehension of Musicke, than the reading of such Writers,”39 which indicates that the common good he mentions is likely a better understanding of music, the contents of the Micrologus suggest that he may also have intended the work to serve as an inducement to musical unity and a defense of the declining art of music. Ornithoparcus, for example, not only included three praises of music within his treatise, but also makes a reference to bees and the hive of common knowledge that could have inspired Dowland’s earlier comment:

37 Dowland, The Third and Last Booke of Songs, Bv.
38 Dowland, Andreas Ornithoparchus his Micrologus, A2v.
39 Dowland, Micrologus, Bv.
yet began I to thinke what I should leave to posteritie for witnesse that I had lived. ... in the end I chose the learning of Harmony; both because it is fit for morall education, and also because it is the servant of Gods praise. ... Hence is it, that excepting those which are, or have been in the Chappels of Princes, there are none, or very very few true musitians wherupon the Art it self doth grow into contempt, being hidden like a Candle under a bushel, the praising of the almighty Creator of all things decreaseth, and the number of those which seeke the overthrow of this Art, doth dayly increase throughout all Germany. ... And what flowers soever other mens volumes had in them, like a Bee I sucked them out, and made this second Book the hive to lay them up in.\textsuperscript{40}

Having written the \textit{Micrologus} a century before Dowland decided to translate it and publish it in England, Ornithoparcus was describing musical decline and negative conditions in Germany that Dowland indicates were reversed in Germany by the time of this English publication. In his \textit{Pilgrimes Solace}, Dowland writes that

\begin{quote}
True it is, I have lien long obscured from your sight, because I received a Kingly entertainment in a forraine climate, which could not attaine to any (though never so meane) place at home, yet have I held up my head within this Horizon, and not altogether beeune unaffected else where. Since some part of my poore labours have found favour in the greatest part of Europes, and beeene printed in eight most famous Cities beyond the Seas. \textit{viz}: \textit{Paris, Antwerpe, Collein, Nurenburge, Franckfort, Leipsig, Amsterdam, and Hamburge}: (yea and some of them also authorized under the Emperours royall priviledge,) yet must I tell you, as I have beeene a stranger; so have I againe found strange entertainment since my returne [to England].\textsuperscript{41}
\end{quote}

He goes on to complain about the incompetent cantors and arrogant young lutenists who have criticized him at home, and he thereby creates a contrast between the places in which he was a stranger and found success and his own home where he should have found acceptance and success but has instead been attacked. Such a contrast indicates that Dowland sees the early seventeenth-century cities of Europe (the majority of which he mentions happen to be specifically German) to be more musically vibrant and contain less (or perhaps no) anti-music

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{40}Dowland, \textit{Micrologus}, 37.
\textsuperscript{41}Dowland, \textit{A Pilgrimes Solace}, Bv.
sentiment than there is in England at this time or than there was in Germany in Ornithoparcus’ time. Dowland’s biography also testifies to this practically, with Dowland finding work and success in Europe while continually being unable to find work at home in England.⁴²

Therefore, if Dowland had identified the similarity between the depressed state that Ornithoparcus mentions in reference to his German musical community and the depressed state of the musical community of early seventeenth-century England and believed that the German musical community had improved substantially since Ornithoparcus’ time, then he might have sought to effect a similar reformation in his contemporary community by translating and publishing one of the works that he may have considered responsible for the reformation of the German musical community. In this way, Dowland’s “travailes (for the common good of our Musitians)”⁴³ might not have only been for their practical education but also for the betterment of their community, a goal for which, as mentioned above, Dowland had already expressed a desire.

As with Dowland’s translation of Ornithoparcus’ Micrologus, Weelkes’s dedication from his 1600 collection of Madrigals of 5 and 6 Parts offers implications of association with infighting and the decline of the musical community in England. In Weelkes’s case, however, the connections are more difficult to unravel and less certain in the end. Nevertheless, I will discuss the dedication here in the interest of completeness. In the dedication, Weelkes writes that

I confesse my conscience is untoucht with any other arts, and I hope my confession is unsuspected, many of us Musitians thinke it as much praise to be somewhat more then Musitians, as it is for golde to bee some what more than

---

⁴² See Diana Poulton, *John Dowland: His Life and Works* (Berkeley: University of California, 1972). Though not recent, this remains the definitive biography of Dowland.
⁴³ Dowland, Micrologus, A2v.
golde, and, if Jack Cade were alive, yet some of us might live: unlesse we should think ... that the Latin tongue comes by reflection.\textsuperscript{44}

Although each part of this passage can be explained to some degree, it is difficult to come to a conclusion as to what Weelkes is trying to say overall. In the beginning he professes to being nothing more than a musicians and criticizes those musicians who think that it is worthy of more praise to be more than a musician. Next, he mentions Jack Cade, the leader of a rebellion in 1450 against government corruption by Henry VI’s administration\textsuperscript{45} and he makes a statement that seems to suggest that musicians (the us that he has previously identified as musicians) might either be able to make a living or actually live if Cade were perhaps alive—presumably to lead a rebellion on their behalf. He then qualifies that statement by saying that they might not be able to live if they think “that the Latin tongue come by reflection,” which implies that they cannot simply achieve their goals thorough reflection alone but instead through action.

If we assume that the interpretation above is correct, which is possible but not certain, then the problem still remains of determining what the instigation of the rebellion and action would be and what form it would take. Based on the context of infighting and anti-music sentiments, it is possible that Weelkes’s statement about being only a musician or more than a musician relates to protecting one’s self from criticism by downplaying one’s status as a musician. The rebellion and action that Weelkes calls for would accordingly be a campaign to unite the musical community against the corruption of music and in defense of the pure goodness of music without need for qualification as if “it is for golde to bee some what more than golde.”

\textsuperscript{44} Weelkes, \textit{Madrigals of 5 and 6 Parts}, A2r.
The most extensive and explicit discussion of infighting, however, comes from Robert Jones, who states that there are “none greater enemies to their owne profession then musicians; ... they are the cause, the art is the less esteemed, and they themselves reputed as selfe-commenders, and men most fantastical.” He also writes later in 1601 that “Our statures are not set above danger; wee lie lowe, fit for everie foote to treade upon: our place is the ground, there is nothing beneath us, and yet detraction will pull us lower.” For Jones, infighting is not only keeping the English musical community from reaching its full potential but it is also actively destroying it; negative opinions of music have arisen at least in part because musicians have acted immorally towards each other and the profession is on the verge of dying because immoral musicians are unwilling to consider anyone but themselves because of their own arrogance and desire for self-advancement: “the ambitious intrap the little portion of anie commendations that maie fall besides him. And like the mercilesse Souldiers; the Castles they cannot take, they blow up.”

This infighting was likely the result of the depressed state of the musical community in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries in England, a depression resulting from the negative press and public opinion that had developed toward music during this period. As it became harder to make a living as a musician, infighting and backbiting developed and led to further bad press as it confirmed negative stereotypes about musicians. It is unclear whether this infighting was coming from minstrels or other upper-class musicians, but it is likely that we have no evidence from the backbiters because they were not in a position to publish their works, did

---

46 Jones, First Booke, A2r. It is also worth noting that the hive of bees, in reference to this discussion above, is a prominent image on the title page of this collection and the following one. Both works are dedicated to different individuals, so the symbol is likely not a reference to a patron.
47 Jones, Second Booke, A2r.
48 Jones, Second Booke, A2r.
49 Mann, 62-63.
not backbite in print, or could not/were not allowed to print their works.\textsuperscript{50} In any case, ethical, competent musicians were in significant danger of suffering from guilt by association, and such a position would have been complicated by the difficulty in differentiating between “good” musicians and “bad” ones.

Furthermore, it is understandable that the term “minstrel” would have been used generically before 1572 because there are many fundamental similarities between all musicians of the early modern period that would have encouraged non-musicians to see little distinction between the two groups. Musicians in both groups would have sought a position in a noble household, which conferred financial security. Musicians in such positions wore the livery of their employer and composed or performed on demand. To the casual observer, “minstrels” and “musicians” would have been practically identical until closer inspection revealed the principal difference between them: their level of education.

There were many instances where the distinction between educated musicians and minstrels would have been implied simply by context; members of the Chapel Royal were referred to as gentlemen and were treated with the highest level of respect of any musicians in the kingdom. It would have been assumed, therefore, that they were learned musicians and not minstrels—not only because portraying such intimate members of the royal household as anything but moral and competent would have led naturally to unsavory associations with the monarch (such as the implication that immoral musicians would be corrupting the monarch with their corrupt music, or that the monarch’s administration was in any way responsible for an error

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid., 62-63.
of judgment in employing immoral musicians). Likewise, a poor, shabbily dressed musician playing in a tavern could never reasonably be mistaken for a learned musician.

If a less fortunate musician wanted to prove that he was more than a minstrel, he would have to provide evidence of his education and/or distance himself from minstrels by condemning their immorality. Such condemnation would display his understanding of the proper and improper uses of music. He might also seek to remind his audience that music has long been considered virtuous and valuable and that he is a steward of such an art, which might bolster his own image by association or at least serve as a defense of his besieged profession. Indeed, as I will argue below, English musicians from this period who presented their work in print utilized all three of these tactics to manage their own public images and the public image of their profession in general.

III. Pro-Music Propaganda

From the beginnings of music publishing in England and consistently throughout the period under discussion here, musicians took the opportunity provided by publication to defend music and by extension themselves. Thomas Whythorne’s 1571 *Triplex*, for example, contains two of the first examples of pro-music propaganda to appear in a printed collection of music. First, he provides a Latin poem by Doctor Walter Haddon in praise of music.\(^{51}\) By including the poem from Haddon, Whythorne may have been attempting to preemptively silence critics by making it difficult for them to criticize him without also criticizing a high-ranking member of the government. He also thereby presents critics of music with evidence of a noted Protestant

---

\(^{51}\) Walter Haddon was a member of the administration of the Church of England and Elizabeth I’s government but was also a noted supporter of Protestant reform. See [http://www.luminarium.org/encyclopedia/haddon.htm](http://www.luminarium.org/encyclopedia/haddon.htm) for a good summary of his life and influence on the policies of the Church of England; Whythorne, *Triplex*, AAA4.
sympathizer who believes that music is noble and valuable. Second, several passages in his prefatory material suggest that he intended his readers to understand that he is only interested in the proper, godly use of music and that he includes secular texts in his collection only begrudgingly as an appeasement to those who are not satisfied with godly music alone: “Part of the matters or ditties that I have set heerto, The Psalter, or Psalms of David I have them taken fro. To the rest of this have I set (the base minds for to pleas)/ Such Sonets as I think will sum of their sour dumps appeas.” Those who are not contented with sacred texts have “base minds” and “sour dumps” and he asserts that he is including secular music simply to appease these individuals. In regard to the purpose of the work, he concludes the preface by saying that

I do it only therwith, Gods prays ech wher to sing
Together with heav’nly solas, to heavy hearts to bring.
For privat use of baser thoughts, not aspyring so hy,
Which like to feed their fansies, all, on wurks that be worldly,
To recre’at th’over burdened, and sore afflicted minds,
To comfort eke the powrs and spreets [spirits], which mans helth brings and binds.53

This emphasis on sacred music and spiritual goals combined with his disparaging of secular music and those who enjoy it and his defense of music from Doctor Haddon suggest an attempt to preempt possible criticisms of his inclusion of secular music and any claims that he is an immoral musician. Furthermore, in the context of his preface, song two of the collection is likely an intentional piece of pro-music propaganda to further guard him and his work, if not also his profession in general, from criticism; the text reads as follows: “The musick tunes of voyce or sound,/ doth help the ears, and doth expell, all sorrowes,/ also the wits it cherish’th well,/ it

52 Whythorne, AAA2r.
53 Whythorne, BBB1v.
soupleth sinewes of ech wight, and eke the faint./ it fills with might."

It is telling that these references to music emphasize all of the uses of the art that were deemed acceptable by Calvin—to praise God and to provide solace and recreation for health reasons—and criticize—through the association of baseness and “sour dumps” with secular music—the uses of music that Calvin opposed.

It is clear that Whythorne is defending music and asserting a personal perspective on what music is good and what music is bad, but as the first detailed discussion of pro-music propaganda in this chapter, it is worth focusing on this work for a moment and examining exactly how the content of Whythorne’s collection functions as propaganda. As discussed in chapter one, any means of communication that contains covert or unclear argumentation and/or illogical support for its arguments constitutes propaganda. Accordingly, an author can both intentionally (primarily) and unintentionally (secondarily) produce propaganda. While it is often impossible to definitely designate a work as primary propaganda, the more evidence that exists surrounding the work the more likely it is we can say that a work was/is functioning as primary propaganda. Even if such a designation is not tenable, a single propagandistic statement is sufficient to designate a work as secondary propaganda.

Turning again to Whythorne, the first aspect of his collection that argues for an interpretation of the work as propagandistic (in part or in whole) is the secondary nature of his pro-music statements in relation to the purpose of the collection as a whole. If Whythorne had stated that the purpose of his collection was to increase the appreciation of music or to defend himself against anti-music critics, then any statements he might make that are related to that

---

54 Whythorne, BBB2v.
primary purpose would be overt and therefore be less likely to be propagandistic. Whythorne, however, claims that his purpose is simply to provide music for praise and recreation; if that were his sole purpose, why should he include a praise of music? Praises of music are not common enough in the literature for them to be considered obligatory; indeed, only approximately 17% of all publications of or about music in England from 1571 to 1639 (not including anti-music publications) contain defenses of music, and these are spread throughout the period, so that the number cannot be explained as a brief vogue. Whythorne must have had a reason for explaining the purpose of his collection and for including a praise of music, but he does not offer that reason to his audience in the collection, which therefore makes it a covert reason and in turn makes propagandistic intention more likely on Whythorne’s part.

The second aspect of Whythorne’s collection that makes it likely that the work was either primarily or secondarily propagandistic is the frequency with which Whythorne returns to the topic of music, its proper use, and his use of music in the brief prefatory material and the second song of the collection. One brief mention in passing, while enough to prove secondary propagandistic function, is not usually enough evidence to prove that an author intended the work to function as propaganda. The use of three different approaches to the topic of music and its value/use, through the citation of Haddon, the assertion of his goals in publishing the music, and in a song in praise of music at the beginning of the collection, however, speaks to either a high level of intentionality or at least a subconscious preoccupation/anxiety over ensuring that his readers understand that his collection is a morally upright endeavor.

55 25 works, including music collections, pamphlets, treatises, and masque libretti, out of 146 total.
Furthermore, Whythorne never presents his statements in favor of music or against secular music (however brief) as claims to be debated, but rather as facts to be accepted. Even if the statement of intention to provide music for praise and recreation is an accurate representation of his perspective, he still could have chosen to present the collection to his audience for propagandistic reasons (in the same way a student might really believe that a class was great and also deliberately mention that fact—in the email that contains their final paper for example—in the hopes that it might influence their instructor’s perspective on that paper). The more functions a piece of writing can serve, the better.

Finally, Whythorne offers us a unique look into his motivations for publishing the collection in his autobiography, *A Book of Songs and Sonnets*. In it he writes that “because I would benefit and profit myself the better therewith, I devised how I might make myself to be known of many in the shortest time that might be. And then came to my remembrance that there was no better way for that purpose than to set and publish some music of mine own making in print.”56 His stated purpose in the autobiography then is to establish his public image, not simply to provide music for praise and recreation as he claims in the collection. He does not explain, however, why he included a defense of music, though he does express considerable anxiety during the publication process over potential criticisms that might be leveled against his work:

> And while I was a-perfecting and writing out of my music in such sort as I meant to set it forth, which was nigh two year a-doing, I had many combats with myself about it. One while would I think to myself, what do I mean now thus to travail and beat my brains about this matter? Do I not daily see how they who do set out books be by their works made a common gaze unto all the world, and hang upon

---

the blasts of all folks’ mouths and upon the middle-finger pointings of the unskilful, and also upon the severe judgements of the grave and deep wits?  

In the end, he decides that “We are not born into this world altogether for ourselves, but to do good in our professions and to our abilities every way: I say, to do good to others so much as we may, and not to live as drones and caterpillars, that live altogether upon the sweat of others’ brows.”  

His inclusion of a praise of music and his song extolling its virtues could in this context be seen as a means of doing good in his profession by defending his profession.

In light of the frequency of propagandistic passages, the lack of clear explanation for their presence, and the further context of the autobiography, it is even more likely that his statements about music in the *Triplex* collection were meant at least as a means of establishing his public image as a learned, pious musician who could recognize the inferiority of secular music and was dedicated to advancing the proper uses of it. Knowing that he was worried about criticism makes it more likely that he was very careful when writing his prefatory material so that he would not fall victim to criticism. Because he does not make it clear in the *Triplex* that one purpose of the collection is to publicize himself and his works, regardless of why he chose not to, the work may be definitively described as a work of primary propaganda.

Like Whythorne, a number of other musicians appear to preempt criticism of themselves and their music by attesting to their preference for sacred music and disdain for the abuse of music. In the preface of his 1585 *Musicke of Six and Five Parts*, John Cosyn writes that “How so ever the abuse of musicke may be great, when it is made an instrument to feede vaine delightes, or to norish and entertaine superstitious devotion: yet the right use thereof is commanded in

---

singing Psalms, and making melodie to God in our harts ... by the grace of God to further the second.”\textsuperscript{59} He also makes a point of saying that he decided to publish the collection “in place of many other Songs neither tending to the praise of God, not containing any thing fit for Christian eares.”\textsuperscript{60} Cosyn not only asserts his understanding of musical propriety and the superiority of sacred music, but he also attests to a careful attempt to avoid the abuse of music and disparages music that is contemporary with his collection as an excuse for having published his works. This allows him to express modesty and avoid the pretension of publication while also deflecting criticism from himself onto the “many other Songs” that are unfit for “Christian eares.”

In 1591, William Swayne, the publisher of William Daman’s\textsuperscript{61} Second Booke of Psalms, was careful to assert that Daman is “so worthie and skillfull a man in his profession” and that one of the purposes of the work was to “leave his Religion and pietie herein witnessed, that so carefullie and speciallie laboured to advaunce the use of singing the Psalms.”\textsuperscript{62} Given the context in which these statements were made, it is at least as likely that the publication was meant to signal Daman’s status as an educated, devout, and skillful musician that would therefore be at least above suspicion and reproach as it is that the publisher was simply offering customary praise.

Furthermore, Edward Harke, the author of the preface to Daman’s 1579 collection of psalms, does not focus on Daman’s personal characteristics, but he does defend music and the collection when he writes

\textsuperscript{59} John Cosyn, Musicke of Six and Five Parts (London: John Wolfe, 1585), A2r.
\textsuperscript{60} Cosyn, A2r.
\textsuperscript{61} His name is also sometimes written “Damon.”
Lastly, to thrust my penne into the large fieldes of prayses and due commendations of Musicke in generall, whether they stand to be made by the judgement of reason, or by the Censure of the holy Ghost delivered in the world: this I doubt not, I might easely begyn, yea and plenteifully proceede in but how or where I should make an end ... truly truly I know not. I leave Musicke threfore to be commended by and of her selfe and the warrant of Musickes commendation, I leave to God and Nature ... Read. 1. Sam. 16.23. a [4] Kyng. 3. 15. Ephe. 5. 19. 1. Cor. 14. 15. ... Neverthelesse in anything by me here written, I have not meant to defende any the abuses of Musicke whatsoever committed in the Church of God ... it is not only not to be allowed of but also with all force of law to be thrust out of the Church. But this our Musicke well imploied upon these Psalms, is altogether free from such abuses.\textsuperscript{63}

\textit{It is worth noting that these two separate preface writers, Edward Harke for the 1579 collection and William Swayne for the 1591 collection, both take the opportunity to defend the collection and to also defend music in the case of the former and Daman in the case of the latter, even though both collections are settings of the psalms and therefore should have been the least objectionable type of text setting available during this period. It is possible, given these circumstances, that Daman encouraged these preface authors to write on his behalf and in his defense, though they also could have done so of their own accord.}

\textit{In either case, these statements serve as propaganda in defense of Daman, his music, and his profession by asserting these arguments as statements of fact and by using language that encourages the reader to accept the author’s position without engaging that position reasonably, as in the case of Harke’s statement, quoted above, in which he asserts without evidence that there are numerous praises of music that are built on reason and no less than the word of the Holy Ghost. He also implies that he could write so much in praise of music that he does not know where he might be able to stop. Finally, he asserts again that God will provide the commendation}

of music and cites several Biblical passages that give the appearance of evidence without actually having to discuss or evaluate the validity of that evidence. Furthermore, these statements are presented in the context of a publication that is overtly focused on the presentation of music, not on the defense of the author, the maintenance of his public image, or the defense of music in general.

In addition to presenting themselves and their works specifically as godly and morally upright, musicians throughout this period also turned to general defenses of music that made use of classical and biblical sources and allowed them to defend sacred and secular music at the same time. One of the first of these defenses by a musician—defenses by non-musicians such as Lodge’s *Protogenes* and *The Praise of Musick* by Case having already appeared in print by this time—is William Byrd’s madrigal, “Piece in Praise of John Case’s Praise of Musicke,” of which only a single part of the six-voice polyphonic texture remains. In this piece, Byrd not only endorses Case’s work but also defends music by summarizing some of the aspects of Case’s defense in the text of the song:

Let others praise what seems them best,  
I like his lines above the rest,  
whose pen hath painted musickes praise,  
he soundly blames the sencles foole, & barbarous Scithyan, of our dayes.  
He writes of Angells Armony,  
above the Harpe of Mercury,  
he writes of sweetly turning Sphaeres,  
how Byrds & Beasts & wormes rejoyce,  
how Dolphyns lovd Arions voice,  
he makes a frame for Midas eares.  
There may the solemne Stoycks finde,  
And that Rude Marsia wanteth skil,  
against Apollos sweete concent, the Nurse of good, the scourge of ill.  
Let Envy barke against the starres, let Folly sayle which way she please,

---
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with him I wish my dayes to spend,  
whose quill hath stoode fayre Musickes frend,  
chief frend to peace, chief port of ease.\textsuperscript{65}

Though the majority of Byrd’s references are classical, he does begin the list by referencing “Angells Armony” and music’s universally attested ability to be a “Nurse of good” and a “scourge of ill,” which may also be a reference to David’s use of music to cast out the demon from Saul in 1 Samuel 16-23—the first Biblical passage that Edward Harke cites in his defense of music in Daman’s 1579 collection preface.

A few years later, Byrd produced another piece of pro-music propaganda in the form of the preface to his 1588 \textit{Psalmes, Sonets, and Songs of Sadnes}, the well-known “Reasons briefly set downe by the auctor, to perswade every one to learne to sing.” Here Byrd appeals to his readers from a mostly practical standpoint, arguing in the first seven of his eight reasons that 1) it is easy to learn, 2) singing is good for one’s health and “delightful to Nature,” 3) again it is good for one’s health, 4) it improves speech problems, 5) it improves “pronunciation” and makes “a good Orator,” 6) people will not know if they have a good voice (a gift that is quite rare) if they do not learn to sing, and 7) the voice is the most beautiful means by which men make music. His eighth reason, however, rests on religious obligation by claiming that “The better the voice is, the meeter it is to honour & serve God there-with: and the voice of man is chiefly to be imployed to that end.”\textsuperscript{66}

After exposing his eight reasons, Byrd then ends the argument by saying that “Since singing is so good a thing, I wish all men would learne to sing.”\textsuperscript{67} While it appears that Byrd is

\textsuperscript{65}William Byrd, \textit{Piece in Praise of John Case’s Praise of Mucicke} (London: [date unknown]), A.
\textsuperscript{67}Byrd, \textit{Psalmes}, A2v.
trying to inform his readers about the benefits of singing, he is also implicitly defending music itself and encouraging his readers to accept his assertion that “singing is so good a thing” without considering the arguments against it, offering evidence to support his claims, or encouraging any further discussion of the topic. Furthermore, we have rare evidence from Byrd’s next collection that indicates that Byrd was at least aware of the propagandistic impact of his Psalms. In his Songs of Sundrie Natures from the next year, he writes in his dedication that “Having observed (Right Honorable) that since the publishing in print, of my last labors in Musicke, diverse persons of great honor and worship, have more esteemed & delighted in the exercise of that art then before” that he was encouraged to publish again. He then writes that “Finding that my last Impression of Musicke (most gentle Reader) through thy curtesie and favour, hath had good passage and utterance: and that since the publishing thereof, the exercise and love of that Art to have exceedingly encreased. I have bene encouraged thereby, to take further paines therin.”

Byrd seems to be saying that the public image of music had improved as a result of the publication of his previous collection, which encouraged him to undertake the publication of a new collection with the implication that perhaps that collection too would improve the appreciation and practice of music.

After Byrd’s 1589 collection, musicians continued to publish defenses of music, and a total of eighteen works (including the Second Booke by Daman mentioned above) that contain pro-music propaganda were published over the next fifty years (1589 to 1639). Some authors—
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such as John Dowland in his preface to his translation of Ornithoparchus’ *Micrologus* and Pilkington in his dedication to the *First Book of Songs*—continued the practice of referencing respected thinkers from the past and/or making references to Biblical passages or sacred music in general. Some emphasized the unfortunate state of music—as we have already seen—in a way that could encourage sympathy and inspire greater support of music. Finally, many authors made brief assertions of the worth of music and/or simultaneously disparaged those who do not support music and those who condemn it.

One example of this practice comes from George Kirbye’s *First Set of English Madrigalls* from 1597. In the dedication of which he writes that

> It were a thing very unnecessary ... for mee (although I were able) to speake any thing in commendation & praise of Musicke, considering (besides that many learned men have learnedly written in commendation thereof) the examples of times past, and our owne experience every day, doth give sufficient testimonie both of the pleasure and proffit that it bringeth to a distressed & melancholy mind. Also I think it convenient not to answere (otherwise then with silence) to those (more sencelesse then brute beastes) that with open mouthes doe in-weigh, & speake all the evill they can against that excellent knowledge.71

Kirbye encourages his readers to agree immediately with his assertion of the excellence of music, not only because it is more or less self evident and has in any case been covered by very learned men, but also because anyone who speaks against music is simply more “sencelesse” than “brute beastes.” This sort of propaganda will not convert those who already disagree with the author—unlike the propaganda of Whythorne, Daman, and Cosyn—but it can encourage those who have

---

not already chosen a side on the topic to make an emotional decision in favor of the propagandist or inspire continued or greater devotion in individuals who already support the propagandist’s cause.

Luckily, we have another piece of primary evidence that sheds light on the reception of pro-music propaganda, but unlike Byrd’s comments that relate to the appreciation of music outside of the musical community, this example from Alfonso Ferrabosco focuses on the use of propaganda within the musical community itself. In his 1609 collection of *Ayres*, Ferrabosco writes that “I could, now, with that solemn industry of many in Epistles [i.e. dedications], enforce all that hath beene said in praise of the Faculty [i.e., music] and make that commend the work,” but he says that he would rather his work commend the faculty. If nothing else, if we accept that he is referring specifically to music when he says faculty, this statement shows that Ferrabosco believed that other musicians were using commendations of music to achieve the goal of convincing their readers of the worth of their works through covert implication and association—hence through propaganda. It would seem that Ferrabosco was himself engaging in a propagandistic maneuver in this collection, however, as there appears a laudatory poem by Ben Jonson that offers a praise of music immediately after Ferrabosco has stated that he would prefer not to praise the faculty as others have. It is possible, of course, that Ferrabosco meant faculty in the sense of ability rather than branch of knowledge, but such a usage would be odd given that dedicatory epistles almost always present the author’s abilities humbly and as unworthy of the
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favor of their patron, especially when written (as they often are) by the author himself, while praises of music as a branch of knowledge appeared consistently throughout this period.

Besides attesting to their piety, condemning the abuse of music, and praising music generally, some musicians also condemned minstrels as the abusers of music and the reason for the decline of music in England. This maneuver allowed them to absolve themselves of association with the abuse of music, distance themselves from the low-class musicians that were actively being persecuted by tract writers and prosecuted by the government, and signal their high moral standing as learned musicians who know the proper use of music. Although the pro-music pamphleteers Lodge and Case were the first to adopt this tactic, musicians (including theorists) continued to employ it from the late sixteenth century until the 1640s.

For Thomas Weelkes, minstrels are the enemy that virtuous musicians in his time were fighting against in an effort to return music to its formerly pure state. Virtuous musicians have taken up this task even in spite of the fact that many of them have been forced into poverty by the infamy of the general populace:

> it is no small comfort the Musicke professors conceive, when they consider the ever misdeeming multitude to brand them with infamy, whom the most Honorable spirits have alwaies honored: and although povertie hath debarred them their fellow arts mens companie, yet nature hath set their better part at libertie, to delight them that love Musicke. Amongst so many worthy men dayly labouring to call home againe the banished Philomele, whose purest blood the impure Ministralsie hath stained....

Such a statement not only casts Weelkes’ patron as a benefactor of virtue—one of the “most Honorable spirits”—who has always honored musicians and thereby encourages further patronage and other “Honorable spirits” to follow suit, but it also encourages readers to divide
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the musical community into good and bad segments according to whether or not one is a minstrel—especially considering that Weelkes gives no concrete description of the “worthy men” except the implication that he is one of them.

In addition to being one of the works from this period that blames the corruption of music and the decline in the appreciation of music on minstrels, Thomas Ravenscroft’s *Brief Discourse* also presents one of the most heavily propagandistic works from this period. There are a number of elements of this collection that make it far from average. On the large scale, the work is both a treatise and a collection of polyphonic vocal music. The prefatory material is as long as the treatise portion (twelve folios for each) and consists of a dedication to thirteen people (individuals associated with Gresham College in London) that also emphasizes Ravenscroft’s education at Gresham College; an “Apologie” section that defends music and comments on the low state of music during this period; ten laudatory poems, which are unusual in any quantity in music collections or treatises but usually do not number more than three; and a preface that also defends music and discusses the state of music in Ravenscroft’s England. The laudatory poems also mention the state of music and praise Ravenscroft for attempting to improve it. The content of these separate sections aside, the ostentatious display of this work was certainly intended as a means of propagandistically influencing his readers by adding an air of authority and importance to the work.

Ravenscroft maintains the emotional appeal of the collection as a whole in the content of the prefatory material. In the “Apologie,” for example, he references Pherecrates’ personification of music as a woman who has been physically abused by musicians who had
through certaine *uncertaine Opinions* and *Changes*, wrought her so much woe. If *Perecrates* had now lived, well and truely might he have presented her ... with scarce *Ligatures* left to preserve the compacture of her *Body*, so much is she wrong’d, dilacerated, dismembered, and disjoyned in these our daies; she scarceely hath *Forme or Habite* left, but e’ne as a *Sceleton*, retaines onely a shape, or shadowe, of what she was in her former purity.76

He not only plays on chivalrous desires to protect innocent women in his imagery of music as a woman, but continues the analogy by making music not only a woman but also the abused and neglected mother of musicians:

> And (if ever) this braine-sicke *Age* wherein we live, may best testifie her [music’s] misery; for neither *Her selfe*, nor her *Lawes* are regarded even of her *Children*, but most led by their stragling passions runne after their owne rebellious Imaginations; which doth breed a misery of miseries unto *Her*, great greife and Sorrow to her true borne Children, and to all, a base wretched *Estimation*, aswell amongst those who know her *Eminencie*, as those who never knew *Her*, nor any other vertue.77

In this analogy, the selfishness of some of music’s children has led them to neglect and disrespect their mother. As Ravenscroft and the author of one of the laudatory poems make clear later, the true children mentioned above are learned musicians, while the children who abuse her are

> those common kinde *Practitioners*, (truly ycleped *Minstrels*, though our City makes *Musitians* of them) who make account forsooth to doe the *Art* Honour, now in these daies of the ill opinion, and small credit it beares, have (fairely) brought it downe from a cheife *Liberall Science*, to the basest almost of *Mechanick Functions*: I make no question, but in good time it may returne upon their owne necks, and their Desert be rewarded, as Statute in that case hath already (most Worthily) provided.78

Therefore, Ravenscroft establishes that he is not only one of the faithful children of music and that his work is not just a contribution to a theoretical debate but is a righteous crusade on

---
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behalf of the moral use of music and a respect for the discipline. Indeed, the laudatory poem by 
William Austin suggests that Ravenscroft is seeking to stop musicians who “hanging up their 
Harpes/ Doe growe to fall Flat out, for Flats and Sharpes./ And by their Discord make that Art 
uneven,;” by using his “Dove-like Pen of Peace/ Strives to out-flie such Strife, and make it cease” 
and is also careful to make sure readers know that like a true politician, Ravenscroft “for Love 
doth This, and not for Gaine.”

Still another laudatory poem, this one by Thomas Piers, asserts 
that Ravenscroft has cleansed the rust from the name of music and that people for generations 
will use his work to “lash the base Mechanicke Rout/ Of Mercenary Minstrels who have made/ 
(To their own scorne) this Noble Art a Trade.”

Ravenscroft’s own stated purpose for the work is to 

in the behalfe of my Mother Musicke, as a dutiful childe to condole, and (to my 
power) to minister a Medicine to Her Maladies, have I oppos[‘]d my selfe against 
a Capitall Rebell Common Practice, or Custome, which long since seditiously 
resisted, and through arrogancy and ignorance hath incenst against Her, and 
drawne away the most part of her Children from their due allegeance; whereby I 
entend either to right Her, by reclaiming them to the line of her Lawes and 
Praecepts, or to make knowne unto the world all her Spurious and Illegitimate 
Children, that doe thus unnaturally oppose themselves against Her.

His goal is to defeat common practice, which has abandoned the laws of music—specifically the 
proper use of notation—and to thereby reunify the musical community under the established 
theoretical principles of the previous generation. It is possible that he really did believe that the 
changes to notation during this period were a significant contributing factor to the decline of 
music and that minstrels were the cause of the changes. It is also possible that he was using the 
trendy topics of the depressed state of the musical community and the ongoing persecution and
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scapegoating of minstrels as propaganda. The fact that he gives no evidence to suggest this connection between minstrels and notation makes propagandistic intent more likely. Using minstrels and the declining state of the musical community as propaganda allowed him to morally elevate himself and his work above his opposition and any personal association with the abuse of music; it also allowed him to denigrate his opposition as lowly minstrels who have corrupted and abused their mother music. It may even be that the entire work was simply meant to increase his reputation in society as a learned, virtuous musician rather than to have any actual effect on the notation of the time. Such an interpretation would explain why the prefatory material is as extensive as the treatise portion of the text and why he then included a full collection of musical pieces that he says are meant to exemplify the ideas in his treatise but are no different from any other collection printed during this period.

Even if Ravenscroft did not intend his references to minstrels to play on his musician readers’ fears of being branded minstrels and thereby subject to prejudice and legal restrictions—as he references in his hope that minstrels get what is coming to them from the statute that already provides for it—the state of the musical community during this period would have certainly done so and thereby served a secondary propagandistic function. Furthermore, Ravenscroft’s condemnation of minstrels and their abuses of music also nevertheless serve propagandistically to distance him from accusations of the abuse of music without his ever having to assert that he has not abused music himself.

The last significant condemnation of minstrels that appeared during this period was made by Charles Butler in his Principles of Musik from 1636. Butler describes the purpose of the work as being “for the furtherance of the studious, to set forth the Principles of both of these vocall
Arts, (Grammar and Musick. [sic])\textsuperscript{82} with the mention of grammar being a reference to a previous treatise he had published on the subject. Much of the work conforms to this goal, with Butler dedicating book one (92 pages) of the total two books in the work to explaining modes (chapter 1); singing (chapter 2); part-setting (chapter 3); and counterpoint (chapter 4). He dedicates the second book (45 pages), which he titles “of the uses of Musick,” however, to defending the use of church music and secular music. It is in this second book, which may very well have been the main purpose of the treatise as a whole—which would then have been disguised as secondary for propagandistic reasons—that we find Butler’s two prominent condemnations of minstrels.\textsuperscript{83}

The first condemnation appears in section four of chapter two in book two, where Butler writes that

it is not meete that any vulgar profane Pipers (whatsoever their skil bee) shoulde bee suffered, in their discordant and irregular Habit, to bare a parte in this holy Action; ... But if for Art and vertue, they shall bee thought meete for the woork; let them first foregoe their profane Profession, and bee ordaine and allowed by Authorite, before they presume to set a foote in the Qire: as is reqired by that ancient Canon.\textsuperscript{84}

The canon he is referencing is that none may ascend to the pulpit and read except those who have been ordained. Prior to this statement, Butler praises the abilities of Anglican composers and choristers\textsuperscript{85} and he argues that care has been taken to ensure that music is always used
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appropriately.\textsuperscript{86} He follows the statement by arguing that he sees no reason why music should not be used in church.\textsuperscript{87} In this context, it is likely that Butler intended his discussion of pipers (minstrels) to distance Church musicians from association with corrupt musicians and the abuse of music. Church musicians know and are expected to uphold the proper use of music and are therefore a benefit to the Church rather than a liability or corruptor of it.

His second condemnation of minstrels appears in section three of chapter three from book two in which he rebuts objections against the civil use of music. Like those before him, Butler simultaneously extolls the virtue of music and condemns those who abuse it, even referencing the laws against minstrels to assure his readers that the problem has been addressed by the government and that there is a formal process for combating the abuse of music:

It is true that those you blame [ballad makers and dance makers], ar the principal Arkitects of all the mischief: they ar the Inventors and contrivers of the Plot: but it is their sordid Agents (the mercenary Minstrels) that put the strategems of them both in execution: they ar the Instruments to publish the filthy Songs of the one; and to teach the filthy fasions of the other. And these, it is in your power that ar but inferior Magistrates, or otherwise men of woorth, to reform. If you find fault, that they say or doe that which is contrari to good manners, which tendeth to the corrupting of yuth, or the offending of modest ears and eys; haply they will bee ashamed: but if you sharply rebuke them; (knowing in what case the Law hath left them) doubts they will fear to offend eftsoones [again] in that kind. But (thanks bee to God) these impure Buffons (weither it bee that they ar not now permitted, as formerly, to defile the pres; or that themselvs ar, at least, ashamed of their stale ribaldri; or that the people, waxing more modest, wil noe longer endure it;) begin, mee thinks, to wear away; and there arises in their steed a better generation.\textsuperscript{88}

In addition to assuring his readers that minstrels and the abuse of music appear to be on the decline, which may have served to lessen readers’ concerns through implication that the problem is essentially solved, Butler’s statements also indicate that the laws against minstrels were still on
the minds of musicians and that anti-music sentiments were still pervasive enough for an author like Butler to include so much pro-music propaganda in a treatise that was only officially described as a means of conveying the principles of music to those who might wish to learn them.

Prose treatises and the dedications and prefaces of music collections were not the only outlets that were available to musicians who wished to publish pro-music propaganda. Musicians could also propagandize through the song texts in their collections. An example from Whythorne and one from Byrd have already been given and prove that the practice of propagandizing through song was present in the earliest music publications in England. Indeed, as Katherine Butler has recently asserted, “it was widely accepted that it [music] could have a profound political affect.” 89 She cites Byrd’s Cantiones Sacrae, in the preface of which Byrd and Tallis assert that “music was indispensable to the state” and The Praise of Musick in which Case asserts that “the changing of musical notes hath caused an alteration of the common state.” 90 There are, however, even more direct statements in other primary sources regarding the use of music and poetry as propaganda. Lodge, in his Protogenes, asserts the propagandistic power, use, and benefit of poetry when he writes,

Did you never reade [...] whatsoever either Virgil did write of his gnatt, or Ovid of his fley [flee]: was all covertly to declare abuse? ... how bravely discovereth Terence our imperfection in his Eunich? ... what so they wrot, it was to this purpose, in the way of pleasure to draw men to wisedome: for seeing the world in those daies was unperfect, yt was necessary that they like good Phisions [physicians]: should so frame their potions, that they might be appliable to the quesie stomaks of their werish patients. 91
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In relation to music, Thomas Campion’s *A Relation* contains a song about courtship that includes the lines “Happie is he whose words can move / Yet sweete notes helpe Persuasion. / Mixe your words with Musicke then, / That they the more may enter.” In both cases, music and text are recognized as tools toward achieving propagandistic goals. Particularly telling is that Campion’s statement comes from one of the first masque texts published in England, a quasi-musical genre that when printed was perhaps the most consistently propagandistic and intimately political of all musical publications to appear before the civil wars.

Knowing that contemporaries recognized the coercive powers of text and music combined, we can conclude that the songs from this period that reference music are more likely to have been intended as propaganda than otherwise. They certainly could have functioned as propaganda secondarily even if they were not originally intended to do so. Overall, two music collections from this period offer reasonably strong evidence to suggest that pieces within the collections were either intended to function as propaganda or would have done so unintentionally as a result of the cultural context in which these pieces were situated—specifically the decline of the musical community—especially in light of the contents of the dedications that are attached to the collections. One of these collections appeared in 1598, Weelkes’s *Balletts*, and the other in 1618, East’s *The Fourth Set*.

As quoted briefly above, Weelkes writes in his dedication that he cannot forget the help his patron has given him, because

> it is no small comfort the Musicke professors conceive, when they consider the ever misdeeming multitude to brand them with infamy, whom the most Honorable spirits have alwaies honored: and although povertie hath debarred them their fellow arts mens companie, yet nature hath set their better part at libertie, to

---

delight them that love Musicke. Amongst so many worthy men dayly labouring to call home againe the banished Philomele, whose purest blood the impure Minstralsie hath stained.  

In light of this passage, songs III, XIV, XV, and XVII from this collection are likely to have been intended as propaganda by Weelkes. The text of song III is as follows: “Sweet love, I will no more abuse thee,/ Nor with my voice accuse thee,/ But tune my notes unto they praise,/ And tell the world love ne’er decayes./ Sweet love doth concord ever cherish;/ What wanteth concord soone doth perish.” As one might expect from a madrigal in the Elizabethan style, the text is set imitatively with the exception of the chordal setting of the lines “But tune my notes unto thy praise” and “Sweet love doth concord ever cherish.” Weelkes also uses the chromatic inflection of D to D# in the motion from a D major triad to a B major triad and G to G# in the motion from a G major triad to an E major triad to highlight “tune” and “concord” respectively. By emphasizing the benefit of concord and the danger of discord, Weelkes may have been attempting to encourage an end to the infighting in the musical community and the division between the “ever misdeeming multitude” who abuse and accuse music and those who have always honored and enjoyed it.

Likewise, the text of song XIV may be interpreted as pro-unity propaganda, with its emphasis on the unity and harmony of the singing shepherds and their resulting happiness: “Sing sheperds after me, our harts do never disagree,/ Fa la la la [etc. ...]/ No war can spoile us of our store,/ we goe not brave,/ a merry hart is all we have.” The singing shepherds are impervious to war because even though they are not equipped for it, they “goe not brave,” their unity and merry
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hearts will either give them victory or at least carry them though unharmed. If we associate the shepherds with virtuous members of the musical community then Weelkes could be using this ballet to emphasize the benefits of unity as the means to weather the persecution that the musical community was currently experiencing.

Songs XV and XVII, on the other hand, may be an attempt at encouragement to suffering musicians who have been “debarred” by “povertie” or as a defense of musicians and music in general. The text of song XV states that “This mirth delights mee, when sorrowes frights me./ Then sing we all,/ Fa la la la la la./ Sorrow content thee, mirth must prevent thee/ though much thou grevest,/ thou none releevest, no no,/ Joy come delight mee, though sorrow spight mee/ Griefe is disdainfull, sottish and painfull./ then wait on pleasure./ and loose no leasure, no no,/ Harts ease it lendeth, & comfort sendeth.”96 In addition to being solace for the musical community, this ballet may also be seen as pro-music propaganda because it reinforces the idea that music relieves sorrow, with the implication that this music in particular—even though it is secular—is also beneficial and therefore has a place in society.

Weelkes returns to the shepherds of song XIV in song XVII and presents them as idyllic and unspoiled people who care not for worldly possessions but are perfectly contented by their music, dance, and rustic sports: “We shepherds sing we pipe, we play, with pretty sport we passe the day,/ Fa la la la [etc. ...]/ We care for no gold, but [only] with our fold,/ We daunce & prauce as pleasure would./ Fa la la la [etc. ...].”97 By representing the shepherds as constantly engaging in pleasure and music but not having been corrupted by it—living in harmony as they do and with no care for gold—Weelkes counters the stereotypes against music as being

---

96 Weelkes, Balletts, C1v-r.
97 Weelkes, Balletts, Dr.
corrupting when used for pleasure. It is true that these songs would not be convincing to any hardline Calvinists because they might never have been willing to hear them in the first place, but propaganda is not only used to convert propagandees but also to maintain their support. These songs therefore might have served to strengthen and otherwise maintain the support of individuals like Edward Darcye (the dedicatee of the collection) who were all that stood between musicians like Weelkes and the poverty he mentions in the dedication.

Like Weelkes, Michaell East comments on the state of music and defends it in his dedication to *The Fourth Set*, saying that “There bee few Arts of the like worth, that so much stand in need of patronage, as Musicke: for with the greatest part of the world, all Sciences which bring not in money, are esteemed needles [needless] and idle.”98 In this context, songs X through XIII may be read as propaganda that attempts to encourage a greater appreciation of music. The texts of songs X and XI emphasize the divine use of music and its connection to God: “O clap your hands together all yea people,/ O sing unto God, with the voyce of melody,/ For the Lord is high, and to be feared./ He is the greatest King, upon all the earth.”99 The text continues in song XI with “God is gone up with a merry noyse,/ And the Lord with the sound of the trumpet/ O sing praises to our King,/ With understanding./ Amen.”100

By making associations between God and music and inciting the listener to praise God with joyful music, East covertly urges his audience to better respect the art as necessary and active. He makes a similar implication in songs XII and XIII, but this time he approaches the value of music from a secular perspective: “I Heard three Virgins sweetly singing, and for the

---

100 East, *Fourth Set*, B2r.
Muses them reputed,/ and such sweetnesse from their lips, was springing,/ But straight their number that confuted,/ Them looking better on their faces,/ I found they were the lovely Graces.\textsuperscript{101} The second part continues in song XIII: “What heart, such doubled force resisteth?/ Or to be wonne by them refuses?/ in whom such excellence consisteth./ For beauty, graces, for singing Muses,/ Where Musicke, lookes, and beauty soundeth,/ what heart so stony, but it woundeth.”\textsuperscript{102} The lovely virgins who are enjoying and producing beautiful music happen to be the three graces who personify grace, beauty, and happiness, and the second text goads the audience into accepting the beauty and power of music through association with the graces and references to the power of music.

\textbf{IV. Conclusion}

This chapter has covered a much longer period than any of the following chapters will—a period spanning approximately seventy years in contrast to the ten-year periods discussed in all other chapters. I have chosen to focus this chapter in this way for several reasons. First, unlike all of the following chapters, which focus on the use of music as propaganda by individuals who were predominantly not musicians, this chapter focuses on musicians themselves and discusses how they used their own art to influence their own community and the wider culture on which they depended for their livelihood. Secondly, in focusing on musicians this chapter discusses issues that arose (perhaps coincidentally) around the same time as the music printing industry in England and are reflected in printed music from that time until the 1630s. Therefore, it was advantageous to begin at the beginning and trace these issues as they developed throughout this period. Finally, beginning with a topic that coincides with the first period of printed music in

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{101} East, \textit{Fourth Set}, C3v.
\textsuperscript{102} East, \textit{Fourth Set}, C3r.
\end{footnotesize}
England also allows for a thorough examination and contextualization of the roots of the seventeenth-century perspective on music and creates a point of reference to which one can refer throughout this dissertation.

As a result of focusing exclusively on musicians and their use of propaganda during this period, I have not discussed the use of music as propaganda for and by non-musicians up to 1639. That topic is equal in scope to the one discussed in this chapter and would require a separate chapter of its own to be covered in its entirety. The main difference between the use of music as propaganda for non-musicians and the use of music as propaganda by musicians themselves is that while the propaganda created by musicians for themselves has been shown to be part of a more or less consistent movement throughout the period, with similar goals, similar talking points, and similar manifestations, music that was used as propaganda for non-musicians was used for diverse purposes and to benefit diverse individuals. Much of it, especially during the reigns of James I and Charles I, was used to control and improve the image of the monarch and his family. Even so, taken as a whole much of the propaganda—with the notable exception of the court masque libretti—appears to be decentralized, uncoordinated, and sometimes a collection of random attempts to either improve the image of one individual or to use the propagandistic act of producing propaganda for them as a means to increase the standing of the individual paying for or producing (or both) the propaganda.\(^{103}\)

---

Take, for example, the many songs in music collections during this period that are lamentations on the death of some notable public figure. These songs appear rather frequently, but they do not appear at the death of every public figure, nor is it clear if they were deliberately produced as public image propaganda, as propaganda toward ensuring that a collection would pass censorship, as propaganda to boost sales, or as an earnest tribute by the composer to a person he admired. The same could be said for the many moralizing songs that appear throughout this period. They generally emphasize common moral messages: do not waste your life being idle, do not give away your virginity, worship God, do not be jealous, etc. There is no indication that they were part of a coordinated effort to improve morals. Focus on the musical propaganda produced by musicians in this period, therefore, offers a look at propaganda directed at a common goal.

Chapter 3: Music as Identity Politics in the English Civil Wars, 1640-1649

Purple: I come to charge ye that slight the Clergie
   And pull the mytre from the Prelates head,
   That you’l be warie lest ye miscarry
   in all the factious humours you have bred:
   And as for the Brownists wee’l have none,
   But take them all and hang them one by one.

