



The Consort  
Music of  
William Lawes  
1602–1645

John Cunningham

THE CONSORT MUSIC  
OF WILLIAM LAWES  
1602–1645



# Music in Britain, 1600–1900

ISSN 1752–1904

Series Editors:

RACHEL COWGILL & PETER HOLMAN  
(Leeds University Centre for English Music)

This series provides a forum for the best new work in this area; it takes a deliberately inclusive approach, covering immigrants and emigrants as well as native musicians. Contributions on all aspects of seventeenth-, eighteenth- and nineteenth-century British music studies are welcomed, particularly those placing music in its social and historical contexts, and addressing Britain's musical links with Europe and the rest of the globe.

Proposals or queries should be sent in the first instance to Professor Rachel Cowgill, Professor Peter Holman or Boydell & Brewer at the addresses shown below. All submissions will receive prompt and informed consideration.

Professor Rachel Cowgill, Faculty of Arts and Humanities,  
Liverpool Hope University, Hope Park, Liverpool, L16 9JD  
email: [cowgilr@hope.ac.uk](mailto:cowgilr@hope.ac.uk)

Professor Peter Holman, School of Music, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT  
email: [p.k.holman@leeds.ac.uk](mailto:p.k.holman@leeds.ac.uk)

Boydell & Brewer, PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk, IP12 3DF  
email: [editorial@boydell.co.uk](mailto:editorial@boydell.co.uk)

ALREADY PUBLISHED

*Lectures on Musical Life*  
William Sterndale Bennett  
edited by Nicholas Temperley, with Yunchung Yang

*John Stainer: A Life in Music*  
Jeremy Dibble

*The Pursuit of High Culture: John Ella and  
Chamber Music in Victorian London*  
Christina Bashford

*Thomas Tallis and his Music in Victorian England*  
Suzanne Cole

THE CONSORT MUSIC  
OF WILLIAM LAWES  
1602–1645

John Cunningham

THE BOYDELL PRESS



© John Cunningham 2010

*All Rights Reserved.* Except as permitted under current legislation no part of this work may be photocopied, stored in a retrieval system, published, performed in public, adapted, broadcast, transmitted, recorded or reproduced in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of the copyright owner

The right of John Cunningham to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988

First published 2010  
The Boydell Press, Woodbridge

ISBN 978-0-95468-097-8

The Boydell Press is an imprint of Boydell & Brewer Ltd  
PO Box 9, Woodbridge, Suffolk IP12 3DF, UK  
and of Boydell & Brewer Inc.  
668 Mt Hope Avenue, Rochester, NY 14620, USA  
website: [www.boydellandbrewer.com](http://www.boydellandbrewer.com)

A catalogue record of this publication is available  
from the British Library

The publisher has no responsibility for the continued existence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this book, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

This publication is printed on acid-free paper

Designed and typeset in Adobe Minion Pro by  
David Roberts, Pershore, Worcestershire

Printed in Great Britain by  
CPI Antony Rowe, Chippenham and Eastbourne

*For My Parents*







# Contents

*Preface* ix

*Acknowledgements* xvi

*List of Abbreviations* xviii

*Editorial Conventions* xxiii

Chapter 1 The 'Lutes, Viols and Voices' 1

Chapter 2 The Autograph Manuscripts 23

Chapter 3 The Music for Lyra-Viol 92

Chapter 4 The Royall Consort 126

Chapter 5 The Viol Consorts 150

Chapter 6 The Fantasia-Suites 177

Chapter 7 The Harp Consorts 213

Chapter 8 The Suites for Two Bass Viols and Organ 249

Chapter 9 Conclusions 273

Appendix 1 Source Descriptions 278

*GB-Lbl, Add. MSS 40657–61* 279

*GB-Ob, MSS Mus. Sch. D.238–40* 285

*GB-Ob, MS Mus. Sch. D.229* 290

*GB-Lbl, Add. MS 17798* 295

*GB-Ob, MS Mus. Sch. B.2* 297

*GB-Ob, MS Mus. Sch. B.3* 305

*GB-Lbl, Add. MS 31432* 308

*US-CAh, MS Mus. 70* 315

Appendix 2 Index of Watermarks 319

*Bibliography* 324

*Discography* 336

*Index of Lawes's Works Cited* 339

*General Index* 342





## Preface

IN 1603 James VI of Scotland acceded to the English throne, becoming James I of England.<sup>1</sup> With his accession many aspects of court life changed. Unlike Elizabeth I, his predecessor, James was married, with children. The court structure had to change slightly to accommodate this, with the establishment of separate households for the Queen and the royal children. The musical establishment at court was also changing. James's accession coincided with the coming of age of many of the best native composers of the early seventeenth century, such as John Coprario, Alfonso Ferrabosco II, Thomas Ford, Orlando Gibbons and Thomas Lupo. (According to contemporary writers Coprario was originally John Cooper, who adopted the Italianate form after a visit to Italy; Ferrabosco and Lupo were English, of Italian descent.) Within the first decade or so of the new century musical fashions had moved on from the Elizabethan period, and James's court became the centre of musical innovation and development. James's sons, Henry and Charles, were more interested in music than was their father. Henry, created Prince of Wales in 1610, amassed an impressive retinue of musicians, mostly singer-lutenists and viol players; however, he died unexpectedly of typhoid in 1612.<sup>2</sup> Charles, created Duke of York in 1605, inherited many of Henry's musicians when he became Prince of Wales in 1616.

Most of the major scoring and formal innovations of the period were conceived and developed between the households of Prince Henry and Prince Charles. English music at the time was embracing many Italian traits; exploration of Italian-influenced musical forms was especially fostered in Prince Henry's household.<sup>3</sup> Composers such as Coprario were experimenting with instrumentally conceived music for viols; also being developed were scoring and formal innovations such as lyra-viol trios and fantasia-suites with violins. Indeed, the introduction of the violin to serious consort music (which would find full expression in the consort music of William Lawes and John Jenkins in the 1630s and 1640s), was one of the most important musical developments of the period. Many of these musical innovations were developed in Prince Charles's household. His musicians were to form

<sup>1</sup> Probably the best general introduction to the period is B. Coward, *The Stuart Age: England, 1603–1714* (3/2003).

<sup>2</sup> For Prince Henry's household, see R. Strong, *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance* (1986).

<sup>3</sup> See HolmanFTF, 197–224.



the basis of the group generally known as the 'Lutes, Viols and Voices' (LVV) after his accession in 1625. The LVV was not a fixed ensemble; rather it was a group of some of the most distinguished performers and composers in England at the time. William Lawes secured a place in the LVV in 1635.

WILLIAM Lawes, son of Thomas (d. 1640) and Lucris [Lucretia] (née Shepherd), was baptized in the Close at Salisbury Cathedral on 1 May 1602.<sup>4</sup> Thomas was a lay-vicar at the Cathedral (and vicar-choral from 1632); this suggests that William may have been brought up as a chorister. His brother Henry (baptized on 5 January 1595/6) may also have been a chorister there; he joined the Chapel Royal in January 1625/6 (first as an epistoler, then promoted to gentleman in the following year), and received a prestigious appointment to the LVV in January 1630/1.<sup>5</sup> We know little of William's early life. According to Thomas Fuller, he was taught by (if not apprenticed to) Coprario in the household of Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford.<sup>6</sup> David Pinto has plausibly suggested that this apprenticeship could have been from c. 1619–26: 'Owing to the guild system, artisans were apprenticed for a long