Orange: I come to talk Sir with you that walk Sir
   in such contempt against the Brownists fashion:
   You are undone Sir, I have a Gun Sir,
   Which Ile discharge upon you in my passion:
   Then Cevalo Sir, come not neere,
   For we will have you up Sir Cavalier.¹

I. Introduction

The quotation above makes no mention of music, yet it was presented by its anonymous
author as the conclusion of a pamphlet titled News from Pauls: Containing a Relation of the
Angry Disputation Betwixt the two Church-Quarrellers, Orange-Tawnie and Purple: Being A
contention about the Lawfulnesse or Unlawfulnesse of Organs and other Ceremonies. This verse
dialogue between Orange and Purple is steeped in political symbolism and propagandistic intent
and succintly represents the intimate connection that developed between music and political
propaganda during the 1640s. This quotation, and the work from which it was taken, will be
discussed in more detail in section III of this chapter. The chapter begins, however, with an
overview of the place of church music in the debates between Puritans and Anglicans leading up
to the civil wars and argues that music was a relatively insignificant element of the debate until
the beginning of the wars. It then discusses the political causes and contexts of the wars before

¹ News from Pauls: Containing a Relation of the Angry Disputation Betwixt the two Church-Quarrellers, Orange-
Tawnie and Purple: Being A contention about the Lawfulnesse or Unlawfulnesse of Organs and other Ceremonies
(London, 1642), 5.
turning to the third and fourth main sections of this work, which discuss the use of church music as propaganda for Royalists and Parliamentarians from 1641 through 1643 and the use of sacred and secular music as propaganda for Royalists and Parliamentarians from 1644 through 1649. Taken as a whole, this chapter argues that the overt musical, theological, and informative content of the works discussed herein conceals considerable amounts of Royalist and Parliamentarian propaganda that I argue was disguised by this straightforward, innocuous content to play upon the easily understandable, intimate connections between music, religion, and identity that were evident during this period. These works aim primarily to win political support, reduce enemy opposition, and/or strengthen existing support for the causes of the propagandists and/or their employers. Any discussion of music or presentation of informative communication in these works is secondary to this covert, propagandistic purpose.

II. Music and Politics Leading up to the English Civil Wars

Arguing about Church Music, 1559-1639

Prior to the 1640s, liturgical music was a relatively insignificant point of contention between Puritans and Anglicans (at least in terms of its representation in print). The topic, taken as a whole, received only a small fraction of the attention authors paid to defending or attacking bowing at the altar, the presence of an alter in the first place, the wearing of surplices by the clergy, and the continued adherence to (and often enforced use of) the Book of Common Prayer. Indeed, no pamphlets that were published during this period have a titular focus on church music or otherwise address it as a main topic of discussion. Although a significant amount of text is dedicated to discussing church music in John Case’s The Praise of Musick from 1586 and
Charles Butler’s *Principles of Musick* from 1636, other authors who mention church music do so only briefly in the course of discussions on other topics.\(^2\) During the admonition controversy of the 1570s, for example, over 1,000 pages across four separate publications were dedicated to arguing the Anglican and Puritan positions on the non-musical, theological points of contention mentioned above, yet fewer than ten pages of text across all four works were devoted to arguing the lawfulness of antiphonal psalm singing, the use of organs in church, and the “curious” polyphony of the cathedrals.\(^3\)

This lack of emphasis carried over into the early seventeenth century, and at the accession of James I in 1603 a group of Puritan ministers who claimed to be over a thousand members strong petitioned the new king with a document known as the *Millenary Petition*, which listed the grievances of the Puritans and asked for consideration towards further church reforms. As with the *Admonition* of 1572, the *Millenary* mentions liturgical music only briefly and in vague, general terms asking only that “Church songs and music [be] moderated to better

---

\(^2\) Here a significant amount of text is defined as constituting at least one titled section or chapter dedicated to the topic or 10% of the overall length of the work. Though we as readers might find an author’s comments on a given topic to be significant from a historical perspective, even if his comments are relatively brief and inconspicuous, we cannot say that an author considered the topic to be significant if it is not presented prominently in his work. John Case, *The Praise of Musicke* (Oxford: Barnes, 1586); Charles Butler, *The Principles of Musick* (London: John Haviland, 1636).

edification.”\textsuperscript{4} When the Hampton Court Conference (which James I called in order to address the issues raised in the petition) convened the next year, the four Puritan ministers that were charged with presenting their case—Dr. Reynolds, Dr. Sparke, Mr. Chatterton, and Mr. Newstubbs—also did not emphasize music as an important liturgical issue. Instead

The doctors named diverse abuses, but insisted chiefly upon the confirmation, the cross in baptism, the surplice, private baptism, kneeling at the communion, reading of the \textit{Apocrypha}, subscriptions to the Book of Common Prayer and articles; one only translation of the Bible to be authentical, and read in the church; the censure of excommunication for so small causes; the corruptions in the bishops’ and archdeacons’ courts, committed by their chancellors, commissaries, officials, registers, and such like officers; together with their immoderate exactions and fees, to be reformed.\textsuperscript{5}

Clearly the Puritans had a long list of reforms that they wished to implement (all of which had remained unaddressed since the early days of Elizabeth I and would remain unaddressed until the civil wars), but it is telling of the lack of emphasis placed on music as a topic of contention before the 1640s that when given the one-time-only chance to present their case to the new monarch of their kingdom—an opportunity that Elizabeth I had never given them—the Puritans choose not to emphasize it as one of their chief concerns.

Several factors may have contributed to this lack of emphasis on church music by Puritan reformers prior to the English Civil Wars. First, both Elizabeth I and James I had charted a moderate course regarding religion that made it clear to dissenters and nonconformists that as long as they publically respected the authority of the monarch, were present at communion at


least once a year, and did not speak out publically against the traditions and authority of the Church of England they would be allowed religious freedom in private, and in practice local parishes were largely free to alter minor elements of the liturgy that were not expressly mandated by the *Book of Common Prayer*—such as music—to suit the majority of the congregation. On this point Peter McCullough has argued that during the reign of James I there was a movement—with Lancelot Andrewes being one of the most notable members—to synthesize and reconcile church music and preaching, which also could have contributed to this lack of attention to church music as a point of contention among Puritans. Second, organs had largely fallen out of use in parish churches and even some cathedrals by the 1580s, and choirs were often too expensive to maintain. This left unison, communal psalm singing as the only musical element of the liturgy in English churches, which was exactly the type of musical activity that Puritans wanted in their religious services.

Therefore, music might not have been a primary concern for Puritans because the state of church music in the kingdom was close to the usage that they desired, and even if some congregations used organs and choirs, Puritans could choose not to employ them in their own local congregations (provided the majority of the congregation and/or the minister were Puritans, or at least agreeable). Even if they became more concerned with music during the reign of Charles I, they would have been prevented from expressing such a concern openly because of the

---

requirement, which was implemented by Archbishop Laud in the 1630s, that religious writings be approved by the Church of England. To risk the punishments for unlicensed publication, music would have had to be a particularly pressing concern. This is especially true considering that having one’s ears cut off was one possible punishment for unlicensed publication, depending on what was written in the publication (this punishment was famously suffered by three individuals in 1637 for daring to attack in print the popish idolatry of all Anglican Bishops).  

9 Temperly, 43; Woolrych, 81; this event is referenced not only in The Organs Eccho but also in The Organs Funerall.

A Culture Divided Leads to Civil War

Whatever respect and stability James I and Elizabeth I had passed down to Charles I, however, was quickly squandered as a result of his heavy-handed, absolutist approach to politics. Because of his proclivity for ritual, exaltation of authority, and formality, Charles I was naturally attracted to what scholars today and contemporary Puritans referred to as Arminianism, which was associated by Puritan polemicists with an imminent return to Catholic practices and communion with Rome (i.e., popery). This association with popery was only made worse by Charles I’s marriage to a French princess who was herself Catholic, ministered to by a Catholic priest, and surrounded by Noble Catholic recusants wherever she went. His consistent advancement of Arminian clergy, most notably William Laud, to the highest positions of civil

10 Arminianism can most succinctly be defined as the belief that salvation was based on free will rather than predestination. In England, individuals called Arminians certainly opposed predestination (but such had always been the position of the Church of England), but they are more accurately termed “Laudians” because Laud’s proclivities for order and ceremony are not inherent Arminian beliefs. The use of the term by Puritans is a conflation and synthesis of actual Arminian beliefs upheld by the Church of England with Laud’s administrative proclivities. As with the term “Puritan,” in designating Calvinists, however, “Arminian” has become the default designator for “high-church” Anglicans during this period, and I use it in that sense throughout this work. See the OED for more information on the usage of the term in English. Woolrych, 50.
and ecclesiastical government—with Laud serving on the Privy Council, as the Archbishop of Canterbury, and as the Chancellor of Oxford University—broke all the precedents of moderation and tolerance that had held religious tensions in check for nearly a century.\textsuperscript{11}

Charles I’s elevation of Archbishop Laud and other Arminians in and of itself might not have been such a problem for Puritans, however, if Laud and his supporters had maintained the status quo as previous administrators of the Church of England had done. The very nature of Laud’s administrative philosophy made looking the other way in regard to local liturgical variances, alternate traditions, non-standardized church furnishings, and dissenting views impossible, because standardization, order, and ceremony were guiding principles of Laud’s administration.\textsuperscript{12} Even before Laud’s appointment as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1633 up to the beginning of the Civil War in 1642, likeminded clerics and bishops sought to emphasize the uniqueness of the Church of England—especially its identity as being separate from both the Catholic church and Protestant denominations—and to restore the respect and awe with which the English public once viewed the Church of England and religion in general.

One of the principal ways they went about achieving this goal was through the use of and emphasis on ceremonial practices in the liturgy. Specifically, Arminians required ministers to wear priestly vestments, and required churches to be kept in good condition, with communion rails separating the laity from the communion table, and the communion table raised and relocated to the east end of the church in order to focus attention on and emphasize the ritual of

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 50-59.
the sacraments. Just as they sought to separate the church and clergy from the laity, so too did they attempt to separate the laity from the sacraments and religious discourse by limiting sermon lengths in favor of increased emphasis on the ceremonies of the service—which were to be performed with reverence and ritual—and by restricting the content of the service to those words, prayers, sermons, and rituals prescribed by the *Book of Common Prayer*.

The logistics of these reforms included a requirement (mentioned above) that all publications related to religion be approved by the Bishop of London or by the administration of Oxford or Cambridge University, active prosecution of clergy for nonconformity, and regular visits by church officials (including Laud himself) to parish churches and distant cathedrals to insure that all branches of the Church of England were conforming to the Arminian reforms. Therefore, Laud and his administration not only looked suspiciously like papists to the average Puritan, but they also prevented Puritans from worshipping according to their own beliefs in their own local parishes, which left them feeling equally oppressed by the Church of England and Charles I’s absolutist government.

In regards to absolutism, Charles made no secret of his opinions and was in the habit of dissolving Parliament whenever it disagreed with him. As an omen of his continued inability to accept contrary viewpoints, Charles could not even endure his first year as king without dissolving his first parliament (1625) for refusing to provide the funding that he had requested. Again in 1626 he dissolved Parliament for attempting to impeach his advisor and friend the Duke

---

13 Woolrych, 77-79; Cressy and Ferrell, 179-193.
14 Dissolving a Parliament does not mean in this case that the organization ceases to exist, but rather that it has been disbanded until such a time as the king decides to call it together again for legislative purposes (often financial).
of Buckingham. In 1629 he dissolved Parliament for attempting to limit his powers through the 
Bill of Rights and Petition of Rights and the spread of Arminianism in the Church of England 
through the Remonstrance, the Resolution on Religion, and the Three Resolutions; this particular 
dissolution resulted in eleven years of personal rule, in which Charles I controlled all aspects of 
governmental administration.

After briefly reinstating Parliament, Charles dissolved it for the last time in 1640 because 
the House of Commons refused to provide funds for his war against the Covenanters in Scotland 
before he addressed their concerns about the spread of Arminianism and his own secular abuses, 
which included Charles I’s routine removal of members of Parliament who opposed him 
publically, the occasional imprisonment of said individuals without trial, the collection of funds 
illegally (without the approval of Parliament), and entering into a war without the approval of 
Parliament (the Bishops’ War). When Charles I assembled Parliament again in 1640 (the so-
called Long Parliament) in a final bid to receive funding for his army and navy, the legislative 
body took decisive steps to divest the control of the government from the hands of the king in an 
effort to prevent further abuses of English law and the rights of English subjects.15

All of the above divisiveness was brought to a climax in 1642 when Charles I and 
Parliament each claimed the right to call up and command armed forces and subsequently 
engaged each other with those forces for the first time on 10 June outside the walls of the city of 
Kingston-Upon-Hull.16 It was at that point that the English public was faced with a choice

15 Woolrych, 54-62.
16 David Plant, Timeline: “The First Civil War 1640-6,” British Civil Wars and Commonwealth Website, 
between supporting their absolutist monarch (along with his ritualistic church), or their largely Calvinist Parliament. As troops took to the field to win the physical conflict, authors took to the presses to win the hearts and minds of these average citizens. It was in this context that the church music practices of the Church of England reached a previously unknown prominence in the printed literature of the civil war period as a means through which propagandists could simplify the complex theological differences between Anglicans and Puritans, inspire group solidarity, and covertly argue on behalf of either side of the conflict. Specifically, the organ was frequently used by both sides as a symbol of Arminianism and the ideas associated with it: Royalists defended the imposing representation of authority and tradition and Parliamentarians attacked it as a symbol of corruption.

III. 1641-1643: Discussions of Church Music as Cavalier and Roundhead Propaganda

Why Church Music? Simple Symbols and Simple Arguments for Average Readers

One of the first representations of the organ as the embodiment of Arminianism appeared in the year prior to the outbreak of hostilities, with the anonymous publication of a parody broadside ballad titled *The Organs Ecco*. Though anonymous, the text was clearly written by one in favor of the Parliament and therefore opposed to Arminianism, with every stanza degrading Archbishop Laud or one of his associates and/or cheering on Parliament for their actions against the Arminians. In light of the text, the title and tune suggestion (with the indication “to the tune of the Cathedrall service”) are poking fun at the end of the Arminian regime and their popish music. The implication of these elements is perhaps that the echo of the organ is the only remnant of the popish devices and ceremonies that will be left after the Parliament cleanses the
church of the abuses of Laud and his associates, all while the common people ironically sing their downfall to the tune of the cathedral service that the Arminians loved so well.\textsuperscript{17}

By personifying the Arminians as the organ in the title, their former strength being nothing but an echo, the author turns away from the scholarly, theological/liturgical arguments of the previous decades that focused on altars and communion rails in favor of a line of argumentation that simplifies and objectifies Arminianism in such a way that the average citizen could understand the objections made against it without any prior knowledge of the theological underpinnings of those objections.\textsuperscript{18} It makes sense that authors would choose the organ as a symbol of Arminianism to use when addressing average readers; unlike the silent, unobtrusive altar or the respectful practice of kneeling at the rails for communion, organs had, and still have, the potential to be poorly maintained and/or poorly played. As a result, they might very well be too loud, unpleasant to the ear, or otherwise performed in a distracting or excessive manner. Therefore, even if readers had never heard a dilapidated organ or a good one poorly played, they could certainly be counted on to concede that organs held the potential to be noisy and intrusive. Authors could then use their criticisms of the sound of the organ to extrapolate general criticisms of Arminianism as an unnecessary distraction when worshipping God and to make larger political points that play on ideas related to music (as I will argued below).

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{The Organs Ecco} (London[?], 1641), 1.

\textsuperscript{18} Cristina Scott Edelen, “Music and Morality in Seventeenth-Century England” (PhD diss., University of Houston, 2008), 194 agrees that “Church music [... in all of its forms] were concrete and visible flashpoints, or symbols, which were often used to represent entire religious ideologies.”
Additionally, many English citizens considered instrumental music and professional musicians to be a gateway to immoral behavior and the immoral side of society respectively.\textsuperscript{19} As a result, organs, organists, and choristers could be transformed into believable stereotypes of Arminians and their supporters, who appear to be pious instruments of the Lord, but are in reality (at least in the Puritan conception) noisy, depraved, and self interested. Puritan authors could also argue that the great devotion that Arminians and Arminian supporters displayed towards their organs was proof that they cared more about spectacle, superstition, and ceremony than they did about devotion to God.\textsuperscript{20}

Indeed, every pamphleteer who wrote about church music from 1641 through 1643 focused on the physical and moral nature of Arminian sacred music as a reflection of Arminianism in general. For some, it was a noisy impediment to the service. For others, it was a source of moral corruption performed by immoral individuals. For one author, writing in defense of the practice and the Cavalier cause, it was a dignified tradition that did no harm to reasonable individuals. Regardless of which argument pamphleteers used to prove their characterization of the organ, they turned their focus unanimously to simple arguments in simple formats that the general public—which might never have contemplated the complex arguments between denominations—could comprehend and support.

\textit{True Newes from Norwich} (1641), for example, claims to recount, in a simple news-like story format, a truthful account of the rude, drunk, and unnecessarily excessive behavior of over

\textsuperscript{20} Marsh, 60-83.
500 individuals who rushed to the defense of the organs in Christ’s Church Cathedral when they received threats that a mob of Puritans would storm the cathedral and tear down the organs. In addition to portraying the lovers of organs as the lowest sort of humanity, the author also takes the opportunity to argue against organs specifically, calling them the “occasion of much evill,”\(^{21}\) “which have indeed lull’d many one asleep in ignorance ... Romish ignorance ... and these are the effects that the Pipes produce.”\(^{22}\) Here the author claims that the reprehensible behavior of the defenders of the organs is a direct result of being exposed to organ music.

*True Newes from Norwich* was popular enough to warrant a second printing in 1642, and that same year saw the publication of *The Organs Funerall*, another work aimed at exposing the errors of those who support and perpetuate Arminian ceremonial music, in this case organists and choristers. The format of this pamphlet is even more direct than the one used in *True Newes from Norwich*. Whereas *True Newes from Norwich* spends time explaining the context of the story and exposing its dramatic elements (by describing the scene, action, and dialogue of the story), *The Organs Funerall* forgoes these dramatic elements in favor of a brief (at approximately 700 words compared to the approximately 1,500 words of *True Newes from Norwich*) dialogue between an unnamed chorister and organist. The propagandistic benefit of this format is that it allows the author to reveal the moral deficiencies and theological ignorance of these two characters in their own words and also allows readers to witness a presumably private (and therefore also presumably honest) conversation between two Arminian sympathizers. This also allows the author, as with *True Newes from Norwich*, to present the propaganda as

\(^{22}\) Ibid., 5.
entertainment or informative writing, thus masking his covert attempt to influence his readers’
political perspectives (which will be discussed in more detail below). Though there is no
indication, as opposed to *True Newes from Norwich*, that this dialogue is being presented as a
genuine transcript of a conversation, it nevertheless serves to reinforce the negative stereotypes
that Parliamentarian supporters might have already held about cathedral musicians, and could
potentially entice a neutral reader to reconsider their opinions about Arminian-style church music
and Arminianism in general.

The chorister, for example, complains that he has lost the preferment that he previously
held under Laud and the Arminians, saying that he now has insufficient funds to support his
family 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, whom I would almost perswade I could procure
pardon for that offence [presumably adultery] But those joves are gone, I must now betake
myself to another course of life, or else I doubt I shall fare as those doe in the Gatehouse.”23 As a
result, he has decided that while he previously obeyed the Arminians in order to remain safe and
well paid, he must now serve the Parliamentarians because “it’s the best policie to serve the
times, and change with the wind, for by that meanes I may be safe when others are questioned.”24
Not only is he guilty of a debauched lifestyle, but he also has no higher purpose than to protect
himself, which leads him to follow the winds of change for the wrong reasons.

The organist, however, will not admit the error of his profession, even though the
chorister informed him in the beginning of the dialogue that Parliament has impeached Laud as a

23 *The Organs Funerall* (London: Kirby, 1642), 3.
24 Ibid., 3-4.
papist servant of the Antichrist and declared his ceremonies superstitious sins: “[Chorister:] the day of absolution is at hand whereby wee shall be freed from our sinnes of superstition and worshipping of God ... with superfluous Ceremonies ... introduced into our Church by the great Patriarch at Lambeth [Laud].” The organist replies that “we hold up and use our profession without contradiction ... as a decent and comely thing in the Church, and a remembrance of the Ordinances of the Law ... to shew that we acknowledge in our religion aswell the Law as the Gospel ... and that wee esteeme not one above the other, which is contrains.” The chorister then concludes by saying “for I am of the same religion with the Parliament and the State; If they command I will obey.” While there is no indication that the organist is morally corrupt like the chorister, he nevertheless, in his well-intentioned desire to give equal respect to the Old and New Testaments, unwittingly perpetuates the Arminian superstitions and ceremonies that the Puritans/Parliamentarians saw as preventing the complete reformation of the Church of England. Therefore, while the Chorister serves as an example of the immorality and self-interest of some Arminians and Arminian sympathizers, the organist serves as an example of the well-meaning ignorance and obstinacy of others.

Just as *The Organs Funerall* employs the same strategy of attacking the moral character of Arminians that was used in *True Newes from Norwich*, the metaphorically sleep-inducing quality of organs from *True Newes* is restated as a physical quality in the anonymous *Newes from Pauls* of 1642. Instead of arguing against organs on the basis of their sleep-inducing quality,
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however, the Royalist author uses this Puritan claim to prove the absurdity of the Puritan dislike of complex music. He accomplishes this through a dialogue—similar to the one used in *The Organs Funerall*—in which a Royalist character (Purple) and a Parliamentarian character (Orange) argue about the use of organs. After some introductory verbal sparring, Purple asks Orange why organs should be removed, and Orange insists that they are bad because members of his group do not understand them. In response, Purple claims that one of Orange’s compatriots told him that he disliked organs because “He said, the sweetnesse of the musick lull’d him into so sweet a sleep, that another by him (inspired with the spirit of providence) stole away his hat and Bible ... [therefore] he verily thought Organs were ordained to no other or no better purpose, but to give assistance to pilferers.” Orange considers this to be a sound reason, but not as great as his, being that while he slept to the sound of the organ his wife was stolen away. In order to negate the Parliamentarian argument that organs are practically flawed—since they are too distracting and cause people to fall asleep—the author reduces their argument to absurdity and counter argues that organs are “well thought of, and by the judicious worthily esteemed before you [Orange] were nine days old.” This argument for tradition sits firmly in line with Cavalier ideology, which affirmed the divine right of the King to rule and the validity of traditions passed down from the Reformation in the *Book of Common Prayer.*

At the same time that T.L. was introducing the characterization of organs as sleep inducing in 1641, *A Short Treatise* written by Peter Smart was emphasizing the loudness of

---
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Arminian music and the disruptions it could and allegedly did cause as a result of its overuse.

Not only does he characterize it as louder than any other music in Europe, calling it an “excessive noise of Musicall harmony, both instrumentall and vocall, at the same time, as the like was never used before, either in this, or any other Cathedrall Church, not onely of England, but of Spaine, Italy, France, and Germany.” but he also insists that Arminians force this musical din into intimate, significant ceremonies, again proving that Arminians have been corrupted by their love of music: “Neither rest they contented with the horrible prophanation of the Lords Supper, with immoderate chaunting, and Organ-playing, and with other superstitious vanities; but the Sacrament of Baptisme also, they will not suffer it to be administered, without an heideous noise of musick.”

He then relates a story of a baptism that was interrupted “with such a noise, that they could not heare one another at the Font, to the great offence of many, and of Mr. Deane ... who greviously complained of that insolent fact of two irregular Canons, disturbing most audaciously Divine Service.”

Loudness returns again in the anonymous pamphlet from 1643 titled *The Holy Harmony: or, A Plea for the Abolishing of Organs and other Musick out of the Protestant Churches of Great Britain, and demolishing of Superstitious and idolatrous Monuments*. In this work the author argues not only that organs are loud and disruptive, but also that loud worship is not the best worship as it often distracts from true devotion. To the author, “holy duties have their life, and vigour without such secondary assistance as is borrowed from leatherne bellies ... tis hard for

---

32 Peter Smart, *A Short Treatise of Altars, Altar-furniture, Altar-cringing, and Musick of all the Quire, Singing-men and Choristers, when the Holy Communion was Administered in the Cathedrall Church of Durham* (1641), 9.
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the vulgar sort to know the Psalme which is cleerely lost by the Organs, and the Quire,"35 "The soule should appeare to God ... in a soft, and a still winde,"36 "Questionlesse the still devotions are deepest,"37 and "I dare a vouch the Primitive times sent up speaking devotions with a little noise or pomp, their holy melodie did not swell their cheeks, but their hearts with sighes."38

Unlike his predecessors, however, this author does make a general attempt to prove his arguments with references to Biblical characters, such as Hanna, who he claims was rewarded for her silent prayer.39

One more pamphlet made use of the noise argument against organs and choirs before the end of the Civil War. Gospel Musick by Nathanael Homes was written in 1644 and despite being largely apolitical throughout, does make an aside from its arguments for the lawfulness of psalm singing to condemn cathedral music, calling it “so abominable, in which is sung almost every thing, unlawfull Letanies, and Creeds, and other prose not framed in Meeter fir for singing. Besides they do not let all the Congregation, neither sing, nor understand what is sung; battologizing and quaverung over the same words vainly. ... tossing the Word of God like a Tenice-ball. Then all yelling together with confused noise.”40

From the above evidence one may see that authors of church music pamphlets during the English Civil War believed unanimously that simple, short arguments that appeal to common sense or long-held prejudices packaged in easy to read, popular forms—such as news pamphlets

35 The Holy Harmony (London: Austin and Coe, 1643), A2.
36 Ibid., A2.
37 Ibid., B3.
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39 Ibid., A2-B3.
40 Nathanael Homes, Gospel Musick (London: Overton, 1644), 19.
and dialogues—would be more effective for persuading their audiences than the scholarly, complex theological arguments—complete with copious citations and marginalia, as well as lengthy quotations in Latin and occasionally in Greek and Hebrew—employed by scholarly Puritan and Church of England authors when discussing theological issues and Arminianism in general before and during the war. As Joad Raymond writes in his *Pamphlets and Pamphleteers in Early Modern England*, “A degree of plainness was essential for effective pamphleteering.”

This contrast is evident in the appearance as well as the content of these works. Compare, for example, a representative page from an anonymous work from 1640 titled *Ladensium ΑΥΤΟΚΑΤΑΚΡΙΣΙΣ, The Canterburians*, “An evident demonstration of the avowed Arminianisme, Poperie, and tyrannie of that Faction,” (Example 1 in the Appendix for chapter 3) and a page from *True Newes from Norwich* from a year later (Example 2 in the Appendix). The author of *Ladensium* indulges in marginalia that consumes nearly the entire page and is complete with citations for multiple works as well as extensive passages in Latin and one sentence in Greek. On the other hand, T.L. uses marginalia only briefly to clarify elements of his story, which makes no mention of works that would be cited and no use of foreign languages.

Furthermore, the accessibility of church-music pamphlets from this period is also evident in their length, especially when compared to scholarly treatises and debate works from this period. None of the church-music pamphlets discussed here exceeds thirty pages, while scholarly works from the same period tend to have a length in excess of fifty pages, with some reaching
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42 The appendix contains several other similar comparisons from other church-music pamphlets and theological works from this period.
over 200 pages. The length of a printed work in early modern England also carried with it practical limitations and connotations. Works that exceeded 100 pages would have necessarily cost more to produce and to purchase; this was evidently acceptable to the authors of lengthy works, however, because they were addressing their works to a niche market of academic, upper-class readers. A work of over 100 pages would consist, in quarto (which was the most common format for printing), of at least thirteen broadsheets of paper, which would have cost between seven and thirteen pence during the seventeenth century. It makes sense then that True Newes is only eight pages long and Ladensium is 156-pages long. True Newes consists of only one broadsheet and would have cost no more than a penny in 1641 when it was published. Ladensium, however, consists of twenty broadsheets and would have cost around ten pence.

While church-music pamphlets have little in common with scholarly publications on theology, they are almost identical with political pamphlets of the time, both in form and (as will be discussed in the next section) content. Formally, political pamphlets are often five to ten pages long, have little to no scholarly apparatus (citation and/or marginalia), make very little to no use of foreign or classical languages, and are presented in straight-forward, sometimes entertaining, formats. The anonymous Cavalier work, The Soundheads Description of the Roundhead (1642), is a representative example of the hundreds of political pamphlets that were

43 See for example A Dispute Against the English-Popish Ceremonies (London, 1637) with 374 pages; D.C., Superstitio Superstes (London: P.W., 1641) with sixty pages; and Henry Parker, The Altar Dispute (London: R. Cotes, 1641) with seventy-six pages.
44 Raymond, 82.
45 Ibid., 82-83.
published during the civil wars. The work is ten pages long, contains only one reference to another work (the Bible), makes use of no foreign or classical languages, and is presented as an entertaining exposition on the physical appearance of a Roundhead and how that appearance relates to his moral character. Likewise, the anonymous Roundhead response to The Soundheads, titled, An Exact Description of A Roundhead, and A Long-Head Shag-Poll (1642), is eight pages long, contains a few references to Biblical passages, four common Latin words, anatomizes both the Roundhead and the Cavalier, and ends with a poem as several of the church-music pamphlets discussed here do.

Therefore, the evidence again suggests—based on the simple, colloquial tone, length, and format of their texts—that these church-music pamphlet authors were attempting to reach a more general audience than authors who engaged in serious theological debate prior to and during the war and are instead closely aligned with the political pamphleteers of the time. Appeals for or against organs and Arminianism, however, were not the only arguments that these authors made in their pamphlets. In fact, every work written on church music or mentioning an element of church music prominently in its title between 1641 and 1643—five works in all—serve principally as delivery systems for war propaganda, which is often more extensive than the actual discussion of church music mentioned above.

Church Music as a Vehicle for Parliamentarian Propaganda

46 The exact number of published works is impossible to know, not only because so many were certainly lost to time and poor preservation but also because the licensing system broke down during the first few years of the war, leaving no record of the publications in the absence of the physical artifacts. Additional examples are included in the appendix.


48 An Exact Description of A Roundhead, and A Long-Head Shag-Poll (London: Tomlinson, 1642).
Indeed, Parliamentarian pamphleteers (and to a lesser extent balladeers) consistently use commentary on church music and the use of organs in church to extol the virtues of Parliament, the lawfulness of its actions, and the popish abuses of its opposition. Turning first to the *Organs Ecco*, we are informed that

[Laud] thought to bring us all in slaverie,  
The Parliament found out his Knaverie,  
And so fell William;

Some say, hee was in hope  
To bring England againe to th’ Pope,  
But now he is in danger of an Axe or a Rope,

And all the rest of that Lordly Crew,  
Their great insolencies are like to rue,  
As soon as Parliament their lives do view:

Then there is also one Doctor Duck,  
The Proverbe sayes, *What’s worse than ill luck*,  
We hope the Parliam.[ent] his feathers wil[I] pluck,  
For being so busie, Doctor Duck;

Deanes and Chapiters, with their Retinue,  
Are not like long for to continue,  
They have so abused their great Revenue,  
That downe must Ceremonies;  
Alas, Popish Ceremonies.

And now the Papists are at their wits ends,  
To see the downfall of so many Friends;  
But they shall all rue it ere the Parliam.[ent] ends,  
Believee it, Romane Catholickes.49

From the author’s perspective, Laud himself is an insolent papist with grand hopes of totalitarian control over the English people, while all other Arminians are likewise guilty of insolence and

49 *The Organs Ecco*, 1.
abuse of power. Thanks to the benevolence of Parliament, however, Laud is being brought to justice and it is likely that all likeminded Arminians will be as well. By casting the relationship between Parliament and the Arminians as one of a body of judges sentencing criminals, the author supports the Puritan/Parliamentary position that Parliament is the lawful authority of the land and that anyone who opposed their lawful execution of justice must be a papist lamenting the interruption of their brutal attempts to return the country to Catholicism.

At the same time that *The Organs Ecco* was emphasizing the legal authority of Parliament, *True Newes from Norwich* was also delving into the issues of legality and the denigration of the opposition. In the preface, T.L. claims that his whole reason for printing his account of the events at Christ’s Church Cathedral is to expose the foolishness of those who love organs and also the lack of legal protection for organs, meaning that organs are unlawful and not only can be pulled down, but should be pulled down:

I put it forth to declare to the world the sillynesse of these Cathedrall Blades: It is a signe that they have no law for the maintenance of their Pipes, that are so afraid of the pulling of them downe by Boyes; if they had law for the maintenance of them, they would by that law cause the offenders to be punished, but they cannot punish the offenders, because they have no law for the upholding of them: but grant they have a law, yet it is such a one as I hope will be abolished, for I hope the Parliament will cause them to be pulled downe, because they are occasion of much evill, which shall be to the comfort of many a one in Norwich, for* [the cathedral courts] they have bee the cause of many a sorrowfull heart in Norwich; and hath bee a trouble to the Author of this ensuing discourse.\(^50\)

Even if there is a law for the protection of organs that he is not aware of, he nevertheless hopes it will be removed by Parliament so that the inhabitants of Norwich may find relief from the evil of
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\(^50\) T.L., *True Newes from Norwich*, 2.
the organs. He returns to the authority of Parliament while attempting to recount the events that led to the assembly of the organ lovers:

(Christ’s church they call it) but there is but a little of Christ taught, and lesse practiced ... there was forthwith a Convocation called, wherein was debated by the *Deane and Chapters [*unnecessary members, so say the Parliament] whether or no the Rayles should be pulled downe ... [they decided] That the Rayles should be pull’d downe, and so they were, but the Organs stood still.51

Here the author negates the authority of the administrators of the cathedral by reminding his readers with marginalia that Parliament has deemed deans and chapters unnecessary members of the church system, thereby asserting and emphasizing Parliament’s authority over sacred and legal matters, which was far from a commonly accepted fact.

In addition to setting Parliament above the administration of the Church of England, T.L. also sets Parliament on an equal footing with the King of England, by expressing his hope that Charles I will accept Parliament’s authority to remove the popish ceremonies and unnecessary members of the Church of England: “I hope the Parliament will take away all the Bishops, Deanes and Chapters, the which they have voted to be unnecessary members, both to Church and State, to God and the King; whose heart I pray God to encline to his faithfull Parliament.”52 The description of Parliament as faithful to the King adds support to the position that it only wants to do what is best for the people.

While T.L. is respectfully building up Parliament he is also disrespectfully attempting to dismantle any popular support for the Arminians and their supporters by presenting unflattering

51 Ibid., 3.
52 Ibid., 8.
representations of each type of individual he claims was present in the group that formed in support of the organs. As might be expected he mocks the Arminian ceremonies and practices of the clergy, saying that

[The priests were set to help defend the organs if necessary, but] I think it had been better for their commendations to have beene at their studies, to prepare themselves to preach this Lent, but I beleeeve their Sermons were not then to get ex tempore, for they cannot preach a Sermon unlessse their bookees [The Book of Common Prayer] be before them ... for some of them cannot, and the rest will not preach ex tempore, but must be mute like asses.

In the second place there were in order set the Canoniers, I meane the singing-men ... they must blow the Rebels away, as they termed them, with their profound sounding roaring voices: They stood centinell in their Canonicaall coats, a body would thinke they should have beene at their English masse, to call to the Pope for a Bull, to roare against the Apprentises, and to have conjured the Rebels away, as they doe in the Letany.\textsuperscript{53}

Here T.L. mixes commonly held Puritan stereotypes of Arminianism into what should have been a straightforward listing of what types of clergy were present and how many of them there were. After all, the lack of extemporaneous preaching or making an association between the magical nature of Catholic ceremonies and the singing of the choristers serves no other purpose than to reinforce these stereotypes and to use them to elicit an emotional response from his readers that encourages their adoption of his biased perspective of the event.

When discussing the lay people that were in attendance, T.L. turns to attacking their character in order to prove that individuals who support Arminianism—and organs specifically—are as corrupt as the superstitious system that they support. After claiming that the musketeers, halberdiers, and 500 other individuals that showed up with weapons to defend the organs were accosting innocent individuals trying to enter the church, the author claims that they

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., 4.
were “intoxicated with strong Ale that was to be sould [sold] at the great Cathedrall.”\textsuperscript{54} Claiming that ale was sold at the cathedral also directly connects the Arminian administration with allowing, enabling, or even condoning the vicious behavior that was allegedly exhibited by their lay supporters.

This tearing down of the opposition by attacking their character and quality, in addition to being an irrational propaganda tactic in general, was a common theme in the purely political propaganda pamphlets produced during the war. The anonymous pamphlet \textit{An Exact Description of a Roundhead and a Long-Head Shag-Poll} from 1642 extols the virtues of the Roundhead group and uses language similar to that used in \textit{True Newes form Norwich} to cast the Cavaliers (called shag-Polls/dolls here) as ignorant, prideful, slanderous, quick to falsely accuse, malicious, profane, etc.:

Firstly, how are they [the Cavaliers] qualified? why, clean contrary to your Round-heads, not with innocency of life, but with nocency, with grosse and palpable ignorance, and blindnesse in spirituall and heavenly things, full of conceidednesse of having that which they are utterly empty of ... the spirit that I mean here that they are filled with; is the spirit of lying and slandering, and false accusing of the Round-heads ... the spirit of envy; malice, and murther, of drunkennesse, epicurisme, and all manner of loose prophane.\textsuperscript{55}

Notice especially that both authors emphasize the drunkenness of the Cavaliers and their proclivity for falsely accusing the innocent.

Parliament is again represented as a source of authority and salvation in \textit{The Organs Funerall}, where the chorister character claims that if it were not for Parliament removing Laud from his position of authority, then he would have continued to support the

\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., 7.
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sine of superstition and worshipping of God in his Service with superfluous Ceremonies, which now is termed by many Idolatrous rags of Popery, the originall whereof they say came from the Pope, which is called Antichrist, and introduced into our Church by the great Patriarch at Lambeth [Archbishop Laud], which if a Parliament had not hapned in the Climactericall yeare of his fall, and that he had but obtained the dignitie of a Cardinall, we might then have beene sure of protection from his little Grace, and have beene by him defended, and maintained our meanes and revenues, augmented not diminished, and might have risen to great preferment; ... But wee may see how vaine a thing it is to trust in riches, in friends, or in the favour of princes in the time of danger, for nothing is able to defend from the just vengeance of God, against hainous transgressors and offendours: And if wee had but thought in the least manner of these times, wee would have been more cautious in seeking the favour of great men, and submitting our selves to their wills be they never so refractory from that which is good, for hopes of a little preferment.56

Not only is Laud portrayed as “refractory from that which is good,” but he is a servant of the antichrist, and it was divine vengeance from God that Parliament removed him from power and prevented him from augmenting the sins of his superstitions.

The author’s chorister character also serves as an example to those individuals that might want to avoid being persecuted by Parliament by claiming at the end of the pamphlet that “I am of the same religion with the Parliament and the State; if they command I will obey; and if there were no Parliament, then the greatest in Authority in the State I would obey right or wrong, it’s the best policie to serve the times, and change with the wind, for by that meanes I may be safe when others are questioned.”57 Even a morally wayward individual such as the chorister knows who is the supreme power in England and knows how to keep out of trouble; instead of going out to serve in the Royalist army in order to protect the likes of him, readers would better serve their health by practicing obedience to Parliament, and those who are already avowed Royalists would

56 *The Organs Funerall*, 1-2.
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do well to stay home and look after their own safety. It is also telling of the political function of this work that any discussion of church music itself is completely ignored by the author, who chose to focus instead on the negative aspects of those who make church music and the authority of those who are fighting against it.

While the above authors incorporate praise for Parliament into their texts without overtly identifying them as pro-Parliamentarian works, the anonymous author of *The Holy Harmony* (1643) identifies praising Parliament as one of his secondary goals on the title page of the work with the promise of "A plenary Expression of the Parliaments Piety, the Cities Charity, [and] the Countreys Constancy." In spite of this goal being presented as secondary, half of the total text of this work is dedicated to praising Parliament for its attempts to remove Arminianism from the Church of England and to praising London and the outlying counties for their continued support of and for Parliament, which the author claims makes all three models of virtue. After presenting his brief argument against the noisiness of Arminian music, the author claims that Parliament is not only attempting to remove these unnecessary obstructions from the Church of England, but is also actively punishing the Arminians for attempting to paint themselves like the whore of Babylon:

> These coares [fruit pits] in our devotions doth the Parliament strive by all meanss [sic] to cut ont [out], as carefull confectioners from Apples, or Peares, or the stones from fruit, that so they may preserve with the Sugar of reformation the fruit it selfe, whith [which] else would putrifie, or like wise Chirurgions that embowell that body, they intend to embalme, tis much better to part with what we can spare and will hurt being kept... I hold it as great an error in us to affect the Pompe of the Romish Church... [who] when as the whore useth garish flaunting, painting, crisping, to insnare the silly beholder:... which whore, and bawd, our Parliament

---

is wipping, and carting for her many fornications, and adulteries committed with 
the Kings of the earth, Rev. 17. 2. this is the way to produce a Holy Harmony.
Those watchmen of Israel, [Parliament] ... how have they already given 
proofs of these pious purposes, having defaced those offensive monuments 
[organs] stopt, and exiled by all possible means the course of her menstruousnesse 
[monstrousness], and branded her with the marks of her prostitutions. 59

Once again we see Parliament presented as only wanting to do its best to improve the religious 
lives of its fellow subjects through its legal authority to punish those who have led the church 
astray and committed crimes against the state.

Indeed, the author believes that piety is the only thing that could cause Parliament to 
wage war against the Royalists since MPs (members of Parliament) are suffering so much to 
create a “Holy Harmony” for the country, which is proof that they earnestly desire reformation:

This then must needs be the basis of their endeavours, for without some spirituall 
end no mortall men would ever involve themselves in such toyls,… I find in that 
Apologue of Iotham, Iudg. 9. that the Olive would not leave his fatnesse, the Fig 
his sweetnesse, the Vine his cheeringsnesse, to be a King. Questionlesse in that 
honourable Assembly there are Olives, Figs, Vines, which have declined the fat, 
sweet, and cheerings of their possessions and retirements, to groan under constant 
incumbrances, hazards threatned, censures proclaimed, and ruines (without Gods 
infinite protection) to be expected, and all this for a Holy Harmony. 60

So earnestly does the author want his readers to appreciate the great pains that Parliament has 
undergone for the sake of the country, that after changing course for fifteen lines of criticism 
aimed at the “brambles” that surround the king and “affect not the religious acts of a Prince 
(which are the true imperiall gems) but cherish any vice that may feed their luxury or avarice,” 61 
he returns to recounting the toils of Parliament, saying that

59 Ibid., B3r-B4v.
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The pious and insupportable care the Houses undergo to produce this Harmony is inexpressible; what depths of unknown troubles wade they thorow? At Sea they stand at the helm by turns, because the labour is great, and only thought to be the businesse of one watch, but in this task of theirs every man is at the helm, the whole voyage being soldered indissolubly, all mens labours are one, and ones is every mans, every Member being both the alarum that strikes, and the wheeles also by which the alarum doth strike....

Now all these bees doe extremly labour to fetch in the hony on their laded thighes from all parts of the kingdome, into the hive of the Church, and common wealth, out of which to make one cake of pure wax of which may be made a blessed, and divine light, to guide us to a holy and heavenly Harmony.\textsuperscript{62}

Notice that the author not only reemphasizes the hardships under which the parliament and their forces have been toiling, but also the unity and equality of those undergoing the struggle. They are soldered together so that “all mens labours are one, and ones is every mans,” and like bees they are working diligently to stock the Church with wax that will form a candle of unity to guide the nation to a “holy and heavenly Harmony.”

By repeatedly presenting his readers with images of unity, the author encourages them to do their part for the war effort. Indeed, his very next topic—the generous support given to the cause by the city of London—is a further incitement to devotion and support for the cause from his readers. He begins by claiming that “this Citty hath not spared any encouragements that would possibly be given, whose helps to this Cause is not unworthy the name of Charity, though it may properly be stiled a magnificent supportment.”\textsuperscript{63} He then proceeds to an extensive list of the ways in which London has supported its mother church and expressed Christian charity, by “seeking such remedies as may recover her health,” paying the “Apothecaries bills” for her, by maintaining schools, hospitals, prisons, and most of all their willingness to pay for the assistance
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of their “languishing Mother” with their own gold and blood. This charity has made them the scourge of Rome, and as soon as their twelve companies of soldiers “like the twelve Tribes, attending the Ark of the Almighty shall rear up their standards and lead you through the wildernes, by the conquest of the Canantic Confederates [the Irish Confederacy],” they will “arrive in the land of Promise where you shall finde what I treat of, a Holy Harmony.” Here the author plays to the emotions of his readers in true propagandistic form by thanking Londoners for their support to make them feel good about giving, stoking their pride in an effort to prevent them from slacking in their devotion, and also by using London as a model to incite other cities to strive equally hard in order to gain a similar measure of respect and praise.

In fact, not only London has taken up the cause, but even the outlying counties of Hartfordshire, Cambridge, and Essex “have furnisht up an Army able to reduce Ireland,” having “sent in 20000 able, wealthy, well armed, trained men, all of the army of the Lord of Hosts to fight this (nay his battell).” These men are a model army, with all the equipment and training necessary to “reduce Ireland,” and they are also completely dedicated to the cause, so that “no sooner had some of his Excellencies trump summoned their appearance, but suddainly every man was in readnesse, forsaking their wives with as great joy as first they met them.” After that, the men “marched with a noble resolution to procure to us a Harmony here which shal be a preparation to that Harmony the Angels make at the throne of the Lamb, to whom be glory now,

---
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and for evermore. Amen.”68 Readers are therefore encouraged to support Parliament’s noble cause by joining the army or otherwise supporting the war effort financially. These statements might also have been aimed at intimidating Royalist readers, with promises of a massive, well trained and equipped army of men that are happy to forsake their wives in favor of service to their cause.

The repeated insistences made by the authors of the above pamphlets that Parliament was the lawful authority of the land and that its actions were just and virtuous were not confined to pamphlets that claimed to focus on church music. Indeed, the argument for the authority of Parliament and the beneficence of its actions was common in purely political pamphlets of the time. An anonymous political pamphlet from 1642, A Moderate Discourse, for example, claims that “The Parliament desires to have preserved to the Subjects, peace, safetie, and all those priviledges which their Ancestors have enjoyed,” that it is “lesse lyable to be misled, and lesse apt to break a trust,”69 that “Parliament is nothing else but the whole Nation of England… better regulated and qualified for consultation then the collective body without this art or order could be,”70 the “Supreame Court of Justice in our State,”71 that “there is not one man of both Houses of Parliament that is violent against all publick set formes of prayer,”72 (i.e., they are religiously moderate) and finally, that “I could not with more cleare and cheerfull confidence die for the truth of the protestant Religion, then for the Justice of the parliaments cause in this warre.”73 Still

68 Ibid., Cv.
69 A Moderate Discourse (London, 1642), 21-22.
70 Ibid., 16.
71 Ibid., 14.
72 Ibid., 11.
73 Ibid., 13.
another pamphlet, *The Privileges of Parliament*, published in the same year as *The Holy Harmony*, argues that Parliament has the right to make laws, alter existing laws, alter the liturgy and ceremonies of the Church of England, and defend itself and its laws through open warfare if need be.\(^{74}\)

Contrary to the prevailing Parliamentarian approach—taken by four of the six authors discussed here as well as numerous political pamphleteers as mentioned above—of praising Parliament and deriding Arminians and Royalists, Peter Smart chose to focus exclusively on attacking Arminianism in the harshest of terms. Even before the war had officially begun, Smart considered Arminians to be “Schismaticall, hereticall, and traiterous Arminians and Papists”\(^{75}\) and “new-fangled Ceremony-mongers, Idolatrous Altar-worshippers, seditious Innovators, schismaticall, factious, and turbulent breakers of the peace, and contemers of governours? nay rotten members, and rebellious sons of this our Mother Church of England, whose doctrine and discipline they renounce, they corrupt and contemne.”\(^{76}\) By branding Arminians as “seditious,” “traiterous,” “schismaticall,” “factious,” “turbulent breakers of the peace,” “contemers of governours,” and “rebellious sons,” Smart encourages his readers to consider Arminians as violent outlaws that should be avoided and shunned as such. He also dedicated six pages—the entire preface—to attacking Bishop Neale, the Bishop of Durham, whom he considered to be

\(^{74}\) *The Privileges of Parliament* (London: Thomas Harrison, 1643), 3-6.

\(^{75}\) Ibid., ii.

\(^{76}\) Ibid., 16.
“ambitious, violent and cruell… an ignorant ideot, who hath onely the outside of a man,”

It is likely that in the wake of Parliamentary proceedings against the highest levels of Arminian administration—including Archbishop Laud—in 1641, Smart was attempting to increase the outrage against the Arminians and Arminianism in the hopes of securing further legal action against them. It is also worth noting that Peter Smart had gained the favor of Parliament, which at least officially amounted to the licensing of his works, as recompense for his having been punished under the Laudian administration. As Jason Peacey writes, “Smart too had a notable Puritan record, having served as prebend of Durham Cathedral until his imprisonment for a sermon against the innovations of John Cosins. He was rehabilitated with the assistance of Francis Rous and Sir Robert Harley, and his willingness to express his views in print made him a perfect conduit for propaganda in the early 1640s.” As we shall see in the next chapter, Smart is not the only author of works on music that is associated with writing propaganda for Parliament during the 1640s and 1650s.

Church Music as a Vehicle for Royalist Propaganda

For reasons yet unknown, Royalists contributed only a few works of propaganda relating to church music to the larger propaganda wars of this period. They even appear, in the absence of more than one pamphlet on the topic, to have been reluctant to defend their own position against the onslaught of pro-Parliamentarian pamphlets. Cavalier authors may have been directed to

---
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focus on other topics for their propaganda pamphlets, or they may not have considered church music to be as politically valuable as Puritans consistently did. It is also possible that many of their pamphlets have simply been lost to poor preservation, misunderstanding, and natural decay.

Whatever the reason(s), only one anonymous author supported the Cavalier side with a church-music pamphlet that follows the Parliamentarian trend of using church music to transmit political messages to average readers. As in *The Organs Funerall*, the anonymous author of *Newes from Pauls* (1642) casts his work as a dialogue. Furthermore, this association, combined with the similarity between this title and *True Newes from Norwich*, which was popular enough to warrant a republishing in 1642, may have been an attempt on the author’s part to engage both of these Parliamentarian works or partake in their popularity/success.

The work begins with Orange, the Parliamentarian (Roundhead) character, passing by Purple, the Cavalier character, at a quick pace, which prompts Purple to ask Orange where he is going:

\[\text{Pur.}[\text{ple:}] \text{Orange-Tawny! Whither so fast in this sweating hast? whither doth the fierce zeal of disorder direct thy factious feet this early morning? what temple is to be ruined, or what religious man, that hath not got the trick to flatter you, must fall a sacrifice under your many-headed triumph? some mischief I know is in agitation, you are so fiery in the pursuit of it.}^{80}\]

Notice that before the topic of church music has even arisen, the author has cast Orange as a chaotic, violent zealot. Orange furthers this impression when he replies with excessively harsh insults that serve to confirm Purple’s negative opinion of him:

\[\text{Oran.}[\text{ge:}] \text{That wicked favour tied to thy hatband by the grandam of grievances, the mother of mischief, the sister of sin & Sodomy, the wife of wickednesse, child}^{80} \]

---

80 *Newes from Pauls*, 1.
of perdition and daughter of damnation, that foul flaps the Whore of Babylon proclaimes thy name to be Purple, yea verily Purple, and woe be to thee therefore; I will hold no disputation with thee, but jog on in my holy violence to erect a religious battery against (those pipes of Popery & Superstition) the Organs.  

Orange is not even willing to talk with Purple because he is convinced that he is in league with the Catholic Church (the whore of Babylon) and confirms that his crusade against organs is violent.

Not surprised that Orange was intent on destroying “one decent Ceremony or other,” Purple asks Orange why he is so intent on refuting and opposing organs. Orange replies with stock Puritan answers about the organ being vain and an instrument of Satan. When Purple pushes further, suggesting that Orange simply envies the complex art and that it is of too high a nature for him to understand, Orange replies by saying that his lot dislike the organ “Because we understand it not, [therefore] we hold it most abominable, [and furthermore] there ought nothing to be allowable but what the Brethren understand.” Not only does Orange dislike the use of the organ, but when Purple counters that music belongs to the seven liberal arts, Orange states that Puritans dislike the seven liberal arts more “then we do the seven deadly sins, since the last are better known to us then the first.”

As the dialogue intensifies, Purple presses for further incrimination against Orange, asking "pray tell me moderately, what particular hindrances to devotion are Organs, that you hold them so contemptible, that without respect of time, place, Law or equity, you dare (to the
disturbance of Divine Service) attempt such riots?" Orange will give no such moderate answer, however, and simply hurls further insults at Purple. This compels Purple to admonish Orange, saying that "Thou leadest thy life so lawlesse, that no man is thy Ruler." At this point Orange’s unreasonableness is as unquestionable as his ignorance. Not only does he refuse to reply to Purple’s questions, but his reasons for disrespecting the law, equity, and the Divine Service in his quest to remove organs rests on his ignorance, his own inability to stay awake during Communion (which is his own fault), and his inability to control his wife (making him a sham of a man). Furthermore, Purple’s emphasis on the Roundheads having no ruler and his repeated use of references to law and lawlessness while describing their actions not only calls to mind their active rebellion against the King, but also counters the prominent Parliamentarian argument that Parliament is the lawful authority in England and is simply serving justice by removing organs and superstitious ceremonies.

After hearing Orange’s laughable reasoning for disliking the use of the organ, Purple claims that there is an army of men prepared to lay down their lives in the defense of church music after learning of the offences committed against the “civill Rites” of the church by the Roundheads:

P.[urple:] I tell thee (man of madnesse and distraction) there be many hundreds of resolved men, that (unlesse you can bring sufficient Authority for your devout battery) will secure the Church-musick with the hazzard of their lives, who, after a great deale of patience, grow sensible of your former riots upon other Churches, in which the Railes, Windowes, Organs, and other civill Rites have suffered demolition.  
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Again the author emphasizes that Orange is little more than a senseless agitator who lacks the authority to remove church music and other Arminian trappings from the Church of England. He also presents his readers with an image—however false in reality—of an army of soldiers dedicated to protecting Arminian ceremonies and church music in particular, thereby countering the position presented in *The Organs Funerall* and the argument that will be presented in *Holy Harmony* the following year (perhaps *Holy Harmony* was written as counter propaganda directed at this work).

In order to counter Purple’s claim of a sizeable force in defense of church music, Orange claims that his group has “the hands of very able men for the performance of this good work which we make such haste to begin,” such as “John Judas [, a] Serjeant,” “Michael Meddle-much [, a] Pin-maker,” “Marmaduke Marre-all [, a] Gunsmith,” “Simon Schisme [, a] Felt-maker,” and “Richard Riot [,a] Locksmith,” to name only a few of his twelve total. Here the author not only cast the Roundheads as traitors, meddlers, ruinous, schismatic, and riotous, but he also implies by their professions that none of the Roundhead supporters are of noble birth.

In contrast, Purple offers half as many names that he considers to be of a higher quality than those given by Orange, including “Thomas True-heart [, a] Gentleman,” “Lawrence Loyall [,] Esquire,” “Francis Well-borne [, a] Gentleman,” “Richard Royal-thought [,] Esquire, Constantius Tryall-proofe [, a] Gentleman,” and “Charles Good-cause [,] Esquire, with many more as well borne, and of as noble natures, which you are not worthy to heare named, since [you are] not capable to understand: my time is now as hasty as yours, though upon an honester

---
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occasion, mine being to preserve, and yours to destroy.”89 Not only are all of Purple’s supporters of noble birth, but they are of such high quality—both in terms of birth and character—that an ignorant commoner such as Orange would be incapable of understanding them and their desire to preserve the lawful and noble music of the Church of England, which Orange in his riotous rage seeks only to destroy.

Finally, the concluding poem furthers the author’s argument against Roundheads on the basis of their ignorance, lawlessness, and violent nature. While long, the poem deserves to be read in its entirety, not only for the insights that may be gleaned from it, but also for its sheer humor:

_I come to charge ye that slight the Clergie_  
_And pull the Mytre from the Prelates head,_  
_That you’l be warie lest you miscarry_  
_In all the factious humours you have bred:_  
   _And as for Brownists wee’l have none,_  
   _But take them all and hang them one by one._

O.[range:] Now Purple have at you for an answer.  
P.[urple:] Doe your worst.  
O.[range:] _I come to talk Sir with you that walk Sir_  
_In such contempt against the Brownists fashion:_  
_You are undone Sir, I have a Gun Sir,_  
_Which Ile discharge upon you in my passion:_  
   _Then Cevalo Sir, come not neere,_  
   _For we will have you up Sir Cavalier._

P.[urple:] _Your zealous actions joyn’d in factions_  
_Are all but aimes to rob the King on’s due:_  
_Then give this reason for your treason,_  
_That you’l be rul’d, if hee’l be rul’d by you._  
   _But leave these factions zealous brother,_  
   _Or you’l be hang’d up one against another._

O.[range:] _You have expounded an honest Roundhead_  
_To be a man almost of no Religion:_

---
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Nay then you jerk Sir, and likewise firk Sir,
And tell us that our Pastor is a Widgeon [a silly fellow]:
Take heed our sisters come not neere,
They vow to have you up Sir Cavalier.
P.[urple:] Your wit abounded gentle Roundhead
When you abus’d the Bishops in a Ditty,
When as you sanged they must be hanged,
A Timpany of malice made you witty.
   But though your hot Zeal makes you bold,
   When you are hang’d your arse wilbe a cold.
O.[range:] You say we club it, and we tub it,
And also vote our Coblers teach in holes.
But I tell you Sir, and dare avow Sir,
They are inflamed with most precious coales:
   With which wee’l burne you if you come neere,
   And therefore take your course Sir Cavalier.
P.[urple:] Leave confounding and expounding
The doctrine which you daily preach in tubs:
You cause this warring, and private jarring,
I doubt in time you’l prove the knave of clubs.
   ’Tis for your lying, not your oaths,
   You shalbe hang’d, and Greg shall have your cloaths.
O.[range:] You shaggie thick-haire, you call us Prick-eare,
Because indeed our Sowce is somwhat large:
You write strange posies on our noses,
Which never put a Cavalier to charge:
   But now the time ‘gins to appeare,
   That we shall pull you down Sir Cavalier.
P.[urple:] But that’s as it happens: farewell Round.
O.[range:] Adieu Square.
P.[urple:] When Casar comes to town Brownists beware.⁹⁰

This concluding poem leaves no question as to the propagandistic nature of this work. The Cavalier is a nobleman who emphasizes that it was the Roundheads who started the war and repeatedly asks the Roundhead to turn away from his factious agitating and general lawlessness, while the Roundhead repeatedly threatens the life of the Cavalier. This emphasis on lawlessness
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and ignorant agitating as cornerstones of the Roundhead personality appeared again in the same year in the anonymous, purely political pamphlet *The Sound Heads Description of a Roundhead*.

According to this pamphlet, Roundheads are:

> For their discourse and language;...nothing but all manner of prophane and filthy language of whores and drinke, mixt with a thousand oaths and lyes, to make themselves merry, like fooles who make a sport of sinne:... railing and cursing all such as doe not observe and follow their humours in their ignorance, prophanenesse and basenesse...The onely disturbers, traytors, and rebels in the State, sowing discord and division in the hearts of all they can infect with their trayterous councells.\(^\text{91}\)

Therefore, the author’s focus on church music and the organ as being in danger of being removed by the zealous, ignorant Roundheads not only perpetuates propagandistic tropes that were in use by purely political pamphleteers of the time, but it also adds further support to the argument that church music became highly politicized during the English Civil Wars. After all, the author of this work would have never made the organ the one and only element of Arminianism that he claims Orange is in a haste to tear down, nor would he have claimed that the army of Cavaliers were willing to hazard their lives in the defense of church music, if he did not think that these claims would elicit an emotional response from his readers.

**IV. 1644-1649: Sacred and Secular Music as Cavalier and Roundhead Propaganda**

**Cavalier Propaganda**

Two additional works of Cavalier music-related propaganda have survived from this period. The first chronologically is R. P.’s *The Soules Life*, which is a devotional work that consists of a collection of meditations “Collected for the comfort thereof [of the soul], in these
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sad times of distraction.” The work was reprinted in 1660, and it is from that edition by John Playford that we learn not only that R. P. is Richard Portman, but also that he was “Chief Organist of his late Majest. Royal Chappel.” Such a change between editions—that the author chose to remain anonymous in the first edition, which was published during the wars and also chose not to reveal his employment as an organist for the king in that edition, but reveals both in the edition that appears alongside the return of the monarchy—is representative of the political implications and (as I will argue below) functions of the work. Although much of the work is not related to music, the twenty-third meditation in each edition is dedicated to arguing the divine worth of music.

The two editions vary in several physical ways: the first edition is sextodecimo, while the second edition is duodecimo; the first edition contains 402 pages (138 in the first half and 264 in the second, or nine broadsheets in the first half and seventeen in the second half for a total of twenty-six broadsheets) and seventy meditations divided into two halves that are numbered separately, while the second edition consists of only the first book of 187 pages (sixteen broadsheets) and twenty-three meditations. Both editions are pocket-sized and would have been more expensive than the quarto pamphlets discussed above. It is possible, however, that the two halves of the first edition were sold separately but preserved together, as evidenced by the pagination restarting in the second half. This would have reduced the price of that edition such

92 R. P., The Soules Life (London: Charles Green, 1645), A1r. The printer of this edition, Thomas Harper, was known to have worked in his earlier days at the King’s Printing House, which may indicate a royalist sympathy on his part at the time of the printing of this work and potentially his involvement as a Cavalier printer during the wars; see “A Note on The King’s Printing House, its Labour Force, and Professional Advisors 1603–1625,” Queen Mary University of London, last modified January 5, 2008, accessed March 25, 2016, http://www.english.qmul.ac.uk/kingsprinter/publications/transcripts/Reader_Aids/Kings_Printing_House.html.

that it would have been accessible by a larger audience than if both halves were sold together. In spite of the physical differences between the editions, the first twenty-three meditations in both editions are identical in order of appearance and text content.

Turning to the content of the work, Meditations VI, "Meditations of the miseries and calamities of the time;" VII, "A Prayer upon the same subject;" and XXIII, "A Meditation on Musick, in which as it were by way of digression, the lawfulness of that Science is asserted" all contain passages that are at least secondarily propagandistic.

In meditation VI, for example, Portman romanticizes the prewar era of Charles I’s absolute reign when he asks,

O God, how happy were we, when we enjoyed that great blessing of peace and tranquility? how were we both a mirror and a terror to all the eyes of the Christian world? how did our corne spring up with encrease of an hundred fold, so that the people did rejoyce and sing? how fruitfull was our Land with all manner of graine? how full of all creatures fit for the use of man? yea how did we abound in all things, so that we were able to live of our selves without the succours of any other Nation? what a sweet harmony and agreement was there among our selves, which made our enemies stand amazed at our felicity, when they themselves enjoyed none of these blessings?94

From the perspective presented in this passage, England was a land of peace and bounty before the war and exhibited a sweet harmony of unity and agreement that was the envy of Europe. This perspective, however, ignores the oppression of dissenting Christians and the—at least from our

perspective of due process, protections against false imprisonment, and freedom of speech—unjust imprisonments and corporal punishments of Charles I’s reign.95

Portman then shifts his meditation to the current state of England in the grips of the civil wars, saying that

O God, how comes this change, and unexpected misery upon us, that now we are in? Surely we did not value that blessing of peace, as wee ought to have done; surely it is our sinne and ingratitude that hath drawne thy vengeance upon us: what a sight is it to see the father shedding the bloud of the sonne, and the sonne the father? brother against brother; kinsman against kinsman; one neighbour cutting the throat of another, and all the whole Kingdome divided and plunged into a world of miseries: how do our fields lye barren for want of tillage, our pastures trodden and spoyled with armies, our woods cut downe, as if it were intended no more should grow in our Land?96

In Portman’s telling, England is suffering from an “unexpected misery,” rather than one that developed because of consistent and long-term tensions over the actions and practices of Charles I’s and Laud’s secular and sacred government. Furthermore, that misery is the result of the ingratitude of the English people for the peace that they previous enjoyed, with the implication being that Parliament and its supporters are specifically the ungrateful parties who did not appreciate how good life was under Charles I and Laud.

In meditation VII Portman offers a prayer that lays out his hopes for the end of the “sad times” of which he has written the work to address:

Give us peace in our time, O Lord, but especially the peace of conscience: O Lord unite the hearts of King and People together, that righteousnes and peace may kisse each other: and we beseech thee, O God, out of thy bowels of compassion,

95 Such as those meted out to William Prynne, John Bastwick, and Henry Burton, who were sentenced to life in prison and to pay a fine of £5,000 each after being pilloried, branded, and having their ears cut off for the crime of printing harsh criticisms/libels of the order of bishops; see Woolrych, 81.
to suffer no more bloud to bee shed in our land, and that wee may heare the voice of joy and gladnesse in our dwellings.\textsuperscript{97}

The author’s solution to the current state of division and desolation in the kingdom is to ask God to unite the hearts of Charles I and his subjects, not Charles I and the Parliament, so that—considering his previous statements about how wonderful and peaceful England was before the wars—the kingdom can return to the way it was, which is essentially what the Royalist side wanted. At the end of meditation VI he also asked God to “Clense the Land from sinne,”\textsuperscript{98} which in the context of his previous association of sin with ungratefulness implies a cleansing of the ungrateful rebels so that the kingdom can return to peace (return that is, rather than achieve a previously unknown peace for which the Parliamentarian supporters were hoping).

The XXIII meditation, while explicitly a defense of music, also reinforces the Royalist propaganda that appears earlier in meditations VI and VII. On two occasions he intimates that those who do not like music are potentially possessed by demons and are in any case disaffected:

and certainly if there bee any that hate the laudable use of this quality [music], we may suspect that this evill Spirit [the demon that possessed Saul] delights to dwell with them, where hee may not be troubled with it.\textsuperscript{99}

But sure I am, there is no good soule, but is pleased and delighted with harmony, nay they must needs be so, if they love their owne soule, which it selfe is composed of harmony. If all this cannot indeare Musicke to the Reader, rather then hee shall remaine disaffected, wee will fetch arguments from Heaven to persuade him.\textsuperscript{100}
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He also claims that musicians are sinless while in the act of performing and that musicians are not totally to blame for the improper use of music:

the serious Practioners thereof [of music], are I may safely say at that instant of time, not obnoxious to any sinne, either in thought, word or deed. ... Now some perhaps will object, that Musick is hurtfull, in regard of divers wanton and lascivious ditties [texts]: but to this, I deny that the Musick is hurtfull, for take away those ditties, and either sing or play those notes that were composed upon those ditties, and you shall finde nothing but innocency and harmony in them; now the fault is partly in the Poet, and partly in the Musitian; the fault on the Poets part is, that hee contrives such wanton and idle words; and on the Musitians part for composing on them.\(^\text{101}\)

Finally, he argues that congregational singing is more of a detriment to devotion than the professional music of the Anglican Church:

also, it is to be wished that people of all sorts could sing their parts, especially those that have ill ears; for if you please to observe at the singing of Psalmes in the Church, you shall heare such untunable voyces, and such intollerable discords, that no man or woman that hath well tuned voyces, but are exceedingly displeased with it, it being a hindrance to devotion. And the Apostle saith, Let all things be done decently and in order.\(^\text{102}\)

In attacking the quality of individuals who are opposed to music of any kind, defending professional/serious musicians as sinless and responsible only for their decision to set lascivious texts, and criticizing the practice of congregational psalm singing, Portman goes beyond a simple assertion of the lawfulness of music to a more specific argument in defense of Anglican musical practices and the administration that set and enforced them.

Portman may have intended this meditation as a direct rebuttal to the numerous criticisms of Anglican musical practices that were discussed above; if so, this section might not have been
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intended to serve as propaganda. It could also be argued that meditations VI and VII were not intended as propaganda but simply represent his personal perspective on the war, which just happens unsurprisingly to coincide with the Royalist position. In the absence of any additional evidence it is impossible to prove that Portman was definitely trying to propagandize, but the work nevertheless could have served as secondary propaganda. It is also more likely that the reprint in 1660, coinciding with the return of the monarchy and occurring after Portman’s death, was definitely intended to serve as propaganda to help clear the way for the return of the monarchy and the Church of England. That possibility also increases the likelihood that the work was recognized in its own time as having propagandistic potential and thus perhaps could have also been intended to serve as propaganda from its first appearance.

The second work of Cavalier propaganda that appeared in this period is Henry Lawes’s *Choice Psalms put into Musick, for Three Voices*, which was published in 1648 by Humphrey Moseley, a known Royalist sympathizer. The collection consists of thirty psalm settings by Henry Lawes, thirty settings by William Lawes, seven elegies on the death of William Lawes, one elegy on the death of John Tomkins (organist in the Chapel Royal), ten canons of three and four voices, and the figured bass parts for the psalm settings and elegies. All of the psalm settings, three of the elegies, and seven of the canons are set in three voices, but the vocal forces are not listed on the four elegies that are not marked for three voices, so they also could be set for three voices or some other number. The psalm translations are the work of George Sandys, who
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also published a collection of monophonic psalm settings with music by Henry Lawes in several editions during this period.

The purpose of the work, according to the dedication and preface, is to honor the memory of William Lawes, who was serving during the early years of the war as a soldier in the Royalist forces and who was killed in battle in 1645. It is certainly true that the work does serve a memorial function, but woven into this overt purpose for the work is an implicit, significantly propagandistic purpose, as will be argued below.

Example 1, the portrait of Charles I and the accompanying canon from folio A3v of Henry Lawes’s Choice Psalms put into Musick.

One of the more obvious examples of this propagandistic purpose is evident in the frequency with which Charles I is referenced in the prefatory material. Rather than waiting to
connect the work to Charles I in the dedication, the printer (perhaps at the author’s or some other individual’s request) references the king on the title page in his identification of the authors as “Henry and William Lawes, Brothers; and Servants to His Majestie.” The reader is then confronted on the verso of the next folio with a portrait of Charles I (example 1) and a 3-voice canon with the text, “Regi, Regis, Regum, Arcana cano,” translated as “to the king I sing the mysteries of the king of kings” or “to the ruler I sing the mysteries of the ruler of kings.” The freer word arrangement of Latin allows the author of the text to repeat the various forms of “rego” and “rex” multiple times in succession without interrupting them with other words from the text. This emphasis on forms of the words king and rule is compounded by the word repetition of “Regi, Regis” before “Regum” so that the text as performed by a single voice amounts to “Regi, Regis, Regi, Regis, Regum, Arcana cano” and canonical entrances of the two other voices creates an even more extensive flurry of “Regi, Regis.” Keep in mind that this has all taken place (if the reader proceeds page by page through the work and considers the canon/is able to realize it in their mind or in performance) before the reader even gets to the dedication of the work, which further focuses on Charles I.
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Indeed, the printer made sure that the reader would not miss to whom the dedication is made, with “Charles” placed in a font that dominates the first page of the dedication (see example 2). According to the dedication, William Lawes’s “life and endeavours were devoted to
Your service [Charles I’s]” and he “fell a willing Sacrifice for Your Majestie [Charles I],” and Henry Lawes states that he would be “unworthy such a Brother, should I tender ought that is his, or mine, to any but our Gracious Master (from whose Royall Bounty both of us receiv’d all we injoy’d;) and such an Inscription would not only seem a Theft and Alienation of what is Your Majesties, but (which I most abhorre) would make me taste of these ungratefull dayes.”\(^\text{106}\) He goes on to associate Charles I with king David, using frequent references to the “Regall Prophet,” “David the King,” and how Charles I has a known “affection” for the psalms, in which “Your Majesties present condition, is lively described by King David’s pen.”\(^\text{107}\) Lawes ends the dedication with a wish that “The King of Heaven and Earth restore Your Majestie according to Your own righteous heart.”\(^\text{108}\)

The “present condition” that Lawes refers to is Charles I’s defeat and capture in 1647 and imprisonment during 1648, which would lead in 1649 to his execution. The restoration he calls for is therefore his return to the throne and the resumption of his rule, which was not rendered impossible until the Treaty of Newport failed and his trial had begun.\(^\text{109}\) It is even possible, though impossible to prove without knowing in what month the collection was published, that this collection was published as a means of supporting Charles I during the negotiations surrounding the Treaty of Newport from September through November of 1648 or as a means to generate support for him before September when he was still being held in custody and the
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Second English Civil War provided hope that the Royalist side might still win some sort of victory.

In any case, it is telling that William Lawes—the individual in whose memory the collection is explicitly presented—is mentioned only once in the dedication, and then only in relation to his service to the king, while the majority of the section focuses on Charles I. William is discussed in more detail in the “To the Reader” section, but even here his service to the king and his love for the king is emphasized. Henry Lawes writes that he would not have wished to publish the psalm settings in the collection “(especially in these dissonant times) but to doe a Right (or at least to shew my Love) to the Memory of my Brother, unfortunately lost in these unnaturall Warres; yet lies in the Bed of Honour, and expir’d in the Service and Defence of the King his Master.”¹¹⁰ Unlike the Parliamentarians, who would wage unnatural war against the king, William Lawes remained faithful to his master, even unto death, and is rewarded for his constancy with honor. Loyalty and service are again, for the third time, emphasized in relation to William Lawes and also in relation to Henry in the laudatory poem by A. Townshend, who describes the brothers as “Mr. Henry, and Mr. William Lawes (Servants to His Majestie)” and writes that the brothers were “In a False Time true Servants to the Crowne.”¹¹¹

With such a heavy emphasis on the wars and on Charles I and his present condition, it is relatively easy to read the majority of the psalms in the collection, and also a number of the elegies, as direct commentary on the civil wars and the captivity of the king. Rather than discussing all of the relevant pieces in this seventy-seven-piece collection, however, in the

¹¹⁰ Ibid., A4r.
¹¹¹ Ibid., A1r.
interest of brevity I will discuss a few representative examples from the psalms and elegies. Psalm setting XI by Henry Lawes, for example, which sets a paraphrase of psalm 120, would almost certainly have been read by Royalists in 1648 as relating to the captivity of Charles I: “Woe is me, that I from Israel exiled must in Mesech dwell,/ and in the tents of Ismael./ O how long shall I live with those, whose savage minds sweet peace oppose,/ and fury by disswasion growes.”¹¹² Not only was Charles I separated from his supporters by his imprisonment following his capture in 1647, but his escape to the Isle of Wight and subsequent imprisonment there must also have seemed like an exile. Such an interpretation would implicate the Parliamentarian side as “those, whose savage minds sweet peace oppose” and whose fury only grows as the speaker (Charles I in this context) attempts to urge them toward peace. Read from this perspective, this psalm paraphrase not only casts Charles I in a sympathetic light as one who has been exiled and is disposed to peace, but also presents Parliamentarians as savage brutes who are unwilling to give up their violent ways. The emphasis on Charles I in the prefatory material of the collection and the repeated references to the wars only strengthens the likelihood that this setting, and many others in the collection, were meant to serve a covert propagandistic purpose.

In the elegies, William Lawes’s death is again politicized through its association with loyalty, the king, and the civil wars. This is especially evident in one particular elegy by John Jinkins, “An Elegiack Dialogue on the sad losse of his much esteemed Friend, Mr. William Lawes, servant to his Majesty,” which describes Lawes as “drencht deep in bloud and unstain’d loyalty,” who with “A fatall breath of honour challeng’d death with death” and has through that

¹¹² Lawes, Z2r.
won the “Vertue to have a loyall fame, a royall grave.”

The association with battle also continues in a number of the psalm settings by William Lawes himself. Setting II is a representative example, with the brief text, “Let God, the God of Battell rise, and scatter his proud enemies: O let them flie before his face like smoak, which driving tempests chase; as wax dissolves with scorching fire, so perish in his burning ire.”

Such a setting is, of course, vague enough as to who the enemies are that it could have been used by both sides of the conflict if they desired, but its strong connection with the Royalist side makes its function as propaganda for the purpose of maintaining and strengthening Royalist resolve likely, even if it were not originally intended for such a purpose by the author (though his service in the Royalist army makes a primary propagandistic intention on his part all the more likely).

Overall, the repeated association of William Lawes’s death with loyalty, honour, and the monarchy could have served as hero/martyr propaganda for the purpose of inspiring greater devotion and further heroic sacrifice from Royalist supporters. Furthermore, the association of Charles I with King David in the prefatory material allows the psalms that follow it to serve as commentary on the current political climate in England, especially as it relates to Charles I, without any direct alteration of the psalm texts or further explication on the part of the author. This would not only allow Royalists to use psalm singing, a central element of Puritan worship specifically and Christian worship in general, as a means of maintaining group solidarity but to do so without arousing the suspicions of the Puritan/Parliamentarians in whose proximity they might be living.
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113 Lawes, Dd2v.
114 Lawes, Eer.
Indeed, Paula Loscocco has recently argued that Royalists during the civil wars and the
Interregnum recognized the political value of the psalms and their association with Charles I,
even having gone so far in 1657 as having set the *Eikon Basilike*, the published final thoughts of
Charles I before his execution, in meter and set to music as the *Psalterium Carolinum*, thus
recreating Charles I as a new David around which Royalists could rally and endure their
figurative and in some cases literal exile.\(^{115}\) Although Loscocco does not discuss Lawes’s *Choice
Psalmes* or directly relate the collection to this trend (she does however mention it unnamed in a
footnote as “Lawes’s edition of Sandys’s psalms”\(^{116}\) and discusses Sandys’s psalter—with music
by Henry Lawes—as being an example of the “partisan model of Royalist psalmic song”\(^ {117}\), I
would argue that it is an earlier manifestation of this larger propaganda trend in addition to
exhibiting stand-alone propagandistic elements.

*Roundhead Propaganda*

Although one could make a case here that the psalm collections published by Puritans
during the war, which also frequently include defenses of psalm singing, served propagandistic
functions, I will forego the discussion of these works until the next chapter, which focuses on the
topic as it applies to the Interregnum, in the interest of greater continuity there and greater
brevity here. Therefore, only one last work of propaganda remains to be discussed in this chapter.
That work is a faux-masque pamphlet, *The King Found at Southwell* from 1646.

\(^{115}\) Paula Loscocco, “Royalist Reclamation of Psalmsic Song in 1650s England,” *Renaissance Quarterly* 64, no. 2
(Summer 2011), 500-543.
\(^{116}\) Ibid., 517, n. 70.
\(^{117}\) Ibid., 517.
Perhaps the cleverest piece of propaganda extant from this period, *The King Found at Southwell* could easily be read by mistake as a masque libretto or as a relation of true events. Such mistaken identifications are intentional on the author’s part; not only is it consistently identified by its author as a masque, but at first glance it follows the conventions of those works by combining a news-style account of how the masque was performed with the texts of the songs that were sung. It differs upon closer inspection, however, from a true masque libretto in that it is only eight pages long (*Britannia Triumphans* in contrast is twenty-seven pages long, which is approximately average for masque libretti published during the 1630s) and there is no appreciable plot nor are there identified fictional roles in the libretto.

Even if a reader were to realize that the work is not a masque libretto, he/she might still see the pamphlet as a news story about a masque performance at the Witney wakes (Witney is a town near Oxford and a wake in this context is a festival) and a recounting of the songs that were sung there. As with the consistent description of the work as a masque, the author encourages the reader to believe that the relation is truthful by never contradicting that interpretation and by maintaining an informative tone throughout. By describing the work as a masque, the author also draws on the previous publishing tradition of court masque libretti and their association with the Royal court. A close examination of the text, however, reveals that the work is likely a complete fiction created by a Parliamentarian author for propagandistic purposes.

The historical context of this pamphlet centers on the siege of Oxford that was coming to a close in 1646 at the time that this pamphlet was published. Oxford was the capital of the Royalist cause during the first civil war, not only because the court was headquartered there but
also because Charles I’s Royalist Parliament was held there beginning in 1644. It was also from Oxford that Charles I escaped to Southwell (hence the title of the work) where he surrendered to the Scottish army.\textsuperscript{118}

The work itself purports to be written by and describe the actions of a Captain Loyd and other members of the Oxford garrison, “Courtiers and Cavaliers”\textsuperscript{119} who supposedly left the city to travel to Witney for the purpose of attending a festival there (see example 3). While at the festival, the members of the garrison “drank themselves out of all their sences,”\textsuperscript{120} “fell to very deboysterous and profane discourses,”\textsuperscript{121} and are treated to music from “the Country Fidlers, a Taberer [pipe and tabor player]; a p[l]ayre of bagge-Pipes, and an Harper,”\textsuperscript{122} and several songs written and sung (allegedly) by Captain Loyd. The harper is further described as a “shag head Ruffen,”\textsuperscript{123} which harkens back to the Parliamentarian propaganda portraits of Cavaliers (see for example An Exact Description of a Round-Head and a Long-head Shag-Poll discussed briefly above), and the roster of musicians overall, all of which would be classified as minstrels, was likely chosen to play on the associations between Royalists and immoral musicians made in previous pamphlets. The pamphlet concludes with a taunting song and verse aimed at the Royal family:

\begin{quote}
Now God ablesse King Charles  
And send him to be merry.  
And bring our noble Queene
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{119} The King Found at Southwell (London: F.L., 1646), 4.  
\textsuperscript{120} Ibid., 4.  
\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., 6.  
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid., 4.  
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid., 8.
A safe over the Ferry,
The Prince [Charles], marry save him
And the Duke [James] his owne brother
God a blessing light upon him,
He is eene such another.
I say the Dukes worship,
For an whole sweet sake
Was a Cheefly intended
We of Witney and the Wake

The King went out of Oxford, in private, towards the North,
And with his Majesty, A Priest, and Ashburnham went forth,
To Southwell then they tooke their way, neare Newarke siege,
But there the Scotts beset the Towne, And Soveraigne Leige,
And did the English then acquaint what they had done,
Both do consult how they may best the King send home.¹²⁴

In this passage and in other aspects of the work, the author is careful not to explicitly
attack the king or the Royalists depicted in the pamphlet and to maintain the illusion that the
work is a product of Royalists and thus an accurate representation of their actions and thoughts.
The contextual implications of this passage, however, with the capture of the king and the
imminent fall of Oxford, cast it as making light of the ill fortunes of the Royalist cause. After all,
what Royalist captain would say that his garrison at Oxford, instead of defending the city, left to
have a drunken, debauched party at a time when their city was still under siege and the king had
just been taken prisoner and that they did so for James, Duke of York’s sake? Not only is such an
occurrence historically impossible, given the siege and the nature of war, but there is also no
other evidence that such an event took place other than the account given in this pamphlet.

As another example of the subtle propaganda in this work, the author dedicates the work
to James, Duke of York, and covertly mocks him while at the same time offering no condolences

¹²⁴ Ibid., 8.
for the capture of his father or prayers for the deliverance of the Royalist cause. He writes at the conclusion that “The Vessell [this pamphlet] is here so unfraught and Empty, that it aimes at so Royall a Haven, not by designe of Commerce, or Trading, but shelter, and safety from tempestuous Censures, which is the greatest Ambition of your Highnesse’s Most humble servant M. LL.” Instead of being a variation of the common tropes of patronal protection, the context of the work overall and the dedication being made to an individual who is trapped helplessly in a besieged city, leads to associations between the lines “unfraught and Empty” and “shelter, and safety” with the current state of the city of Oxford, the “Royall [....] Haven” being starved by the siege and thus empty while at the same time a place of shelter and safety.

What purpose then did the author of this work have in publishing it when he did and in hiding his anti-Royalist sympathies? Propaganda of this sort, in which the origins of the work are not only obscured but explicitly falsified, is often used to reduce the morale of one’s opposition and to bolster the courage of one’s own side. This pamphlet could entice a Royalist to start reading, and thereby begin to receive its message, before he realized that the work was propaganda (if he even would). It would remind him of the unfortunate recent events and perhaps make him feel that his cause was hopeless. On the Parliamentarian side, the more incompetent and frankly idiotic one can make the enemy appear, the less one’s own troops will fear combat with them. Along the same lines, the less sympathetic and human one can make one’s enemies appear, the less likely it is that one’s own troops will hesitate to kill them and would be inclined to return to peace before victory is achieved. In any case this faux-masque is yet another example
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of how music and the idea of music was repurposed for political and propagandistic purposes during the intense, personal fighting of the English Civil Wars.

Example 3, the title page of *The King Found at Southwell*, 1646.

V. Conclusion

As this chapter has shown, musical practices and beliefs became a key element of Royalist and Parliamentarian identity and were used in that capacity as propaganda for both sides.
throughout the wars. This is not surprising considering that civil wars are especially difficult to wage and maintain without the leaders of both sides consistently reminding their followers that they are not the same as their enemies and that the differences between both groups are significant and irreconcilable. Because both sides in a civil war normally share the same language, this most intimate of identity designators is largely unavailable to those who wish to preach and maintain division. Barring language, religion (especially in the more encompassing manifestation of it that was evident during this period and included personal and political philosophy as well as culture generally) and music are the two most intimate elements of personal intellectual identity that can be used to separate a group of people into opposing camps.

Music propaganda makes up only a small fraction of the total propaganda output during this period, but it is currently impossible for us to say whether that was the result of its having been unsuccessful as a propaganda tool or if it simply represents unlucky preservation of sources. In either case, the number of sources that do survive indicates that multiple individuals saw music as a viable vehicle for their political goals, just as we saw under different circumstances in the previous chapter and will see under slightly different circumstances in the next one.
Chapter 4: Orthodoxy and Cultural Identity through Music in the English Interregnum

I. Introduction

“Unprecedented” perhaps best describes the Interregnum period in English history. The regicide of Charles I began the period in 1649 with a political world turned upside down, one where kings could be put to death and monarchy abolished. Parliament enshrined this perspective in law when it moved before Charles’s execution to legally prevent a successor from being named. This rejection of monarchy necessitated a fundamental rethinking of how government should and could operate at the highest levels. With a populace fractured by war and deprived of its most central cultural institutions, the monarchy and the Church of England, this task was made even more difficult. The government also had to consider and address potential and actual domestic threats; Royalists that remained in England could cause untold problems for the government, and the rise of nonconforming Protestant sects also presented a significant threat to the government’s attempts to establish a new national church and maintain public order.¹ Groups within the new government also fought each other for control, with Parliament contending with the army and Presbyterians competing against Independents. In this unprecedented cultural and political landscape, reestablishing and maintaining unity between the government and its subjects became a necessity and a significant goal of the newly formed and reformed England.²

To establish the necessary unity to maintain their control over the country, Parliament and the other facets of the new government strove to generate legitimacy and create/maintain a

---

new religious orthodoxy. Recent scholarship on the period discusses several aspects of their quest. Kevin Sharpe, for example, has argued that “Civil war and revolution in England underlined the centrality of a legitimacy founded on texts, images and performances that conveyed authority,” and he has examined the ways in which that secular legitimacy was performed before, during, and after the Interregnum by Stuart and Commonwealth governments. Similarly, Bernard Capp has argued that the government also sought the support of the clergy “to provide legitimacy and to promote reformation.”

Through the establishment of the Triers and Ejectors in 1654, the first Protectorate Parliament attempted to ensure that support from the clergy would be forthcoming by requiring that ministers be licensed by the government before they could receive official positions and stipends. These Government-approved and financed ministers upheld their end of the bargain by “fending off spiritual challenges” and defending the new orthodoxy from the pulpit, in person, and in print. At the same time, the government also attempted to enforce its new orthodoxy by changing the calendar and officially abolishing any holiday that was not scripturally evident. It also attempted to enforce moral reforms on gaming, idleness, drinking, etc. through closer scrutiny of the populace by the major-generals that Cromwell had appointed to oversee the
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eleven districts of England and Wales beginning in 1655 and through official legislation in 1656-1657.7

English religion and culture, however, could not simply be remolded as if exerting influence on a passive body of individuals. The Commonwealth government, after all, attempted nothing less than the removal and replacement of core aspects of English culture: a fundamental reimagining of what it meant to be English. At the same time, however, increasingly prominent and numerous sects in England also attempted to remake English religion and culture in a variety of different, conflicting, and sometimes (from the perspective of government) dangerous ways. This meant that the government not only had to convince neutral or willing individuals to adopt its cultural and religious reforms, ones desired before the war by only a powerful minority of the English population, but it also had to compete with growing and decentralized Christian sects that they could not easily silence or remove altogether. In response, the government dedicated a significant amount of legislation and energy to controlling these sects.8

As early as 1641, Presbyterian-leaning Puritans such as Thomas Edwards, who favored a national church founded on Calvinism like the one in Scotland, fought strongly in sermons and print against what they called the “Ecclesiastical Anarchy,” of toleration that would allow the “Sectaries of this time” to cast a curse “over the face of the whole land.”9 It is true that the government was a mix of Presbyterians and Independents, who in contrast desired toleration, and that power struggles between the two groups led to legislation that favored one side, the other, or
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a compromise between them. This is evident in the contrast between the passage in the Instrument of Government that allows for government support of ministers “for the instructing [of] the people, and for discovery and confutation of error, hereby, and whatever is contrary to sound doctrine”\(^{10}\) and the following passage that allows freedom of conscience as long as it is not licentious or tends “to the civil injury of others and to the actual disturbance of the public peace on their parts.”\(^{11}\) Even so, while Presbyterians targeted sects because of their threat to the new orthodoxy, independents targeted them for their threat to public order and government authority.\(^{12}\)

Baptists, for example, perhaps because of their position as the oldest and most numerous of the sects, “were regularly denounced as heretical and subversive, a threat to good order and the stability of both church and state.”\(^{13}\) Moreover, Andrew Bradstock has argued that “we should not underestimate the extent to which Baptists were seen as subversive and a threat to good order, even if this can best be understood as the outworking of their democratic theology in a milieu which knew no distinction between ‘religious’ and ‘political’ questions, rather than the consequence of any overt political intent.”\(^{14}\) Along with the Baptists, the Quakers were perhaps the most prominent of the sects in terms of numbers, conspicuous oddity, and fiery insistence on their beliefs (including the abolishment of minsters, which must have been taken by some as a


\(^{12}\)Cromwell himself was an Independent and no friend to the Quakers or other “radical” sects; see Craig W. Horle, “John Camm: Profile of a Quaker Minister during the Interregnum,” *Quaker History* 70, no. 2 (Fall 1981): 73.


\(^{14}\)Ibid., 25.
precursor to the abolishment of government).\textsuperscript{15} These aspects of their identity meant that they were subject to similar persecution in defense of public order. Henry Cromwell, Oliver Cromwell’s son and Lord Deputy of Ireland, wrote at the end of the Interregnum period that “our most considerable enemy now in our view are the Quakers.”\textsuperscript{16} Jonathan Clapham, who we shall see was no friend of the Quakers, insisted that “the raging Quakers ... never ceased disturbing them [Puritan ministers] and vilifying them, till they were themselves curbed by the civil powers.”\textsuperscript{17} As we shall see, the Quaker disdain for all but spontaneous, and therefore improvised, music making (either inside or outside of the worship service) was a significant threat to the new orthodoxy that government-backed ministers spent a considerable amount of time refuting.

In both its quest for secular and sacred legitimacy and religious orthodoxy, Parliament not only relied on legislation and enforcement, but they also, as scholars have shown, continued to make use of propaganda (in its various forms) just as they had during the civil wars.\textsuperscript{18} Jason Peacey has connected propaganda directly to the establishment of orthodoxy, saying that “It could be used in more or less official ways in order to create an orthodoxy, and in more or less subtle ways in order to conceal its origins.”\textsuperscript{19} Though Parliament did make use of propaganda that was clearly tied to the government, with official licensing statements and prominent mentions of government officials and/or propagandists, they were also aware of the value of the covert nature of propaganda. The Puritan minister and propagandist John Preston indicated as much when he wrote, “when we ... have any great things to be accomplished, the best policy is to

\textsuperscript{15} Horle, 69.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 73.
\textsuperscript{17} Jonathan Clapham, \textit{A Full Discovery and Confutation of the Wicked and Damnable Doctrines of the Quakers} (London: Adoniram Byfield, 1656), 65.
\textsuperscript{18} See for example, Jason Peacey, \textit{Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum} (Burlington: Ashgate, 2004), 40 and all of chapter 1 in general; Capp, 62.
\textsuperscript{19} Peacey, 303.
work by an engine which the world sees nothing of.” The fact that the covert nature of propaganda was recognized at the time, and indeed made use of through anonymous publication and disguised origins, makes it difficult in the present day to definitively connect many individual pieces of propaganda to the government, though some evidence of such a connection for the works discussed in this chapter is luckily available. Cuthbert Sydenham, for example, the minister and author of *A Christian and Sober Plain Exercitation on the Two Grand Practicall Controversies of these Times; Infant-Baptism, and Singing of Psalms*, was a known propagandist who was paid a £100 salary for his propaganda work for the government.

In contrast to Parliament, which struggled to establish and maintain order and orthodoxy, and which was caught in the middle of the Interregnum government’s political and religious/cultural conflicts, were the losers of the civil wars, the Royalists and hangers-on to the court of the now-abolished monarchy. Though some of these unlucky individuals were able to follow the remnants of the court into exile in France, many more, especially if one includes the average soldiers and civilian supporters of the crown, were left behind in England to live the life of a conquered people. In such a position they were left at the mercy of their conquerors, who legislatively persecuted them in a number of ways during this period. Royalists were restricted from participating in government, their property was seized to pay for the debts of the new government, they were ejected from London and Westminster, and they were required to go no
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further than five miles from their homes. Furthermore, the *Book of Common Prayer* and “prelatical” (i.e., Anglican) worship were criminalized. For these defeated and disenfranchised members of English society, the memories, literature, some of the people, and significantly the music of the pre-war years were all that remained of their former glory and the only means of sustaining their cultural identities during their internal exile in their very own homes.

In addition to continuing to appreciate the poetry and prose literature of the pre-war years, Royalists also wrote new poetry and literature that allowed them to comment on the state of their community and express their feelings about their internal exile without attracting the attention of the authorities. The *Lachrymae Musarum*, for example, was published in 1649 in the earliest days of the Interregnum and only a few months after the execution of Charles I. This collection of elegies on the death of Henry Hastings, who was only nineteen years old at the time of his death, is considered to be both a work in mourning of the young Royalist and a covert work in mourning of the Royalist cause and Charles I. Gary Schneider has argued that published letter collections from this period were “employed ... precisely to demonstrate many of the cultural
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qualities that for Royalists were absent from the civil war and commonwealth periods.”

He goes on to argue that they were also used in an attempt to prevent the cultural changes that Royalists saw taking place during the civil wars and Interregnum period.

As a dedicated servant to Charles I and brother to a well-known Royalist martyr, Henry Lawes was a key cultural figure for the Royalist community of the Interregnum. He and other former members of the royal court were a rallying point around which the remnants of the Royalist culture could gather. The musical performances that Lawes put on in his home were an opportunity for Royalists to come together and both relive and revive their court culture, even while they were under the watchful eye of the authorities.

Finally, music publication also served an important role in the maintenance of Royalist culture. John Playford has been a recent focal point for scholars of music and politics in the Interregnum, and he was certainly a transfer point through which Royalist musicians were able to pass on their music and the music of the pre-war court to the Royalist community in England. It also might be argued that in serving in such a role—as a middleman or arbiter of sorts—Playford was also responsible for deciding exactly what would constitute Royalist culture in the Interregnum. As such a central figure in the Royalist community, Playford will be discussed in detail below, along with a number of Royalist musicians who have yet to garner attention in the scholarly community.
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Overall, in examining the music and writings on music of the Puritan government and Royalist community in England during the Interregnum, this chapter defends the claim that much of the music and music-related publishing activity during the period was undertaken either as cultural propaganda to support the government’s quest for order and conformity or to maintain the cultural identity of the Royalist community. Accordingly, section II of this chapter focuses on the ways in which defenses of psalm singing can be connected to the desires of the government and its supporters to solidify their control over the country and firmly establish a new religious identity for the nation. Likewise, section III focuses on exposing the Royalist cultural content of several of the most popular music collections of the period and on discussing the larger Royalist context of these works as examples of maintenance propaganda, which I define as propaganda that is designed to shape the identity of a group while potentially also encouraging group solidarity and/or generating resolve for political action in a community.

One type of maintenance propaganda makes use of references to the past. Through the glorification of the past, authors can encourage the maintenance of cultural norms from that time period, thereby shaping the cultural community of their present. References to the past may also be used to keep the memory of a golden age or an injustice fresh in the memories of readers/audiences so that they will continue to aspire to a revival of a given political/economic system or to the righting of the injustice.

Another type of maintenance propaganda comments on the present state of a community. Through references to the present state of a given community, especially with language that emphasizes an “us” versus “them” mentality, authors can encourage readers to continue identifying with that community. They can also point out an injustice currently being suffered by
the community in an attempt to encourage political action, or they can spread positive news about the community in an effort to recruit new members or embolden existing ones.

Finally, another type of maintenance propaganda focuses on discussing the future. This can give community members something to look forward to and encourage them to maintain their identity within the group. It can also encourage them not to actively disassociate and become a member of a new group with a new cultural identity (especially in the case of Royalists, one that would not face government sanctions and suspicion).

II. Psalm Singing, Calvinist Orthodoxy, and the Interregnum Government

It is no surprise that psalm singing became a significant point of contention between Puritans and sects during the civil wars and the Interregnum. Indeed, more defenses of psalm singing appeared between 1644 and 1659 than during the history of English publishing up to that point and for thirty years after it. Psalm singing was an important part of Puritan worship and identity that constituted half of their religious Service and served as the only congregational participation in it. Psalm singing was also a significant paraliturgical element of Puritan life. Therefore, by defending psalm singing Puritan authors were also defending a fundamental element of Puritanism from the sects that continued to gain popularity and threaten the establishment of a national Puritan orthodoxy. Moreover, just as music had served as a representative shorthand symbol for the complex religious debates of the civil-wars era, so too could it serve as a symbol for the differences between the various sects from which the English
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29 It was only after the passage of the Toleration Act in 1689 that more defenses of psalm singing were published between 1690 and 1700 than in the period discussed here, and even then the number was only exceeded by two (eight as opposed to six). See Appendix B for a chronological list of church music pamphlets and pamphlets with significant discussions of church music.

people could, whether legally or otherwise, choose during the Interregnum. It is also worth noting that because preaching was ubiquitous among the competing sects in England, the other essential half of the Puritan Service was safe from criticism in a way that singing the psalms was not.

Psalmsinging was not simply an important aspect of religious practice for Puritans, however, and that the government had a vested interest in defending psalm singing is evident in the Directory of 1645, which was approved and mandated for use by Parliament itself. The ordinance through which the Directory was instituted, titled “An Ordinance of the Lords and Commons Assembled in Parliament for the more effectuall putting in execution the Directory for Publique worship, in all Parish Churches and chappells within the kingdome of England and Dominion of Wales, and for the dispersing of them in all places and parishes within this kingdome, and the Dominion of Wales,” not only outlaws the Book of Common Prayer and replaces it with the Directory as the guiding liturgical document of the country, but it also institutes a fine of 40 shillings to “every Minister which shall not henceforth pursue and observe the Directory for publique worship, according to the true intent and meaning thereof, in all excises of the publique worship of God.” It also criminalizes any criticism of the Directory with a fine of between five and fifty pounds.

It is important to acknowledge that the Directory was intended as a set of best practices and not as a rigidly laid out system of worship: Puritans were, after all, against set forms of prayer fundamentally. Nevertheless, it is clear that the writers of the Directory favored psalm
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singing and intended it to be a central part of the worship service. Along those lines, the 

*Directory* mentions psalm singing in relation to several aspects of worship. These include: prayer after the sermon,\(^{34}\) sanctification of the Sabbath,\(^{35}\) public fasting,\(^{36}\) and public thanksgiving.\(^{37}\) The final section of the *Directory* is also dedicated specifically to addressing psalm singing and how it is to be undertaken. In that section, the authors of the *Directory*, the ministers who took part in the Westminster Assembly, assert that “It is the duty of Christians to praise God publiquely by singing of Psalms together in the Congregation, and also privately in the Family.”\(^{38}\) It also endorses the practice of lining out, in which one individual reads each line of the psalm before it is sung so that people will know the words.\(^{39}\) The *Directory* therefore endorses use of psalm singing as an ever-present facet of religious life under the government’s new orthodoxy and makes it a fundamental element of it.

Given such a fundamental place in the Puritan orthodoxy, it logically follows that sects would attack psalm singing if they wished to attack the Puritan establishment and that Puritans would mobilize (either at the behest of the government or of their own volition) to defend it. Sects might have chosen to do this for purely religious reasons or they may have seen it as a way to distinguish themselves from the Puritans in the marketplace of religious ideas; unfortunately, there is not enough evidence available surrounding their publications to know one way or another. In any case, we have evidence from both sides attesting to the importance of psalm
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\(^{38}\) A Directory for Publique Prayer, Reading the Holy Scriptures, Singing of Psalms, Preaching of the Word, Administration of the Sacraments, and Other Parts of the Publique Worship of God, Ordinary & Extraordinary (London: Edward Husband, 1645), 82.
\(^{39}\) Ibid., 84.
singing as a controversy during this period. On the Puritan side, Cuthbert Sidenham (also spelled Sydenham) prominently titled his contribution to the psalm singing debate *A Christian, Sober and Plain Exercitation on the Two Grand Practical Controversies of these Times; Infant-Baptism, and Singing of Psalms*. On the sects’ side, the Baptist William Kaye writes that

the second thing in controversie, is the denying of singing of Psalms; ... as to the point in controversie about Singing, this I have to say, That as Christ shall more and more reign, he shall rouze up and gather his Saints to be baptized into one body, 1 Cor. 12.14. and united into, and acted with the Spirit of Christ and his Apostles, that their hearts will be in tune: That as Independent Churches cast off Infant-sprinkling, so Churches of Christ under baptism will return (as some of them for the present are) unto singing. And yet I finde, that those that are not under the present practice, dare not deny their title to the Ordinance of Singing.\(^{40}\)

During the 1690s, Baptists actively engaged each other in a pamphlet war over the use of singing psalms in church, and Kaye confirms here that they were divided on the issue even as early as the Interregnum.\(^{41}\)

While Baptists may have kept the issue of singing mostly to themselves, with Kaye’s work being a rare example of their discussion reaching into the public sphere, Quakers were eager to attack psalm singing and non-spontaneous music making in general as a perversion that should be completely abolished. This desire was made manifest in the middle of the decade when two prominent Quakers published pamphlets attacking not only psalm singing but the Puritan religious establishment in general and one Puritan minister in particular: Jonathan Clapham. According to Clapham, the attack was instigated by his having given a neighbor a manuscript copy of a defense of psalm singing that he had written at that neighbor’s request, the neighbor


\(^{41}\)For examples from this pamphlet war, see the works by Isaac Marlow, Benjamin Keach, Richard Allen, and William Kiffin in Appendix B for Chapter 6.
being a Quaker who wanted to see what he might say in defense of it. Somehow, however, the manuscript made its way into the hands of George Whitehead and Christopher Atkinson, who proceeded to publish *David’s Enemies Discovered*, “A True Discovery of that Custome and Forme [i.e., psalm singing] which the Priests of this Generation would make an Ordinance of, to blind the eyes of the simple, as this *priest Clapham* in his 6 Arguments” together in 1654. Clapham then published his *A Short and Full Vindication of that Sweet and Comfortable Ordinance, of Singing of Psalms*, which garnered a reply by George Whitehead titled *Cain’s Generation Discovered*, which continues the attacks from the previous work on psalm singing, the Puritan establishment, and on Clapham personally. One passage from each Quaker pamphlet gives a good idea of the intensity of the Quaker opposition to the Puritan establishment. In *David’s Enemies Discovered*, Whitehead and Atkinson write that

> they who are members of the church which is in God [i.e., Quakers] they sing with one spirit, being thereunto called by the Lord, which was not morall but spirituall, and they did not bring old Authors to prove their Actions by, as thou doest, but in that they worshipped which was before Authors was, and before Oxford and Cambridge was, which thou and thy generation makes a trade upon, and by the same spirit they sang by which the Gospell was preached, and there was no division, and they made not a Custome of other mens conditions as to get them into rime and meeter and give them forth unto a company of blind people as thou and thy generation do, and by the same spirit they sang by which the Gospell was preached, and there was no division, and they made not a Custome of other mens conditions as to get them into rime and meeter and give them forth unto a company of blind people as thou and thy generation do, and their singing was with the spirit, and with understanding, which we owne, but thee we do deny and all thy generation, wo [who] give people Davids conditions to sing in a meeter, where David did mourn and where he was afflicted ye sing, and where he quaked, and trembled, and prayed, and prophesied, these ye sing, & tell God you do so, and here you make a custome like a stage play upon Davids conditions, and scoffs and scornes at them now who witnesse Quaking.  
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They go on to say, “Here (Priest Clapham) thy Arguments are answered, and the rest of thy rotten stuff which is not worth mentioning, with them comprehended, and seen with the light to be all acted, in this filthy reason and Inventions, which are stuffed up with so many lies and wrestling Scriptures as thou art here disproved in.”\(^{45}\) They also demand that Clapham stop living off of money taken from the people and threaten him personally and all those like him when they write that “the sword of the Lord is drawn against thee, and that generation thou art in, and wo and misery is the end of your songs, and your joy and your profession of God and Christ ... the day of your trouble and torment and misery is coming upon you, Wo, wo to you pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture, saith the Lord.”\(^{46}\) To Puritans and other observers, the intensity of their rebuke of Clapham and predictions about the wrath of God against him and his “generation” of Puritan ministers would have sounded like a threat of violence, and their aggressive criticisms of a government approved minister and government mandated religious practice might sound like a threat to the rule of law or at least to the established order of society. Jonathan Clapham certainly considered their intentions to be violent, and he alleges that he was sent twenty-three queries “with this threatening annexed (That if I would not answer them, I should be set upon the Cross) This (Reader) is the custom of these Rabshakehs whose trade is to raile and revile; and therefore what ingenious man can fault me, if I refuse to deal with such bawling creatures.”\(^{47}\) Clapham also requests that his readers pray for deliverance from not only Whitehead and Atkinson, but “this generation of men, having found them by sufficient experience ... absurd and unreasonable men; such as are not worthy to have place amongst men,

\(^{45}\) Ibid., 8.
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being, more like bruits then men, whom no reason will satisfy ... Only I request thee (Christian Reader) thy prayers that we may be delivered from such absurd and unreasonable men."^48 That Clapham is certainly talking about all Quakers is confirmed by another publication of his from 1656, titled *A Full Discovery and Confutation of the Wicked and Damnable Doctrines of the Quakers*. This work not only contains a republication of his psalm singing defense and a larger refutation/propagandistic attack on Quakers, but it also gives evidence that Clapham was writing as a propagandist for the government, as will be discussed below.

In *Cain’s Generation Discovered*, Whitehead also raises the issue of singing in a congregation that includes individuals who are not good Christians:

> and thou sayest, why should any fear that mixture of wicked men in singing, who are bound to sing Gods praises as well as to pray, though they sin in both? Here Priest Clapham, out of thy own mouth thou art judged to cause the people to erre, who hast confessed that the wicked both sin in singing and praying, and yet art preaching for it.\(^49\)

Although many of their attacks are directed squarely at Clapham, both *David’s Enemies* and *Cain’s Generation* make it clear to the reader that Whitehead and Atkinson are also criticizing and attacking all Puritan ministers by extension and concurrently. In *David’s Enemies* this is stated in the very opening of the work when the authors assert its purpose as being

> to clear the truth and lay open the deceit of this generation of priests, who make a Custome and a trade of Scriptures, who take peoples money for that which is no bread, but for dishonest gain destroyes souls, and keeps poor people in blindness and darkness, by their Inventions and vain Imaginations, that under their Dark Ministry poor people are ever learning, never able to come to the knowledge of the truth, and for their sakes who by these blind guides are led in blindness, Are we moved to answer something to this Priest Clapham’s Arguments.\(^50\)

---
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In *Cain’s Generation*, Whitehead presents a separate section titled “certain Queries to You Teachers of the world, who profess the Scriptures to be your Rule to walk by” in which his first question addresses the Puritan establishment of ordained and approved ministers, just as both authors had in their previous work:

What warrant of example have you from Scripture to be made Ministers by the wil of man at *Oxford* and *Cambridge*, and there to learn so many years Arts and Sciences, and rudiments of the world, and so to have your Commission from man, seeing the Ministers of Christ were not made Ministers by the will of man, neither had they their Commission from man, and the Apostle declares against the rudiments of the world.\(^51\)

His eighth query also criticizes infant baptism. Although not specifically about psalm singing, another work, this time from 1658, titled *To the Musicioners, the Harpers, the Minstrels, the Singers, the Dancers, the Persecutors*, directly criticizes the government of England in its entirety and it is likely for this reason that the work was published anonymously. The author writes that

the persecuting Rulers of England, need not to put this far from them, being rich and mighty in the earth, and envious like *Cain*, and delighting in the musick, like the rest of his seed, for the great Whore, and mother of Harlots, and abominations of the earth, Mistery Babylon, have made all the Kings of the earth drunk with the wine of her fornication ... and even in this nation, and other adjacent Kingdoms, the Princess the Governours, and Captains, the Judges the Treasurers, the Counsellers, the Shriefs, and the Rulers of the Provinces, delighteth in the instruments of Musicke, and are envious against the righteous seed, who cannot bow to any image, nor worship, any golden glorious image, or likeness whatsoever, but the living God who is able to deliver them, and is a Spirit dwelling in his people.\(^52\)

Therefore, psalm singing (and music in general) was both a passionate point of contention for Quakers and an opportunity for them to attack the entire Puritan establishment and
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secular government of the Commonwealth at the same time. In the face of this fiery opposition, Puritans fought back with defenses of psalm singing that were designed to address the objections raised by sects. By countering the attacks by sects on music and psalm singing, Puritans were not only defending their theological beliefs and practices; they also took the opportunity to attack non-conformity and division in the religious community in general, thus counter-propagandizing on behalf of Puritanism.

We can see, for example that the psalm singing defenses published in this period are a direct response to the sects and their criticisms of Puritan practices rather than simply generic encouragements to learn to sing or to enhance one’s worship through psalm singing. Clapham’s pamphlet most directly addresses the Quakers, as has been shown above, but every one of the other published defenses that are extant from this period contains refutations of the criticisms made by Quakers, and Baptists in some cases, as evidenced by the writings of Whitehead and Atkinson. Thomas Ford, Cuthbert Sydenham, John Cotton, and Nathanael Homes all directly address singing in mixed congregations (where the saintly and sinners were allowed to sing together), the applicability of the psalms to the individual Christian life, the translation and setting of the psalms in English meter, and why spontaneous singing is not preferable to singing the psalms. These authors also directly address and criticize non-Puritans in their works (including Anglicans and Catholics).

---

Thomas Ford, for example, writes that those who are attacking psalm singing are doing so because it is the easiest place to begin turning people against all ordinances. Whether or not that means civil and/or sacred is unclear, though he does say that people who ignore the ordinance of psalm singing soon “live above Ordinances and Duties ... and so live like beasts in the shape of men”\(^{54}\)—which may indicate a general disregard for all ordinances, both civil and ecclesiastical:

And let it be considered in what juncture of time singing of Psalmes hath been so much denied and spoken against, even when all the Ordinances of God, and all the Duties of his Worship have been as much slighted by too many amongst us. Here (as I said even now) men begin, but seldom or never stay, but go further to question and decry all Ordinances. They begin here (as I conceive) for this reason, because wrangling wits have some more specious and faire pretences, whereby they can more easily entangle simple and unstable souls, and so make them to scruple at this duty sooner then at any other. And to say as the thing is, The ignorance of most concerning the Nature, End, and Use of this Duty, hath given the greatest advantage unto others to seduce and draw them away from it.\(^{55}\)

Defending psalm singing is therefore for Ford a way to maintain religious orthodoxy, if not also civil order, by ensuring that Christians will not be seduced away from Puritanism, which he considers the true path, by a slippery slope of cast-off ordinances that leads ultimately to men living as beasts and the implicit destruction of society that such circumstances would entail.

The controversies of psalm singing and infant baptism are likewise presented by Cuthbert Sydenham as a threat to the peace and order of society: “I have treated on these two subjects, because I know they are the tempting errors of these times, and have the fairest glosses set on them, and have too much influence to disturb the peace and Order of Churches.”\(^{56}\) Moreover, he writes that psalm singing and baptism are being attacked at the behest of Satan to disturb the

\(^{54}\) Ford, 173-174.
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peace of the churches in England; at the beginning of the section on psalm singing he writes that
“The next publick controversie which Satan hath raised to disturb the Churches, is about the
practise of singing Scripture-Psalms, on purpose to deprive the Saints of the benefit of that soul-
ravishing, & heart-ravishing Ordinance.” Sydenham therefore sets up his work as an attempt to
undeceive his readers and to return order to the churches of England, which was a common
stance for propagandists to take during this period. As Peacey writes, “the rhetoric of education
was often mixed with language which intimated that the people had been deceived and deluded ...
all sides spoke of the need to ‘undeceive,’ and to undo the harm done by opponents.” His work
therefore is a direct attempt to combat the growth of the two most prominent sects that opposed
infant baptism and psalm singing, the Baptists and the Quakers. The fact that Sydenham was
licensed by the government and was a known propagandist writing on its behalf makes it likely
that this work was written as government-commissioned propaganda, but even lacking definitive
evidence one way or the other, it is at least in line with the government’s agenda at the time and
would have been sanctioned by government officials through the licensing system.

John Hanson, in addition to defending psalm singing and the public appointment and
maintenance of ministers, praises the Commonwealth government, saying that “Godlinesse was
never in any age or country since Gospell times, so countenanced by authority as in this” but
acknowledges that the lack of more stringent laws concerning religion have led to the rise of
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Chapman, 1658), 79-83 and 84-85.
differences and discontents ... that since the law was abrogated, that no place is to be respected before another, so that some will not come into a publick meeting place lest they countenance idolatry, & say the Sacraments of Baptisme and of the Lords Supper were never in the Apostles time administered in any publick meeting place, it is to[o] true that most men doe dearly tender their own interest.  

Indeed, even the two earliest treatises on psalm singing, those by Nathanael Homes and John Cotton, indicate that their authors were writing to combat a growing movement against psalm singing and a larger trend of dissent from the rising Puritan orthodoxy that was only just being established by Parliament during the period between 1644 and 1647. Homes, for example, writes of

this age, wherein every old Heresie, is revived, stripping Christ of all. Anabaptisme that began to oppose Reformation in famous Luthers time, is risen again [i.e. Baptists], taking away Baptisme from beleevers children. ... And so the opinion of the Hilarians unlawfulnesse of singing Psalmes, is risen again from the dead, that before lived in Hilarius his time, to take away this Gospel ordinance, and sweet solace of the sanctified soule.  

Furthermore, Homes indicates his concern over orthodoxy when he writes that men should not be allowed to write psalms of their own and sing them spontaneously in church “without the advise of the Church whether they were orthodox or no, and without their allowance and leave that they should be used by the Church.”

Cotton indicates that the matter had become a significant controversy when he writes that “To prevent the godly-minded from making melody to the Lord in Singing his Praises with one accord (I meane with one heart, and one voyce) Satan hath mightily besterred himselfe, to breed a discord in the hearts of some, by filling their heads with foure heads of scruples about the
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duty." Likewise, in concluding his work he condemns dissent from Puritan orthodoxy and urges a return to unity through the intercession of God:

How much more safe were it, for humble and sincere Christians to walke in Gods holy feare, and in sence of their own ignorance, infirmites, and temptations, to suspect their own private apprehensions, and humbly to beg a Spirit of Light and Truth, to lead them into all Truth, and meekly to consult with Brethren without setting up any Idoll or forestalled Imagination in their hearts, before they resolve to runne a by-way, to the griefe and scandall of their Brethren. It is a Palsey distemper in a member to be carried with a different motion from the rest of the body: The Lord heale our swervings, and stablish us with a Spirit of Truth and Grace in Christ Jesus.

He further suggests that he may have the Quakers in mind as one of the groups that have worked on Satan’s behalf to breed discord in the Puritan community when he writes of “Such as tremble at the word (as the framer of this objection professeth himselfe to doe,)” in regard to the objection that Ephesians 5:19 calls for speaking in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs rather than singing.

Cotton’s reference to trembling at the word may refer to George Fox, who during his trial in 1650 quoted Isaiah 66:5 to his judges when he “bade them tremble at the word of the Lord.” In response, one of the judges called him a Quaker, and Fox put forth this instance as the first use of the term. While this passage also appears in the 1647 edition of Cotton’s pamphlet, which predates the instance mentioned in Fox’s autobiography, it is possible that Fox used the phrase prior to the trial in 1650 and that Cotton was made aware of it somehow (Fox had risen to popularity by ca. 1647). It is also possible that Cotton is referring to an unknown Seeker author.
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or individual. The Seekers predated the Quakers by around two decades, shared many of their practices (including sitting in silence, the casting off of all ordinances, and a lack of clergy), and many of them joined the Quakers beginning in the late 1640s. Unfortunately, Cotton makes no direct mention of who the framer of the objection is, and no anti-psalm singing pamphlets from before the 1650s are extant. We know at least one did exist, however, as Homes’s *Gospel Musick* was written in direct refutation of an anonymous pamphlet titled *Certain Reasons by way of Confutation of Singing Psalms in the Letter*.

We also know that the government actively promoted and likely commissioned propaganda against sects that mentioned their musical practices prominently. *The Routing of the Ranters*, for example, claims on the title page to be a “full Relation of their uncivil carriages, and blasphemous words and actions at their mad meetings, their several kind of musick, dances, and ryotings” that was “Published by Authority,” which indicates that the work was approved by the official state licensers. Though all of the pro-government works discussed here were almost certainly licensed and thereby approved by the government, and licensing does not indicate that the government commissioned the work, calling the reader’s attention to that fact is either indicative of a desire on the part of the authorities to support the work or one on the part of the publisher to evoke authority. In either case, a connection to the government is presented to the reader and can lead to an assumption of endorsement. And, as Peacey has said, “Licensing was a means of encouraging the appearance of works with whose message public authorities were in agreement.”
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defenders and the Interregnum government, we can at least say that the government certainly would have approved of their efforts.

This chapter has already shown that defenders of psalm singing were using their pamphlets to attack sects—claiming among other things that they were in league with Satan—and to call for religious unity around a Puritan orthodoxy. In doing so, I have provided strong evidence for the idea that Puritans were defending psalm singing to protect the new national orthodoxy and cultural identity of the Interregnum. All that remains is to connect these works to the government itself. The combined forces of time and poor record keeping, in concert with the often disguised origins of propaganda, however, have conspired to make a definitive connection between the works discussed here and the Interregnum government illusive at best and non-existent at worst. If I cannot definitively connect these psalm-singing defenses to the government, I can at least connect the authors of these works to it or to political activity that would suggest an ulterior motive for their works.

As has been mentioned above, the most obvious connection that is evident between any author discussed here and the government is the salary of £100 that Cuthbert Sydenham received for his services as a propagandist. We also know that all of the works discussed here would have been licensed for publication by the government and that as licensed ministers, all of these authors (with the exception of John Cotton who was in New England at this point) would have been approved for government stipends by a board of government-appointed individuals and would have been watched to ensure they complied with the laws relating to religion and conformed to the Puritan orthodoxy. In the case of John Cotton, while he may not be directly connected to the Interregnum government in England, he was an influential member of the
government of New England, and as Glenda Goodman has commented, “Cotton, Shepard, and others ... keenly anticipated a puritan English nation, a possibility that seemed to be on the verge of becoming reality in the 1640s. They fashioned their musical ideas to support that goal.”

That Cotton was government-minded is evident in his “An Abstract of Laws and Government” which was “presented to the generall Court of the Massachusetts” before his death in 1652 and published in England in 1655. That he was vehemently against toleration of other religious perspectives is evident in his 1647 reply to Roger Williams’s Bloudy Tenent with his The Bloudy Tenent Washed ... wherein the great Questions of this present time are handled, viz. How farre Liberty of Conscience ought to be given to those that truly feare God? And how farre restrained to turbulent and pestilent persons, that not onely raze the foundation of Godlinesse, but disturb the Civill Peace where they live?

We also know that Thomas Ford was a member of the Westminster Assembly of ministers that Parliament charged with writing the Directory. It makes sense then that he would have a vested interest in maintaining the government-mandated religious orthodoxy that he helped to define and establish in the first place. Similarly, Nathaniel Homes (or Nathanael Holmes), was selected to preach before the Commons at least once in the 1640s, which indicates a close ideological (and perhaps personal) connection to the Interregnum government, its officers, and its goals. He also wrote a number of pamphlets that criticize toleration and urge religious unity, such as his Ecclesiastica methermenutica, or, Church-cases cleered wherein are held forth
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some things to reclaim professors that are slack-principled, anti-churchians, non-church seekers, [and] church-levellers from 1652 and his *Plain Dealing or The Cause And Cure of The Present Evils of The Times* from 1652, which was delivered as a sermon before the Lord Mayor of London, thus showing a further connection to the Interregnum government. Finally, we know that the Council of State encouraged licensers to take into consideration (read: approve) Homes’s *Resurrection Revealed* in 1653, which indicates that his work was known by the highest ranks of the government and that it was their desire that his works be approved for printing.

**III. Maintaining Royalist Cultural Identity through Music**

*Royalists and Music Printing*

Just as pro-psalm singing pamphlets unanimously originated from Puritan authors during this period, music collections unanimously originated from Royalists, or at the very least musicians associated with the pre-Interregnum court and the Church of England (see Appendix A for chapter 4 for a list of music collections from this period, and Appendix B for chapter 4 for a breakdown of the contents of the collections referenced below). Henry Lawes represents the most successful and prominently Royalist musician of the mid-seventeenth century and contributed three collections to the eighteen total prints (not including pedagogical works) published during this period. He was also credited as the composer of the music for two of the three masque libretti that were published in the 1650s. His works were also featured prominently in contemporary music collections published by John Playford, including the *Select Ayres and*...
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Dialogues from 1659, the Select Musicall Ayres of 1652 and 1653, and the Second Book of Ayres from 1652. As mentioned above, there is no doubt that Lawes was not only a Royalist but also an important one within their community in England during the Interregnum. That his presence was in high demand in the Royalist community, as mentioned above, helps to explain why he was also the most published composer of the period, with three collections of his own music published throughout the decade (in 1653, 1655, and 1658).

Indeed, only John Playford surpasses Lawes’s output of printed works with the eight anthologies he published during the 1650s, but this is only by virtue of the fact that we ascribe them to him as their compiler. Playford is considered by all recent scholarship to have been at least willing to cater to Royalists for monetary reasons and by some to likely have been a Royalist himself. This perception is supported by evidence that he sometimes published pro-Royalist propaganda and even had a warrant out for his arrest because of it. As Lindenbaum argues, Playford only rarely included in his anthologies music from musicians that associated with Cromwell; eleven pieces out of the approximately 1,000 published by Playford in the 1650’s were attributed to musicians that were supported by Cromwell’s household during his administration. Furthermore, all of the composers and poets Playford published and advertised prominently in his prints were Royalists. If we credit Playford with the revival of music printing, then it seems likely that we should consider it a Royalist revival.

Turning back to the composers themselves, John Gamble is the next most published composer of this period with two collections of Ayres and Dialogues from 1656 and 1659. It is also worth noting that Gamble was published by William Godbid rather than Playford, which is
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an indication that Royalist music publication was not limited to the reach of John Playford or the sole product of his personal goals or desires. Gamble was most likely a musician in the King’s Company and at the Middle Temple before the Interregnum; after the Restoration he maintained his connection to the court as a member of the king’s wind band.  

Like Lawes, John Wilson’s Royalist identity is incontestable. Not only does Henry Lawes attest that Wilson was a servant of “his late Majestie,” but records of his service at court are extant. Furthermore, Wilson’s *Psalterium Carolinum*, his only publication as sole author from this period, is an extensive work of propaganda in support of the Royalist cause, which will be shown below.

The last music collection by a single composer that this chapter will argue contains Royalist propaganda was published by Walter Porter. Like all of the composers mentioned above, Porter was connected to the court of Charles I before its dissolution. In his case, he served as a gentleman of the Chapel Royal and as Master of the choir at Westminster. His collection of motets was his only publication from this period.

Six additional composers published music collections during the Interregnum or were otherwise featured prominently in one or more of Playford’s anthologies. All six had connections to the pre-Interregnum court and/or to the Church of England. Charles Coleman, for example, had served as one of the king’s musicians since at least the death of James I and was featured in
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Playford’s *Select Musicall Ayres* and *Select Ayres and Dialogues*.\(^8^4\) Likewise, William Webb was a member of the Chapel Royal around the time of the outbreak of the civil wars and was also featured in Playford’s air and dialogue collections.\(^8^5\) Nicholas Lanier served as a court musician for James I, Charles I, and Charles II, and he was Charles I’s master of music while the court was at Oxford during the civil wars.\(^8^6\) He is also featured prominently on the title page of Playford’s *Select Ayres and Dialogues*.

John Hilton, William Child, and Matthew Locke, the remaining three musicians who published music collections during this period, were all employed before the civil wars as organists for the Church of England, and two (Child and Locke) may have had additional connections to the Royalist side during the wars. Matthew Locke, for example, may have been conscripted into the Royalist forces during the civil wars and spent some time with the exiled court in the Netherlands, where he may have even converted to Catholicism.\(^8^7\)

While it is tempting to read the dominance of Royalist, or at least Royalist-connected, musicians and sympathizers (such as Playford and perhaps Godbid) over music publishing
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during this period as a propagandistic conspiracy, and in spite of the fact that I will argue that many of the music publications from this period are propagandistic, there is a possible, innocent, and logical explanation for this profusion of Royalist music publication. The very nature of the Puritan perspective on music and musicians, as has been examined in previous chapters, meant that no ideologically consistent Puritan would become a professional musician and that the Royalist side was the only major societal group that was hospitable to professional musicians. Not only that, but antebellum musicians would have been employed almost exclusively by individuals and institutions of the government that would eventually become the Royalist side at the outbreak of the wars. If only Royalists were hiring, then musicians could not help but associate with them and it is not a surprise then that some would come to sympathize with them when the nation was forced to choose sides. This thus leads to the expectation that Royalist culture would naturally be reflected in the music publications of these musicians: they were raised in that culture and were an integral part of it before it was exiled and suppressed by the Interregnum government. This also somewhat explains the preference composers had for setting texts by Royalist poets. The top two poets set by Henry Lawes, for example, were Henry Hughes and Thomas Carew, both of whom were noted Royalists. Composers who worked for the court would naturally associate with court poets, and ideologically consistent Puritans would probably not have been writing poetry that would have been in fashion at court.

Even so, the number of propagandistic songs published in this period suggests a clear intentionality toward the maintenance and propagation of Royalist culture. We know, for example, from Lawes’s manuscripts that he set Hughes’s poetry in the 1650s, which shows
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continued interaction with Royalists and a willingness to maintain Royalist culture after the war by creating new works that perpetuate it.\textsuperscript{89} He did not simply publish old songs from his days at court; he also wrote new ones that perpetuated the court culture of that period.

\textit{Royalist Propaganda in its Published Context: Interregnum Music Collections}

In spite of their propagandistic content, Interregnum music collections only occasionally offer any hint of their political significance through their construction and presentation. Indeed, no specific non-textual elements appear in these collections that one might consistently associate with, or use to anticipate, the presence of propaganda in them; this includes formatting, the presence of a particular type of prefatory material, or even song arrangements within collections. Title pages vary only slightly from one print to the next and from one printer to another; Playford’s title pages present a consistently higher level of ornamentation than those of Godbid (often including woodcuts, ornate boarders, etc.) but overall these differences relate more to the printer’s abilities and preferences than the presence of propaganda in a given collection.\textsuperscript{90}

As overall uniformity rules title pages, so variety rules prefatory material. Some collections, such as Playford’s \textit{Second Booke of Ayres} from 1652 and \textit{Select Musicall Ayres} from 1653, contain no prefatory material and transition immediately from the title page to the first song of the collection; some contain brief prefaces and/or dedications, such as Porter’s \textit{Mottets} and Locke’s \textit{Little Consort}; and others contain woodcuts, laudatory poems, and dedications or “to the reader” sections, such as Gamble’s \textit{Ayres and Dialogues} from 1656 (see Appendix A for Chapter 4 for information on the prefatory content of each collection published during this period). As with title pages, however, the inclusion of a particular type of prefatory content in a

\textsuperscript{89} Ibid., 82.
\textsuperscript{90} See Appendix C for Chapter 4 for examples of title pages from the song collections discussed from this period.
given collection offers no indication of whether or not that collection will include propaganda. One might expect, given the discussion in Chapter 2, that composers and publishers might make use of their dedications and prefaces to propagandize, but in this period they exhibit apolitical content in a majority of instances. Laudatory poems, however, consistently appear in collections that contain propaganda, and sometimes contain propaganda themselves. While we can say that all laudatory poems appear in collections that contain propaganda, not all collections that contain propaganda contain laudatory poems. The same concept pertains to woodcuts: almost all woodcuts appear in collections that contain propaganda, but not all collections that contain propaganda exhibit woodcuts. Therefore, the formal aspects of front matter offer no clues to the nature of a given collection’s contents, and only in individual cases can some of these aspects be shown to function propagandistically (discussions of such cases appear in the following section).

Furthermore, the number of songs contained within these collections and thus also the size of the collections, varies widely. As shown in Appendix A, song quantities range from sixteen in Playford’s 1652 Second Booke to 142 in John Hilton’s Catch that Catch Can from the same year, with an average of approximately fifty songs per collection. As one can also see in Appendix A, there is no correlation between the number of songs in a collection and its likelihood of containing propaganda.91

Although song quantities may seem high when compared to publications from earlier in the century, song recycling in successive publications occurs among secular song collections and lowers the overall number of individual songs in circulation. This practice of republication,
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91 For my purposes, likely propaganda here refers to works that I will argue later should be considered propaganda. Possible propaganda refers to works that I have identified in my research as possibly propagandistic but were not as evidently propagandistic as the likely propaganda songs and therefore not discussed in this dissertation. Collections marked as “yes” in Appendix A are undeniably propagandistic.
combined with the arrangement of propaganda songs within these collections, also makes it
difficult to tell if collections were deliberately arranged or if songs were arranged randomly. In
some secular song collections, such as Lawes’s first book of *Ayres and Dialogues*, we can
identify clusters of possible or likely propaganda songs, with songs three, four, five, sixteen,
twenty-four, twenty-five, thirty-three, thirty-four, thirty-five, thirty-six, and thirty-eight
representing all possible and likely propaganda in the collection (see Appendix B). Even so, song
sixteen stands as an outlier in the midst of three groups of two or more songs. If one considers
only the likely propaganda songs in this collection, then the grouping appears less consistent,
with songs five, twenty-four, thirty-four, and thirty-six representing the propaganda content of
this collection.

Other secular song collections, such as Lawes’s second book, contain no groupings of
propaganda songs, with songs eighteen and twenty-four representing the only likely propaganda
in the collection, and song thirty-six representing the only possible propaganda song in the
collection. In addition to the inconsistency of arrangement for propaganda songs in these
collections, only one collection begins or ends with a propaganda song: Lawes’s third book from
1658, which begins with “*Cloris* landing at Berlington.”

In light of the above evidence, three possible explanations arise. 1) the individuals
responsible for deciding what these secular song collections would look like and consist of
deliberately tried to hide the propaganda that appears in them by disguising them as unassuming
song collections. 2) they were unaware/unconcerned with the fact that propaganda was being
included in them. 3) they knew the collection(s) contained propaganda, if only with the notion of
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92 I discuss all of the pieces mentioned here in more detail in the following sections.
it being favorable to their political ideology, but saw no need to hide or emphasize it in their collection(s).

*Music as Maintenance Propaganda*

At least some publishers were likely aware that some of their collections contained propaganda. Scholars have already argued that Playford, for example, intended his publications to function propagandistically. Keith Whitlock, for example, has argued that Playford’s *English Dancing Master* was an attempt to defend court culture and traditional English recreation by making the music and dances used in court masques available in print. Peter Lindenbaum has argued, as I am in an expanded form here, that Playford was “sustaining a given art form and specific group of artists for a now disempowered and disenfranchised audience and clientele. For nine years Playford had not simply been publishing music but also holding up the music he was publishing as a flag for Royalists to rally around, until better times might come again.”

Playford’s publications were, in other words, maintenance propaganda aimed at keeping the cultural identity of Royalists, and thereby their continued resistance to the new Puritan orthodoxy, alive. Playford seems to support this argument himself in his statement from the 1652 *Select Musicall Ayres* when he writes that the collection is for “the preservation and expression of this Noble and Heavenly Science.” He also writes in the *Select Ayres* of 1659 that “this my present Endeavor and care in the true and exact publishing this Book will redound to Publick Benefit,” which speaks at least to an awareness of, if not an actual concern for, the social impact of his publications.
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93 Whitlock, 564-566.
94 Lindenbaum, 137.
95 *Select Musicall Ayres* (London: John Playford, 1652), A2r.
96 *Select Ayres and Dialogues* (London: John Playford, 1659), A2r.
Lindenbaum also points out that the frontispiece of Playford’s 1659 edition of the Select Ayres and Dialogues (see example 1 below) gives us a good idea of Playford’s perspective on the effects of the civil wars on English musical culture and evidences his belief that music had the power to solace the losers of that conflict. The frontispiece contains the following text:

“Although the Cannon and the Churlish Drum/ Have strooke the Quire mute, and the organs Dumb:/ Yet Musicks Art with Ayre and String, and Voyce/ Makes glad the Sad, and Sorrow to Rejoyce.”97 Notice also the courtly fashion of the female musician in the woodcut. I would suggest that Playford intended this musician to serve as a representation of court culture in all of its glorious beauty, defiant in the face of hardship. Such a representation could have inspired nostalgic longing for the antebellum years of the court; it likewise could serve as an inspiration to maintain the court culture in the face of Puritan attempts to eradicate it, especially in light of the caption below it. The female musician in this woodcut might not only be a representation of court culture but a direct allusion to Henrietta Maria of France, the Royal Consort of Charles I and mother to Charles II and James II. Note the similarities between this example and the portrait given as Example 2: both dresses share similar neck lines and sleeves; both models wear pearl necklaces; both have a similar hair style of curls and bangs; both wear earrings that consist of two pearls; and both have large eyes, a small chin, and a somewhat hooked nose. If the image is meant to be a representation of Henrietta Maria, then it would still function in the same way as maintenance propaganda for the Royalist community, but it might also serve as a reminder that their queen was still alive and still keeping the court culture alive during her exile in France.

97 Lindenbaum, 134.
Example 1, the frontispiece from John Playford, *Select Ayres and Dialogues* (London: John Playford, 1659).
Example 2, Portrait of Henrietta Maria by Anthony van Dyck, ca. late 1630s, currently housed in the San Diego Museum of Art.

In any case, Henrietta Maria does appear as an important subject for some of the songs published during this period. Turning to the music of Henry Lawes, Ian Spink has shown that Lawes frequently set texts that refer to Queen Henrietta Maria as Chloris in both his published collections and in the manuscript collection of his works. Examples include “Cloris landing at Berlington,” and “Amintor’s Dream,” from book three of the Ayres and Dialogues by Lawes. Both Spink and Philip Major have pointed out the political significance of “Staying in London,” from book one, which tells the story of an anxious Royalist waiting to meet a compatriot in London in spite of the act banishing Royalists from the city. Major also briefly points out the political lines in “Beauties Eclyps’d,” which mention Charles and Mary and lament that “Honor

98 Spink, 84-89.
99 Ibid., 96-97; Major, 272.
and Beauty are but Dreams./ Since Charles & Mary lost their Beams." He also points out the political lines in “Love and Loyalty,” which lament that kings and queens cannot be reunited. Going beyond Lawes and Playford, Paula Loscocco has also examined the *Psalterium Carolinum*, a musical setting of a verse adaptation of the *Eikon Basilike*, the final writings of Charles I that proved to be such a scourge to the regicide authorities. She argues that the work, and several others like it, were Royalist attempts to reclaim the psalm singing tradition as a part of Royalist culture and thus wrest it from the hands of the Puritans.

**Maintenance Propaganda: References to the Past**

As we have already seen, references to the past feature quite noticeably in works published by Royalists during this period. An additional example may be seen in the *Psalterium Carolinum*, where lines from Charles I’s own writings remind readers of the last years of the wars and even actively propagandize in Charles’s favor. Take, for example, the line from ode nine that proclaims “My other suff’rings far their Calumnie Outweighs, who tell the world this war (my greatest crosse) was rais’d by me. Yet this by silence I to men would owne. Might it their malace satisfie, whilst thou my innocence hast knowne.” Here Charles asserts that his innocence is known by God (his addressee) and is simultaneously able to maintain the conceit of silence while the posthumous publication of these texts proclaim his private thoughts to the world. References to the events of the last years of Charles I’s life would
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100 Henry Lawes, *Ayres and Dialogues* (London: John Playford, 1653), 35.
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103 Previously mentioned examples include references in works by Lawes to Charles I and his queen and a general rehearsal of court culture through Playford’s *English Dancing Master*.
104 The prose writings of Charles I were versified by Thomas Stanley and set by John Wilson, who only affixed his name and the name of Charles I to the work when it was reprinted in 1660.
have not only served to remind readers of the alleged injustice that was done to him but also would have helped to keep his memory as a devout and honorable martyr alive for the Royalist community.

As discussed in the previous chapter, this work was also part of a larger Royalist attempt to reclaim the psalms as part of their culture and to combat the Puritan association of them with their own orthodoxy. Walter Porter’s *Mottets*, which are themselves two-voice settings of Sandys’s psalm paraphrases, also play into this battle over the cultural ownership of psalms, when he writes in the dedication of the collection that

had the Church of England but the Happiness to receive into Her Assemblies Those Psalms Thus Translated; Her Enemies long before this would have turn’d their Scorn into Envy, and Witty Atheists their Scoffs into Admiration. I am sure the Prudent Worshipper of God, in stead of Scandal, had receiv’d Delight.  

Part of Porter’s comment here is certainly intended as flattery of George Sandys’s translations, thereby promoting them and these motet settings of them by extension. It also indicates, however, a belief that psalm singing (performed antiphonally in the cathedrals to Puritan disdain) contributed to the negative opinion Puritans had of the Church of England. It also suggests that the right type of psalm settings and translations could have at least gone a significant way toward healing the divisions in society that caused the eventual abolishment of the Church of England.

Publishing the libretti of court masques from before the civil wars was another way to remind readers of the golden age of the court and to emphasize the difference between Royalist culture and Puritan culture. It also allowed old propaganda to be repurposed for the new situation of the Royalist community. Publishing new masques was likewise a way to maintain Royalist culture and produce new propaganda. At least all three of the masques that were published in the
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1650s were published with full publication information, which indicates that those involved were
not worried about government reprisal and that the works may also have been licensed. Indeed,
in the introduction to *Fancy’s Festivals* by Thomas Jordan, the only newly composed masque
that was published during this period, the author writes that “from hence/ Will issue onely Art
and Innocence: We shall do nothing that may wrong these three./ Religion, Government, or
Modestie.”107 Such a desire to claim innocence was common enough in this period among
Royalists that Henry Lawes makes a similar claim in his dedication for the third book of his
*Ayres and Dialogues* from 1658: “nor make I any precarious use of this Publication.”108 This
claim of innocence runs counter, however, to the content of the masque, which is an allegorical
discussion of political philosophy. Act five is a particularly good example of this and presents a
discussion between the characters Poetry, Fancy, and Aurora concerning how to conclude the
masque. Poetry says he would like a scene from Elizium, “Where those triumphant Worthies are,
whose blood/ By war was wasted for their Countries good;/ Where pious Priests and Princes
reassume/ The heads and Crowns they lost in Martyrdome.”109 The final song of the masque also
must have been intended as a message to the Royalist community, or at least would have
resonated with its members, when it declares,

```
Come ye happy Souls that be
Clad with Immortality,
Ascend your Thrones,
Though the World did use ye hard,
Here ye shall have full reward,
For all your groans.
```

```
You that have by cruel War,
```

108 Henry Lawes, *Ayres and Dialogues* (London: John Playford, 1658), A2r.
109 Jordan, D4v.
Been reduc’d to what you are,
with many a wound
For your conscience, here you may
Enter into Royall pay, And all be crown’d;
They that so are forc’d to yield,
Win an everlasting Field.\textsuperscript{110}

Although no music was published to accompany the three libretti that are extant from the Interregnum, two of the publications (those that were written for the court before the civil wars) do mention that the masque music was composed by Henry Lawes, whose connection to the Royal court is also presented prominently on the title pages of both works. These two masques, \textit{The Floating Island} by William Strode and \textit{Coelum Britannicum} by Thomas Carew not only make unambiguous references to Charles I and Henrietta Maria, but they also contain pre-civil war propaganda that in the context of the Interregnum could take on new significance for the Royalist community.\textsuperscript{111} The anonymous author of the “To the Reader” section of this edition of \textit{The Floating Island} admits as much when he writes that “if now it seems (in Language or Plot) to fit these times, it must be prophesie.”\textsuperscript{112} This also appears to be an attempt to downplay the political nature of the work, and he goes on to say that the author “wrote it at the instance of those who might command him; else he had scarce condescended to a Play.”\textsuperscript{113} Even though it was written almost two decades before its publication in the 1650s, its plot can be intimately connected to the circumstances of the Interregnum. Briefly, the plot involves a king named Prudentius (whom the epilogue associates with Charles I) who outlaws debauchery at his court. This in turn angers some of his subjects to the point that they resolve to depose or kill him and to

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., D4r.
\textsuperscript{111} \textit{The Floating Island} was originally performed for the king in 1636; \textit{Coelum Britannicum} was given at Whitehall in 1633.
\textsuperscript{112} William Strode, \textit{The Floating Island} (London: H. Twiford, N. Brooke, and J. Place, 1655), A2r.
\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., A2v.
install Phancy as their new queen. The king finds out about their plot, however, and decides to leave the kingdom and allow his subjects to do as they wish. After Phancy begins her reign, her policy of allowing everyone to follow their passions leads to chaos, and by the end of the masque the same subjects who wished to depose and/or kill the king are begging him to return and save them from the mess they have made, which he graciously agrees to do. It is also worth mentioning that the only character that is associated with a real-life political/religious group is Melancholico, who is described as “a Malcontent turn’d Puritan.” Furthermore, Act four, Scene three is dedicated to making fun of Melancholico and Puritan ideology in general, and Melancholico is the only character who even at the end of the masque does not respect the king but instead bows because he must: “I kneel not/ To thee, but to thy power; I kneel to thee/ But not adore thee.” Indeed, scholars have noted that the play was commissioned by William Laud as propaganda against Puritanism.

Likewise, Carew’s masque provides moments of anti-Puritanism that could have reminded Royalists of how much they hate, or “should” hate, Puritans. Momus, the main character of the antimasque, suggests of the vices that “it is not safe that these infectious persons should wander here to the hazard [of] this Iland ... I should conceive it a very discreet course ... to embarque them all together in that good ship called the Argo, and send them to the plantation in New-England, which hath purg’d more virulent humours from the politique body, than
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*Guaieum* and all the West-Indian drugs have from the naturall bodies of this Kingdome.”¹¹⁸ This characterization of Puritans, who were the primary inhabitants of the New England colony at Massachusetts Bay, as “virulent humours” would have seemed even more accurate to Interregnum Royalists than it had to their pre-war counterparts; such representations of Puritans would have encouraged Royalists not to adopt the new orthodoxy and to maintain their opposition to it and its Puritan progenitors.

Likely or definite references to Henrietta Maria form the bulk of allusions to the past that appear in Royalist song publications from this period. In addition to those from Lawes, Carew, and Strode already mentioned above, further examples appear in collections by Gamble, Lawes, and Playford. Each of Playford’s air and dialogue collections contains a song that references Chloris or Venus that may have either been intended as a reference to the queen or could have been read as one by Royalists. The first one chronologically, song thirty-two from the 1652 collection, is “Wake my Adonis,” which presents the lamentations of Venus at the death of Adonis. The final lines of the text, as set by Charles Coleman, focus on Venus’s state of existence after the death of Adonis and emphasize not only her love for him, but also his evident centrality to her identity as Venus, such that she ceases to be herself without him: “Whither art thou my Deity gone? / Venus in Venus there is none:/ in vain a Godes now am I,/ only to grieve & not to dye:/ but I will love my griefe,/ make tears my tears relief,/ & sorrow shall to me/ a new Adonis be:/ and this the fates Shan’t rob me of/ whilst I a Godess am to greeve,/ and not to dye.”¹¹⁹ Venus’s words in this passage reflect sentiments that readers might have imagined Henrietta Maria expressing at the death of her husband: she grieves but continues to live; she is a

¹¹⁹ Playford, 1652, 29.
queen just as Venus is still a goddess, yet she has like Venus lost something that was integral to her identity; and like Venus she is left with only sorrow because fate has taken everything else away from her.  

“To his Chloris at Parting,” from Playford’s 1659 collection, is even more likely to be a reference to Henrietta Maria in light of her previously cited association to Chloris in works that predate this collection. Therefore, even if the author did not intend to imply such an association, Royalist readers could have nevertheless been primed by previous experience to interpret Chloris in this work as a stand-in for Henrietta Maria. As a dawn song (in which we expect the speaker to lament his separation from his lover at the rising of the sun), the text of this song seems straightforward and unassuming. The text of the refrain, however, with its conspicuous focus on the woes of the speaker, suggests that the text may be read as the words of a Royalist who has been left behind at the flight of Henrietta Maria to France. The refrain reads, “Farewell, farewell, Chloris, ‘tis time I dy’d, the night de-parts, yet still my woes abide.” The song therefore ends on a reference to the unspecified woes of the speaker, and it is worth noting that the text does not indicate which character is leaving the other, thereby allowing for the possibility that the speaker is being left behind.

Furthermore, while the death that the speaker references here is traditionally given a sexual connotation in European poetry of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, such a common interpretation does not inherently preclude in this case an alternative use that would be equivalent to “surrender.” This is suggested by the speaker’s reference to the departure of the
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night as if it should be expected to coincide with the relief of his woes, which are present before the dawn and will unexpectedly continue to be present after it arrives. In poems where death is associated with sex, however, interpretations of night and dawn are typically contrary to the one presented here. Dawn (which should be a representation of rebirth and light conquering darkness) is ironically described as an unwanted inevitability because the night at least allows the two lovers to remain together, while dawn signals their separation. Here, however, the speaker assumes the value of the dawn and denies that value by pointing out its inability to relieve his woes. If the death described here were meant to refer to sex, we might expect him to indicate that his woes begin with the rising of the sun or that his woes begin again when the darkness departs. Instead, the departure of the night takes with it Chlorus but leave his with his already existing and constant woes. We might therefore interpret the death in this poem as a surrender to the realization that even though the darkness of the civil wars is departing, it has likewise taken with it the object of the speaker’s love (in this case Henrietta Maria) and left him only with continued anxiety over his place as an internal exile.

Turning to additional references in other collections, John Gamble’s second book of *Ayres and Dialogues* contains one example of a song that may be a reference to Henrietta Maria. “Admired Beauty” presents the adoration of a self-described prisoner who finds solace in the beauty of Atalanta. He declares that her beauty will bring about in “the faction” a repentance at their realization that it was an error to think “it sin to worship such a Saint.” The speaker claims that

I Am no Pris’ner sure, nor can it be,  
when such rare Beauty comes to visit me:  
The free and uncontroled Air’s confin’d,
more than my mind,
when it reflects upon those beams that lately in my prison shon;
that glorious Angel which was sent to free the captive Saint,
more bright Divinity brought not with him,
than in this darksome place,
from Atalanta’s face brake forth and ravish’d me,
with adoration of that Deitie:
Blest Atalanta, may that powerful spring of Beauty in thy Cheeks ne’r die,
but bring thee more Idolaters:
May the faction now see in thy Brow their errors, and repent,
that thought it sin to worship such a Saint.122

There is no story of Atalanta that includes a relationship between her and a prisoner, so it
is more likely that the author is referencing Atalanta because her character (in Greek mythology
she is equal in strength and skill to men and also of course beautiful) is similar in some way to
the character of the woman he is addressing. On that point, the active part that Henrietta Maria
played during the civil wars, not only gathering troops and supplies but also leading them in
campaigns and engaging in political negotiations, could certainly have led to an association
between her and the famous huntress. Furthermore, the fact that Atalanta in this poem was
present but is present no longer mimics the flight of Henrietta Maria from the country before the
end of the wars. She was also present during a time when many Royalists either were actual
prisoners or might have felt like prisoners, as in the first siege of Oxford, which began soon after
Henrietta Maria had left the city.123 The reference to “the faction” further suggests that this text
is referring to the civil wars and implying that Henrietta Maria’s beauty was not only a solace to
Royalists that were involved in or suffering because of the conflict, but that her beauty also had

the power to illuminate the errors of the opposing side as it “bring[s] thee more idolaters.” This passage may also be a reference to her ability to raise troops for the Royalist cause.

Including the song about Henrietta Maria’s landing at Bridlington, Henry Lawes’s three collections of *Ayres and Dialogues* contain eleven songs that may be or are definitely references to Henrietta Maria (one in book one, one in book two, and nine in book three). “To his Mistress going to Sea” from book one presents a farewell song to an unnamed “Mistress,” who is also described as a “fair Saint,” and the majority of the text focuses on the speaker’s telling the wind and the waves to be kind to his mistress. Although at first glance this text seems to be a standard love poem, a detailed examination of its contents suggests that this text is yet another reference to Henrietta Maria. “Mistress” during this period, for example, still retains its original meaning as the female equivalent of master, which places the female addressee above the station of the speaker, in addition to the newer connotation of a female lover. Moreover, the reference in the first line to “the hearts and eyes you leave behind” and the fact that the woman in question is the one leaving further suggest that this text is describing Henrietta Maria’s flight to safety in France.124 Even if this were not the case, such an interpretation could have been made by contemporary Royalists for the same reasons given above. Furthermore, the description of the mistress as a saint links this song to Gamble’s “Admired Beauty,” discussed above, in which the female subject is also described as a saint.

Luckily, for “On his hearing her Majesty sing” from book two we need not speculate if it was intended as a reference to Henrietta Maria. The text simply recounts the heavenly beauty of both the face and singing of a female that the speaker insists must be an angel. Such a text not

124 Lawes, *Ayres and Dialogues*, 1653, 10-11.
only encourages listeners/readers to reflect longingly on the lost days of the court, but it also encourages them to maintain their devotion to the queen as the last major symbol of Charles I’s court and as a living hope for its restoration. In its repeated references to her as an angel, who is “Divine” with an “Angels face,” this text is also connected to the saintly female addressee of the other texts mentioned above.\textsuperscript{125}

Turning to Lawes’s final collection, nine of the songs in book three that mention Chloris are likely references to Henrietta Maria. The association begins in the very first song of the collection, “Cloris landing at Burlington,” which was discussed above and is an indisputable reference to Henrietta Maria. It would be a mistake, however, to assume that all references to Chloris are definitely references to Henrietta Maria, and indeed two of the songs in the collection that mention Chloris do not seem particularly relevant to her, one because it is an admonition to Chloris to guard her chastity (“Counsel to a Maid”), and the other because it claims that Chloris has died (“Chloris dead, lamented by Amintor”), while Henrietta Maria did not die until after the Restoration. The remaining eight songs include a song about the power of Chloris’s eyes (“His Rivals danger”); a song about Chloris lending her arms, hair, and the darts from her eyes to Cupid so they can become his bow and arrows (“Cupids Artillery’’); A song likening the diverse beauties of Chloris to a pot of flowers (“A Pot of Flowers presented to Chloris’’); a song that describes the beautiful sight, smell, and sound of Chloris and refers to her as “Beauties Queen”\textsuperscript{126} (“A description of Chloris”); and a song that describes how material possessions pale in comparison to Chloris’s beauty and ending with the line “But Chloris like a constant comfort shines./ Not only to our Bodies but our Mindes,” which may indicate the power of her beauty to

\textsuperscript{125}Lawes, Ayres and Dialogues, 1655, 21.  
\textsuperscript{126}Lawes, 1658, 24.
solace the Royalist community ("Chloris a constant comfort"). The remaining three songs focus mainly on referencing what appears to be the fragmented state of the Royalist community and will be discussed in the next section. As a living, authentic vestige of the pre-war court, Henrietta Maria would have been a natural focal point for Royalist longing, both nostalgically in retrospect and hopefully with an eye toward the future.

Direct references to the civil wars was another means by which Royalists could be encouraged to remain separate from the Puritan orthodoxy that was being promoted by the Interregnum government. Two prominent examples, one each from Gamble and Lawes, offer references to the civil wars. The first chronologically comes from Lawes’s second book of Ayres and Dialogues from 1655. “To a Lady, more affable since the war began” consists of a speaker relaying to a woman identified as Cloris that even though their peace has been disturbed by war at least one good has come of it, namely that the danger has made her more kind and favorable to him: “Cloris, since first our calm of peace was frighted hence, this good we finde, your favours with your fears increase, and growing mischiefe makes you kinde.” While the text is focused on a relationship between two individuals, it speaks to a larger trend in communities that are impacted by war or other catastrophic events. Members of the group can be encouraged by stressor events to put aside their differences and act in the interest of and with preference for the group with which they identify. As propaganda, the song could be used to remind Royalists to be kinder to each other and thus increase the solidarity of the community; it also implies that these improved relationships are a benefit of their overall suffering and therefore a way to be optimistic about the oppressed and depressed state of their community. Although this text

127 Ibid., 25.
128 Lawes, 1655, 16.
references the past, it can also be read as referencing the present state of the Royalist community because the “fears” and “mischiefe” of the wars continued for Royalists into the Interregnum.

Gamble’s reference to the civil wars is not only more explicit in its discussion of the wars but also much more extensive. “The Allegory” uses Plutarch’s allegory of the serpent’s head overthrown by its tail to recount the history of the civil war period in a ten-stanza text, the longest text of the collection:

As Plutarch doth write,
(a man of known credit) a Serpent there was had a mutinous Tail,
rebell’d ‘gainst the Head, that so oft had fed it,
and would not permit it to lead or prevail:
I’st not fit that by turns we Leaders should be?
Quoth the Tail, Follow me, as I’ve follow’d thee.

Now the Body being grown too strong for the Head,
Quoth the Head. Since it must be, then let it be so;
‘Tis for quietness sake I yield to be lead,
Though I fear that from hence some danger will grow:
A thing so unnatural never was read,
As the Head to turn Tail, and the Tail to turn Head.

The Tail takes precedence as blindly leads on,
As deaf to the Reason the Head had it given;
It blusters along, and ne’r thinks upon
The straights thorouh which, th’ poor Head had been driven: At last by an accident a Scean of woe,
The Head was destroy’d and the Tai
l perish’d too.

A Monster like this, but of stranger conditions,
Ingender’d there was in the year Thirty nine; Rebell’d ‘gainst the Head, but with fawning Petitions,
To have it its right and its power to resigne:
This Monster, the truth on’t to speak, was begot
T’wixt a Mungrel Parson, and that Witch the Scot.

So large and so mighty this Tail grew in length,
That where so e’r it came, it swept all before it;
There was no resisting so powerful a strength,
The Head at the last was forc’d to implore it:
All our Castles and Towns this Tail did subdue,
A sad tale to tell, but believe me ‘tis true.

Above seven years conflict this Head did indure
With that monsterous Tail, and the spawn it begot;
In which time scarce any mans life was secure,
Their Goods and their Cattle went all to the pot:
At last came a Champion with an Iron Flail,
And ended the strife ‘twixt the Head and the Tail.

The Head being departed, the Body began
To consult with the Tail what best was to do;
Saint George (quoth the Body) ‘tis said was a man,
But what can this thing be that’s called Saint O:
Why? he (quoth the Tail) was one of our rout,
And ‘tis wondrous strange, he should turn Tail about!

But while they thus argu’d, in rush’d brave Saint O,
with courage more keen, then the sword that he wore;
Quoth he, You are vile things, not fit here to grow,
Such Fins in this place were ne’r known heretofore:
The blood and the fat of the Country doth feed you,
And high time it is I guess now to bleed you.

Some say that this tail wore the mark of a P;
O is a letter in rank known before it;
But it makes no matter, ‘tis all one to me,
Save this, I’m sure the O had the more wit:
Their no man so blind but may easily see,
H’ has added unto his smal O, a tall P.

My story now ended, come, viva Saint George,
That old true blew Lad and Hospital Saint;
Bring a But of good Sack to fill up my gorge,
At this tale of Head and Tail I almost faint:
How e’r let it pas, if you study upon’t
I hope you will neither make Head or Tail on’t.129

In stanzas four through ten, the text identifies the Bishops’ War of 1639 as an instigator
of the civil wars, describes the desolation of the civil wars, the capture (and possibly also

129 Gamble, 1659, 30-31.
execution) of Charles I, and concludes with an extensive praise of a character identified only as O. O is most likely the Marquis of Ormond, who from 1646 through 1649 was the Royalists’ best hope of any sort of Royalist victory, both before and after the execution of Charles I. Indeed, Ormond was plotting Royalist uprisings as late as 1658, and therefore this text not only serves to maintain Royalist resentment over the outcome of the wars and perpetuate reasons why such an outcome was absurd, but it also encourages the maintenance of hope for the cause on the shoulders of the Marquis of Ormond.\textsuperscript{130}

Maintenance Propaganda: References to the Present and Future of the Royalist Community in the Interregnum

In addition to references to the past, references to the present and future were also valuable propagandistic tools by which propagandists could shape opinions and create hope during the Interregnum. Even though it was written long before the Interregnum, we might nevertheless call \textit{The Floating Island}, discussed above, not only a commentary on the present of the Interregnum, but also a dream of the future in which a king Charles returns from exile and restores order to the kingdom. A Royalist reader of the Interregnum might therefore read the work, identify their current situation as being synonymous with the chaos that occurs under the reign of Phancy, and find solace in the hope that Charles II would return to mend the broken state of England. From that perspective, the work does end up being surprisingly accurate: just as it predicted the Interregnum, it also predicts the Restoration.

Walter Porter’s motet collection also comments on the Royalist community of the Interregnum. In the “To all Lovers of Musick” preface, he writes that he is unable to repay the

kindness of his friends because he has been “plung’d by these tempestuous times in many
dangerous stormes of adversity, and growing calamities.” He therefore attempts to repay his
friends in some small measure by dedicating each psalm setting to a different friend (see table 1
for the names in order of appearance in the collection). Interestingly enough, twelve of the
seventeen individuals mentioned can be confirmed as possible or definite Royalists, and the
remaining five whose background cannot be securely established may also have been Royalists
as well. It is possible that as a Royalist Porter was simply dedicating the psalm settings to his
friends without thinking of the larger political or cultural implications of such an action. It is also
possible that he intended the work as a means to maintain the Royalist community by
establishing an association between these Royalist individuals or by solidifying it in print. This
would appear harmless to government officials but allow his (at least largely) Royalist circle of
associates to be known to the larger, hidden, Royalist community. Even if Porter did not intend
the work to function as a directory of Royalists, who might be willing to help an Anglican
minister or musician who is out of work, it nevertheless could have been used as one and thereby
could have served to strengthen the Royalist community. A community cannot exist, after all, if
members of that community are not in regular contact with each other or lack ideological unity.
At the very least these dedications are an overt reference to the present constituency of a segment
of the Royalist community of the Interregnum. It is also worth noting that the psalm texts
themselves may be a message to the Royalist community, containing as they do so many
passages about suffering and deliverance, such as the text of motet sixteen, with its passage “So
we deprest by enemies, and growing troubles, fix our Eyes on God, who sits on high;/ Till he in
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mercy shall descend to give our miseries an end, and turn our tears to joy.”¹³² With the texts of these psalms in mind, we can speculate that Porter intended the collection to serve as a message of comfort to not only his circle of friends, but also to the Royalist community at large.

Table 1, the incipits, dedications, and dedicatee identities from Walter Porter’s *Mottets* from 1657.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motet Incipit</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“When Israel”</td>
<td>Sir William Owen</td>
<td>Royalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“O blest estate”</td>
<td>Sir John Thorowgood</td>
<td>possible Royalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Behold”</td>
<td>Sir Edward Sebright</td>
<td>Royalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“How Long”</td>
<td>Mr. Edward Montague</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I will lift up”</td>
<td>John Mostyn, Esq.</td>
<td>Royalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Who knows the terror”</td>
<td>Sir John Brown, Esq.</td>
<td>possible Royalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Cast off”</td>
<td>Mr. William Setterthwait</td>
<td>possible Royalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The bounty of”</td>
<td>Justinian Paget, Esq.</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“When I the behold”</td>
<td>Mr. Lambert Orberstyn</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Great God of hosts”</td>
<td>Mr. Richard Busby</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“But o thrice blessed he”</td>
<td>Captain William Cresset</td>
<td>possible Royalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My Ravisht soul”</td>
<td>Mr. James Howel, Esq.</td>
<td>Royalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Lord showre on us”</td>
<td>Mr. George Palmer</td>
<td>Royalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Who knows what”</td>
<td>Mr. William Fuller</td>
<td>Royalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“thou mover”</td>
<td>Mr. Robert Coleman</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“O happy be”</td>
<td>Mr. Edward Wormal</td>
<td>possible Royalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My soul”</td>
<td>Mr. John Hilton, B.M.</td>
<td>Royalist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹³² Ibid., 24.
In addition to the works by Henry Lawes that reference the past, six works across all three of his *Ayre and Dialogue* collections contain texts that may be read with varying levels of certainty as commentary on the state of the Royalist community or as references to its future. The first example of such a text comes from book one and is titled “To his Inconstant Mistris.” Although the text is directed to a lover and is centered around faithfulness in love, the text may also be read as a comment from a Royalist to a Parliamentarian or to another Royalist who has begun to collude with the government:

> When thou, poore Excommunicate  
> from all the joyes of Love shalt see  
> the full reward and glorious fate,  
> which my strong faith hath purchas’d me,  
> then curse thine Owne Inconstancy: for thou shalt weepe,  
> intreat, complaine to Love, as I did once to thee,  
> when all thy teares, shall be as vaine as mine were then,  
> for then shalt bee damn’d for thy false Apostacy.”

The role reversal that is described in this text, where the speaker is rewarded for his constancy while the addressee is punished with the same pain and fruitless begging that the speaker had undergone previously, is exactly the type of role reversal that Royalists would have dreamed of since their defeat in the civil wars. The text further hints at a political interpretation with the unusual relationship between the speaker and the addressee; the speaker has remained faithful, but not (it would seem) to the addressee because the speaker’s faithfulness would not be rewarded by the addressee, especially because the addressee did not relent to the speaker’s entreaties in the past and the speaker does not wish for reconciliation between them but rather a fitting revenge on the addressee. Although they are connected in some intimate way, the speaker will receive his reward from some other entity, while the addressee will similarly be punished by

---
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a third party. Furthermore, a “glorious fate” is not often associated with love, but it is commonly associated with public reputation and politics, just as “Apostacy” was used during this period to refer to abandoning one’s religion and also to betraying one’s country.\textsuperscript{134} Whether read literally as a speaker being rewarded with a good reputation for his faithful dealings with his lover, whose reputation will be destroyed by her inconstancy, or as a political allusion to faithfulness and faithlessness to the crown, the text nevertheless emphasizes the importance of maintaining one’s loyalty as a key to achieving revenge on those by whom one has been betrayed. Interestingly enough, the second work in book one that may be read as a reference to the Royalist community and its state during the Interregnum deals with the same topic, even using the word “Apostasie,” but this time from a female perspective.\textsuperscript{135}

Similarly, “A Dialogue betwene a Lover and Reason” from book two of Lawes’s \textit{Ayres and Dialogues} presents a text that is ostensibly focused on the speaker’s love life but can also be read as a commentary on the decision to follow the court into exile rather than stay with the Royalist community in England:

\begin{verbatim}
Weepe not, nor backward turn your beames, 
fond eyes; sad sighes, locke in your breath, 
lest on this winde, or in those streams, 
my griev’d soule flie, or saile to death, 
Fortune destroys me if I stay, 
Love kils me if I goe away; 
since Love and Fortune both are blind, 
com[e] Reason and resolve my doubtfull mind.

[Reason:] Fly, fly, and blind Fortune be thy guide, 
and gainst the blinder God rebell; 
thy love siek heart shall not reside 
where scorn and self-wilde Error dwell,
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{134} see OED, “Apostacy.”
\textsuperscript{135} see “No Constancy in Man,” Lawes, 1653, 35.
where entrance unto truth is barr’d,
where love and faith finde no reward;
for my just hand may sometimes move
the wheele of Fortune, not the sphere of Love.\textsuperscript{136}

The speaker’s heart will break if he leaves, but if he stays he will be destroyed by misfortune because of the “scorn and self-wilde Error” that dwells in the place he is leaving, it being a place “where entrance unto truth is barr’d” and “where love and faith finde no reward.” From the Royalist perspective, it must certainly have been a heart-wrenching decision to leave behind the land of their birth and many if not all of their family members and other loved ones for the sake of following the court into exile. Staying in such a hostile environment, however, would have prevented them from advancing or even maintaining their livelihoods and professions. Presenting such a text to a Royalist audience could have engendered sympathy for the exiles rather than resentment at their luck in escaping. Such sympathy would have been important for maintaining the cohesion of the Royalist community across the channel, especially if any hope of further action toward the restoration of the monarchy was to be successful.

Though the above reference to the Royalist exiles may be an innocent coincidence (in the absence of more concrete evidence than the circumstances of its creation and publication), the three songs in Lawes’s third book of \textit{Ayres and Dialogues} that I will argue are references to exile have the added evidentiary support of referencing Chloris in the context of the above-mentioned “Chloris landing at Burlington,” the incontestable illusion to Henrietta Maria as Chloris that stands as the first song of the publication. They also contain language that points strongly to an interpretation of these songs as Royalist references to the flight of Henrietta Maria and their

\textsuperscript{136} Lawes, 1655, 30-31.
hopes for her return. The first of the three, “Amintors welladay [alas],” describes how distraught Amintor is at the absence of Chloris:

_Chloris_ now thou art fled away,  
_Amintor’s_ sheep are gone astray;  
and all the joy he took to see,  
his pretty Lambs run after thee,  
is gon[e] is gon[e], and he alone, sings nothing now but welladay, welladay.

His Oaten pipe that in thy praise  
Was wont to play such roundelays,  
Is thrown away, and not a swain  
Dares pipe, or sing, within his plain;  
‘Tis death for any now to say  
One word to him but welladay.

The Maypole where thy little feet  
So roundly did in measures meet,  
Is broken down, and no content  
Come near _Amintor_ since you went.  
All that I even heard him say  
Was _Chloris, Chloris_, welladay.

Upon those Banks you us’d to tread  
He ever since hath laid his head,  
And whisper’d there such pining woe,  
As not a blade of grass will grow;  
_\textit{O Chloris! Chloris!_ come away,  
And hear _Amintor’s_ welladay._}

Since Henrietta Maria’s flight from England, not only has the Royalist community (personified by Amintor) been distraught by her absence and the absence of the court, but the traditional English pastoral activities, such as piping and dancing around the maypole, have also been under attack from the Interregnum government and therefore silenced through the dual pressures of both unfortunate circumstances.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{137}}Lawes, 1658, 10.
“Future Hope” continues with this theme of destitution at the absence of Chloris but also discusses the value of hoping for her return:

When shall I see my Captive heart that lies in Chloris brest?  
or, when will Love again restore those joys I once possest?  
Yet, ’tis a blessing I confess, when Fate is thus severe,  
not to be barr’d of future hopes to mitigate our fear.

The Tyrant Love would be depos’d,  
And from this Empire thrown,  
Were not his subjects fool’d with hope  
That mercy would be shown.  
Then Captive heart contented lye,  
And banish all despaire,  
Since there is hope that she may be  
As kind as she is faire.\textsuperscript{138}

Although the speaker does not know when Chloris, in whom his hopes of happiness are vested, will return, he nevertheless believes that hope is a “blessing” that helps to “mitigate” the despair that not only he but also an unspecified “we” feel in their present situation. Furthermore, if one accepts the “Tyrant Love” as an allegory for the Interregnum government, which has fooled its subjects in “this Empire” with hope, then the last stanza of the text is encouraging Royalist readers to not put their faith in the mercy of the government, but rather to maintain their hope in Henrietta Maria (to let their “Captive heart[s] contented lye”) and in her future return.

Finally, “Amintor’s Dream” presents a similar scenario as the previous two songs, but adds new details concerning Chloris’s flight and an assurance at the end that she has not really fled and will eventually return:

As sad Amintor in a Medow lay  
slumbring upon a bed of new-made Hay  
a Dream, a fatal Dream unlock’d his eyes,  
whereat he wakes, and thus Amintor cryes;

\textsuperscript{138} Ibid., 1658, 13.
Chloris, where art thou Chloris? She’s fled, and left Amintor to a loathed Bed.

Heark how the Winds conspire with storm and rain To stop her course, and beat her back again: Heark how the heavens chide her in her way For robbing poor Amintor of his joy: And yet she comes not. Chloris, O! She’s fled, And left Amintor to a loathed bed.

Come Chloris come, see where Amintor lies, Just as you left him, but with sadder Eyes; Bring back that heart which thou hast stoln from me, That Lovers may record thy Constancie: O no she will not. Chloris, I she’s fled! And left Amintor, &c.

O lend me (Love) thy wings that I may flye Into her bosome, take my leave, and dye: What comfort have I now ith’ world since she That was my world of joy is gone from me, My Love, my Chloris: Chloris, O she’s fled And left Amintor to, &c.

Awake Amintor from this dream, for she Hath too much goodnesse to be false to thee: Think on her Oathes, her Vows, her Sighes, her Tears, And those will quickly satisfie thy fears. No no, Amintor, Chloris is not fled, But will return into they longing Bed.\textsuperscript{139}

Here Chloris’s flight is across a sea, as winds, storms, and rain conspire to make her turn back.

Amintor thinks the worst of Chloris because he has dreamt that she has fled and because when he calls her she does not come. In the final stanza, however, we are assured that Chloris is too good to abandon him and that she assuredly will honor her oaths and return to him. This song could have served as maintenance propaganda by encouraging Royalists to maintain their hope for the return of the monarchy in general and Henrietta Maria specifically (considering that she was the

\textsuperscript{139} Ibid., 1658, 27.
most prominent remnant and representative of Charles I’s court). Even though they may feel as though they have been abandoned, Royalists can rest assured that their queen would never abandon them and that their imaginations are far worse than the reality of the division within their community.

John Gamble’s second book of *Ayres and Dialogues* contains eight additional songs that could have either been intended as or functioned as propaganda for the Royalist community of the Interregnum. Unlike many of Lawes’s songs, which are carefully worded to avoid being too obvious in their message, the works in Gamble’s collection make bold reference to the politics of the time. “The Exile,” for example, asserts that the speaker has been exiled because of his loyalty to the crown. He suffers from both too much and too little liberty and has been separated from his wife by his exile. He muses, however, that he should not be so distraught over it, considering that the king and queen are likewise separated. The text concludes with the assertion that Parliament is responsible for his woes and is the cause of the tyrannical state that has oppressed him:

Have you observ’d the Hermet when he runs his weary race,
without a home like other men, but walks from place to place?
Look then on me, whom grief makes tame;
my wandering fortunes are the same,
known only by another name.

Or have you seen a helpless man,
Pursu’d from Town to Town;
Whose guilt from honesty began,
And loyalty to th’ Crown?
‘Mongst untrod Thorns have you bin lead,
Or seen a tumbl’d Sick-mans Bed?
Such places for such faults I tred.

Like him that is consin’d to be,
Close Prisoner all his dayes;
Or clow’d with too much libertie,
Or banish’d sundry wayes:
Although my patience scorns to grutch,
Yet my intemperate state is such
Plagu’d with too little, or too much.

Have you beheld the sick estate
Of seperated Doves?
So ‘tis with mee, so with my Mate,
Yet why so angry have I been,
Since in these latter dayes there’s seen,
Such difference ‘twixt the King and Queen.

But since the Law alowes no Love,
And Tyranny so reigns,
We will implore the Powers above
To ease us of our pains:
Then let there be with one intent,
Petitions unto Cupid sent;
Never to call a Parliament.\(^{140}\)

Such a text not only encourages listeners/readers to sympathize with the exiled members of their community, but also reinforces a hatred of the Interregnum government as the source of the Royalist community’s misfortunes.

Like “The Exile,” Gamble’s “Liberty breeds Presumption” is quite forward with its political content. In its thinly-veiled allegory, the rivers begin to question the right of the Ocean to rule as their king. This leads the speaker to chastise those who think that they have any power on their own. According to the speaker, all of their power is actually derived from their ruler, like the stars borrow their light from the Sun and the rivers empty into the ocean:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{When the unfetter’d subjects of the Seas,} \\
\text{the Rivers, found their silver feet at ease;} \\
\text{no sooner summon’d, but they swiftly went,} \\
\text{to meet the Ocean at a Parliament:}
\end{align*}\]

\(^{140}\)Gamble, 1659, 13.
Did not the pretty Fountains say, their King, the Ocean, was no Ocean but a Spring?
As now some do the power of Kings dispute; and think it less, ‘cause more is added too’t.

Pale ignorance, can the excess of store
Make him seem poorer than he was before?
The Stars, the Heavens Inferior Courtiers, may Govern the Nights darkness but not rule the Day:
Where the Sun Lords it, though they all combine with Lucia, in her Vulgar dress, to shine
Brighter than they; nor can He be subdu’d,
Although but one, and they a multitude.

Say Subjects, are you Stars, be it alow’d,
You justly of your Members may be proud;
But to the Sun inferior; for know this,
Your Light is borrow’d, not your own, but his:
And as all Streams into the Ocean run,
You ought to pay your contribution:
Then do not such Ingratitude oppress,
To make him low that could have made you less.¹⁴¹

Such an argument serves to reinforce the Royalist perspective on political power as derived from the monarch and further encourages listeners/readers not to believe that the government of Interregnum England is or could be legitimate.

In a slightly different vein, “Bushels Myners” is built on the conceit that simple country folk not only support the monarchy implicitly, but are far enough removed from society at large that they have been able to maintain a humble but peaceful existence throughout the turbulence and violence of the civil wars:

You Ladies of our Nation
where is your greatness gone?
what sudden alteration
hath forc’d you from your own?
whilst we live here obscurely, in Cottages unknown,

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 1659, 45.
no Cares or Fears we ever think upon.

Our Walls are higest Mountains,
For we live in a Comb;
We drink of Flowing Fountains,
Our dwelling is our Tomb:
Nor look to be expected before the day of Doom,
Where Scribes for bribes shall ne’r deny us Room.

We have a dreadful summons
Up in the high Countrie;
Our gracious King and Commons,
They say cannot agree:
This harness is for Cedars, and no such shrubs as we,
Yet still we will pray for a unitie.

The day we spend in working,
And chanting harmless Songs;
No mallice here lies lurking,
our thoughts are free from wrongs:
And those that civil War do love, we wish they had no tongues,
No Drums no Guns, nor what to War belongs.

We wound the Earths hard Bowels,
Where hidden treasure grows;
With Twibil, Sledge and Trowels,
Pick-Axe and Iron-Crowes:
We search for sinful Silver, that all dissention sowes,
Their health and wealth, men do so ill dispose.

We eat the Bread of Labour,
And what endeavours brings;
Sorrow is no next Neighbour,
Our Eyes they are no Springs,
Unless we shed a Tear or two, when as we pity Kings;
The Fates of States to us are Hebrew things.  

As propaganda, this song encourages readers/listeners to believe that the simple, honest, morally upright people of the country were and still are allied to the Royalist side. The only reason they did not take part in the war is that they considered it too far removed from their simple lives.

142 Ibid., 1659, 74.
They are consistently sympathetic to the monarchy, however, and wish ill on those who brought about the civil wars. Although the Royalists might not be able to count on their physical support for future military activities, believing that good people (as the text takes pains to present these miners as being) are on their side would certainly have encouraged them to remain steadfast in their opposition to Parliament and in their support of their monarch (Charles II at this point).

As in a number of songs in Lawes’s *Ayres and Dialogues*, Gamble also includes a song in his 1659 *Ayres and Dialogues* that uses the context of amorous conversation to conceal political commentary. In “To Phelicia” a speaker urges Phelicia to resist the advances of other suitors and to reserve her love for him alone. He does this, however, by likening love to politics, saying that her other suitors are just lying to her to get what they want, in the same way that politicians lie to gain power and then become tyrants themselves. It is likely that Royalist listeners/readers of this song would have immediately made the association of this description of political lies and power lust to the rise of Parliament and the Commonwealth government. This would in turn remind them of their hatred for the current government and encourage them to remain separate from it, just as the speaker encourages Phelicia to do in her case:

*Phelicia,* since that I find
thee true to thy self, and just to me,
ne’r fear their deposing:
For those Repelling Looks of thine
must keep thee safe, securely mine,
‘gainst our Fates opposing.

No matter though thy Votaries
Complain how thou dost tyrannize,
And do resolve to storm
Thy Beauties Citadell; Be wise,
Thou art beyond their subtilties
Thus circled in my arme.
Should they with factious force rebell,  
Their faith and loyalties (too) sell;  
’Tis what we must expect;  
For when at first they did pretend  
A duty, ’twas for their own end,  
And treachery in effect.

So such as have desire of power  
Think other government too sower,  
And preach up libertie;  
Till they into the stirrup get,  
And mounted are by other wit  
It’h place they did defe.

Nay, though they swear they’l make thee far  
More glorious then the Eastern Star,  
Know, such as swear will lye;  
And’t hath been prov’d in tricks of State  
When they have got as they would ha’t,  
Now have at all, they cry.

Then dearest, in thine own hands keep  
That power that will preserve thy sleep  
Against conspiracie,  
Let thy majestick frowns repell  
All trecherous hearts that would rebell,  
But keep thy smiles for me.\textsuperscript{143}

Although Gamble’s \textit{Ayres and Dialogues} from 1659 are similar in a number of ways to the works we have discussed from other Royalist composers/authors of this period, they differ in that Gamble included a substantial number of songs, half of those discussed here, that mix references to alcohol and Royalist politics into propagandistic interpretations of drinking songs. Considering the Puritan objection to drunkenness, and their attempts through the Interregnum government to enforce their moral orthodoxy on the nation, the politicization of drinking songs would serve not only to defy the Puritan orthodoxy, but also to emphasize the acceptance of

\textsuperscript{143} Ibid., 1659, 27.
alcohol and what we might call “wine culture” as an important element of the Royalist cultural identity. “Sacks Flavour,” for example, does just that when it declares that none may enter the group of merry makers unless they show the visible signs of being drunk. One of these signs is the redness of their faces, which appear scarlet like the coats of the Cavalier forces during the civil wars. This group of wine lovers plot revenge and curse those singers of psalms who have attempted to banish wine from the country:

Joyn thy enamell’d Cheek to mine,  
I’le bring thee where is Rasie Wine;  
and where a loving Leagur’s kept,  
where many Tankard tears are wept for the Cash  
that is gon: That is here;  
joy and grief, in a Tear we will wash.  
There we studie Revenges.  
Make plots without hinges.  
More black then the fifth of November’s.  
With Pipe, Pot, and Cup,  
our Estates we rake up,  
till our Eyes do appear like the Embers.

There with a Sack-incensed Face,  
In speckled State and [ami] Grace,  
With dabbl’d Doublet doth appear  
The Corall front of Caveleer  
With a Bole:  
Full of Sack, such as can  
In the most dying man  
Raise a Soul.  
And forbids any venter  
The League to enter,  
Or neer it commit such a Trespass;  
If his Cheeks do not shine,  
With the bloud of the Vine,  
And his Nostrils do look like a Respass.

In Fletcher’s Wit, and Johnson’s Style,
There we will sit and fret a while;
Cursing the puddle of their Brains
That pull’d down Grapes, and put up Grains;
They are Foes
Who with Bag-pipes for shalmes,
Deal in smal Beer and Psalms
Through the Nose;
May want of drink grieve them,
And no man releive them,
Till scoring inform them what Hell is;
May Howns-dich, and Tower-ditch,
With Shore-ditch, and More-ditch,
Be empt’ed to fill up their Bellies.

May all the Ills that can be thought
Either to heavy or to hot
Light on his Belly and his Back,
That envies us the joys of Sack:
Let him dye;
Or let him live with so much strife,
That he may beg to lose his life,
Till he cry
Good fellows forgive me;
If you will beleive me;
I swear by the Sword of a Lay-man,
I’le draw out my Whyneard,
And set up the Vineyard,
In spight of the Devil and Drayman.144

References to the Gunpowder Plot (the fifth of November), Fletcher, and Ben Jonson recall the
glory days of the Stuart monarchy before unrest led to the civil wars and its downfall. Though
their plots are “without hinges” and therefore harmless, it nevertheless allows them an outlet for
their sorrow over the current state of the nation and their community. As propaganda, this song
could serve to remind Royalists that within the Royalist community they have a place to go

144 Ibid., 1659, 48.
where everybody knows their names, where they can be themselves, and where they can remember (and perhaps briefly relive) their shared past with fondness.145

Similarly, “Lilly Contemn’d,” takes its name from the famous astronomer/astrologer William Lilly, who was favored by Oliver Cromwell and the Military because of his favorable predictions for them,146 and calls on listeners/readers to pay no attention to the politics of the time, to Lilly’s predictions, or to their depressed situation and instead to enjoy a drink and a friendly bar fight:

Why art thou sad? Our Glasses flow
like little Rivers to the Main,
and ne’r a man here hath a shrew,
what need’st thou then complain?
Then Boyes mind your Glass,
and let all News pass,
that treats not of this our Canary.
Let Lawyers fear their Fate.
In the turn of the State.
We suffer if this do miscarry:
‘Tis this will preserve us ‘gainst Lilly’s predictions,
and make us contemn our Fate and his Fictions.

‘Tis this maintains the City Ruff,
And lines the Aldermen with Furr;
It makes the Watchmen stiff and tuff
To call, Where go your Sir?
‘Tis this doth advance
The Cap of Maintenance,
And keeps the Sword sleeping or waking;
It Courage doth raise
In such men now a dayes,
That heretofore cry’d at Head-aching.
‘Tis this doth infuse in a Miser some pity,
And is the Genius and Soul of the City.

Then why should we despair, or think

145 Names like Sam, Frasier, Cliff, Norm, etc.
146 See William Lilly, William Lilly’s History of his Life and Times (London: Charles Baldwyn, 1822), 175-190.
The Enemy approacheth nere?
Let such as never use to drink
Sack, be enslav’d to Fear:
Then to get Honour,
And that waits on her,
Strange Titles Illustrious and Mighty,
We’l have a smart Bout,
Shall speak us men [mean] and stout,
And I’le be the first that shall fight ye.
He that stifly can stand to’r, and hath the best Brain;
Shall be styl’d Son of Mars, and God of the Main.¹⁴⁷

Furthermore, the references to “our Fate” and “The Enemy” indicate that this text is directed at a specific group of individuals who share similar circumstances and enemies. One might argue then that social drinking was not only a mark of cultural identity for Royalists in the Interregnum, but that it also served as a means of escape through which they could forget the oppression and misfortune that had befallen their community while also maintaining their membership in that community.

Finally, “Bacchus true Adorers” encourages readers/listeners to continue drinking in spite of an unnamed “Act” that declares “that Healths are [to be] put down.” This could be a reference to one of any number of acts passed during the Interregnum that were aimed at enforcing Puritan morality by curbing ungodly behavior (especially during the Sabbath). One example is the “Ordinance impowering the Commissioners of the Customs and others, for the better suppressing of Drunkenness and prophane Cursing and Swearing in persons imployed under them” from June of 1654, which cites the “Laws of this Nation against Drunkenness, Swearing and Cursing” that

¹⁴⁷ Gamble, 1659, 58-59.
were already in place at the time.\textsuperscript{148} The text is also derisive of Puritans in its references to “Zealots” and “Teaching Brothers”:

It’s the news of the Town,
that Healths are put down;
Zealots say ‘tis for our ease;
then tipple like a Sinner,
at a Thanks-giving dinner,
who is drunk with what you please:
Kind Remembrances now
each good Fellow must alow,
the Act forbids not drinking,
fill the Glass to the brim,
and let our Fancies swim,
none is excluded thinking:
To Bacchus Rites we’ll pay,
and on his Altar lay,
both Fat Zeal, and Goats, and Swine;
then his Phrygian Horne,
which Teaching Brothers scorn,
in our thought shall be sublime.

Let Anachrions Boul be full,
and fill Ben. Johnson’s Scul;
Who approv’d of Apollo’s Wine,
we have liberty to drink, to nod, wink, or think, to his, to thine, or to mine.\textsuperscript{149}

\textbf{IV. Conclusion}

As we have seen throughout this chapter, music continued to be an important aspect of cultural identity for Puritans/supporters of the Interregnum government and Royalists alike during the 1650s. Puritans used defenses of psalm singing as a means of defending and advancing the new cultural and religious orthodoxy that they were actively trying to legislate into


\textsuperscript{149}Gamble, 1659, 76-77.
existence during the Interregnum, while Royalists used music to maintain their cultural identity and group cohesion in spite of government persecution and the scattering of their community across Europe. As the group in power, Puritans were able to publish freely, provided that such publications were in support of the government’s agendas. Royalists, however, were subject to censorship and imprisonment if they produced work that was contrary to or critical of the aims of the government (as in the arrest warrant issued for John Playford). Yet, some surprisingly frank references to politics were allowed to be published by the state licensers in the music publications of Lawes, Gamble, and Playford. Perhaps the authorities saw no harm in the references, did not recognize their political potential in the same way they might have with a pamphlet, or did not think that sophisticated music would reach a wide enough audience to do any significant political damage.

In any case, we have seen that the upper-class, professional musical community was largely Royalist and willing to produce and publish Royalist propaganda during this period. There is also evidence suggesting that other Royalists were aware of their propagandistic activities and that they saw a clear goal in it. In her laudatory poem to Lawes’s second book of Ayres and Dialogues, Katherine Philips, the Royalist poet and translator, writes that Lawes should

Live then (Great soul of Nature) to asswage
The savage dulness of this sullen Age;
Charm us to sense; and though Experience fail,
And Reason too, thy Numbers may prevail.
Then (like those Ancients) strike, and so command
All Nature to obey thy generous hand:
None can resist, but such who needs will be
More stupid than a Fish, a Stone, a Tree:

---

150 See Lindenbaum, 127.
Be it thy care our Age to new create,
What built a World, may sure repair a State.\textsuperscript{151}

Similarly, Mary Knight, a student of Lawes’s, wrote in her laudatory poem of Lawes that

\begin{quote}
And now thou marchest forth, when Wars are fled,
To metamorphose Griefe and Hearts of Lead;
To mould our \textit{Chaos}, and returne our \textit{Sphear},
To rank and file our Hearts as once they were:
For \textit{Musick} these Felicities hath found;
Then say how much we all to \textit{Lawes} are bound,
That here present’s us with such Gifts as these,
You’l think they were (not his) dropt from the skies;
But all’s his own: let Criticks search and scan,
They’l find this Book the Mind’s Physitian.\textsuperscript{152}
\end{quote}

Both authors see Lawes’s music as a means to reorder, reorganize, and even reform their society and the state. For Philips, his music is a means to “charm” those who are unconvinced by reason and experience: his music is in both cases understood as propaganda in all but name.

\textsuperscript{151} Lawes, 1655, A3r.
\textsuperscript{152} Ibid., 1655, A4v.
Chapter 5: Supporting the Monarchy and the Church of England during the Restoration

I. Introduction

The restoration of the monarchy in 1660 was in many respects as surprising and unprecedented in English and European history as the civil wars and regicide that had deposed the monarchy a decade earlier. Although Charles II had attempted, unsuccessfully, to regain control over the English realm with military force during the early 1650s, the Restoration (a term used at the time) was both bloodless and instigated by certain elements of the destabilized Commonwealth government rather than by Charles II or any significant dedicated Royalist endeavor. The subjects of the crown had restored it to power, which gave the people a certain amount of power over the crown that the crown had not recognized, to its detriment, before the Interregnum. The power of public opinion was undeniable in post-Restoration England, and the emphasis on law as being above even the power of the king made ruling a constant battle for consensus and unity in a divided and conflicted society.¹ That the Restoration was so unprecedented also made it especially tenuous. The king had not defeated his enemies; he owed his return to some of them.

The country’s old divisions remained. Religion, especially the presence of sects, continued to be a source of disagreement and fear both from the top down (fearing revolution from non-conformists) and the bottom up (fearing a return to Catholicism), especially after James, Duke of York, was revealed to be a Catholic. This fueled fears that Charles II was himself a Catholic and would announce a national return to Catholicism at any moment (something that

was later revealed to be more fact than fiction via the 1670 Treaty of Dover between Charles II and Louis XIV). This fear was only increased when James was crowned James II in 1685, which eventually led to the Glorious Revolution of 1688. The crown and Parliament continued to disagree over the balance of political power between them. Pet projects and group divisions amongst members of Parliament or the administration also created a divide in Parliament that eventually grew into the political party system of Whigs and Tories by the late 1670s. Occasionally, a combination of religious and political division combined with public anger and/or fear led to riots, plots, and rebellion. Finally, questions concerning the goodness of the monarch led to a public image battle over whether or not the king and his intentions could be trusted, and suspicions similar to those that had haunted Charles I, such as the willingness to disregard English law and a desire to return England to popery, continued to haunt his children and ultimately led to the downfall of the Stuart dynasty.

The reigns of Charles II and James II were thus marked by a desire to reach consensus and unity in a country that would never again be as unified or as trusting of the monarchy as it had been under Elizabeth I or even James I. At the very least, the public had to be pacified enough to prevent another rebellion and regicide. However impossible such a unity might have been, both monarchs were assisted in their attempts to create it through a propaganda network that included the use of music as a tool to combat religious division and support the monarch, both in terms of his public image and his broader political goals. This chapter focuses

---

2 Ibid., 91.
specifically on the ways in which music served as political propaganda in support of the restored monarchy and contributed to pacifying and unifying the divided nation.

II. Sacred and Secular Music as Government Propaganda, 1660-1669

It has been commonly assumed that the English people were joyously exuberant at the return of the monarchy in the spring of 1660. That is certainly the impression that the propagandists of the English government wanted readers and observers to have. The return of the Stuarts was accompanied with a veritable confetti of propaganda leaves of every shape, size, and color before, during, and after the court landed in Dover on May 25.

In the waning months of 1659 and the beginning of 1660, broadside ballads were published that attacked the Rump Parliament, glorified General Monck, and called for a return of the monarchy. An anthology of forty-seven of these ballads was published in 1660 under the title *The Rump, or a selection of Songs and Ballads made upon those who would be a PARLIAMENT, and where but the RUMP of a----- House of Commons, five times dissolv’d.* Although the majority of the anthology focuses on denigrating the Rump, the final stanza of the final ballad leaves the reader with the overall moral of the collection: “Now God bless Charles & York & Gloucester/ From Many or from One Impostor,/ May Kings and Peers and Commons ioyn/ To save us both from Rump and Loyn.” The collection finally concludes with “Rump id est Finis” playing on the customary “Finis” at the end of Broadside ballads.

3 *The Rump, or a selection of Songs and Ballads made upon those who would be a PARLIAMENT, and where but the RUMP of a----- House of Commons, five times dissolv’d* (London: Henry Brome, 1660).
4 Ibid., M9v.
5 Ibid., M9v.
Likewise, broadsides published during and after Charles’s official return encouraged all classes to sing the praises of Charles and his associates and to mythologize his return as a blessed moment in English history. *Iter Boreale*, for example, recounts how General Monck resisted the corruption and scheming of the Council of State, rallied the just members of Parliament to vote to call back Charles II, and triumphantly entered London with Charles,\(^6\) while *The Royall Entertainment* asserts that “Such glory and gladnesse was ne’r known before [as] ... When *London* invited the King to the City.”\(^7\)

The procession from Dover to London was surrounded by all the pomp one might expect from a monarch who was significantly influenced by the court of Louis XIV, including his adoption of the twenty-four violin ensemble employed at the French court, which performed at his coronation in 1661 and became a regular element of the King’s Musick.\(^8\) The celebrations leading up to the king’s return, beginning as early as February, included bon-fires, Morris dancing, burning the Rump in effigy as a side of beef at least once (which is illustrated opposite the title page of The Rump ballad anthology), play performances (such as the comedy *The Rump, or The Mirror of The Late Times*), musical performances, and at least the publication of, if not also the performance of, one masque.\(^9\)

Owing to the scope of the celebrations and the ravages of time, we can be reasonably certain that the majority of the musical material from these Restoration events has not survived.

---

\(^{7}\) *The Royall Entertainment* (London: Francis Grove, 1660).

\(^{8}\) Montano, 62.

\(^{9}\) Ibid., 54; Patricia J. Ortmayer, “‘Public Pillars of the State’: Restoration, Resistance, and Propaganda in Charles II’s England” (PhD diss., The George Washington University, 2000), 42-47.
The Subjects Joy for The Kings Restoration, the masque mentioned above, and An Ode Upon the Happy Return of King Charles II to his Languishing Nations, May 29. 1660, however, were printed during this period and probably performed as part of the celebration, especially considering that both works orient May as the present day (as evident on the title page of the ode and the beginning of the “To The Candid Reader” section in the masque). The ode is more likely to have been performed than the masque because the title page of the ode indicates that it was set to music by Charles Coleman, but the print only includes the text of the ode. Therefore, if it was set to music by a prominent composer who was also tied to the court but the music was not intended for the publication, then it must have been set for performance (otherwise it would have been set for no purpose). The masque, on the other hand, neither mentions on the title page that it was performed, nor provides a cast list, both of which were common practices in theatrical works during this period. In any case, both works represent an attempt through their publication to extend their propagandistic reach to the largest possible audience.

As propaganda, both works focus on discrediting and demonizing the Interregnum experiment with republican rule and on presenting Charles II as a heaven-sent answer to the problems created by the failed experiment. The ode, for example, begins by asking,

And is there one Fanatique left, in whose Degenerate Soul a thought can stray, And by the witchcraft of a cloud, oppose This Bright, so long expected, Day? Whence are these wild effects of Light, Emergent from our tedious night?11

---

11 James Shirley, An Ode Upon the Happy Return of Charles II to his Languishing Nations (London, 1660), A2r.
The fanatics described here are the Puritans who darkened the aspect of the three nations with a cloud that is now easily dispelled by the bright light of Charles’s return, which is “Purging th’ infected air, our eyes, and mind,” and Shirley asks if this healing light “should strike these poor men [the fanatics] blind?” 12 In the conclusion of the ode, Shirley instructs his audience/readers on the means of maintaining their returned blessings: “That Knaves may never preach him out agen,/ Nor us into Rebellion,/ Tis our turn now to Vote and Vow,/ And Justice cry our streets throughout.” 13 The reference to preaching is another clear allusion to the Puritan ministers who stirred up rebellion during the civil wars. This passage also emphasizes the maintenance of the monarchy and lays the responsibility for maintaining justice on the shoulders of the people, which shows how important public opinion already was in the minds of government supporters.

12 Ibid., A2r.
13 Ibid., 4.
Similarly, one of the first things a reader sees in the masque publication is Example 1, an image of the devil (or some other demon) and Oliver Cromwell—identified above his head as “Jeroboam” (the villain of the masque) and between his feet as “O. Cromwell”—both together holding up a cart wheel with a crown sitting on top of it. Around the boarder of the image the author includes verse seven from Psalm 52: “Loe this is the man that tooke not god for his strenght but trusted unto the multitude of his riches and strengthen’d himselfe in his
wickedness.”

The author then offers a dedication to General Monck in which he describes his purpose as being

to court the affections, of the most Disloyall. ... and [render] Treason ... in the Abstract, hateful, both to God, and Man.
Religion and Allegience, are the wings of the soul, to mount her unto Heaven: and the present Masque, is, but to preserve the Beauty, of so fair an Allegation; and to attest before the world, my utter abhorrence of the least Confederation, against the Higher Powers.
Oh Sir! may the Higher Powers be, as safe, as sacred: and may That SaCRed [sic] Person, into whose hands, God, by his Grace; Nature, by Descent; and the Law, by Right; have successively given the Globe and the Scepter: may, He, -----ah may He be, as happy, as He is Good; and as Good, as He is Great: the Best of Men, crowned with the Best of Blessings.

Sadler goes on to use the same sun and cloud imagery in the “Candid Reader” section as Shirley did in his ode, saying, “Rejoyce my Fellow Subjects, All, as One./ Congratulate the Rising of This Sonne;/ Whose Royall Lustre hath dispell’d our Fears,/ And Clouds of Grief, to drop with Joyful Tears.”

The purpose of Sadler’s masque, like Shirley’s ode, is both to signal his own loyalty and identity as a royalist and also to model absolute devotion and submission to the restored monarchy, glorifying it while condemning all those who fought against it. Indeed, although the masque is ostensibly based on the rebellion of Jeroboam as recounted in the Old Testament in 3 Kings 11-16, references to non-Biblical story elements, such as Jeroboam attempting to turn a kingdom into a commonwealth and repeated references to regicide, reveal the work to be a

---

14 Sadler, A1v.
15 Ibid., A3v-r. The capitalized “CR” in the middle of sacred is consistently repeated throughout the masque and may have been a symbolic association of the word sacred to Charles II, perhaps with a meaning of “Charles Restored” or “Carolus Rex.” I owe thanks to Tobias B. Gregory for suggesting the “Carolus Rex” interpretation.
16 Ibid., A4r.
17 Ibid., 12, 16, 20, 27, 37.
mythologized discussion of recent English history overlaid with character names and some historical details from the Biblical story (such as the battle in which Abijah defeats Jeroboam’s forces). The plot of the masque consists of various characters assuring Abijah that he will regain his kingdom, that God allows treason but condemns traitors to Hell, and that God is on his side. All of this talking eventually leads to Abijah’s victory over Jeroboam, which culminates in a fanciful representation of Jeroboam/Cromwell repenting as he is killed by the Devil and cast into Hell, another decidedly non-Biblical scene:

sate Jeroboam, in a Chair of State: Hell, under him; the Devil, behind him: and King Abijah in a Throne, above him: whom when the Rebel saw; he cries out----
O Treason, Treason: what have I done, and how was I bewitch’t. O Treason, Treason: ceasing, to be Loyal; I left to be Religious; I first, forsook my King: and then my God: Thus, by degrees I fell; and now, I fall;
To be more wretched, then Accursed Saul. With that, the Devil tares him in pieces, and throwes him into Hell. Whereupon, the Party for Abijah, clap their hands.19

The mixing of the Biblical story with recent English history not only allows Sadler to give Charles II the crushing military victory over Cromwell that he never had, as well as a general victory over the rebels that never materialized, but it also gives him the opportunity to explain away the success of the Parliamentarians as a mysterious divine will that is only completed with their damnation at the Restoration. Sadler is also careful to emphasize that loyalty is inextricably linked to religion, such that one cannot remain loyal to God if one commits treason against one’s king; in addition to execution then, Hell also awaits those who commit treason. The meshing of sacred and secular history in the conflation of this Biblical story

18 Ibid., 32-33.
19 Ibid., 34.
and secular English history adds large-scale reinforcement to the author’s localized statements to this effect.

Sadler’s emphasis on the fundamental connection between secular and divine loyalty was not an anomalous concept at the time. Religion was after all not simply descriptive of the supernatural and immortal life, but also proscriptive of how to interact with the natural world and to live one’s mortal life. David Lloyd argues in his biography of Charles II from 1660 that the ministers in London were instrumental in bringing about the Restoration because the

Ministry, ... can promise to their adherents eternal happiness, and threaten their adversaries with eternal misery, by both which men are easily prevailed with to despise the profit, pleasure and honour of sin for a season ... So powerful is Religion over Souls, not utterly sensless and stupid, that we may say of our Ministers, now, ... that they could provoke men to war, and charm then again to peace at their pleasures, with the speculation of eternity.20

Members of the newly revived Church of England such as Richard Henchman, writing in his A Peace Offering in the Temple, argued further that this power of religion, through the aggressive pursuit of conformity to the Church of England, could be used to increase civic unity and guard against societal unrest.21 Indeed, not only Henchman but also John Sudbury, writing in A Sermon Preached at the Consecration, sees social unity as a main function of the clergy. Sudbury writes, for example, that the office of bishop was necessary “to preserve Truth and Peace and Unity ... for there is nothing that so effectually rules the Multitude as Religion.”22

This belief in the propagandistic power of religion and the duty of the clergy to advance government interests may explain the publication of four pamphlets defending the church music

21 Montano, 55, 58-59.
22 Ibid., 58-59.
practices of the Church of England during the first half of the 1660s, especially considering that three of the four pamphlets were written by restored clergymen of the Church of England and the other is a reprint of *The Souls Life* by Richard Portman, an organist of the chapel Royal, which was discussed in chapter three as a work of Royalist propaganda. That the restoration of church music was linked to the restoration of the monarchy is made particularly clear in the earliest examples from 1660 by Portman and Brookbank.

The reprint of Portman’s work from 1660 makes several telling changes to the 1645 original. The reprint replaces the semi-anonymous R. P. with a full citation of the author, which also notes his status as “chief Organist of his late Majest. Royal Chappel.”23 It also mentions prominently on the title page that the work includes “His Pious Meditations on the Divine use of Musick.”24 These changes reflect the shift of power back to the royalist party and the added benefit that being associated with the monarch could bring to the promulgation of this work’s message. Because an association with the monarch would not have been a benefit for the first edition, its absence there and inclusion here makes sense. The mention of a section on music also indicates a desire to create more visibility for that section when compared to the first edition. The only change to the body of the text is the removal of the final section of meditations after the discussion of church music. This revision also indicates that the meditations were seen as less important than the section on music (considering that an entire section of them was cut rather than the whole number edited down) and increases the prominence of the discussion of sacred music by making it the final section of the work.

24 Ibid., A1r.
Portman’s text, though written during the civil wars, contains propaganda that is apt for the circumstances of the Restoration. In writing of the glorious state of England before the civil wars, for example, he asks,

O God, how happy were we, when we enjoyed a great blessing of peace and tranquility? how were we both a miror and a terror to all the eyes of the Christian world? how did our corn spring up with encrease of an hundred fold, so that the people did rejoynce and sing? how fruitfull was our Land with all manner of grain? how full of all creatures fit for the use of man? yea how did we abound in all things, so that we were able to live of our selves without the succours of any other Nation? what a sweet harmony and agreement was there among our selves, which made our enemies stand amazed at our felicity, when they themselves enjoyed none of these blessings?25

From the perspective of the Restoration, especially its beginning in 1660, this passage reminds readers of how wonderful life was during the monarchy of Charles I and implies that it can be just as wonderful again in this new age of Charles II. Likewise, when Portman shifts his focus to discussing the destruction and deprivation of the civil wars, he reminds reads of what can happen if this second chance at monarchy is squandered:

O God, how comes this change, and unexpected misery upon us, that now we are in? Surely we did not value that blessing of peace, as we ought to have done; surely it is our sinne and ingratitude that hath drawn thy vengeance upon us: what a sight is it to see the Father shedding the blood of the Sonne, and the Sonne the Father? Brother against Brother; Kinsman against Kinsman; one neighbour cutting the throat of another, and all the whole Kingdome divided and plunged into a world of miseries: how do our fields lie barren for want of tillage, our pastures trodden and spoiled with armies, our woods cut down, as if it were intended no more should grow in our Land?26

In the context of the Restoration, Meditation VII, Portman’s prayer for peace and unity, not only plays into the larger Royalist campaign for unity, but also uses the bloody history of the

---

25 Ibid., 30-32.
26 Ibid., 32-34.
civil wars to remind readers of what will happen if they choose the path of ungrateful rebellion again:

Give us peace in our time, O Lord, but especially the peace of conscience O Lord unite the hearts of King and People together, that righteousness and peace may kisse each other: and we beseech thee, O God, out of thy bowels of compassion, to suffer no more blood to be shed in our Land, and that we may hear the voice of joy and gladnesse in our dwellings.27

As discussed above, Portman’s defense of church music may also have been intended as Royalist propaganda and could have functioned as such in any case. Disparaging those who do not like Anglican-style church music, for example, encourages those who are not diehard opponents of the practice to rethink their position on the issue in order to avoid being branded as disaffected and possibly possessed by an evil spirit:

and certainly, if there be any that hate the laudable use of this quality [music], we may suspect that this evil Spirit [the demon that possessed Saul] delights to dwell with them, where he may not be troubled with it.28

But sure I am, there is no good soul, but is pleased and delighted with harmony, nay they must needs be so, if they love their own soal [soul], which it self is composed of harmony. If all this cannot indear Musick to the Reader, rather then he shall remain disaffected, wee will fetch arguments from Heaven to perswade him.29

Finally, his defense of church musicians as sinless in the act of producing church music and his criticisms of congregational singing serve to address the criticisms of those who cannot be swayed by insinuations about the negative character of those who dislike Anglican-style church music and further contribute to the cultural and religious reunification of the country.30

27 Ibid., 42.
28 Ibid., 157.
29 Ibid., 178-179.
30 Ibid., 175-178.
Turning to Brookbank’s *Well-tuned Organ*, the prefatory material alone offers strong evidence that the work was meant to serve a propagandistic purpose. The title page, for example, claims that the work is, “Intended for the *Glory of GOD, the Quiet and Peace of these Nations.*” Such a statement suggests at least that the work is meant to pacify if not also unify the kingdom by resolving the conflict over the use of instrumental music in divine services. The dedication adopts a similarly reverent and joyous tone in its dedication to Charles II, whom it calls “The most Pious, Gracious, & Illustrious Prince.” Brookbank goes on to describe how he served in the Royalist forces during the civil wars, was taken captive at the battle of Newbury, was then rescued by Royalist cavalry, and says that “since which time, I have *suffered abundantly*, because I have ever been a devoted Servant unto Truth, abhorrent unto Flattery and sinister Policy, and avers unto Popularity.” These statements encourage readers to accept his arguments because of his unwavering dedication to the monarchy and also allow him to reduce the Interregnum to an age of “Flattery,” “sinister Policy,” and “Popularity” before moving on to discredit the ideas about music that were advocated by the government during that period. He concludes the dedication by reiterating and expanding on the purpose of the work as mentioned on the title page and by making an association between the musical practices of the Church of England and Charles II, indicating that an attack on one is an attack on the other:

therefore setting *Gods Glory* in the first place, your *Majesties quiet*, and the *Peace of your Kingdoms*, in the next, I have here, as I trust, vindicated from contradiction, a piece of Gods Service, practiced in Your Majesties Chappel

---
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Royal: for which the black-mouth’d vulgar speak unworthily and basely of Divine Worship, and your Gracious Majesties practice.\textsuperscript{34}

He reiterates his intentions again in the body of the work when he writes that he has undertaken this endeavor “therefore out of mine endeared affection to truth, mine ardent desire, and utmost endeavour, after Unity, Peace, and Concord, in the whole Church of God, but especially in these Nations wherein we liv.”\textsuperscript{35} By defending church music, Brookbank is also attempting to defend the monarchy and bring peace to the kingdoms by taking up the pen just as he did during the civil wars by taking up arms. The connection of church music to the monarch also encourages readers to agree with his arguments out of loyalty to the newly restored king. He reiterates his assertion that an attack on church music is an attack on the king when he writes that all English subjects should rise up “to vindicate his Gracious Majesty, from these foul aspersions; and Divine Worship, (as also Gods Ministers,) from such horrid and devilish rebuke and slander.”\textsuperscript{36}

Brookbank may have been so insistent on defending church music as a way to create unity in the nations because he believed that “the Church of God was never in a peaceabl [sic], and settled condition, or brought to any measure of strength, and stability, but she hath used Instrumental Musick, joyned with Vocal, in her solemn Assemblies and Services.”\textsuperscript{37}

Although Charles II was restored with the promise of some form of toleration for the various Protestant denominations as alluded to in the Declaration of Breda, the election of the Cavalier Parliament in 1661 gave the government an Anglican, pro-monarchy majority with which to advance a campaign of religious unification and defense of the Church of England that
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lasted from 1661 until the fall of Clarendon in 1667. The desire of the Cavalier Parliament and the administration at large to punish non-conformity is evident in five acts passed between 1661 and 1665. The first of these, the Corporation Act, was passed shortly after the incorporation of the Cavalier Parliament in 1661; it restricted the holding of government offices to those who were at least publically Anglican, which helped to ensure governmental unity (at least in terms of religion) even if it only really excluded those who were unwilling to lie about their religious convictions. This was followed in 1662 by the Act of Uniformity—which resulted in the ejection of Calvinist-leaning Anglican ministers from positions in the Church of England and the educational institutions administered by the Church—and the Press Licensing Act, which helped the government to make sure that the recently ejected dissenters and other non-conformists would not be able to spread their ideologies in print. This anti-dissenter agenda continued with the Conventicle Act of 1664, which made it illegal for dissenters to congregate in non-Anglican religious services. This was enhanced by the Five Mile Act of 1665, which imitated the Interregnum banishment of Royalists by making it illegal for dissenting ministers who would not swear never to rebel against the king or otherwise attempt to alter the state or church to be found within five miles of any location that sends representatives to Parliament or any parish in which they had previously been employed as a minister.

In concert with these legislative attempts to remove dissent and unify the sacred and secular realms of the English kingdoms, two additional pamphlets on church music and one collection of services and anthems were published, thereby continuing the practice started in 1660 with the publication of Portman’s and Brookbank’s works. The first of these works, written
by Joseph Bentham and published in 1661, makes the connection between the monarchy and church music explicit in its title, *The Right of Kings by Scripture. Or, A Collection of some Scriptures Shewing Kings to be of God. ... Together with, A Defence of Psalm-Singing*. Like Brookbank, Bentham takes the opportunity in his preface to point out his long-standing loyalty to the monarchy and the suffering he endured during the Interregnum because of it. He claims that he wrote the work during the civil wars but did not publish it because a government committee discovered that he was the author of it and he feared making it public after that.38 He goes on in the preface to the entire work (each section has its own preface as well) to address both the returning Anglican ministers and the outgoing dissenters and their supporters and asks both sides to unite in forgiveness and understanding. Of his fellow Anglicans he asks, “That as we formerly shewed much Patience, Courage, Cheerfulness, and Constancy: So now, as much Moderation, Meekness, Forgetfulness of Injuries, forgiving of wrongs,”39 and of dissenters he asks that especially you who so much favour them as ... to condemn us, complaining at our Re-admission; and bewailing their Removal from our Rights; to consider seriously our right, and theirs; our persons, and theirs. ... Do not, I humbly intreat you, murmur at our returning ... and do not cry out of Cruelty, of Persecution, of our throwing out of good men ... Now that you may see that I and my fellow Sufferers had good ground for what we did, and suffered; this Discourse will evidence: so, as (I hope) to cleer us; and to convince you to joyn with us in *Fearing God and Honouring our King, and no more to meddle with them who are given to change*.40

---
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Notice that while Bentham is asking for unity behind God and the king and against those who desire change, he is also encouraging dissenters to accept that Anglican ministers are being reinstated at the expense of dissenters and to comply peacefully with the transition.

Bentham’s section on psalm singing, like all three sections of the work, is set as a dialogue and allows him to construct a scenario in which he can simultaneously disparage his intellectual opposition by personifying them in a discourteous zealot character, glorify his position by presenting it through a reasonable character, and give himself a fictional victory by using a third character who is undecided at the beginning but eventually sides with the Anglican. The dissenter character, named Authadaes and described as “a proud Caviller,” is at least a dissenter and likely a Quaker. He argues, for example, against outward singing on the grounds of the passage in Ephesians where “The Apostle enjoynes us to speak to our selves; to make melody in our hearts; what is this to their shouting and clamorous noise which they make, many of them together?” He objects to mixed congregations of holy and unholy people: “Prophane persons and Children joyn with you in singing, who neither do nor can sing with understanding.” He also objects to singing the psalms of David because they are not new and they contain language that does not apply to the circumstances of the present day: “We are to sing new songs; the Psalms of David are not new. ... Because the book of Psalms was penned for the state of the Jews, the Church then. ... How can we now sing them?”

---
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Christopher Atkinson and George Whitehead during the 1650s (discussed in chapter four) as additional proof of their Quaker origins.

Bentham’s choice to defend psalm singing against a Quaker is telling of the government’s inherited concern from the Interregnum over the Quakers and its desire to suppress them, as evidenced by the Quaker’s Act of 1662 which resulted in the arrest of 1,300 Quakers in the first year alone. Bentham also takes the opportunity to defend instrumental music in church before concluding the work: “Instrumental Musick may still be used in God’s service; so far forth as it may, doth, and will further edification.” Shortly after this moment, Planaes, the undecided listener, interrupts the dialogue to say that he has been convinced to return to the divine service of the Anglican Church and that he hopes his Quaker friend will do the same:

Neighbour Authades, I assure you, I am well satisfied, and resolved in Publique to joyn with the Congregation, and to sing at home with my Family as I have done. ... Mr. Hodaegos, I thank you, and bless God for this our meeting, hoping my Neighbour will consider better with himself, and alter his mind as I have done.

The campaign for religious unity in the kingdoms continued in 1663 with the publication of John Reading’s *A Sermon Lately Delivered in the Cathedral Church of Canterbury Concerning Church-Musick* and J.C.’s *The Divine Services and Anthems Usually Sung in the cathedrals and Collegiate Choires in the Church of England*. Although Reading does not make prominent connections between the state and the church, he does make it clear that he is writing to convince people to stop thinking that Anglican church music is improper and thereby to encourage them to return to the church. He writes, “I come to you this day ... to remove the Stone
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and Rock of Offence taken at our Church-Musick, that the Flock may be watered. My endeavour shall be ... to shew why we use it, and you should joyn with us therein.” At the end of the work he reiterates his point about returning to the church: “If thou hast been a careless or negligent Hearer, yet seriously repent thee, and henceforth more diligently frequent holy Assemblies, and more attentively hear the Word of God: It is as the Eastern Star, to lead Wise men to Christ.”

As with the works mentioned above, The Divine Services and Anthems collected by J.C. propagandizes for secular and sacred unity, but through a slightly different approach. Rather than argue for the benefit and legitimacy of Anglican church music, the author hopes that providing readers with the words for the most commonly used music of the Church of England will “redress this evil of ignorance, and ... bring all to the knowledge of this Musical piety ... that the people may follow the Choire in their Devotions.” He writes that his overall purpose is to “inform the Ignorant, reform the Obstinate, conform the Moderate, and confirm all to Communicate in the Church of God.” It is also telling of his recognition of the propagandistic function of music when he writes that “we have a proverb of remark, --- The plainer the better: Considering this, and of how near a relation Musick is to Rhetorick, yea more ravishingly vocal and moving the spirit beyond the others most violent efforts.” Because music exerts a greater persuasive force than rhetoric does, J. C. goes on to say that he will not attempt to disprove the arguments made against church music but rather allow the music of his collection to refute
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them. The arrangement of the anthem texts in his collection suggest that in addition to allowing the music to defend itself, he is also attempting to support the monarchy as well. The first two anthems of the collection, for example, are about and for the king. Indeed, the first one even mentions him by name, being titled “O Lord make thy servant Charls [sic]” and subtitled “A Prayer for the King.” The second is titled “O Lord grant the King a long life.” The text of the first anthem is particularly propagandistic: “O Lord make thy servant, thy servant Charles our King to rejoice, rejoice in thy strength; give him his hearts desire and deny not the request of his lips ... But prevent [sic; present] him with thine everlasting blessing, ... and give him a long life even for ever and ever ... Amen.” The request to God for Charles to have “his hearts desire” and for all his requests to be answered encourages listeners and readers to see the king as an absolute authority who should never be opposed or denied. Anthem 126 takes a similar stance as an anthem “For the Kings Inauguration”:

O God of Gods, O King of kings! Eternal Father of all things; In heaven and earth and every where, ij By whom all Kings their Scepters bear God of our Sovereign (Charles) King of peace, Heavens darling, Englands happiness; For him we praise thee in this song: ij And pray, that we may praise the [thee] long, ij And we beseech the mighty Lord, To us such favour to afford; ij That this triumphant Festival, This holy day Imperial.

Listeners and readers are encouraged to see Charles as not only a source of happiness and peace, but also as “Heavens darling.” Anthem 127 is a variation on the previous text and claims that “Great God of Charles our blessed King, ij Who peace and joy ij to us did bring, ij Whom thou a
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chief and Royal guide, ij Didst for our guideless troup provide.”

In this iteration, Charles is heaven-sent in addition to being a source of peace and joy. Anthem 112 is a short prayer for the king, Anthem 128 is a song of thanksgiving on Gun Powder Plot day, Anthem 137 offers “A prayer for the King, and the Royal Family,” and anthem 155 is a song in praise of the king for Coronation day. The fact that the author describes these texts as those that are “usually sung” is telling of how frequently propagandistic texts would have and could have appeared before congregations that could afford a professional music program. While more research will need to be done on the topic, it would appear that the idea of “tuning the pulpit” for political purposes extended to the choir as well.

After 1663, no church music pamphlets are extant until the appearance of one publication in 1678 by Wettenhall, and then another gap appears until 1690. While many unintentional occurrences may explain this gap, it is also possible that church music pamphlets were not published because of the government’s turn toward toleration during this period. It is also possible that the allegations of popery against the court made defending church music, a well-established correlate to Catholic practices, unworthy of the risk of drawing further claims of popery onto the government. In any case, after the aggressive push for religious unity gave way at the end of the 1660s, theatrical music publications, including masque and opera libretti, began
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to appear again with regularity and offered a secular outlet for pro-monarchy propaganda and propaganda that supported government agendas.

III. Sacred and Secular Music as Government Propaganda, 1670-1685

The last fifteen years of Charles II’s reign (1670-1685) were marked by plotting and the ever-present political and religious divisions that had become hallmarks of seventeenth-century English culture. Charles II plotted with Louis XIV to return England to Catholicism and help Louis conquer the Netherlands via the Treaty of Dover (1670), while Catholics were falsely accused of plotting to kill the king (the Popish Plot of 1678 and Meal-Tub Plot of 1679), Parliament plotted to exclude James, Duke of York, from the line of succession because of his Catholic faith (the Exclusion Crisis of 1679-1681), a small group of Whigs plotted to kill the king and the Duke of York (the Rye House Plot of 1683), and at the end of the period the Duke of Monmouth plotted to overthrow James II and install himself as the new king of England (the Monmouth Rebellion of 1685). During this period of mistrust, popular support was a valuable and tenuous asset that Charles II was well aware he needed to possess and maintain.\(^{62}\) Therefore, while propaganda in support of the musical traditions of the Church of England became less prominent—as far as surviving sources suggest—multi-page, pro-monarch propaganda not only continued to appear during this period but also increased in quantity.

Of all the primary musical sources discussed in this dissertation, the most consistent scholarly attention by far has been paid to the operas and masques that were produced during this

---

Scholars have argued for and against the presence of political allegory in works as early as *The Siege of Rhodes* and as late as *The Judgement of Paris* and have provided extensive discussions of the political contexts and contents of these works. Therefore, rather than argue for any particular allegorical reading of any of these works, an endeavor that would require a chapter-length discussion for each work, I will discuss the propagandistic arguments made in the prefatory materials of these works and on allegorical connections that can be succinctly argued. In all other instances, especially in those cases where an allegorical reading has not been suggested or where my own reading contrasts with an existing one, I will briefly present the possible allegory but will not attempt to defend it as intentional on the author’s part or otherwise definitive, presenting it instead as one possibility among others.

Musical propaganda from the latter half of Charles’s reign begins with the publication of two masques that were originally published during the pre-war period and the Interregnum respectively, *Coelum Britannicum* by Thomas Carew and *The Siege of Rhodes* by William D’Avenant. As with the republication of Portman’s *The Souls Life*, the content of these works may have been specifically directed at a wholly different context in English history, but they


64 See Winkler, “Politics of Pleasure;” and Hume, “Politics of Opera.”

65 *Coelum Britannicum* was originally published in 1634 and again in 1651; *The Siege of Rhodes* was originally published in 1656 and republished in 1659, 1663, and 1670.
nevertheless contain passages that remain propagandistically valuable for their re-publishers and relevant for readers of the Restoration. The passage, for example, where one of Carew’s characters advocates the shipping of dissidents to the colonies as a means of cleansing the nation of their “infection” could not only still be applied to Puritans, but it now could also be applied equally to the other nonconformist sects that were actively dividing the religious landscape of England. Carew’s character argues that

> it is not safe that these infectious persons should wander here to the hazard [of] this lland [sic] ... I should conceive it a very discreet course ... to embarque them all together in that good ship called the Argo, and send them to the plantation in New-England, which hath purg’d more virulent humours from the politique body, than Guaiuem and all the West-Indian drugs have from the naturall bodies of this Kingdome.66

Similarly, *The Siege of Rhodes* may have been repurposed to influence listeners in a different way from what originally might have been intended in 1656. The plot centers around the Sicilian duke Alphonso, who is trapped in the stronghold of Rhodes while the island is being besieged by the Ottomans under the rule of Suleiman.67 When Alphonso’s wife Ianthe hears of his situation, she sells her jewels and buys supplies to assist her husband and those besieged along with him, even going so far as to bring them to Rhodes herself.68 The remainder of the plot revolves around the Rhodians’ trying to fend off the Ottomans—while slowly and inevitably being beaten into submission by overwhelming force—and the power of Ianthe’s honor and virtue to win over Suleiman, who allows her to make the terms of surrender for the town and

---
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spares Alphonso’s life for her sake.\footnote{Ibid., 87-99.} While Curtis Price has suggested that “the non-resolution of the drama ... was surely an allusion to the exiled King Charles, frustrated by hollow French promises to raise an army against Cromwell,”\footnote{Price, 5.} I suggest that Rhodes (not insignificantly an island) may be interpreted as representing all of England, with the siege representing the First English Civil War in which Charles I was besieged in his own kingdom, a kingdom that eventually fell to the besiegers. Ianthe’s selling her jewels could then be an allusion to Henrietta Maria’s selling her jewels to buy supplies for the war effort, and Ianthe’s travel to Rhodes to assist her husband could then represent Henrietta Maria’s return to England in 1643. The fact that Rhodes was the last bastion of Christianity in the region and that it was under imminent threat of conquest could be read as an allusion to the religious aspect of the civil wars and the struggle of Anglicans to defend what they would describe as the true church. In 1656, the masque could have therefore served as maintenance propaganda for the Royalist community by encouraging them to remember the bravery and virtue of their king and queen in the face of a foe who was impossible to defeat (thereby absolving them of any negative associations with their defeat) and to continue to view the Parliamentarians as an invading, religiously separate, entity.

For Restoration audiences, any potential allegory in the work, whether or not the author implied or the audience inferred one, might have been less significant than its overall moral. Indeed, D’Avenant provides in the dedication one of the most commonly cited passages about the propagandistic use of theatrical works, writing that

If I should proceed, and tell your Lordship of what use Theatres have anciently been, and may be now, by heightening the Characters of Valour, Temperance,
Natural Justice, and Complacency to Government, I should fall into the ill
manners and indiscretion of ordinary Dedicators, who go about to instruct those
from whose abilities they expect protection.\textsuperscript{71}

D’Avenant wrote this dedication to the Earl of Clarendon, the highest-ranking administrator in
the Restoration government, in 1663 when Clarendon was at the height of his influence and
power. As this dissertation has shown, a number of contemporary authors have indicated an
awareness of the use of music and poetic/dramatic texts for propagandistic purposes, but the
most interesting and telling element of this particular quotation is the fact that D’Avenant
specifically mentions “Complacency to Government,” especially considering that he is
addressing the passage directly to one of the most powerful individuals in the government of the
time.

Although D’Avenant does not explicitly discuss the process by which theatrical works
may be used to instill complacency into the populace, he does offer some indications of the
process by way of prior statements in the dedication. He writes, for example, that he has been
careful “to render the Ideas of Greatness and Vertue pleasing and familiar.”\textsuperscript{72} He also indicates
that audience perceptions of rulers on the stage reflect their perceptions of their own rulers when
he writes that “it proceeds from the same mind, not to be pleas’d with Princes on the Stage, and
not to affect them in the Throne; for those are ever most inclin’d to break the Mirrour, who are
unwilling to see the Images of such as have just authority over their guilt.”\textsuperscript{73} Theatrical works
may therefore be used not only to model virtue and proper conduct to audiences in general, but
also to specifically endear them to a particular, desired conception of virtue and greatness by
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presenting them in a pleasing manner. Furthermore, theatrical works can be used as a litmus test for identifying individuals who oppose their rulers by observing how a given individual responds to the content of theatrical works. If he/she opposes theatrical works, and opposes theatrical representations of authority, then he/she is likely to oppose authority in real life as well.

In light of D’Avenant’s comments on the propagandistic use of theatrical works, one final passage from the dedication of *The Siege of Rhodes* may indicate the desired political effect of both the 1663 and 1670 reprints. D’Avenant writes that

> In this Poem I have reviv’d the remembrance of that desolation which was permitted by Christian Princes when they favour’d the ambition of such as defended the diversity of Religions ... in Germany; whilst those who would never admit Learning into their Empire (lest it should meddle with Religion and intangle it with Controversie) did make Rhodes defenceless; which was the only fortify’d Academy in Christendom where Divinity and Arms were equally profess’d.  

Here D’Avenant ascribes the desolation of Christian areas of Europe at the hands of the Ottoman Empire to princes who tried to allow the coexistence of Catholicism and Protestantism in their realms in Germany ca. 1520. He also blames the fall of Rhodes on the Holy Roman Emperors who would not admit “Learning,” which I take to mean Protestantism, into their empire because it would entangle Catholicism in controversy. In both cases, D’Avenant is implying that religious diversity and religious conflict are bad for Christianity and may even be implying that they will lead to its downfall. Therefore, only by uniting behind the learning of true Protestantism—i.e., Anglicanism—can England defend itself from its enemies. Such a message against religious toleration would have been equally relevant in 1663, when the government was still actively pursuing religious unity, and in 1670, as a reaction against the renewed calls for toleration that
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began around 1667. Although the Cabal and Charles II supported toleration, the agenda was unpopular with the Anglican majority of the Cavalier Parliament and was abandoned officially in 1670 when Charles moved toward returning England to Catholicism as part of the Treaty of Dover.\(^75\) The republication of *The Siege of Rhodes* may therefore represent a conscious attempt to support the government’s shift away from support for toleration in 1670 just as it may have also been re-published in 1663 as support for the previous policy of religious unity that pervaded the early years of the Restoration.

In addition to *The Siege of Rhodes, Cantica Sacra*, published by John Playford in 1674, may also have been intended as propaganda support for the Anglican Church after Charles II’s administration turned away from toleration. That Playford is often considered by scholars to have had Royalist sympathies and (as discussed in chapter four) can be at least tied to the publication of musical propaganda does not, of course, mean that this collection of hymns and anthems was intended to serve as pro-Anglican propaganda. It does, however, add to the likelihood that it was. Such an assessment is further suggested by the fact that Playford dedicated the collection to Charles II and claimed his purpose in publishing the collection was “the Promotion of the Divine Use of MUSICK.”\(^76\) The propagandistic passage from the dedication claims that

> Your Majestie since Your most happy Restauration hath extended Your Royall Bounty to the Advancement of this *Divine Service* more than any of Your Ancestors, which must proceed from that *Seraphick* and judging Soul Your Majestie is endued with above other Kings. The King of kings grant Your MAJESTY a Long and Prosperous Reign over all Your Subjects, which is the dayly Prayer of Your Majesties Ever-Loyall and most Obedient Subject.\(^77\)

\(^75\) Montano, 86.  
\(^76\) John Playford, *Cantica Sacra* (London: William Godbid, 1674), Bv.  
\(^77\) Ibid., A2r.
Playford not only signals his loyalty in this passage, and in the publication of this work, but he also models loyalty and obedience for Charles II’s other subjects. He also connects Charles II to the advancement of the divine service (i.e., the Anglican service) and thereby allows for the inference of a connection between sacred and secular loyalty such that loyal subjects will also support the divine service as Charles II has and Playford is attempting to. The work also bears a resemblance to J.C.’s *The Divine Services and Anthems Usually Sung in the cathedrals and Collegiate Choires in the Church of England* from 1663, and it is possible that Playford was aware of the previous collection and intended his own to serve a similarly propagandistic function. One might also argue that because Playford had published a collection of twenty-five Latin anthems titled *Cantica Sacra* by Richard Dering and dedicated to dowager queen Henrietta Maria in 1662, J.C.’s collection might have originally been in imitation of that first collection, which would further make Playford’s second collection a continuation of a prior practice. Playford’s first collection, however, lacks a dedication or preface, is much shorter than the other two collections, and is written entirely in Latin. Therefore, the second *Cantica* bears more resemblance to J.C.’s collection than to Playford’s first one. In any case, promoting the hymns and anthems of the Church of England could have functioned as secondary propaganda for the Church even if Playford did not specifically intend it to.

Turning to secular propaganda, throughout the 1670s propaganda that encouraged loyalty to the king and stigmatized disagreement as rebellious continued to appear just as it had during the 1660s. For example, *London’s Resurrection to Joy and Triumph* (1671) by Thomas Jordan, an account of the festivities on Lord Mayor’s Day that focuses on three pageants that were
presented as the main event of the day, begins with the character Orpheus declaring to Charles II that “To Your Indulgence we this Blessing [of the new Lord Mayor] owe,/ Who to your Subjects Peace and Joy bestow./ May we Your Royal Favours still improve,/ First to Obey, and next Rejoyce and Love.” The citizens of the city of London owe their peace and joy to Charles II, and in exchange for these and still greater blessings, they must obey, be glad, and express their love for the king. Orpheus then turns to the Lord Mayor and speaks about the importance of unity in government, saying that in the beginning

*Union* fill’d all the *Universe* with free
Felicious and Seraphick Harmony.
All parts of the *Creation* did consent,
and the world was one well-tun’d *Instrument*:
…………………………………………………
*Nature* it self knew no *Antipathy*.
but when the peace was broke by mans Transgression,
*Revenge* with *Rage* and *Ruine* took possession;
*Disorder* rioted, and (in conclusion)
Old Amity was turn’d into confusion.
But *Orpheus* whose person I present
(The *Hieroglyphick* of good Government)
By the sweet power of his harmonious hand,
Reduc’d their salvage [sic] Natures, made’um stand
Listen, attend, and with their active paws [that is, the animals of nature] Dance and conform their feet to *Musicks Laws*.
Such is the power of *Concord*, and *Consent*, The very soul of humane Government.
………………………………………………………………
My Lord, it is your Destiny to rise
From one of the most ancient Companies
In this Metropolis, we hope y’are one
That will restore our long-lost *Union* [original in black letter type].
‘Twill make us *Rich*, and *Righteous*, and please *God*,
Firm to our friends, fierce to our Foes abroad.
*Union* breeds *Peace*, and Plenty in the Land;

78 Thomas Jordan, *London’s Resurrection to Joy and Triumph* (London: Henry Brome, 1671), 5. For additional and similar comments about this work, see Montano, 126-127.
But Cities self-divided, *Cannot Stand.*79

This passage uses the language of and references to music to make its point about unity in the midst of a show that is using music to do the same thing that Orpheus is described as having done to the animals (that is, attempting to unify the audience with music). It also promises wealth, peace, and bounty in exchange for the people’s consent to unity.

Following the exposition of these ideas concerning union and division, Jordan reinforces them through the dialogue of the third pageant, which begins with the characters Hoyden and Freeman (representing country folk and city folk respectively) arguing about whether city or country people are better. They soon come to the realization that they need each other and are then joined by Billet (a soldier), who informs them that they also need him as much as he needs them. In conclusion, they all sing a chorus: “Let the City, the Countrey, the Camp, and the Court,/ Be the Places of Pleasure, and Royal Resort:/ And let us observe, in the midst of our Sport,/ That Fidelity makes us as firm as a Fort:/ A Union well-grounded no Malice can hurt.”80

They are then joined by a character symbolizing Oliver Cromwell named Oliver Faction. Just in case you could not tell that he is factious and the villain of this show, he introduces himself:

*Oliver Faction* is my Name,  
I love as life  
To sow the seeds of Strife  
‘Twixt Father, Mother, Sister, Brother, Husband, and Wife.  
My Nature too is like my Name,  
All peaceful Minds abhor it;  
I put all Nations in a Flame,  
And give them Reasons for it;  
I deal debate/ In Church and State,

---
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And bring all in Combustion.\textsuperscript{81}

After boasting of how he used religion to cause the division in England that led to the civil wars, the characters Country-Man and Citizen attempt to take him to jail for his crimes and insist that he will never again be able to spread his division in England: “You sha’not, nor cannot comply with [i.e., find or produce] a Citizen/ That will support your pride./ Their hearts now with faith and reality/ Are united so much unto Loyalty,/ Love true Religion and Loyalty,/ They to the Sovereign power do fix,/ Your new knacks will never prevail with us.”\textsuperscript{82} In the end, however, they allow him to stay because he promises to toast a health to the king.\textsuperscript{83} In doing so, they have both proven their immunity to his divisive designs and also created even greater unity by forcing him to unify with them such that no opposition remains to loyalty and cooperation in the kingdom.

Musical propaganda that extolled the virtue of unity and the dangers of division continued to appear in the 1670s in the form of two dramatic works from 1676, \textit{Musick; or A Parley of Instruments} and \textit{Beauties Triumph}. \textit{A Parley of Instruments} does not include a dedication or any other prefatory material that might provide context for the work, but the stage directions within the text suggest that the work was performed, or at least intended to be, in a context similar to a masque. The work consists of a dialogue between three characters, Alexis, Corydon, and Strephon, with brief interjections from a fourth character, Pallas. The plot of the brief work revolves around a disagreement between the three main characters as to which kind of instrumental family (bowed strings, plucked strings, or wind instruments) is superior to all others.

\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., 15.
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid., 16-18.
\textsuperscript{83} Ibid., 19.
Much like the disagreement that occurs between Hoyden, Freeman, and Billet in *London’s Resurrection*, the characters of this dialogue eventually conclude that they sound better together in cooperation and union. First Strephon and Alexis agree that “Strephon: Since we cannot agree while our Notes we compare,/ Let’s joyn in a Chorus,/ Alexis. Let’s joyn in a Chorus/ Strephon. Of melodious, of melodious Air./ Chorus. Of melodious, of melodious Air.” Finally Strephon and Corydon conclude the work saying that

*Corydon.* But to your scatter’d Parts we add a Sp’rit.  
*Strephon.* Then let us mix and make one great Compound.  
*Chorus.* Like Birds wee’l engender and bill in the Air,  
The Gods never envy’d so happy a pair.  
Then let us unite, and merrily play,  
Wee’l sport all the Night, and wee’l sing all the Day;  
In Consorts of Love  
Each Couple shall move,  
Then the new-marry’d Bride more chearfull and gay.  
Like Birds wee’l engender, &c.  
In a various Chorus of Musical Lays,  
Our Fancies shall meet, and our Spirits embrace;  
While the Goddess of Love  
Our mirth shall approve,  
And the Nymphs in a Row our Nuptials shall grace.  
Like Birds wee’l engender and bill in the Air,  
The Gods never envy’d so happy a pair.”

While previously their division only caused disagreement, their union now makes them so happy and filled with love that they will be the envy of the gods.

Unlike the previous examples of discord resolving into unity, * Beauties Triumph* takes the opposite course, showing what can happen when unity is dissolved by discord. The plot of the masque centers on the judgment of Paris. The story in this iteration begins with Fate enraged by

---
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the peace, joy, and harmony that will result in the world from the union of beauty, wisdom, and power as personified by the three goddesses. Fate therefore concocts a plan to divide them by sending discord to tempt them with the golden apple that can only be possessed by the fairest goddess:

Fate. Juno and Pallas with Venus joyn,
The awfull Throne of Fate to undermine:
Ingratefull pow’rs! I’le break your close design.
Hoe Discord! Hoe!

When power and wisedom with beauty unite,
Mankind will be drown’d in such Seas of delight,
My frowns they’l despise, and my favours they’l slight.
Proud Deities, dare you oppose my Yoke,
When your poor petty Cobweb plots are broke?86

Discord and his furies then sing a song that reinforces the idea that discord ruins all human endeavors:

Disc. Lean Vertue shall down with her barren reward,
When Discord comes on she’l no longer be heard.
1 Fur. Great Power, and Wisedom, and Beauty we’l sever,
2 Fur. And singly destroy what would conquer together:
3 Fur. The fair shall be foolish, the wise shall be mad,
And by their delusions the great be misled.
Chorus. The Fair, &c.87

Just as the author makes it clear that discord is causing all of the problems in the plot of this work, he is also careful to emphasize repeatedly the value of unity. An entire scene in this brief work is dedicated to a celebration by shepherds and shepherdesses in honor of the fall of fate and the rise of virtue as a result of the alliance between Venus, Juno, and Pallas: “Come, come away,/ To solemnize this happy day;/ with joyfull cries/ Let’s rend the skies,/ For
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Fortune’s fall is Virtue’s rise.”\textsuperscript{88} The next scene begins with the direction that the goddesses “Enter Juno, Pallas and Venus, embracing.”\textsuperscript{89} This unity ends when discord throws the golden apple down at their feet, which they begin to fight over; they continue to do so as they leave the stage.\textsuperscript{90} The conclusion of the story, though only alluded to in the masque, brings horror, death, and destruction to Greeks and Trojans, all because the union between Juno, Pallas, and Venus was allowed to dissolve into jealous, vain squabbling. Although the plot takes an opposite approach to propagandizing in favor of unity, the moral remains the same: strength, peace, and joy come from unity, while chaos, weakness, violence, and suffering result from faction and division.

In addition to general political propaganda that serves the ever-present governmental need for popular support and ideological unity, a number of works were published in the latter half of Charles II’s reign that make mention of or allusions to specific political events of the period. One of the first works of this kind that will be discussed here is the opera \textit{Ariadne} by Louis Grabu (spelled “Grabut” in the publication) from 1674. In both its dedication and prologue, Grabu uses \textit{Ariadne} to spread pro-monarchy propaganda relating to the recently ended Third Angelo-Dutch War, and he also mentions the recent marriage of Mary of Modena to James, Duke of York, in 1673. The dedication to Charles II begins with Grabu’s assertion that “WHilst [sic] all \textit{Europe} besides, lies now groaning under the Weight of a Crual War ... \textit{England} alone, by Your Royal Care, does now injoy a happy Tranquility and sees Peace and Justice raign in all

\textsuperscript{88} Ibid., 10.  
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her Borders. “91 He goes on to call England a “New Ark” and “An Earthly Paradice, inviron’d round about with Sandy Desarts.”92 He also asserts that

Your Vast Mind was not yet fully satisfied, in having by Your Invincible Force made her Triumph over her Fierce and Audacious Enemies, bringing them (in spight of their Obstinacy) to Beg Peace at Your Royal Hands, and by that happy Peace, fill the hearts of Your People with Joy and Satisfaction.93

Grabu not only gives Charles the glory for the recent peace with the Dutch and reminds his readers how happy and satisfied they should be by that peace treaty, but he also makes a larger point about how lucky they are to live in England, safe and bountiful in comparison to the rest of Europe.

To reinforce this point about how great living in England is in comparison to other countries in Europe, the prologue of the opera offers a dialogue between the Thames, Tiber, Seine, and Po rivers in which the Thames invites the other rivers to come and see how great England is. Having done so, they remark on how wonderful it is and how it is all thanks to Charles II:

APproach, [sic] approach fair Sisters, cross the Main,
To come and tast my Sweets, ye Tyber, and Sein.
Every thing here doth seem to smile!
Cupid himself raignes in this Isle:
E’r since, Venus resolv’d to quit
Her Native Throne, to come and dwel in it.
Fair Albion now will new Cythera prove,
And must be call’d, The Sweet Island of Love.94

The Tiber replies with an allusion to Charles being the reason for the creation of this paradise:

91 Louis Grabut, Ariadne (Savoy: Thomas Newcombe, 1674), A2r.
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Fairest Thamis, thou Famous Flood,
Whose Monarch ever Great and Good,
By Wholsom, Just, and gentle Laws,
In calm his Restor’d Empire awes;
Whilst his Dreadful Navies, controul
And rule both Seas, from Pole to Pole;
Making Commerce and Arts flourish at home,
As in my Caesars-times they did in Rome.
To Him, and thee I come this day,
My Homages and Tribute to pay.95

The Seine then reiterates the part about the navies and war, thereby propagating the exaggeration that the English soundly defeated the Dutch:

Fairest of Flouds, How glorious is thy Fate!
The World and I, have seen thy Sons of late,
As invincible as thy Victorious Fleet,
The very Ocean with thy Foes submit,
Whilst on the Land, a Warlike Duke of thine,
Whose Lofty Meen speaks him of Royal Line,
In Lewis’s sight, his valliant hand imbrues
In Belgian-blood, and Maestrickt-Wals subdues.96

The Tiber then remarks with marvel that “Such Prudent-heads thy happy Albion bears,/ As its great State secures from storms and fears.”97 This eventually leads the Thames to confide that although valor and justice are a big part of England’s success, it is because of Charles’s love for his people that they love him in turn: “Vallor and Justice both may act their parts,/ But Love makes Charles to Rule his Peoples hearts.”98
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As the prologue concludes, the Po enters and says that she has left her “fertil Plains, and Shoars, to bring/ A Royal Sister to thy Greatest King.”

This reference to Mary of Modena is further expanded by the Thames, who claims that even though there was some displeasure over the announcement that the Duke of York was going to marry a Catholic, she has nevertheless won over all of England: “And thou maist see his People now./ To thy Princess, both love and honor shew:/ This Bliss, thou ow’st to her alone, whose Charm,/ In spight of Fate, all resistance disarm:/ And makes Envy it self t’adore/ Her now, whom it oppos’d before.”

The dedication of John Dryden’s *The State of Innocence, and Fall of Man*—his opera from 1677 that was never set to music or performed during the seventeenth century—evidences an additional attempt to sway public opinion in favor of Mary of Modena with propaganda that depicts her as both great and beautiful. The first indication of the importance of the work as propaganda for Mary of Modena is the title page, where the dedication to “THE DUTCHESS” is positioned so prominently that the font is larger than that used for the title of the work (see Example 3 below). The prominence of the dedication is increased by its rarity, being one of only three published operas or masques from the period between 1660 and 1677 to mention the dedicatee of the work or otherwise name a person in whose honor the work was made or published. The other two examples of this practice have already been discussed, Sadler’s *The Subjects Joy* from 1660 and Jordan’s *London’s Resurrection* from 1671. In contrast, seven other
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opers or masques from this period were published without such a dedication: over double the number of those that contain one.

Example 3, the title page of John Dryden’s *The State of Innocence, and Fall of Man*.

Even if we set aside the title page as an oddity and nothing more, the length and language of the dedication itself is remarkable. At five full pages of continual praise, the dedication is a marathon of propaganda selling Mary to the reader. A few examples from Dryden’s dedication will serve as representative of his extensive praise:

---

Give me leave, MADAM, to acquaint the World that I am Jealous of this Subject [her beauty]; and let it be no dishonour to You, that after having rais’d the Admiration of Mankind, You have inspir’d one Man to give it voice. But with whatsoever Vanity this new Honour of being Your Poet has fill’d my mind, I confess my self too weak for the Inspiration; the Priest was always unequal to the Oracle: The God within him was too mighty for his Breast: He labour’d with the Sacred Revelation, and there was more of the Mystery left behind than Divinity it self could inable him to express. I can but discover a part of Your Excellencies to the World.\textsuperscript{102}

He goes on to say that

He [God] has plac’d You so near a Crown, that You add a Lustre to it by Your Beauty. You are Join’d to a Prince who only could deserve You: whose Conduct, Courage, and Success in War, whose Fidelity to His Royal Brother, whose Love for His Country, whose Constancy to His Friends, whose Bounty to His Servants, whose Justice to Merit, whose Inviolable Truth, and whose Magnanimity in all His Actions, seem to have been rewarded by Heaven by the gift of You. You are never seen but You are blest: and I am sure You bless all those who see You. We think not the Day is long enough when we behold You: And You are so much the business of our Souls, that while You are in sight, we can neither look nor think on any else.\textsuperscript{103}

Even when Dryden is propagandizing for James, Duke of York, he still manages to bring it back to Mary and how all the great things about James have made him alone worthy of her greatness and beauty.

However much the Royal family may have wanted the statements in these sources to be true, time would prove Mary and her Catholic identity (not to mention James’s Catholicism) to be one of the most unpalatable aspects of James’s court when he acceded to the throne. Indeed, fears over the prospect of an unbroken Catholic line of monarchs springing from the union between James and Mary and eventually leading England back to the Pope was a pivotal consideration when Parliament eventually decided to offer the crown to William of Orange in
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exchange for the deposition of James II via the Glorious Revolution. The fact that so few English people rose up to defend James II and his son from the Dutch usurper is proof that Mary had not won over quite as many hearts and minds as Dryden’s prologue claims.

Just as Dryden echoed Grabu’s praise for Mary of Modena, so too did John Crowne echo his praise and commentary on the Third Angelo-Dutch War in the prologue of his masque *Calisto* from 1675. The prologue begins with the Thames sitting with two nymphs symbolizing peace and plenty as characters representing Europe, Asia, America, and Africa bring gifts to lay at her feet. This scene is interrupted by voices crying offstage for assistance, which are later revealed to be the inhabitants of Europe, probably because of the Franco-Dutch and the Scanian wars that were being waged across Europe. This frightens Thames and makes her worry, especially when she sees that Augusta (identified by a marginal note as London) is also crying. Because of this she is afraid that peace, plenty, and the four corners of the world will desert her. These characters, however, insist that they will not abandon her. With Augusta still crying, the Genius of England awakens and proceeds to further attempt to allay Thames’s fears. He argues that “These fears do not belong to Her [Augusta] nor You:/ Europe onely should lament,/ The Nymphs of his fair Continent,/ Some Gyants now pursue,/ But this sweet isle no Monster can invade.”104 The Thames then comments that someone should send help to Europe and is informed by Europe that Charles II has already sent help in the form of two heroes (most likely the Duke of Monmouth and either the future Duke of Marlborough, John Churchill, or James, Duke of York):

---

104 Crowne, *Calisto*, br.
From the mild power of this happy place.
Who is inclin’d,
To make the World as peaceful as his mind,
They have already gain’d the grace:
Two Heroes of his own Celestial Race
Are sent; the one to Triumph o’re the Seas,
And all the watery Divinities.
The other, Monsters of the Land to quell,
And make the Nymphs in safety dwell. ¹⁰⁵

The two heroes are then crowned as victors and encouraged by the Genius of England to then place their prizes at Charles II’s feet as a symbol of how their fame derives from him.¹⁰⁶ This prologue exhibits several similarities with the form, content, and overall message of the prologue from Grabu’s *Ariadne*. Not only do both focus on the Thames as the central character, but both emphasize the peace and plenty present in England in contrast with the war and deprivation that was filling much of the continent at the time. They both also emphasize military prowess and send the message that Charles is powerful and much more generous than other rulers, with the implication that his subjects will not find a better one anytime soon or anywhere nearby.

In addition to these extensive examples, pro-Monarchy propaganda also appears in works that are largely apolitical, including works on musical instruction, collections of songs, and poetic miscellanies. Examples include the health to the king in A.B. Philo-Mus’s *Synopsis of Vocal Musick* from 1680, the ballad in the anonymous *Mock Songs and Joking Poems* from 1675 about how the heralds at Physick Garden managed to prevent the removal of Charles I’s coat-of-arms from the gate by instead removing the Earl of Danby’s coat-of-arms, the song in Henry Bowman’s *Songs for One, Two & Three Voices* from 1678 that describes the injustices suffered...

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., br.
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by Charles I during the civil wars, and the song of praise to Charles and James in Henry Playford’s *The Theater of Music* from 1685.¹⁰⁷

Alongside pro-monarch propaganda, propaganda against those who disagreed with the monarch was also transmitted via music during the latter half of Charles’s reign. After 1679—when the two-party system of Tories and Whigs developed in the wake of the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis—this propaganda often takes advantage of the ideological simplification of the party system to attack Whigs without having to name or criticize specific individuals or ideas. This in turn provided space for the *en masse* character attacks that have and always will be a significant part of any system of government that relies on popular support for its legitimacy and authority. The anonymous *The King’s Health: Set to Farrinel’s Ground* from 1682, which was printed as a three-page pamphlet, for example, not only praises Charles and James, Duke of York, but also attacks the Whigs as rebellious, saying, “Let Tories guard the King, Let Whigs in Halters swing ... Faction and Folly, and State Melancholy, with Tony [Anthony Ashley-Cooper, 1st Earl of Shaftesbury] in Whigland for ever shall dwell; let wit, Wine, and Beauty, then teach us our Duty, for none e’re can love, or be wise and rebel.”¹⁰⁸ *The True-Blue-Protestant Dissenter*, set “To the Tune of the Down-fall of Anthony” (another reference to Anthony Ashley-Cooper), vigorously links the Whigs of its present with the Puritans of the past and thereby uses guilt by association to cast all Whigs as traitorous liars. The ballad begins with an allusion to Oliver Cromwell as Jeroboam (as in Sadler’s *The Subjects Joy*) and then claims that during the

---
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Interregnum present-day dissenters (ca. 1682) were just children, but nonetheless the children of Puritanism:

WHEN Jeroboams Calves were rear’d,
And Church was neither lov’d nor fear’d:
When Treason had a fine new Name,
And Pulpits did like Beacons flame. ... Dissenter (now grown a great Rabby)
Was then in’s Swadling Clouts a Baby:
Dissenter, Son of Presbyter,
Who was undoubted Son and Heir
Of Puritan.109

The author goes on to address the dissenter as

Thou little Mortal of three Names,
Pilot of Plots, and Sire of Shams,
Thou Subteranean, secret Spring,
Tht mov’st all Engines ‘gainst the King:
If thou Forsake us, we dispair,
The Tory Sheriffs, and new Mayor
Will th’ Righteous all to pieces tear.

Wo unto thee thou stubborn Whigg,
Who whilom lookd so bold and big,
Thou willt be taught another Jigg!
Goals, Dungeons, Racks (he knock’d his Breast,
Inspir’d as Prophet, and as Priest)
Ropes, Halters, Hatchets, Pillories
Present themselves before our Eyes:
Oh true blew Protestant Rioters!
Off goes your Heads, and eak our Ears;
The Sisters pour’d out floods of Tears.110

The author concludes the ballad by stating that no matter how many times the king pardons the crimes of the civil wars, dissenters will always be traitors.

---
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By this point, Shaftesbury had fled England, and rumors of Whig rebellion plots were to be given a real-life justification in the shape of the Rye House Plot of 1683, in which a group of former civil war Parliamentarians and their supporters plotted to kill Charles II and his brother James while they traveled to or back from New Market, where they were known to frequent the horse races. While the plot was never attempted, one of those involved informed on the others, which led to retaliatory investigations, trials, and executions by the government. The plot was a win-win for the Tories; not only was it unsuccessful and indeed not even attempted in the first place, but the planning of it alone gave justification to the propaganda claims that had already been made against Whigs: calling them traitors and regicides looking for another opportunity to strike again. As in previous periods, political propaganda was not only published in works that seem solely intended as propaganda. Works like The Newest Collection of The Choicest Songs, As they Are Sung At Court, Theatre, Musick-Schools, Balls, etc. from 1683, for instance, collates political propaganda into an overtly innocent and apolitical collection of popular songs. In total, six of the fifty-three songs in the collection contain propagandistic references to loyalists or Whigs. The first of the six, “A Momento to the Whigs, or a Looking-Glass for Deceivers,” begins by declaring, “REmember [sic] you Whigs./ What has lately been done,/ What cursed intreagues/ Your dire Plottings brought on” and proceeds to remind readers of the atrocities committed against the church and monarchy during the civil wars, concluding with the assurance that “now we grow wise,/ It shall never be said,/ That we’ll shut our Eyes/ Whilst the Nation’s betray’d.”

111 The Newest Collection of The Choicest Songs, As they Are Sung At Court, Theatre, Musick-Schools, Balls, etc. (London: T. Haly, 1683), 43–45.
As propaganda, this text encourages readers to condemn all Whigs as plotters and betrayers and offers emotive reminders of what the Parliamentarians had done to the Church of England and Charles I, such as “Church-Plunder was counted/ An innocent sport,” and “They ruin’d the Nation,/ And Murther’d their King” to encourage readers to never again allow the political descendants of the Parliamentarians to gain political power over the country.112

Although there is no direct evidence that “A Momento” was specifically used as a campaign song for an election, even if it has that air about it, “Loyalty Triumphant” is a victory song for the election of two Tory sheriffs in London, probably Dudley North and Sir Peter Rich, in 1683.113 All three stanzas of this song include a mix of praise for the new Tory Sheriff and Lord Mayor of London and invectives against the Whigs, as evidenced in the first stanza: “NOw [sic] Loyalists cast up your Caps and rejoyce,/ Since of Loyal Sheriffs, the City’s made choice./ The Torrent of Faction begins to decline,/ And those that succession oppos’d i’th right Line./.../ And in vain they do study more shams to invent.”114

Likewise, “The Loyal Health” builds up James, Duke of York while tearing down Whigs as traitors: “Let us mark ‘um for Whigs, who were never yet Loyal,/ And out of our company strait let them hie all./ For this is a place set a part for true Tories;/ We’ll here have no Canting nor seditious stories.”115 “Country Discourse” uses language that imitates the northern dialect (from around York) to mock Whigs for what appears to be a recent electoral loss (though it could

---
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also be at the revelation of the Rye House Plot, or both). The country characters of Tom and Dick discuss the event, saying that

[Tom:] I’se tell thee, ther’s News from London Town; Loyalty at last got up, and Faction tumbled down.[Dick:] I’vaith I’se hear as much Tom, the De’l [devil] has now forsook u’m; The London Mons no longer will suffer Whigs to Rook u’m.

[Dick:] Zouz now, I’se don’ think on’t, where Don Whigland [Shaftesbury] stand[s], Every where, where Treason brings up the Rear or Van.¹¹⁶

“The Grievances of the Nation Discovered” proves that unity was still a goal on the minds of Royalists, with its declaration of “A Pox of these Whigs let us rout ‘um,/ Too long they have pester’d the Nation./.../ The Kingdom will soon have a blessing,/ If Faction and Schisme once perish,/ For Union will spread past expressing.”¹¹⁷ Finally, “The Loyalists Delight” credits “Great CHARLES our blest Sovereign” with having “At last ... subdued/ The Murmuring Faction/ That strove to intrude/ Into Matters of State/ For to Imbroil the Nation; Sedition no More/ Shall be made a Vocation.”¹¹⁸ The similarity in messaging between these songs is an indication that they were purposefully included in the collection as propaganda. It is also worth noting that none of the songs in the collection express a pro-Whig position or anything close to criticism for the crown or Tories.

IV. Music Propaganda during the Brief Reign of James II, 1685-1688

Even if the general public strongly suspected that Charles II was a Catholic, and even with significant criticisms of the hedonistic atmosphere of his court, and of his political agendas
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and dealings, he commanded sufficient loyalty to maintain his throne against such uprisings as did occur.\footnote{119 As in the Scottish uprisings of 1666 and 1679; see Harris, \emph{A Nation Transformed}, 129-130.} James was not so lucky. While Charles II’s Catholicism had long been suspected (in fact he converted on his deathbed), James II’s had been known as early as 1673, when he refused to comply with the Test Act.\footnote{120 Timothy Harris, “Introduction: Revising the Restoration,” in \emph{Politics of Religion}, ed. Timothy Harris, Mark Goldie, and Paul Seaward (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 3.} His marriage to Mary of Modena that year promised a Catholic succession and the prospect of England’s return to communion with Rome. Fears about James’s accession had triggered the Exclusion Crisis of 1679-1681, during which Parliament tried to block Catholics from the line of succession. Charles supported his brother, and the attempt was eventually defeated, but at a heavy political cost.\footnote{121 Harris, “Introduction: Revising the Restoration,” 15.} The defeat of the exclusion bill did not eliminate the anxieties over the Catholicism of the royal family, however, and these fears provided an opening for the Monmouth Rebellion. Fortunately for James II, the uprising proved harmless, but it showed the level of public anxiety concerning a Catholic monarch.

The anxieties of James’s subjects were only made worse by his unwillingness to compromise politically on what seemed to be his most pressing goal: achieving legal equality and political power for the long disenfranchised Catholics of England. In the end, his insistence on the existence of a standing, professional army, which he stocked with Catholic officers, his dispensing with the Test Act and subsequent appointment of Catholics to offices in government, his Declarations of Indulgence from 1687 and 1688, and his punishment of Anglican bishops for requesting in print that he withdraw his Declarations, were extremely concerning for opponents of arbitrary government (i.e., absolute government) and opponents of Catholicism. The final
straw for many English citizens and members of parliament, however, was the birth of James’s son and heir in June of 1688. This meant that there was no hope that the next in line for the crown, William of Orange and his wife Mary Stuart, would be able to wait out James II and fix what he had done after his death. A month after the birth of James, Prince of Wales, William of Orange agreed to intervene on behalf of the English people in the Glorious Revolution that ended the reign of James II.¹²²

The music propaganda that did appear during, or just before, James II’s brief reign follows a similar style and content as the propaganda that was produced for Charles II during the previous two and a half decades. As in the beginning of Charles II’s reign, in 1685 N.T. published A Choice Collection of 180 Loyal Songs, a collection of broadside ballades that were published between 1678 and 1683 and enhanced in this collection with the inclusion of their accompanying tunes (a practice that was uncommon for individual broadside publications throughout the century). Like The Rump, or a selection of Songs and Ballads made upon those who would be a PARLIAMENT, and where but the RUMP of a----- House of Commons, five times dissolv’d by Henry Brome from 1660, this collection preserves and concentrates Loyalist propaganda that centers around a specific Royalist agenda. In the collection from 1660, the agenda was denigrating the Rump Parliament and its supporters while elevating General Monck and Charles II in anticipation of the return of the monarchy. In A Choice Collection, the agenda is to use the Exclusion Crisis and the Rye House Plot to neutralize the political propaganda of the Whigs and ensure obedience and complacency in the populace. Indeed, the author admits as
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much in his preface, while also providing another contemporary statement proving that music was considered to be a valuable vehicle for propaganda during this period:

Amongst [sic] the several means that have been of late years to reduce the deluded Multitude to their just Allegiance, this of BALLADS and LOYAL SONGS has not been of the least influence, While the Fergusons, and Heads of the Factions were blowing up Sedition in every corner of the Countrey, these flying Choristers were asserting the Rights of Monarchy, and proclaiming Loyalty on every street. The mis-in-form’d Rabble began to listen; they began to hear to Truth in a SONG, in time found their Errors, and were charm’d into Obedience. Those that despise the Reverend Prelate in the Pulpit, and the Grave Judge on the Bench; that will neither submit to the Laws of God or Man, will yet lend an itching Ear to a Loyal Song, nay, and often become a Convert by it, when all other means prove ineffectual.123

The author also hopes that in publishing the collection “the World may see I have not been Idle in the worst of times, but have done my endeavour (to the utmost of my Talent) for the Interest of the KING and Government; which That [sic] they may flourish in spight of all his Adversaries.”124

As with the Lord Mayor’s Day pageants published consistently by Thomas Jordan during the 1670s and early 1680s, two examples of Lord Mayor’s Day pageant libretti were published during James II’s reign. Just as Thomas Jordan had been the designated author of these works in Charles’s reign, Matthew Taubman authored both of the examples discussed here. The first pageant libretto was published in 1686 under the title London’s Yearly Jubilee for the election of Sir John Peake as Lord Mayor for that year. It includes pro-monarch propaganda such as the portion of the first speech to the Lord Mayor from Neptune in which the sea god indicates that the Lord Mayor owes his authority to James, who possesses the power of Neptune himself:

124 Ibid., A4v.
This Honour to your State, an Homage due,
First to Illustrious JAMES, and next to you.
To him long since I did my Power resign,
Of Seas of floods, and what e’re else was mine.
His boundless Soveraignty none dare withstand,
invincible by Sea as well as Land.
Who forc’d the lofty Foe to truckle under,
And makes the Sea-Gods tremble at his Thunder.\textsuperscript{125}

Similarly, \textit{London’s Triumph, or the Goldsmiths Jubilee} from 1687 is complimentary to the power and kindness of the king, but it also propagandizes on behalf of the recent Declaration of Indulgence, with passages such as this one from the second speech of the pageant, given by St. Dunstan:

\emph{Amphion} and old \emph{Orpheus} playing by,
To keep our Forge in tuneful Harmony.
These pontifical Ornaments I wear,
Are types of Rule and Order all the Year.
In these white Robes none can a fault descry,
Since all have liberty as well as I:
Nor need you fear the Shipwrack of your Cause,
Your loss of Charter or the Penal Laws,
Indulgence granted by your bounteous Prince,
Makes for that loss too great a Recompence.\textsuperscript{126}

The author anticipates the shock to the crowd of St. Dunstan appearing in pontifical robes and reminds them that they have just as much right to a similar freedom of religion as he does thanks to the generosity of James II. He also reminds them that the Declaration of Indulgence—in allowing Protestants freedom of religion—more than makes up for the freedom that is similarly granted to Catholics. Liberty of conscience is even objectified as a shield that the character

\textsuperscript{125} Matthew Taubman, \textit{London’s Yearly Jubilee} (London: Henry Playford, 1686), 6.
\textsuperscript{126} Matthew Taubman, \textit{London’s Triumph, or the Goldsmiths Jubilee} (London: J. Leake, 1687), 7.
Liberty carries along with the king’s banner.\textsuperscript{127} Another character, Janus, informs listeners at the end of his speech that for the benefit of the future of the nation, he has provided them with “Wisdom and Providence to be your guide;/ With Liberty of Conscience to be just,/ That you with Honour may discharge your Trust.”\textsuperscript{128} This implies that liberty of conscience is necessary for justice and requires that all people trust each other to live and let live.

Finally, opera continued to be a vehicle for Royalist propaganda during the reign of James II. The most prominent example of this is the opera by John Dryden and Louis Grabu, \textit{Albion and Albanius}, the score for which was published in 1687. As Dryden describes in the 1691 edition of the libretto, work on the opera was begun before Charles II’s death, and because “The Subject of it is wholly Allegorical; and the Allegory it self so very obvious, that it will no sooner be read than understood,”\textsuperscript{129} the end had to be changed to accommodate his death.\textsuperscript{130} The allegory relates the stories of the Restoration of the monarchy; the Popish Plot; the subsequent exile of James, Duke of York, (represented allegorically as Albanius) to the continent; the Rye House Plot and its failure; and the death of Charles II (represented as Albion). Throughout the opera, Albion and Albanius are presented as noble heroes who are undermined and plotted against by Zelota, Tyranny, and Democracy, the allegorical representations of the Whigs. As Grabu says in his dedication to the 1687 edition

\begin{quote}
The feigned Misfortune of two Persecuted Hero’s, was too thin a Veil for the Moral not to shine through the Fable; the pretended Plot, and the true Conspiracy, were no more disguis’d on the private Stage, than they were on the publick
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{127} Ibid., 10.
\item \textsuperscript{128} Ibid., 11.
\item \textsuperscript{129} John Dryden, \textit{Albion and Albanius} (London: John Tonson, 1691), Br.
\item \textsuperscript{130} Ibid., B2r.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Theater of the World. Never were two Princes united more straightly together in common Sufferings from ungrateful and Rebellious Subjects. As Grabu alludes to here, the plot of the opera posits that the Popish Plot was a fabrication by the Whigs to create division between Charles and James, but Charles was aware of the plot the whole time and ends up trapping the plotters in their own plot. Shortly after, Charles as Albion is called to heaven by Jove, leaving James as Albanius in charge of the kingdom in his stead.

V. Conclusion

Throughout the Restoration, maintaining public support for the reigning monarch was a significant concern for the royalist side of the government. Charles was well aware that failure to take public opinion into account was a significant error on his father’s part, and he feared a repeat of his father’s fate and by extension the groups that contributed to it, especially the dissenters. In the early days of the Restoration, creating cultural and religious unity in the nation was one means by which the administration sought to manage public opinion. As much of the propaganda from this period attests, unity was seen as a means to peace and a cure for conflict.

Along with this pro-unity propaganda, propagandists published musical works and writings about music that encouraged readers to adore and respect the royal family for their generosity, virtue, and their military power and skill. While this propaganda may have helped to bolster Charles II’s public image enough to help him retain control over the country until his death (even if there were periods in which he had significant difficulties), it was ultimately unsuccessful at improving the public images of James, Duke of York, or Mary of Modena,
Duchess of York. Their Catholicism was too negative a factor in the eyes of the English people to be outweighed by propaganda that focused on personal abilities or virtues. The insistence that James II showed in his quest for equality (or perhaps even superiority) for English Catholics and the birth of his Catholic son pushed the English people to seek and endorse the transfer of power from James II to William of Orange, which ultimately led to the Glorious Revolution and the exile of James II and his immediate family for the remainder of their mortal existence (considering that their remains are still interred outside of England).

In addition to pro-unity and public-image propaganda, music was also used to convey invective propaganda against the royal court’s enemies to audiences across the spectrum of social classes. After the Exclusion Crisis, this negative propaganda was directed squarely against the Whig party and its prominent members, such as Anthony Ashley-Cooper, Early of Shaftesbury. Whereas positive-image propaganda for the royal family focused on their skills and virtues, negative-image propaganda against the Whigs focused consistently on tying their political and ideological lineage to the Parliamentarians of the civil wars and Interregnum, with the implication that they were little more than a group of traitors and schismatics who wanted nothing more than to bring chaos and death to the kingdom. It just so happens that they did revive revolution in the nation through the Glorious Revolution, but it was at least mostly bloodless and resulted in a new state of the kingdom that was in some ways more harmonious and ordered than the world and administration that it replaced.
Chapter 6: Music as Propaganda for the Church of England after the Toleration Act

musick one would think might reconcile them [non-Anglican Protestants]; if they had ears to hear, their hearts would be affected too, and they could no longer hold out in this harsh, jarring, ungrateful distance, but would fall in with the general tone, and join in a friendly consort with their brethren.¹

I. Introduction: The Toleration Act and the Church of England as One Church among Many

As discussed at the end of the previous chapter, the Glorious Revolution of 1688 saw the deposition of James II and the accession of William and Mary as the legally recognized monarchs of England. This relatively bloodless revolution was instigated in part by an ever-present and growing dissatisfaction with the many favors that James II had bestowed on Catholics, by these and other actions that were seen as considerably indicative of arbitrary (absolutist) rule, and the birth of James’s son, who would have ensured the perpetuation of a Catholic monarchy (if not also a return to Catholicism as the state religion of England) for at least another generation, if not in perpetuity. As the closest Protestant male heir to the throne, William of Orange was seen by some members of Parliament as the best means of preventing an imminent return to Catholicism in England at the hands of James II and his Catholic offspring, hence his invitation to defend England against James II.

Indeed, William and Mary clearly signaled the religious allegiances of their administration when they assented to one of the first significant changes made to English law and society during their reign, the passage of the Toleration Act in May of 1689, just a month after their coronation. Both Charles II and James II had attempted to legalize non-Anglican worship, but they were either blocked by Parliament (as with Charles II) and/or failed to gain widespread support for their attempts to offer religious indulgences because their constituents
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believed (correctly) that their toleration was designed to benefit Catholics. William and Mary’s toleration, on the other hand, was not seen as a suspicious endeavor, and it likely succeeded because it recognized the religious freedoms of non-Anglican Protestants while specifically maintaining the suppression of Catholic religious freedom: Catholics were still subject to the same restrictions that had been placed upon them since before the Toleration Act was passed.²

As we shall see, the average Anglican might not have been impacted by this socio-legislative change, but members of the Anglican clergy were placed in a difficult position by it.

With the passage of the Toleration Act, Protestant sects that dissented from the Church of England (notably including special language for Baptists and Quakers) were granted an indulgence to proselytize and congregate. To do so, they were required to be licensed (as ministers and congregations) and/or registered as having sworn the requisite oaths or certifications of allegiance to the Crown and against Catholicism. This practically—though with heavy regulation—legalized religious dissent in England.³ The impact that this act had on English society and dissenter visibility within that society was drastic,⁴ and dissenting authors repeatedly expressed their surprise over the transformation that occurred in the kingdom and the dissenting community as a result of this legislation. In 1693, for example, Oliver Heywood (a Presbyterian) observed that

---

² For an in-depth discussion of why the Toleration Act was passed and its relationship to European politics of the period, see Lionel Laborie, Enlightening Enthusiasm: Prophecy and Religious Experience in Early Eighteenth-Century England (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2015).
⁴ The term dissenter is used here to refer to all non-Anglican, non-Catholic Protestant sects in England during this period, not only because it was a term in common use at the time, but also because it is used specifically in the Toleration Act as a legal designator of the group to which it was addressed. For the text of the act, see “William and Mary, 1688: An Act for Exempting their Majestyes Protestant Subjects dissenting from the Church of England from the Penalties of certaine Lawes. [Chapter XVIII. Rot. Parl. pt. 5. nu. 15.],” in Statutes of the Realm: Volume 6, 1685-94, ed. John Raithby (s.l: Great Britain Record Commission, 1819), 74-76. British History Online, accessed October 23, 2016, http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol6/pp74-76.
The wonder of publick liberty of the gospel, and spirituall priviledges maintained and increased this year to great admiration: the vast number of new meeting-places erected all over the kingdom, the multitude of hopefull young men sent out of private schooles yearly to supply them, the vast summes of money distributed through the kingdom from the fund at London for maintenance besides many private well-meaning gentlemen building meeting-places, and giving comfortable encouragement to ministers all by this Act of Parliament, King, Lords, and commons, in the open face of our Enemys, who gnash their teeth at it, but cannot hinder it, the laws being in force.\(^5\)

Dissenters not only took advantage of this new-found freedom to worship and discuss their religious views but also took the opportunity to be seen publicly as dissenters and as supporters of religious alternatives to the Church of England. In keeping with the ever-growing print culture of the time, dissenters took advantage of their freedom to publicly dissent by printing pamphlets that not only supported their own views but attacked those of the Church of England and/or other dissenting sects. James Lardner (an Anglican clergyman) commented in 1700 on the frequency and boldness of dissenting publication, saying that

> The labouring Press … doth, almost every day, produce some sly Pamphlet or other; the design of which, is to Undermine our most Holy Religion, and Ridicule and Scoff at all the Professors of it: Nor do these things steal secretly into our Hands, or by their Privacy betray an inward Shame in the Author, but every Page doth publickly declare, that the Publisher of it is a profess’d Enemy to the Faith.\(^6\)

Another disadvantage to the Church of England was legal: while dissenters were enjoying and flaunting their new-found additional freedoms thanks to the Toleration Act, the very same act had effectively removed all of the legal power the Church of England had previously enjoyed in regards to the enforcement of attendance and conformity. Under the Toleration Act, the Church of England became—legally if not culturally—one church among many. In 1694 Charles Leslie, one of the divines who refused to accept the \textit{de facto} authority of William and Mary

\(^5\) Rose, 166.  
\(^6\) Ibid., 181.
because of his prior oath of allegiance to James II, expressed frustration at this loss of legal authority, saying that

we must give up our jure divino right, which we have endeavoured to hold out so long against the dissenters; and profess to hold hereafter by no other tenure than that of an act of parliament, which now grants equal liberty to the dissenters as to ourselves … if any, or all, of our flocks should desert us to-morrow, and go over openly to the dissenters, we have no power left us, by this act, to restrain any of them by ecclesiastical censures or any other way … they think them all to be churches; and the law giving equal liberty to all, who dare quarrel with any for taking that liberty to go to any or all of these churches?7

For the first time, the Church of England would have to compete in an open religious marketplace of ideas.

At the same time that the Church of England was coming to terms with its loss of authority, there was a surge of renewed interest from both Anglican and dissenting authors in church music, which had nearly disappeared from the book market in the 1670s and 80s. Approximately half of all the extant church-music pamphlets published in the seventeenth century appeared in print for the first time between 1690 and 1699 (these works are listed below in example 1; for a chronological list of all extant works, see Appendix B for Chapter 6).

Furthermore, eight of the twenty-two pamphlets were published by Anglican authors, and though they make up less than half of the total pamphlets published during the decade, they represent a four-fold increase in interest on the part of Anglican authors, who previously had produced only four pamphlets on church-music in the forty-nine years between the beginning of church-music pamphlet publication in 1641 and the period in question here, beginning in 1690. Although they appear at first glance to be nothing more than pro-music tracts, these Anglican pamphlets only began to appear in earnest after the Church of England had experienced the negative effects of the passage of the Toleration Act for several years. Furthermore, they fall in line with other

7 Ibid., 172.
Anglican pamphlets that are overtly aimed at defending the ceremonies of the Church of England in an attempt to stem the tide of fleeing congregants that resulted from the religious freedoms recognized by the Toleration Act.

To explain the correlation between the shifting political and religious climate in post-Toleration Act England and the sudden growth of church-music pamphlet publication among Anglican authors, this chapter focuses on the context and content of the eight Anglican church-music pamphlets that were published in the 1690s, comparing them to contemporary dissenter pamphlets on church music, most of which were written by Baptists. The evidence suggests that while these dissenter authors were producing massive, dense tomes arguing the minutia of Greek and Hebrew etymology as proof that music should not be used in church (or only sparingly), Anglicans were publishing more compact, cheaper, and less educationally demanding pamphlets that were intended not as contributions to the scholarly debate that was fervently being engaged in by Baptist/dissenter ministers, but as part of a larger campaign directed at members of the Church of England and lay members of dissenting congregations to garner and bolster support for the Church of England in the wake of the impediments placed upon it by the Toleration Act.

II. Form as an Indicator of Audience

Turning first to form, Anglican church-music pamphlets from the 1690s exhibit a brevity, simplicity, and readability that contrasts starkly with contemporary church-music pamphlets by dissenters. With an average length of twenty-three pages, these eight pamphlets are considerably shorter than all but one of the fourteen dissenter pamphlets published in the same decade, which
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have an average length of 101 pages. Furthermore, with the exception of two statistical outliers (of two and forty-four pages respectively) the page range of Anglican pamphlets falls between twenty-two and twenty-seven pages. In contrast, the page range of dissenter pamphlets (once the twelve-page outlier is removed) runs from forty-seven pages to 247 pages (see figure 1 below).

Figure 1, page-length distribution of dissenting (black-outlined) and Anglican (gray) church-music pamphlets in chronological order of publication, from 1690 to 1699. See the explanation below for the author, title, and date that corresponds to each number on the figure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Keach, <em>The Breach Repaired</em>, 1691.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Knollys, <em>An Answer to a Brief Discourse</em>, 1691.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kiffin, <em>A Serious Answer to a Late Book</em>, 1692.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Estwick, <em>The Usefulness of Church Musick</em>, 1696.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hickman, <em>A Sermon Preached at St. Bride’s Church</em>, 1696.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Marlow, <em>The Controversie of Singing Brought to an End</em>, 1696.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Towerson, <em>A Sermon Concerning Vocal and Instrumental Musick in the Church</em>, 1696.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Brady, <em>Church-Musick Vindicated</em>, 1697.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Simply in terms of page length, Anglican pamphlets would therefore have been cheaper to purchase on average than contemporary dissenter pamphlets. This would have given their works the potential to reach a wider audience and thereby the potential for greater dissemination of their message, which would have been necessary for these pamphlets to function effectively as propaganda.⁹

In addition to being widely accessible on account of their size, the Anglican church-music pamphlets of the 1690s present simple, sleek arguments that an audience of almost any educational level could comprehend. Not only do the authors avoid cluttering their pages with frequent references to or discussions of primary or secondary sources, but when they do cite sources, they focus almost exclusively on Biblical passages rather than contemporary theologians or authors from antiquity. Out of eight pamphlets, only *A Sermon Concerning Vocal and Instrumental Musick in the Church* (1696) by Gabriel Towerson, *The Lawfullness and Expediency of Church Music Asserted* (1694) by Ralph Battell, and *The Lawfulness and Use of Organs in the Christian Church* (1696) by John Newte cite non-Biblical sources in support of their arguments. Even then, references to these non-Biblical works are sparse and, like Biblical references, presented in a colloquial rather than academic manner.

Anglican church-music pamphlets from the 1690s also demand less academic experience and intellectual ability of their audience than their dissenter counterparts. As with non-Biblical citations, Anglican authors again chose almost unanimously to avoid arguments and evidence that relied on Greek, Latin, or Hebrew texts or extensive discussions of etymology. Indeed, only two of these Anglican pamphlets contain texts in foreign or classical languages within the main body of text—two brief three-word Latin phrases, one three-word Greek phrase, and two Greek
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words (all immediately translated) in Battell’s *The Lawfullness and Expediency of Church Music Asserted*, and two parenthetical Greek words in Newte’s *The Lawfulness and Use of Organs*—and only the pamphlets by Towerson and Newte contain marginal notes in foreign languages: one note in Greek in the former and one note in Greek, seven in Latin, and three providing translations of three separate Hebrew words in the latter. In every instance, foreign words and quotations are presented by Anglican authors in such a way that ignorance of their meaning, which is always given by the author anyway, does not lower the readability of the work or obscure the author’s arguments and evidence.

As Joad Raymond writes in his *Pamphlets and Pamphleteers in Early Modern England*, “A degree of plainness was essential for effective pamphleteering.” Likewise, Anthony Milton has offered a similar interpretation to mine concerning works written for the general readership, saying that a work written to appeal “to the general reader rather than the scholar” would contain “only minimal citations, and the tone [would be] light and popular” with “spare and idiomatic” writing” and “limited” analysis, as evidenced in the *Cosmographie* of Peter Heylyn. Regarding propaganda, Bernard Capp and Jason Peacey both point out that government propaganda was tailored to appeal to the unsophisticated and uneducated.

In contrast, dissenter church-music pamphlets abound with non-Biblical references, extensive quotations, and lengthy digressions on matters as unrelated to church-music as infant baptism. For example, compare two pages from *A Sermon Concerning Vocal and Instrumental*
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11 Raymond, 44.
Musick in the Church in which Towerson references Tertullian, Pliny, and Eusebius with a page from The Controversie of Singing (1696) by the dissenter Isaac Marlow in which Marlow cites at least six separate theological works from throughout the late Medieval and early modern period (Appendix A for Chapter 6, Examples 1 and 2). Towerson presents only a brief quote from each source and transitions smoothly to and from them without extensive digression. In contrast, Marlow not only provides lengthy quotes, but he is hardly done presenting one quotation when he begins another from a different source, many of which would have been familiar only to those theologians who were particularly interested in the pros and cons of infant baptism. The fact that Marlow is discussing infant baptism at all, not to mention so fervently, in a pamphlet about church music is telling of the audience Marlow and his fellow dissenter authors were trying to reach: one that could comprehend and afford to buy a work that devoted textual real estate to marginal notes and in-line digressions.

Dissenter church-music pamphlets also present untranslated blocks of foreign text, as seen in Richard Allen’s A Brief Vindication (1696) (Example 3 in Appendix A), where Allen presents two entire psalms in both Hebrew and Roman script in order to prove that the psalms in their original Hebrew did rhyme, and they also contain obsessive examinations of Greek and Hebrew etymology. So important was etymological understanding to dissenter authors that all but two of the fourteen church-music pamphlets published by dissenters during the 1690s contain substantial discussions of Greek and/or Hebrew etymology. The most exhaustive of these etymological endeavors appears in Richard Claridge’s An Answer to Richard Allen’s Essay,
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15 Richard Allen, A Brief Vindication of an Essay (London: Harris and Bell, 1696), 36-41.
16 The two works that do not contain discussions of etymology are William Kiffin, A Serious Answer to a Late Book (London, 1692), and E. H., Scripture Proof for Singing of Scripture Psalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs (London: Astwood, 1696).
Vindication, and Appendix, where Claridge spends fifty-three pages examining the meanings and derivations of the various Greek and Hebrew words that are used to indicate singing, music, or instruments in the Old and New Testaments (see Example No. 4 in Appendix A for two representative pages from Claridge’s etymological discussion). While important from a scholarly standpoint, extended quotation of foreign languages—especially those written in non-Roman scripts—and detailed discussions of their semantic intricacies would only serve to impede readability and overall comprehension if directed at a general audience.

Finally, the titles that both Anglican and dissenter authors applied to their pamphlets provide strong evidence as to the audiences these authors were attempting to address with their works. Turning first to the Anglican pamphlets, they are, with only one exception, unanimously described as sermons given by their authors at specific places and times. By publishing their sermons, these authors utilize their authority as sanctioned ministers of the Church of England to bolster their claims and also send a message that their pamphlets are directed at a general congregation of literate citizens, whatever their station, vocation, or education.

Furthermore, five of these sermons were written for St. Cecilia’s Day celebrations, which began in the early 1680s. It seems likely that these sermons were a new addition to the festivities in the 1690s; no corroborating evidence for the inclusion of sermons in the celebrations during the 1680s has survived, and no examples were printed. Therefore, I would suggest that sermons began to be included in the 1690s, altering a decade of festival tradition, because the celebration was a perfect opportunity for Anglicans to propagandize in favor of their church. Not only could
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18 An Apology for the Organs and Prayers used in the Church of England (London: Griffin, 1692).  
they provide Anglican listeners with arguments to defend their musical practices and talking points to market their church to nonmembers, but they could also propagandize directly to any nonmember in the audience through the text of these sermons and their accompanying musical performances. Publishing St. Cecilia’s Day sermons would have further publicized the festivities and served as an innocent excuse to covertly spread pro-Anglican propaganda in the print market in the guise of news prints covering recent events.

Additionally, both modern scholars and contemporary authors from throughout the early modern period in England attest to the propagandistic use of sermons. Tim Harris, Joad Raymond, Barbara Shapiro, Kevin Sharpe, and Jason Peacey have all recently argued in favor of the propagandistic function and value of sermons. Likewise, as mentioned in the previous chapter, in 1660 David Lloyd argued for the propagandistic power of the sermon, saying that with it the

Ministry, ... can promise to their adherents eternal happiness, and threaten their adversaries with eternal misery, by both which men are easily prevailed with to despise the profit, pleasure and honour of sin for a season ... So powerful is Religion over Souls, not utterly sensless and stupid, that we may say of our Ministers, now, ... that they could provoke men to war, and charm then again to peace at their pleasures, with the speculation of eternity.

Shapiro provides an excellent collation of primary-source excerpts on the topic, which I quote here for its brevity and significance:

Thomas Fuller indicated that ‘those who hold the hem of the pulpit’ possessed the capacity to ‘steer the people’s Hearts as they please,’ and Charles I thought, ‘People are governed by the pulpit, more than the sword in time of peace.’
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Clarendon believed ‘that the first publishing of extraordinary news was from the pulpit; and by the preacher’s texts, and his manner of discourse upon it, the auditors might judge, and commonly foresaw, what was like to be next done in the Parliament or Council of State.’ Gilbert Burnet … reported that ‘all that passed in the state’ … ‘was canvassed’ in sermons and prayer…. James Howell linked the pulpit and the press when he characterized them as ‘the most advantageous instruments’ of parliamentary rebellion. According to John Nalson, the pulpit was one of Parliament’s ‘principal Engines of Battery.’ Thomas Hobbes pointed to the preachers ‘in most of the market towns of England’ as underminers of the nation.22

Although these quotations are referencing sermons mainly as they were spoken, the printed sermon, especially when identified as such, certainly would have carried a similar amount of authoritative persuasion and indeed could be even more effective as propaganda considering its greater reach and staying power once in print.

Dissenter church-music pamphlets, however, are titled overwhelmingly as refutations of other dissenter authors and their works: only three of the fourteen dissenter church-music pamphlets published in the 1690s do not claim to be arguments against the work of one or more authors.23 As refutations, eleven of these pamphlets are naturally directed at the author(s) against which their author is arguing and take on a scholarly tone that explains their length, propensity for dense exhibitions of primary and secondary evidence, and overall complexity.

Indeed, the goals of Anglican and dissenter pamphleteers were so dissimilar that only once in a decade did either side acknowledge the other in print. The anonymous Letter to a Friend in the Country Concerning the use of Instrumental Musick in the Worship of God (1698) was written as a response to John Newte’s The Lawfulness and Use of Organs. It makes sense, however, that a dissenter would choose Newte out of the other seven authors, considering that

22 Shapiro, 167.
Newte’s pamphlet is the only one that comes even close to the complexity and length of contemporary dissenter pamphlets (even though it too is described as a sermon).

Additional evidence also suggests that if Anglican authors intended to address the same audience and discuss church music from the same perspective as their dissenter contemporaries, then they would have written works with sizes, formats, and contents comparable to dissenter works. An Anglican response to the Letter to a Friend in the Country, titled A Treatise Concerning the Lawfulness of Instrumental Musick in Holy Offices (1700) by Henry Dodwell, for example, has all the scholarly trappings of a dissenter pamphlet: it is 227 pages long, with numerous non-Biblical sources and digressions (including a discussion of circumcision), and Greek and Latin text in non-Roman script both in marginal notes and in the main body of the text. That only one Anglican author from this period chose to write in the dissenter style and that all others chose to either publish sermons or pamphlets that are sermon-like is telling not only of this difference in purpose between Anglicans and dissenters, but also of the surprising uniformity of both sides during this period.

One might argue that the fact that these Anglican pamphlets are described as sermons diminishes the significance of their physical and formal differences in comparison to dissenter pamphlets. After all, sermons in their spoken form would not benefit from extensive marginalia and would necessarily have length restrictions. From this perspective, these Anglican pamphlets were originally written to be spoken while dissenter pamphlets were originally written to be read and therefore the comparison is one of apples to oranges. This argument assumes, however, that these Anglican authors were publishing their sermons without any revision, expansion, or

---

significant thought to their function as printed works. Only then could one convincingly argue that the simplicity and brevity of these works is incidental and unintentional when compared to other contemporary publications on church music. This argument also assumes that there was a significant conceptual difference between the written and spoken word during this period. When or how quickly reading transitioned in English from a spoken to a silent practice, however, remains an open question. The difficulty in answering this question makes it equally difficult to say whether or not authors would have assumed that all works would be read aloud. The method of delivery therefore likely had less influence on style than a consideration of the intended audience.

Moreover, as Joad Raymond suggests, authors of printed sermons were not simply presenting their sermon scripts to printers for publication. Sermons in print were noted by contemporaries (including their authors) to differ in content from their spoken versions. Sermons directed at a general audience also “tended towards plainness in printing and in preaching style.” Authors in many cases could not simply have passed off their sermon scripts to their printers because sermons were often given from notes rather than fully-written out scripts in the first place. Finally, the presence of marginalia indicates some consideration for the text as a printed work. Even if we were to grant the claim of this objection, that Anglican sermons were published verbatim, the fact that Anglican authors chose to publish their sermons at all rather than write the lengthy, scholarly arguments to which the dissenters were prone only strengthens the assertion that the publication goals of these two groups were very different.

---


26 Raymond, 222-223.
Likewise, these authors certainly could have included extensive footnotes and non-scriptural citations in their sermon publications if they had wanted to, as evidenced in the printed sermons from the early eighteenth century of the Anglican Arthur Bedford, such as his *Serious Reflections on the Scandalous Abuse and Effects of the Stage*, which also discusses church music.\(^{27}\) In any case, until Dodwell, Anglicans seem to have had no interest in the published academic debate around church music, just as dissenters had little interest in publishing sermons on church music.\(^{28}\)

**III. Appealing to the Congregation for Support of the Church and its Music**

Overtly, these Anglican authors advertise the quality of and defend the use of liturgical music in the Church of England. In the course of their defense of liturgical music and music in general, however, these authors also actively campaign for a return to the Church of England, advertise the Church of England’s support for general (in addition to specifically musical) congregational enjoyment during worship, and propose that reason and common sense are more important than enthusiasm (i.e., revelation) when making religious decisions.

Furthermore, the call for a return to the Church of England is presented more or less uniformly by four authors, all of whom employ a variant of the “just give it a chance and you will see how great it is” argument to entice readers back to the Anglican service. Newte, for example, believes that if dissenters would attend the divine service, they would be cured of their passionate obstinacy and the country could be united again under the “Excellent Service” of the Church of England:

---


But to regulate these [their passions], I must prescribe Church-musick as the best means; and if Mens Prejudices against the Service of our Church, be not too great and unreasonable, which is most to be feared, That being duly and devoutly attended to, will in all possibility effect the Cure. So shall we be brought to live as Brethren, Converse as Neighbours, and go up to the House of God as Friends; there jointly to partake of the great Blessings and Benefits of our Excellent Service … by this means we shall be brought to mind the same things, to walk the same way, and at last arrive at the same happiness and blessed Society of Saints.\(^{29}\)

Estwick also believes that dissenters would be more inclined to the divine service, or at least stop backbiting it, if they would come and try it for themselves:

> I could wish for the good of their souls, that they would come to our Churches, and try whether it [church-music] is a fault or not; and then it might be hop’d we might keep them there, at least, give ‘em no just cause to forsake our Assemblies.\(^{30}\)

For Brady and Hickman, the analogy of consonant harmony and musical unity illustrate the necessity for liturgical unity within the kingdom through a return to the Church of England. According to Brady, peace and unity will bring about a delightfully pleasing melody unto the ears of God:

> Peace that banisher of discord, that mother of harmony, that band of union to consenting minds … O! That all the several parties in this Kingdom, however, formerly divided by interest or design, would resemble the Trumpeters and Singers in the Text! That they were as one! that they would make one sound to be heard … How delightful a melody, would this consort of Brethren that dwell together in unity, make in the Ears of God.\(^{31}\)

Similarly, Hickman believes that church music itself has the potential to remove the dissonance of dissenter antipathy and unite the kingdom in one tone of liturgical unity:

> But yet musick one would think might reconcile them [dissenters]; if they had ears to hear, their hearts would be affected too, and they could not longer hold out in this harsh, jarring, ungrateful distance, but would fall in with the general tone, and join in a friendly consort with their brethren.\(^{32}\)

---

\(^{29}\) Newte, 36-44.


\(^{31}\) Nicholas Brady, *Church-Musick Vindicated* (London: Wilde, 1697), 16-18.

The pleasant unity described above is compounded by all eight authors through repeated emphasis on the perspective that worship should be enjoyable, especially in contrast with the dissenter insistence on enthusiasm/austerity. By making the Church of England the pleasant alternative to the scowling dissenter sects, these authors are not only attempting to justify the enjoyment of music as an integral element of the liturgy, but they are also advertising the pleasant atmosphere of the divine service in an attempt to increase congregational attendance. Hickman, for example, makes the contrast explicit, saying that he does not doubt that music would be called profane by many zealous pretenders of our age, who think that our God is to be served, just as some idolaters worship theirs; with painful convulsions of body, and unnatural distortions of face, and all the dismal solemnities of a gloomy soul, and a dejected countenance. But God be thanked, we are otherwise instructed in my text, which teaches us, that these violent strains of devotion are as contrary to religion, as to nature: and therefore commands us to serve the Lord with gladness. Indeed gladness is the only qualification which makes our services acceptable unto God. ‘Tis only a cheerful, a free-will offering, in which he delights; and out worship is never so grateful unto him, as when it is pleasing to our selves. 

Brady also believes that “Religion, however mistaken or misinterpreted by some, is the most entertaining thing in Nature … and therefore nothing has done her a greater prejudice, nothing has more hindered her diffusiveness and efficacy, than the false draughts made of her by some sort of people, who would have her to consist in moroseness and austerity.”

Even those authors who do not present a direct contrast with some form of dissenter ideology cast enjoyment as a fundamental benefit and necessity of worship. Estwick, for example, believes that sensible pleasure ensures “that at the same time he [a good Christian] is gratify’d and delighted, he may be better’d and improv’d by it in Holy and Vertuous Living.”

---
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Likewise, Towerson believes that joy is “A passion, which religion doth not only not forbid, but enjoyn upon us, and commend to us.”36 Sherlock argues “That Praise and Thanksgiving is the most excellent part of Worship, because this is the Religion of Heaven, and therefore ought to be the chief Delight and Entertainment of those who hope to go to Heaven.”37 He is also careful, however, to point out that while music is an important part of praising God, it must be tied to devotion for it to be beneficial: “As for Hearers, they ought also to consider, That their business at Church is, not meerly to be Entertained with Musick, but to Exercise their Devotions, which is the true End of Church-Musick … It is a Contempt of Religion, and of the House of God, to come only to please our Ears.”38 If his audience keeps this in mind and turns “the Delights and Charms of Musick, into the Raptures of Devotion” it will “most effectually silence all the Enemies of Church-Musick, and Cathedral-Worship.”39

While these authors believe unanimously that worship should be enjoyable, and therefore excite the passions (Sherlock discusses this point at length), they are against the use of enthusiasm when making religious decisions. Instead, they suggest the use of reason, which dissenters, such as Thomas Manton (the prominent Puritan minister), directly opposed. Richard Claridge quotes Manton in his An Answer to Richard Allen’s Essay from 1697 as support for his argument in favor of enthusiastic revelation over reason: “Reason is not the judge of controversies in religion … the matters of God are not to be determined by the dictates of

36 Towerson, 7-8.
38 Ibid., 23.
39 Ibid., 3-4.
Nature.” Towerson, for example, appeals consistently to his reader’s reason to support his arguments and suggests reason be a guide when making religious decisions:

But as if we be well assured of the good will of him that is to fill us [with joy], as well as of his calling upon us to get our selves filled with it, we cannot doubt of his chalking out ways, whereby we may come to be filled with it; so we shall find, if we consult the scripture, or our own Reason, what those ways and means are.

Here the reader may choose either the scripture or his own reason because either one will lead him to the correct conclusion of what means are proper to fill him with the joy with which God wants his people to be filled.

Likewise, Hickman believes that reasonable people will naturally choose the proper type of joy that will satisfy God:

And this may teach us the difference, between the joy of a godly, and a worldly man. The one chooses such a joy as is agreeable to his nature, and at the same time consistent with his religion: such as his reason recommends, and his God approves … Whereas the other, looks no higher for his satisfaction, than to his senses; and no farther, than to the present time … If his senses are but gratified, he cares not though it disgusts his reason and offends his God.

Reason is again presented as an indispensable guide for proper worship; it not only recommends the proper joy, but becomes disgusted if that proper joy is not chosen. Hickman also makes a point of telling his readers that following their senses will only lead them to worldly pleasures.

---
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that cannot last. Indeed, Hickman confesses that “we talk much of a rational way of worship; and ‘tis fit indeed that Reason should direct the way.”

Furthermore, by transposing the reason/enthusiasm dichotomy onto the Anglican/dissenter dichotomy, and by offering reason-based arguments throughout their works, these Anglican authors also hope to convince their readers that the Church of England is the common-sense choice for religious affiliation and that all the ceremonies that have taken root in the liturgy of the Church of England were retained because of their reasonable nature. Towerson, for example, attempts to prove that instrumental music, and other additions to the liturgy, ought to be allowed in church because common sense dictates that beneficial things should be utilized:

But, I will however, to silence, if possible, the clamours of unreasonable men, make it appear to have a sufficient foundation in that Reason which is common to us all, and which as it had a being long before the Law of Moses, so will continue of force, as long as we our selves shall: that, I mean, which persuades the use of such things in the worship of God, as may be serviceable to it, or helpful to the Devotions of those that have a part in it.

Here Towerson highlights his ongoing argument that only unreasonable people are unable to see the value and superiority of the Church of England and its ceremonies.

Brady likewise supports his defense of music with the argument that it would be unreasonable to think that God would allow improper practices to continue if they were in fact offensive to him, especially because angels perform music in heaven. He also insists that God would not allow his people to be led astray by those individuals (both ancient and modern) who are properly endorsed by their theological educations and divine connection:

Unless therefore we will unreasonably imagine, that God would be so far wanting to his best beloved servants, as to suffer them to go on in a sinful coarse, without giving them any notice of the error they lay under; unless we will blasphemously suppose him so unfaithful to us, as to suffer us to be deluded by those who come

43 Ibid., 15.
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Only unreasonable people will blasphemously assert that music, and the other ceremonial practices of the Church of England by extension, is unlawful; God has had so many opportunities to express his disapproval of them that his silence must serve as proof of his consent.

In addition to being frequently cited in a positive light, reasonableness was also a quality that these authors expected their readers to desire and appreciate as highly as they did themselves. Newte, for example, attempts to convince his readers of the value of instrumental music by claiming that the use of it in the liturgy will make the congregation more reasonable: “Thus instrumental is musick to make us most knowing, as well as most devout. Our reason too, will reap a great benefit by it, and we shall become the more rational, and have a clearer insight into the things above, by being awakened thereto, in the service of God, with stringed instruments and organs.” Therefore, the music of the divine service will not only bring one closer to God, it will also improve one’s reasoning skills and make one more knowledgeable (perhaps we should give Newte credit for discovering an early version of the “Mozart effect”?

Finally, that these works were part of a larger Anglican campaign to inspire a return to the Church of England is evidenced by an examination of the other pamphlets that were being published by Anglican authors during the 1690s. The Religious Conference Between a Minister and Parishioner (1696) by Charles Leslie, for example, attempts to call parishioners back to the Church of England by arguing for the lawfulness of infant baptism within an engaging, easy to

45 Brady, 10.
46 Newte, 27.
understand, twenty-nine-page dialogue. Leslie’s goal of greater unity is made obvious by the
Minister and Parishioner in the first exchange of the dialogue:

P. … I have often wish’d my self and this parish under your Ministry again; it
might have been a means under God to have kept some of us from falling from
the Church into divers errors, and particularly that of opposing infant baptism.
M. I am mightily concern’d to hear such opposers of truth do increase in these
parts.
P. So am I to see it, and to tell you that one of your flock, who was a constant
attendant on your publick prayers, preaching, and holy sacrament, has been lately
dipt by them; and others I fear are like to follow.
M. This grieves my very soul, the good God put a stop to this spreading contagion.
P. And pray sir lend your helping hand to cure it.
M. I shall readily and freely do it by satisfying your doubts, or answering any
puzzling questions you shall propose about it.  

Dissenters, who are styled here as opposition to the truth, have turned even those parishioners
who previously loved the prayers and sacraments of the Church of England away from the
Church through misinformation, and it is the purpose of the Minister and Parishioner’s dialogue
to clear up the misinformation and call these lost sheep back to the fold while reaffirming one of
the core ceremonies of the Church of England.

As with reunification, other Anglican authors also advertised the joyful quality of the
service and the importance of happiness as a key part of Anglican worship at the same time that
they were defending other facets of the Anglican liturgy. William Beveridge for example, in his
A Sermon Concerning the Excellency and Usefulness of the Common-Prayer (1696), argues that
the church is a place devoted specifically to the glory of God and to the congregation’s happiness:

But if it can be fully made out, that the service, which is here to be performed,
doeth highly conduce to the advancement of God’s glory and your happiness, the
great ends wherefore such places [churches] are erected, then you cannot but
acknowledge … that this day wherein the said service is begun to be performed in
it, is one of the most joyful days that this parish ever saw.

47 Charles Leslie, Religious Conference between a Minister and Parishioner (London: Churchil, 1696), 3-4.
48 William Beveridge, A Sermon Concerning the Excellency and Usefulness of the Common-Prayer (London:
Manship, 1696), 3.
Here again, while principally arguing for the lawfulness and benefit of an element of the Anglican liturgy, Beveridge advances the Anglican perspective on joy and happiness as being integral to the worship of God, just as all of the Anglican church-music pamphlet authors do.

Similarly, appeals to reason orient and inform the arguments and perspectives of additional Anglican authors who were principally arguing for the lawfulness and usefulness of Anglican liturgical practices. For example, Thomas Beverly, in his *A Discourse Being the Substance of Several Sermons in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper* (1696), intended not only to “win mens souls to the outward observation” of the holy communion, but also to open their minds to the “spirituality and the reasonableness of divine things.” If successful, Beverly would not only convince his readers that the communion ceremony is necessary, but also reorient or strengthen their thought process as one based on Anglican reason rather than dissenter passion.

**IV. Conclusion**

The Anglican pamphlets discussed in this chapter are neither simple pro-music pamphlets nor independent, unrelated works. They focus on defending church music because it is an integral part of the liturgy of the Church of England, and in doing so they contribute to a larger campaign by Anglican authors to defend the Church of England and encourage average readers to return to the Church. This larger Anglican campaign has yet to be researched in depth, however, and while the evidence above suggests that a general, pro-Anglican pamphlet campaign did exist and was ongoing throughout the decade, its full extent remains unknown and deserves additional scholarly inquiry.

---

While it may seem odd that these authors do not overtly identify the revival of the Church as a goal of their works, doing so would not have been advantageous. If these works had been presented any more overtly as apologies for the Church of England, then they would have run the risk of being either too general or too lengthy to successfully compel average readers to agree or engage with them. By concentrating their pamphlets on specific elements of the liturgy, however, Anglican authors of church-music pamphlets and the above-mentioned pamphlets on the *Book of Common Prayer* and the sacrament of communion were able to divide the larger argument into constituent claims that defend the Church of England while retaining the brevity that would ensure a larger readership.
Conclusion

The history of music as propaganda in early modern England, in general, presents us with the following contours. While chapter two focuses closely on the use of music by Elizabethan and early Jacobean musicians to defend themselves from association with minstrels, it also discusses some of the earliest examples of printed music propaganda from England. Music and propaganda must have already been connected in the culture of early modern England, because so many examples appear so soon after the print market developed, and there was no significant change, no evident trial and error, in the way music was used as propaganda during the century, though music gained an additional symbolic use during the civil wars and Interregnum periods. Indeed, I have shown propaganda to be present in even the earliest examples from this period, such as Thomas Whythorne’s 1571 *Triplex*, in a form that is practically identical to that of propaganda in, for example, Grabu’s score for *Albion and Albanius* from 1687: both use prefatory material to comment on the contents of their works in a propagandistic way.

Generally, we can also see that printed music was intimately connected to the maintenance of political power throughout the early modern period, even if it is difficult to identify sustained campaigns for any one given political purpose. Chapters three, four, five, and six of this dissertation discuss this connection between music and political power in depth and show that a variety of ideological groups or political groups were willing to use music to advance their political goals. Even Puritans, whose Calvinist perspective placed narrow restrictions on the use of music in practice, used the idea of music as a means to support the establishment of their new religious and cultural orthodoxy during the Interregnum.
I have also shown, through chapters three and four, that music became a political symbol at precisely the time when religion became not just ideologically divisive but politically divisive and representative as well. As a gulf began to form between the supporters of Charles I and supporters of Parliament before the English Civil Wars, religion became an inseparable facet of the debate. Parliamentarians used it as a brush with which to paint Arminians—and Royalists by extension—as papists, and Royalists used it to paint Parliamentarians as radical, divisive, and factious. Music then became a symbol of these two religious perspectives and of the political groups so intimately tied to each religious group, as discussed in chapter three. This trend continued in the Interregnum, as discussed in chapter four, with mainstream Puritans casting nonconforming Protestant sects as radical and divisive because they opposed psalm singing, while sectaries accused Puritans of conscience-forcing and corruption. The Restoration, with its focus on monarchy and monarch, saw a shift away from the use of music as a political symbol, though political propaganda was still conveyed through discussions and publications of sacred music and music in general.

In summary, printers, authors, and their sponsors utilized printed music during the seventeenth century in England as propaganda in the following general ways. They used it as a way to defend themselves, their identity groups, their ideologies, and the leaders of their political groups. They used it as a way to support their political groups when they were in power and to bring those groups to power. They used it to silence their political opponents and characterize them as distasteful or dangerous. They used it to maintain their culture and to establish new cultural orthodoxies. And, in all cases they used it in an attempt to gain support from the general public and manipulate public opinion. I have shown throughout this work, in other words, that
printed music propaganda in early modern England served every major function of political propaganda and therefore represents a significant facet of the political, literary, and propaganda history of early modern England.

Furthermore, in service of the many functions mentioned above, printed music conveyed propaganda in a remarkably consistent way throughout the century. Not only were specific genres used consistently across the century, but they were often used consistently by the same political group(s). Political texts were set to music and published by Royalist musicians in every period. Political allegories were likewise written into musical dramas and set by Royalist musicians from the Jacobean era onward. Brief or extensive political allusions were inserted into the prefatory materials of works from across the political spectrum—from Quakers to Puritans to Royalists—and over the entire period of 140 years covered here.

Similarly, Puritans and Royalists alike made propagandistic use of broadside ballads. Puritans dominated the publication of pro-psalm singing propaganda, but Royalists also turned psalm singing to propagandistic use. Interestingly enough, pamphlets on music only served a politically propagandistic purpose when they focused on the topic of sacred music. Like prefatory propaganda, pamphlets on sacred music were written by all major political/religious groups. Unlike prefatory propaganda, however, they were only published from the 1640s onward.

This dissertation makes a number of important and valuable contributions to our understanding of music, politics, and propaganda in early modern England. Propaganda is a powerful cultural force, and by examining music’s role in influencing culture through propaganda, we can better understand a significant use and cultural aspect of music. This is especially true of historical periods in locations that were marked by intense political strife and
upheaval, such as early modern England. Therefore, this work helps us to understand an important facet of the use of music in a time period and location that established the foundations of modern media and propaganda.

As the first work to connect all of the diverse genres of music publication created during this period and examine how they were used throughout the entire century to influence the hearts and minds of the English people, this dissertation not only sets a foundation for future research in the area, but it also helps to prevent the potential misunderstandings that can occur when these works are examined in a narrow context. Contemporaries, after all, did not have a conception of one genre or another as being elevated and apolitical; every genre was potentially political as far as it could be of use. Therefore, compartmentalization in scholarly works can be misleading, because propaganda exists, like any aspect of culture, within a network of other cultural artifacts, events, and ideas. Without an understanding of the contexts for which an examination of multiple genres allows, scholars can unintentionally ignore or misrepresent the scope, significance, or even meaning of the works they are examining. One scholar evidences this when she misidentifies the characters in *Newes from Pauls*, discussed in chapter three, as “the Catholic protagonist, ‘Purple,’ [and] the zealous Protestant, ‘Orange-Tawny.’”¹ My work offers scholars a launching point for connecting the currently fragmented landscape of music and politics research into a unified area of scholarly inquiry.

The examination of the beginnings of the music printing industry in chapter two of this work has also proven that propaganda was immediately and consistently attached to music and conveyed through music. Indeed, my work here has also expanded our understanding of the

connections between music printing and politics in the Interregnum, which is especially significant considering that it was during this period that John Playford is popularly known to have independently revived music printing in England. I have attempted here to contribute to the scholarly literature on the revival of music printing by showing how that revival was intimately linked to music propaganda.

I have also shown that, at least in early modern England, music and politics existed symbiotically. Music was not simply a vehicle for propaganda, but it also served as a political symbol at times, which is a fact that has never been clearly articulated before this dissertation. While scholars have noted that ideas about church music were divided according to political parties, they have never before shown that music was active in the formulation of political identities and the manipulation of the beliefs of large segments of the population. The compilation of more contemporary statements regarding the use of music as propaganda than any other work to date is another accomplishment of this dissertation. Even if scholars utilize this work solely for its consistent exposition of how music was seen during this period as an effective means to manipulate people, then this work will have added great value to our understanding of the conception of and use of music in early modern England.

Considering how important texts are to the musical culture of early modern England, with song being far more frequently printed than instrumental compositions, it is surprising that no scholars have previously applied the extensive literature on propaganda in early modern England to musical texts. Such an application has, however, been attempted here. Although there has been a considerable amount of scholarship on broadside ballads and masques/opera as they relate to politics, this dissertation has also broken new ground in the areas of scholarship on pamphlets on
music, sermons on music, and on the propagandistic implications of whole networks of music collections, and it thereby expands on previous scholarship that has focused on individual collections or individuals and their connections to politics.

As I wrote at the beginning of this work, music was everywhere in seventeenth-century English daily life. I have shown that where music was in early modern England, so too was propaganda. Now, at the end of this work, it seems appropriate to revise this first sentence: music propaganda was everywhere in seventeenth-century English daily life.
Appendices

Appendix for Chapter 3

Example 1, page 54 from the anonymous *Ladensium 'AYTOKATAKRISIS, The Canterburians* of 1640.

(94)

1. Montag. antid. pag. 28. Verbumum est

3. That the church of England (they take that church commonly by a hudge mistake, for their own prevalent faction therein) doeth not only keep innumerable images of Christ, and the Saints in the most eminent and conspicuous places of their Sanctuaries; but also daily erect a number of new, long, and large ones, very curiously drested, and that herein they have reason to rejoice and glory, above all other reformed Churches; (m) 4. That these their manifold images, they use not only for ornament, but also to be books to the Laicks, both for their instruction and kindling of their affections to piety, zeal, charity, imitation of the Saints;

Studley in his glass for schismatics about the end, tells us, that he knew a Churchwarden for the taking downe of a crost, which he conceived to have beene by his neighbours idolized, to have at his swine toicken with madneffe, and therafter the man in desperation to have drowned himselfe: Whence he exhorts all men to beware to much as to cenfure their aneceffors of idolatry, for erecting such monuments of their devotion (m) Montag. antid. pag. 24. Haretici nequaquam a te conferunt deherni innumerales imagines, prefertim vero levis Christi redemptoris crucifixi, etiam in templorum cryptis, & latarum in parochis, & fenestrae eorum rament non adoram. Ibid. pag. 26. Nos autem non idola conscripimus, ut cuncta Theodoreto loqua, impugnamus, & progenientur. Sine apud nos quod ali quos dicentum frequentissime imagines in Ecclesias per saltos, ut vocant, Canonicium, per fenestras, ambones, caertas, tellumenta, & isla suavissima. Pokling. altare pag. 87. In my lord of Lincolne private chappell, are to bee leene beside the altar, most richlie furnisht clothe to the wall under the east window, many goodly pictures which can not but frick the beholders with thoughts of piety, and devotion at their entrance into so holy a place, as the picture of the passion, and likewife of the holy apostles, together with a fair crucifix, and our blessed Lady, and S. John set up in painted glasse in the east window, just over the holy table, or sacred altar. So that I must say, That who so lives in this diocese, must bee condemned of great impieties, that will defert his Lord, and not follow him giving a precedent of such devotion, to conformable of the rubrick of our Church.

Heylens anfwere, page 174. For your particular instances, in the cathedrals of Durbane, Britou, Paulis, &c. the most that you except against, are things of ornament, which you are grieved to see now more rich or costly, nor they have
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dance; one of which said, that he had beene to doe his duty: that is, he had been at singing Service, that they there use, and now sayes he, I am come to doe my duty to keep the Organs; and there he, with the rest, stood like a company of fooles, to keepe them from danger, which none that I doe know, had any minde to hurt.

And sayes another, what rogues are these that dare offer to pull downe the Organs; for sayes he, if I doe but goe into Church and say my prayers, and heare the Organs goe, they make the water runne downe my cheeks, they are so good and so sweet a musick. Thus good Reader, thou maist see how these men are rock’d and lull’d asleep by this musickke, which have indeed lull’d many one asleep in ignorance. There is one Trew that is a constant hearer of this musick, and he faith, that he findeth great comfort by it, how will he doe when it be put downe? as I hope it will ere long: Thus are many lull’d asleep in Romish ignorance, (as the Papists say) the mother of devotion, which is I thinke all the devotion that many (if not all of them) use; and these are the effects that the Pipes produce.

In the fourth place there were the Musquetiers, ready charged with bullers; and one of them had in his Musket a bullet split in parts for to shoot the Apprentises when they come (say they:) Thus they stood all the day long shooting, and threatening the Rebels that dare come to pull downe their Organs, when as the Apprentises had no intent to come, but were at home about their masters occasions; and did not intend to soule their fingers about such a company of rake-thames: and thus they stood like so many Abrahaam Ninnies, doing nothing but tell how many Crowes flew over the pinnacle.

And in the fift place there was the Holbardiars, they kept centinell, expecting to runne their Holbards in any A 3 bodies
Of the Ancient gesture.

Example 3, page 80 from *A Dispute Against the English-Popish Ceremonies*, 1637.
Example 4, page 3 from *Newes from Pauls*, 1642. Notice how much less text is on the page when compared to example 3.

(3)

belongs to the last, one sin supports another, but pray tell me moderately, what particular hindrances to devotion are Organ's, that you hold them so contemptible, that without respect of time, place, Law or equity, you dare (to the disturbance of Divine Service) attempt such riots?

O. Surely thou speakest like a Purple Papist, thou leadest thy life like Lunsford, and Robert is thy Ruler.

P. Thou leadest thy life so lawless, that no man is thy Ruler; one of your factious cruel and I having such a disputition, gave me a sufficient proof why Organ's were detestable, and not sitting to be suffered, but thou hast rendered me none at all.

O. And what was our Brothers answer?

P. He said, the sweetness of the musick lull'd him into so sweet a sleep, that another by him (inspired with the spirit of providence) stole away his hat and Bible, for which disaster he verily thought Organ's were ordained to no other or no better purpose, but to give assistance to pilferers, and such as come not to pray to God, but prey upon their neighbours.

O. And verily, a sound reason, but short of mine; for whilst I was sleeping, one stole away my wife.

P. Is that all? I would never have been so violent against the Organ's for so small a cause, surely I should rather love Organ's the better all the dayes of my life, that should rid me of so great a trouble.

O. Surely, so should I, had I not been troubled with her againe, but the chiefe cause why we condemne their musick is because we know not what they sing, or what they say, but in a tedious winter morning, whilst they are singing, and blowing of the Organs, wee
Example 5, page 7 from *The Soundheads Description of the Roundhead*, 1642.

(7)

Bare nothing but oaths, curses, railings, bawdry every moment.

His hands and feet ever in one quarrell or other, or employed in some brothell-house in the lustfull embraces and hellish clasings of some of his filthy and uncleane Mistresses, and whorish Ladies, till he returns home lame full of the heavy disease by the vulgar sort called the Poxe.

And thus you have the integralls of this Roundhead described, from the particular causes producing a Roundhead, which in plaine terms and few words is this: The evil heart & manners of the men bring them to the Poxe, the Poxe eates of their naturall haire, and so they become Roundheads.

And thus went the haire away, the Gentleman becomes bald, his wits here going first away, and a very little returning to him (upon the cure in part wroughe) he consults with the artificialists and excremationalists of the time, that he may bring up a new fashion to make Perriwig Gentlemen.

And so we passe to the uniting of the third knot; which is:

3. The reall properties and peculiarities of a Roundhead, whereby he may be notoriously knowne and seen by any judicious observant eye.

And these properties are not a few, but so many as we shall really collect and compare within the compass of this short Discourse, we shall endeavour to give the world information of.

The Gentleman Roundhead being now created and formed by those former producing causes; now you shall see him fashioned in all his excremational perfections.

The which, I will comprize under these five heads, and so finish the Discourse.

He may be described

1. By his cloathing.
2. By his posture.
3. By his discourse or language.
4. By his associates, and his bastard brood.
5. By his actions.

First, for his clothing, a singular property, he loves rich clothing, and borowes of all Nations a severall dreffe & attire, he hath infinite mind for change of rayment, as the haires of his Perriwig be infinite and past numbering.

Therefore we must begin to reckon from the first artificial haire in his Perriwig, to the last artificial stitch in the foale of his Bootes hold, hold, hold, what have we said, we must begin there, we must give our selves
Example 6, page 2 from *The Holy Harmonie*, 1643.

and all instruments of Musick, D. N. 3. 7. were arranum appointed as Violls
to the adoration of those living statues to a dead image, as if the eare must
be roused before the heart, or as if mens devotions were like Bucks, Borets
or Hares, not to be roused without hollowings, hornes, and hounds, or as if
men had slept all night in a strange lodging, and were to be awakened the
next morning by the Weights of the townne, with good morrow to your
Worship, certain that zeal is halfe dead the six days, that must have all
that stirre to awaken his nap the seventh; certainly this is no holy Har-
mony.

Me thinks it affeect that holy pastime, and devout devisor of Eliahu used
to the Priests of Baal, when he was by the convincing, and converting of
Irael, to confound them, 1. King. 18. 27. Crie aloud, (sayes he ) for lo! a
God, either he taketh or purfeth his enemies, or is in his journey, or it may be
that he sleepeth, and must be awaked, but this would have been one of the de-
vils fleeting, a great crie and no wooll.

Lazy and sluggishe devotion is cold in operation, holy duties have their
life, and vigour without such secondary assistance as is borrowed from less
thene bellies: what needs such horrid shouts unless it bee to confound the
sweetnes of a hymne? tis hard for the vulgar fort to know the Psalmes
which is cleerely loft by the Organ, and the Quire, well may they admire
the art of the Musician, but not edify themselves; yet many I suppose have
gone to see the praiers, but they could not distinguish by the sound they were
so, yet was this appland by the unholy, for the holiest harmony.

The soule should appeare to God, as God to Moses in a soft, and a still
wind, the holy and sweet sighes, or silent expressions of the soule are most
acceptable, Paul knew the sweetnesse of this still Musick, these heavenly
breathings, and would have preferred one of them before a thousand crowds
of sack utts, this is the holy harmony.

I find the ancient Romans had a kind of Vergers that went before their
solemne processions, to proclaime silence that so there might be no distur-
bance to their devotions, forinde me thinks it had been absurd for a peo-
ple to speak to their God who must of necessity hold his tongue, but the
new Romans being emptier of zeale, have their Organs to rouze theirs, lest
like those in a swoone they should die in a qualme of ardeny, tis the organs
of our selves we should imploy in that service. Poore Hanna obtained a
sonne for never a word speaking, 1 Sam, 1. 13. for Hanna spoke in heart, he
lippes did move only, but her voice was not heard, but mark she that con-
cieved a prayer in her heart, forthwith conceives a son in her wumbs, such

(2)

but long since instituted: It hath been in more estimation in its priority, then in these latter times and decrepit age of the world, more esteemed when it was new and in its minority, then now: It is a maxime of the mad world; too much of one thing is good for nothing: This Probleme seems verified in our time: frequency of benefits not regarded seems tedious and irksome; short and sweet, but too much used is wearisome: it proves so in these times: the constancy of Parliaments made this nation secure, and rest safely in their counsels; but the omission preventing their free intercourse, made the use of them neglected, and of little estimation: for probate of the antiquity of Parliaments, I need not bring many Authors: since William the Conqueror it hath been in use, and the only way in esteem for the preservation of the liberty and immunities of the subjects of England, and before his reign, from King Lucius to Edward the Confessor, Councils both of the Lords and Commons of the Realm hath been summoned to treat of the weighty affairs of the Kingdom, for the safety and protection thereof against foreign force and invasion; yea in the time of the division of this Isle by the Septuagint, or reign of the seven Kings, Councils of this nature in their several jurisdictions have been summoned, and therefore the benefit of Councils have been known before now: I mean, Councils National. But (as I said) the neglect or abuse makes them now of no value, which is the cause (as I conceive) that makes this present Parliament regardless, especially this Nation being grown to that height of careless liberty, and overspread with contrary opinions of the best way for the security thereof, that every man would now be his own judge, what Law and Religion is best to follow and be observed (not looking back to the peaceable times of former ages, when the whole State agreed in one uniformity of law and religion most agreeable to sacred Writ and divine approbation) by which means have accrued these sad disasters and discontents that now this land doth groan under; and having plunged it self into these troubles, will not admit of those medicines that may cure these ills, prescribed and propounded by the Parliament. And now I proceed to the Power and Jurisdiction of that high Court, wherein it will not be amiss to consider of these particulars: viz.
## Appendix A from Chapter 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (*=anthologist and **=author and anthologist)</th>
<th>Title (†=works indexed in Appendix B)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number of Songs in the Collection</th>
<th>Prefatory Elements (D=dedication; W=woodcut; P=preface; L=laudatory poem[s]; I= instructions)</th>
<th>Contains propaganda/is Propagandistic?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*John Playford</td>
<td>The English Dancing Master</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>P (with a woodcut on the title page)</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*John Playford</td>
<td>A Musicall Baquet</td>
<td>1651</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>P, I</td>
<td>Not likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**John Hilton</td>
<td>Catch that Catch Can</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>D, L, P</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*John Playford</td>
<td>A Booke of New Lessons</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>P, I</td>
<td>Not likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*John Playford</td>
<td>†Select Musicall Ayres, and Dialogues</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*John Playford</td>
<td>†The Second Booke of Ayres</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lawes</td>
<td>†Ayres and Dialogues</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>D, P, L (woodcut on the title page)</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*John Playford</td>
<td>†Select Musicall Ayres and Dialogues</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lawes</td>
<td>†The Second Booke of Ayres, and Dialogues</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>D, P, L (woodcut on the title page)</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*John Playford</td>
<td>Court-Ayres</td>
<td>1655</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>D, P</td>
<td>Not likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Locke</td>
<td>Matthew Locke his Little Consort</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Not likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Child</td>
<td>Choise Musick to the Psalms of David</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>Copyists</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gamble</td>
<td>†Ayres and Dialogues</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>W, D, P, L</td>
<td>Not likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Porter</td>
<td>Mottets</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>D, P</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wilson</td>
<td>Psalterium Carolinum</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>D, L</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Lawes</td>
<td>†Ayres, and Dialogues … The Third Book</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>D, L, (woodcut on the title page)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Gamble</td>
<td>†Ayres and Dialogues</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>W, D, L</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*John Playford</td>
<td>†Select Ayres and Dialogues</td>
<td>1659</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>W, P</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B from Chapter 4

#### Song Collection Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Incipit</th>
<th>Propaganda Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. “Like hermit poor”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “Take, o take”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “As I walkt forth”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “She which would”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “Why shouldst thou”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. “I wish no more”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “When thou didst”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. “Come lovers all to me”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. “Thou art not faire”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. “Amidst the mirtles”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. “Faith be no longer”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. “I am confirm’d”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. “How coole &amp; temperate”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. “A lover once I did espy”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. “My Clarisa”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. “Neither sighs”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. “Of the kind boy”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. “She that loves me”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. “If any live that”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. “Tell me you wandering spirit”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. “Bid me but live”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. “Tell me no more her eyes”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. “If the quick spirit”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. “Phillis, why”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. “Victoriuos beauty”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. “How happy art thou”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. “Lay that sullen Garland”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

John Playford, *Select Musicall Ayres, and Dialogues*, 1652
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28. “Fain would I Cloris”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. “I love a lasse”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. “Cloris, false love made”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. “Wer’t thou more”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. “Stay, stay, o stay”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. “Wake my Adonis”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. “Bright Aurelia”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. “Never perswade me to’t”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. “How am I chang’d”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. “Since love hath”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. “About the sweet bag”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. “Cloris, farewell”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. “Let not thy beauty”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. “Come lovely Phillis”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. “A willow garland”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. “Little love serves”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. “By all thy glories”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. “No, no, faire Heretick”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. “Beauty and love”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. “Go, go, and bestride”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. “Fuggi, fuggi, fuggi”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. “To Bacchus we”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. “Quench, quench, in sprightly wine”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Propaganda
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Incipit</th>
<th>Propaganda Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. “Sheephard in faith”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “Come my Daphne”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “Forbeare fond swain”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “Dear Silvia”</td>
<td>Propaganda related to the <em>Lachrymae Musarum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “Did not you once”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A dialogue occasioned by the death of the young Lord Hastings; set by Henry Lawes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “Charon, o gentle Charon”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. “I wish no more”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. “Young &amp; simple though I am”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. “Though I am young”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. “gather your rose buds”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. “Let her give her hand”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. “Not that I wish my mistress”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. “Cloris, farewell”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. “As the sweet breath”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. “O tell me Damon”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title/Incipit</td>
<td>Propaganda Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. “Ariadne sitting upon a rock”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “A complaint against Cupid”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “To his inconstant mistris”</td>
<td>Possible Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “In the person of a lady to her inconstant servant”</td>
<td>Possible Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “To his mistress going to sea”</td>
<td>Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. “The surprise”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “Disdaine returned”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. “To a lady singing”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. “To the same lady, singing the former song”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. “Beauties Excellency”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. “To Amarantha to dishevell her haire”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. “The reform’d lover”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. “The caelestiall mistress”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. “Night and day to his mistress”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. “To his mistress objecting his age”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. “To his mistress upon his going to travell”</td>
<td>Possible Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. “Love above beauty”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. “Mediocrity in love rejected”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. “The selfe banished”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. “The heart entire”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. “The primrose”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. “Coelia singing”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. “Love and loyalty”</td>
<td>Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. “Tun ‘ANACREONTOS’ eis lugan ah”</td>
<td>Possible Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. “Anacreon’s ode” [a translation of the previous song]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. “Desperato’s banquet”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>“To Caelia, inviting her to marriage”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>“Beauty paramount”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>“Youth and beauty”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>“Love and musick”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>“The excellency of wine”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>“An anniversary on the nuptuals of John Earle of Bridgewater, July 22, 1652”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>“Staying in London after the Act for Banishment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>“No constancy in man”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>“beauties eclyps’d”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>“An eccho”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>“A dialogue betwixt Cordanus and Amoret”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>“A dialogue betwixt Time and a Pilgrime”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>“A pastorall dialogue betwixt Cleon and Caelia”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>“A Bachanall”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>“Upon a crown’d heart sent to a cruell mistress”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>“the fickle state of lovers”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>“The power of musick”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>“Chloris taking the ayre”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>“A smile, or frown”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>“The captive lover”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>“To a lady putting off her veile”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>“In priase of his mistress”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>“To a lady weeping”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>“Sing fair Clorinda”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>“Grieve not”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>“A caution to faire ladies”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>“Tavola”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title/Incipit</td>
<td>Propaganda Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. “Like hermit poor”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “Neither sighs, nor tears”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “Thou art not faire for all”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “Why shouldst thou sweare”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “I wish no more thou shouldst love me”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. “When thou didst think I did not love”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “Faith be no longer coy”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. “Victorious beauty”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. “Tell me no more”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. “Go, go and bestride”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. “Of the kind boy”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. “She that loves me”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. “About the sweet bag of a bee”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. “Come lovers all to me”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. “A lover once I did espy”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. “Beauty and love once fell at odds”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. “Bid me but live”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. “By all thy glories”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. “No, no, faire heretick”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. “Tell me you wandering spirits”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. “How coole and temperate”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. “How happ art thou”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. “I am confirm’d a woman can”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. “Phillis, why should be delay”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. “If the quick spirit of your eye”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. “Little love serves my turn”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. “Cloris, farewell, I now must go”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. “Let not thy beauty”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. “Come lovely Phillis”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. “A willow garland”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. “Ladies fly from loves smooth tale”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. “Amidst the mirtles”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. “Cloris false love made Clora weepe”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. “I love a lasse”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. “Wer’t thou more fairer than thou art”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. “Fain would I Cloris”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. “Take, o take”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. “Lay that sullen garland”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. “Wake my Adonis”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. “Stay, stay, o stay”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. “Change Platonicks”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. “When Celia I entent to flatter you”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. “Bright Aurelia, I doe owe”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. “How am I chang’d”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. “Never perswade me to’t”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. “I prethee send me back my heart”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. “Bring back my comfort”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. “Why dearest should you weep”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. “Since love hath in thine &amp; mine eye”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. “I can love for an houre”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. “No more blind boy”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. “Tis but a frown”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. “I will not trust thy tempting”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. “Tell not I dye”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. “Victoria victoria victoria”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. “I prethee keep my sheep”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. “Shepheard in faith I cannot stay”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. “Come my Daphne”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. “Forbeare fond swaine”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. “Vulcan, Vulcan, O Vulcan”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>“Dear Silvia”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>“Did not you once Lucinda vow”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>“Thyrsis, kind swain come near”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>“Charon, o gentle Charon”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>“Con bel se gella de se”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>“I wish no more thou”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>“Let her give her hand”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>“Cloris, farewell, I now must go”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>“Not that I wish my mistresse”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>“O tell me Damon canst thou prove”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>“Wert thou yet fairer”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>“You meaner beauties of the night”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>“Though I am yong”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>“O my Clarissa!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>“Gather your rose buds”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>“In the merry month of May”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>“Welcome to the grove”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>“Musick, musick, thou queen of souls”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>“As the sweet breath”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>“Fine yong folly”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Henry Lawes, *The Second Booke of Ayres, and Dialogues*, 1655

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Incipit</th>
<th>Propaganda Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. “A storme”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “No reprieve”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “Not to be altred from affection”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “Parting”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “Cupids embassie”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. “He would not be tempted”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “A prayer to <em>Cupid</em>”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. “Parting” [a second song with this same title]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. “The rose”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. “Bee not proud”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. “Tell me no more”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. “Loves martyr”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. “leander drownd”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. “Betrayd, by beleefe”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. “O how I hate thee now”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. “Disswation from presumption”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. “A remembrance”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. “To a lady, more affable since the war began”</td>
<td>Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. “Cloris singing”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. “Know <em>Celia</em>”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. “When we were parted”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. “Sufferance”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. “Was it a forme”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. “On his hearing her majesty sing”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. “Tis not ‘ith’ pow’r of all thy scorne”</td>
<td>Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. “Let longing lovers sit and pine”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. “Come <em>Cloris</em>, leave thy wandering sheep”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. “When first I saw fair <em>Doris</em>”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>“And is this all?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>“A false designe to be cruell”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>“Mutuall affection betweene <em>Orinda</em> and <em>Lucatia</em>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>“Disdaine”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>“Parting” [a third song with this same title]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>“An elegiack song”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>“On a pink of sack”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>“A dialogue between a lover and reason” Possible Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>“A dialogue between <em>Phillida</em> and <em>Coridon</em>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>“A pastorall dialogue between two nymphs <em>Amarillis</em> and <em>Daphne</em>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>“Anacreons ode concerning himselfe”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>“Anacreons ode Englished”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>“Hither we come”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>“View <em>Lesbia</em> view”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>“A lover nee I did espie”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>“Among rose buds”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>“In the non-age of a winters day”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>“Call the spring”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>“Fear not”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>“About the sweet bagge of a Bee”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>“Beauties, have ye seen a toy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>“Deare, let mee now this ev‘ning die”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>“Why should great beauties”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>“To God the father”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>“To God the sonne”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>“To God the holy ghost”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>“Orpheus hymn to God”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title/Incipit</td>
<td>Propaganda Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. “The return”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “The answer”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “The tombe”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “Celinda, by what potent art”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “When I lie burning”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. “<em>Favonius</em>, the milder breath o’th spring”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “So fair <em>Aurora</em>”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. “On this swelling bank”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. “I prethee let my heart alone”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. “Love what tyranick laws”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. “Delay: alas there cannot be”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. “Prethee trouble me no more”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. “Roses (loves delight)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. “Foolish lover go and seek”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. “Dear, back my wounded heart restore”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. “Since fate commands me hence”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. “Chide, chide no more”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. “Fool take up thy shaft again”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. “Though when I lov’d thee”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. “When dearest beauty”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. “Think not pale lover”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. “Torment of absence and delay”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. “I will not trust”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. “You that unto your mistress eyes”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. “You earthly souls”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. “See how this violet”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. “Why thy passion should it move”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. “Ask the empress of the night”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. “Dear urge no more the killing”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>“Not that by this disdain I am realeas’d”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>“When deceitful lovers lay at thy feet”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>“He whose active thoughts”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>“No, I will sooner trust the wind”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>“Such icy kisses”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>“That I might ever dream”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>“Roses in breathing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>“Rebellious fools that scorn”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>“Yet ere I go”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>“Cast off for shame”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>“Wert thou by all”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>“Deceiv’d and undeceiv’d”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>“Men and maids at time”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>“I must no longer now admire”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>“Love the ripe harvest”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>“See the spring”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>“Now will I a lover be”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>“Dear fold me once more”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>“Thine eyes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>“Faith ‘tis not worth your pains”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>“Reach me here that full crown’d cup”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>“Oh turn away those cruel eyes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>“Now love be prais’d”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>“To set my jealous soul”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>“Wrong me no more in thy complaint”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>“My sickly breath”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>“Alas! Alas!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>“As when some brook”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>“I languish in a silent flame”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>“Not always give a melting kiss”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>“Whilst our joys”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>“Tis no kiss”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>“As in a thousand wanton curls”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>“When I see the young men play”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>“Now with roses we are crown’d”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>“On this verdant <em>Lotus</em> laid”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>“I yield, dear enemy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>“Draw neer you lovers”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>“I go dear saint”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>“The lazy hours move slow”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>“When on thy lips”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>“The air which thy smooth voyce”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>“<em>Doris</em>, I that could repel”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>“Cast <em>Chariessa</em>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>“Number the sands”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>“This silk worm”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>“Pale envious sickness”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>“Come my dear”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>“When thou thy plyant arms”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>“As on purple carpets”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>“With a whip of lillies”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>“When my sense”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>“Vex no more”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>“Old I am”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>“A kiss I begg’d”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>“Fair rebel to thy self”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>“A dialogue between <em>Chariessa</em> and <em>Philocharis</em>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>“Dialogue II. Between <em>Philocharis</em> and <em>Chariessa</em>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title/Incipit</td>
<td>Propaganda Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. “Cloris landing at Berlington”</td>
<td>Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “Constancy protested”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “Counsel to a maid”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “Love despis’d”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “Hopeless love cur’d by derision”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. “A young maids resolution”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “Cupid no god”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. “Inconstancy return’d”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. “His rivals danger”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. “To his Platonick mistris”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. “Amintors welladay”</td>
<td>Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. “Affection for a lady he never saw”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. “Freedome from charmes”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. “Future hope”</td>
<td>Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. “On a black ribbon”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. “A resolution to love no more”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. “Cupids artillery”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. “A lady to a young courtier”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. “Falshood discovered”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. “Liberty”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. “A pot of flowers presented to Chloris”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. “A doubt resolv’d”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. “To the first object of content”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. “A recantation”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. “A description of Chloris”</td>
<td>Possible Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. “Chloris a constant comfort”</td>
<td>Possible Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. “Inconstancy”</td>
<td>Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. “Amintor’s dream”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. “Chloris dead, lamented by Aminor”</td>
<td>Possible Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. “A dialogue on a kisse”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. “A dialogue between a lover and his friend”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. “A dialogue. Strephon---Amaryllis”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. “A dialogue. Cleander---Floramell”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. “Once Venus cheeks that sham’d the morn”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. “I have prais’d with all my skill”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. “When doth love set forth”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. “Trust the form of ayrie things”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. “Deer, throw that flatt’ring glass away”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. “Do not delay me”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. “If you can find a heart”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. “Sure thou framed were by art”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. “Go Phaebus”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. “I prethee send me back my heart”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title/Incipit</td>
<td>Propaganda Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. “A smile”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “A temptest”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “The rebbel”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “Love surpris’d”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “Admired beauty”</td>
<td>Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. “On Celia”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “Loves theft”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. “A Calme”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. “On man’s frailty”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. “The Haymaker’s song”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. “Advice to Cloris”</td>
<td>Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. “The exile”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. “Loves theft” [different song with same title]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. “A health to Bacchus”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. “Coyness in love”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. “A Schismatick in love”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. “Fortune adored”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. “Loves passion”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. “Love enlightned”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. “Love decyphered”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. “Love disguis’d”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. “Constancy”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. “The cheat”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. “To Phelicia”</td>
<td>Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. “The Presbyters gill”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. “Loves power”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. “The Allegory”</td>
<td>Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. “Sacks vertue”</td>
<td>Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. “To his mistress advising him from wine”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>“The deceiving mistress”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>“How to chuse a mistress”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>“Jealousie”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>“The poor Scholar’s song”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>“Upon recovery of a fit of sickness”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>“A kiss”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>“His mistriss bidding him make another choice”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>“To a mistress that thinks”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>“The country man’s life”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>“To a simple coy mistress”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>“The real drinker”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>“Beauty and love at ods”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>“Natural beauty best”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>“Liberty breeds presumption”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>“The true sack-drinker”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>“Love insatiable”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>“Sacks flavour”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>“The resolve”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>“A dialogue between Cloris and Doris”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>“A dialogue between Lucasta and Alexis”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>“A pastoral dialogue”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>“Lilly contemn’d”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>“Loves charm”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>“The vanity of wealth”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>“Musick being heard”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>“A dialogue between Castadorus and Arabella”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>“A pastoral dialogue”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>“A dialogue between Thirsis and Dorinda”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>“A dialogue between a Shepherd and a Nymph”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>“The contented bachelor”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>“Bushels myners”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Incipit</th>
<th>Propaganda Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61. “Bacchus true adorers”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. “An Epitaphium on the nuptials of Thomas Stanley Esquire”</td>
<td>Possible Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. “Jove sent thee Paris”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**John Playford, *Select Ayres and Dialogues*, 1659**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title/Incipit</th>
<th>Propaganda Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. “A lovers melancholy repose”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. “Cupid’s weak artillery”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. “Love preferring virtue above wealth”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “A strife betwixt two Cupids reconciled”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. “Venus lamenting her lost Adonis”</td>
<td>Possible Propaganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. “To his love answering no”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. “On his loves absence”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. “Beauty clouded with grief”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. “On loves artillery”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. “On the vicissitudes of love”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. “A false designe to be cruel”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. “Constancy in love”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. “On inconstancy”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. “On Womens inconstancy”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. “A resolution to love”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. “A forsaken lovers complaint”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. “At a masque, to invite the ladies to dance”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. “An Italian ayre”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. “A French ayre”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. “Loves scrutiny”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. “No beauty without love”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. “Delayes in love breeds danger”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. “On Caelia’s coynesse”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. “Loves sweet repose”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. “A willow garland sent for a newyeers-gift”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>“Loves victory”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>“Diswasion from presumption”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>“The careless lovers resolution”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>“Disdain”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>“Loves fruition”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>“Loves drollery”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>“Disdain returned”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>“Loves content”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>“To his forsaken mistresse”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>“To a lady singing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>“On a bleeding lover”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>“Two songs in the play of The Royal Slave”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>“Love and musick”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>“A resolution in choice of a mistresse”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>“Inconstancy in love”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>“Discontent”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>“Loves votary”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>“To Aurelia”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>“Loves flattery”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>“To Chloris”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>“Seeming coyness”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>“Loves Bachinall”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>“Platonick love”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>“Love neglected”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>“Lovers wantonnesse”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>“Venus to her Adonis”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>“Loves flattery”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>“Inconstancie in women”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>“A lovers legacy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>“Loves martyr”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>“Amintor for his Chloris absence”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. “Love in calme”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. “Loves shepherdesse”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. “Love without additionals”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. “A frozen heart made warm by love”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. “False love reproved”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. “Loves torrid zone”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. “To his Chloris at parting”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. “Coyness in love”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. “Love possesest”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. “A Lovers resolution”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. “The primrose”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. “Cupid’s embassage”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. “Coridon to his Phillis”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. “On Chloris attractive beauty”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. “Clora forsaken, thus complains”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. “Reciprocal love”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. “On loves deceitful charmes”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. “Beauty a fading ornament”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. “Beauty in eclipse”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. “Cupid detected”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. “Loves flattery”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. “Loves theft”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. “Power of love”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. “A motive to love”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. “On liberty”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. “Beauty and love at ods”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. “Love admits no delay”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. “The Anglers song”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. “On attractive beauty”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. “Power of love”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. “The jovial begger”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Propaganda
Possible Propaganda
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<p>| 88. | “A protest against love” |
| 89. | “The excellency of wine” |
| 90. | “An Italian ayre” |
| 91. | “An Italian ayre for two voyces” |
| 92. | “A dialogue betwixt Phillis and Clorillo” |
| 93. | “A dialogue between Silvia and Thirsis” |
| 94. | “A dialogue between a Shepherd and Lucinda” |
| 95. | “A dialogue between Daphne and Strephon” |
| 96. | “A dialogue between Shepherd and shepherdess” |
| 97. | “A dialogue betwixt an Nymph and a Shepherd” |
| 98. | “a dialogue between Strephon and Phillis” |
| 99. | “A dialogue between Venus and Vulcan” |
| 100. | “A dialogue between Charon and Philomel” |
| 101. | “A dialogue between Thyris and Damon” |
| 102. | “A glee to Bachus” |
| 103. | “A glee, with chorus” |
| 104. | “A glee to the cook” |
| 105. | “The tinker” |
| 106. | “A glee” |
| 107. | “I wish no more” |
| 108. | “Though I am young” |
| 109. | “Chloris taking the ayre” |
| 110. | “When Troy town” |
| 111. | “From the fair Lavinian shore” |
| 112. | “Where the Bee sucks there suck I” |
| 113. | “When love with unconsined” |
| 114. | “Do not fear to put thy feet” |
| 115. | “In the merry month of May” |
| 116. | “O my Clarissa!” |
| 117. | “Gather your rose buds” |
| 118. | “Fear not, dear love” |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>“Fine young folly”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>“Sing fair <em>Clorinda</em>”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>“Smiths are good fellows”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>“Musick, musick, thou queen of souls”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>“See, see, see”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>“Turn <em>Amarillis</em> to thy swain”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>“Now we are met”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Title Pages from Interregnum Song Collections
SELECT
Musical Ayres,
AND
Dialogues,
For one and two Voices, to sing to the Theorbo, Lute, or Basse Viol.

Composed by
John Wilton, Doctours of
Charles Coleman, Musick.
Henry Lawes,
William Webb, Gentlemen.

To which is added some few short Ayres or Songs for three
Voices, to an Instrument.

London, Printed for John Playford, and to be sold at his Shop in the Inner Temple, near the Church doore.

Anno Domini, 1652.
SELECT
Musical Ayres
AND
Dialogues,
in Three Books.

First Book, contains Ayres for a Voyce alone to the Theorbo, or Basse Violl.
Second Book, contains Choice Dialogues for two Voyces to the Theorbo or Basse Violl.
Third Book, contains short Ayres or Songs for three Voyces, so Composed, as they may either be sung by a Voyce alone, to an Instrument, or by two or three Voyces.

Composed by thee several Excellent Masters in Musick, viz.

Dr. John Wilsow, Mr. Nicholas Lanuere,
Dr. Charles Colman, Mr. William Smerigli,
Mr. Henry Lawes, alias Catesby,
Mr. William Lawes, Mr. Edward Colman,
Mr. William Webb, Mr. Jeremy Bassil.

LONDON,
Printed by T. H. for John Playford, and are to be sold at his Shop, in the Inner Temple, near the Church doore. 1653.
THE SECOND BOOK
OF
AYRES,
AND
DIALOGUES,
For One, Two, and Three Voyces.
BY

LONDON,
Printed by T. H. for J. Ploegford, and are to be sold at his shop in the Inner Temple, 1655.
AYRES
AND
DIalogues
(To be Sung to the Theorbo-Lute or Base-Violl:)

By
JOHN GAMBLE.

Horat. Od. 3. 10.
quidem eihora taceamus
Sustine Musaeum, neque semper arcum
Teode Apoll.

LONDON,
Printed by William Godbid, for the Author,
1656.
MOTTETS
OF TWO VOYCES

FOR TReBLE or TENOR and BASS.

With the CONTINUED BASS or SCORE:
To be performed to an Organ, Harpsichord, Lute or Basi-Viol.

PUBLISHED
By WALTER PORTER,
Who was one of the Gentlemen of the Royal Chappel of the late King, and Master of the Choristers at Westminister.

BASSO CONTINUO.

LONDON,
Printed by WILLIAM GODBID for the Author.
1657.
Appendix A for Chapter 6

Example 1, pages 15-16 of Towerson’s *A Sermon Concerning Vocal and Instrumental Musick in the Church* from 1696.
Some Brief Remarks on

Ringing of Bells, and as touching Obedience to Mense Traditions, they received and allowed all those Ordinances which serve for Order, Decency, and Reverence of the Ministry. But as for other Ceremonies which have been brought into the Church of God, either as a part of Divine Service, or to merit Remission of Sins, or else to bind men's Consciences, because they are mere repugnant to the Word of God, they could by no means receive them.

From whence we may observe, that however those Waldenses complied with Circumstantial Things, respecting the Reverence of the Ministry, yet they could not bear with any Ceremonies brought into the Church of God as part of Divine Service; and except they might be proved by the Sacred Scriptures, they counted them mere repugnant to the Word of God, so all Worship is not required therein.

See Mr. H. D. his Treatise of Bagism, pag. 337, "Three Waldenses (as Mr. Henry Dakers states) by the Learned Usher, and many of our Protestant Writers, owned to have been the Truth of the Church, and from whom the Protestants derive, in opposition to the Papacy; and hence these words, viz. We esteem for an Abomination, and as Antichristian, all Humane Inventions, and trouble and prejudice to the liberty of the Spirit."

And in Mr. Henry Dakers his Treatise of Baptism, p. 285, we have an Account of the Principles and Doctrines of that Eminent Servant and Confessor of Jesus Christ, Mr. John Wickeff.
An Answer to Richard Allen's Essay by Richard Claridge, 1697.

68 Hymneo primarily and properly

hath it, Controu. of Singing, &c. p. 15.) because he not only renders it himself by Laudente, Gratias agere, Hymnum discere, to Praise; but also quite the Vulgar Latin, the Arabick Version, & No.

The Signification of ιωνος, Hymnum, shall be spoken to hereafter. And as for the Marginal Citation in Leigh's Critick, Canere, &c. & laude, &c. This may serve for an Answer; he vouches no Authority for it, as he doth for the other Readings.

"R. A. Symson in his Lexicon, puts down as the Primary, and so the Proper Signification, [ Hymnum, Hymnos cano ] to Sing an Hymn, or Hymns. Appendix, ibid.

Answ. He puts down Hymnum, Hymnos cano, to Sing an Hymn, or Hymns; but doth not say, as the Primary Signification: For he hath also Hymno ditto, I speak an Hymn, and Speaking is surely prior to Singing; for there must be Speech, before there can be an Artificial Modulation of it. And Laudo, I Praise; and when he puts down the Greek Words, to Sing, he puts ιωνος, ιωνος, Adon, Pailo; not ιωνος, Hymneo.

"R. A. Constantine also, in his Greek Lexicon, sets down as the Primary and Proper Signification, [ Dico Hymnum, Hymnos cano ] to Sing an Hymn, or Hymns, and thence derives [ ιωνος, Cantator, Poeta ] a Singer, &c.

"Post. Appendix, ibid.

Answ.

1. Dico Hymnum, is not truly and properly trans.

2. Constantine thence derives [ ιωνος, Hymneus, Laudo ] a Praisin, and [ ιωνος, Hymnus, Laudo ] a Praiser; and not [ Cantator, Poeta ] a Singer, a Poet.

He likewise hath ιωνος, ιωνος, Hydro, Hymno, Laudo, I Praise, before he sets down Cæno, I Sing. And ιωνος, ιωνος, Herodas, in Constan. And after they, they were Praised.

And ιωνος μη και ιωνος ιωνος, De cæno de Senculatur, mis vivibus præcito, I Praise mine strenght. ibid.

The Author of the Reflections on J. M's. Appendix to his Treatise, Entituled [ Preliminary Forms, &c. ] at the End of B. Keach's Book, concerning Singing, and referred to by R. A. Edin., p. 18, acknowledgeth a Difference between Singing, and Sining or Pronouncing an Hymn, according to Constantine, not Confounding (as R. A. doth) Dico Hymnum, and Hymnum cano. And the Reason which he gives, why ιωνος, Hymneo, is used for Sining or Pronouncing an Hymn, contributes more than probably he was aware of, to the clearing up of its Primary Signification. "The Reason may be, saith he, because Sining or Pronouncing is not necessarily included in Singing; for Singing is but a particular Mode of Saying or Pronouncing: Reflection, p. 59. For if it be so, then it will necessarily follow, seeing Hymneo is used both to Say or Pronounce, and to Sing an Hymn, (which later Rendring he sets down first, and the other last, inverting
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Chronological List of Pamphlets with a Titular or Significant Focus on Church Music, 1586-1711.

1. 1586: John Case, *The Praise of Musicke*
2. 1637: Humphrey Sydenham, *Sermons upon Solemne Occasions*
3. 1641: T. L., *True Newes from Norwich*
4. 1641 and 1643: Peter Smart, *A Short Treatise of Altars, Altar-Furniture, Altar-Cringing, and Musick*
5. 1642: *Newes from Pauls*
6. 1642: *The Organs* [sic] *Funerall*
7. 1643: *The Holy Harmony*
8. 1644: Nathanael Homes, *Gospel Musick*
11. 1645 and 1660: Richard Portman, *The Soules Life*
12. 1647 and 1650: John Cotton, *Singing of Psalms a Gospel Ordinance*
13. 1653 and 1659: Thomas Ford, *Singing of Psalms the Duty of Christians*
15. 1655: Christopher Atkinson, *Davids [sic] Enemies Discovered*
16. 1655: George Whitehead, *Cain’s Generation Discovered*
17. 1656: Jonathan Clapham, *A Short and Full Vindication of...Singing of Psalms*
18. 1658: Samuel Chidley, *Bells Founder Confounded*
19. 1658: Humphrey Smith, *To the Musicioners*
20. 1660: Joseph Brookbank, *The Well-Tuned Organ*
21. 1661: Joseph Bentham, *the Right of Kings by Scripture...Together with, A Defense of Psalm-Singing*
22. 1661: H. D. M. A., *A Sober and Temperate Discourse, Concerning the Interest of Words in Prayer...Together with...the Utility of Church Musick*
24. 1662: William Thomas, *A Preservative of Piety*
25. 1663: John Reading, *A Sermon Lately Delivered in the Cathedral Church of Canterbury Concerning Church-Musick*
27. 1677: John Mulliner, *A Testimony against Periwigs*
28. 1678: Edward Wettenhall, *Of Gifts and Offices*
29. 1689: Edmund Hickeringill, *The Ceremony-Monger*
30. 1690: Isaac Marlow, *A Brief Discourse Concerning Singing in the Publick Worship of God*
31. 1691: Benjamin Keach, *An Answer to Mr. Marlow’s Appendix*
32. 1691: S. W., J. C., J. L., *Truth Vindicated; or Mr. Keach’s Sober Appeal, Answered*
33. 1691: Benjamin Keach, *The Breach Repaired in God’s Worship*
34. 1691: H. K., *An Answer to a Brief Discourse Concerning Singing*
35. 1691: Isaac Marlow, *Prelimited Forms of Praising God*
36. 1691: Thomas Winnell, *A Sober Reply to Mr. Robert Steed’s Epistle*
37. 1691: Joseph Wright, *Folly Detected*
38. 1692: An *Apology for the Organs and Prayers Used in the Church of England*
39. 1692: William Kiffin, *A Serious Answer to a Late Book, Stiled, a Reply to Mr. Robert Steed’s Epistle Concerning Singing*
40. 1692: Isaac Marlow, *Truth Soberly Defended*
41. 1694: Ralph Battell, *The Lawfulness and Expediency of Church-Musick*
42. 1696: Richard Allen, *A Brief Vindication of an Essay to Prove Singing of Psalms*
43. 1696: E. H., *Scripture [sic] Proof for Singing of Scripture Psalms*
44. 1696: Sampson Estwick, *The Usefulness of Church-Musick*
45. 1696: Charles Hickman, *A Sermon Preached at St. Bride’s Church*
46. 1696: Isaac Marlow, *A Clear Confutation of Mr. Richard Allen*
47. 1696: Isaac Marlow, *The Controversie of Singing*
48. 1696: John Newte, *Mr. Newte’s Sermon Concerning the Lawfulness and Use of Organs in the Christian Church*
49. 1696: Gabriel Towerson, *A Sermon Concerning Vocal and Instrumental Musick in the Church*
50. 1697: Nicholas Brady, *Church-Musick Vindicated*
51. 1697: Richard Claridge, *An Answer to Richard Allen’s Essay, Vindication, and Appendix*
52. 1698: *A Letter to a Friend in the Country, Concerning the Use of Instrumental Musick in the Worship of God*
53. 1698: *Singing of Psalms Vindicated from the Charge of Novelty*
54. 1698: B. P., *The Parish Clerk’s Guide: or, the Singing Psalms Used in the Parish Churches.*
55. 1699: William Sherlock, *A Sermon Preach’d at St. Paul’s Cathedral*
56. 1700: Henry Dodwell, *A Treatise Concerning the Lawfulness of Instrumental Musick in Holy Offices*
57. 1700: Eugenius Junior, *Church-Pageantry Display’d: or, Organ Worship*
58. 1700: John Shuttleworth, *A Sermon Preached at Bridgwater [sic] in Somersetshire*
59. 1711: Arthur Bedford, *The Great Abuse of Musick*
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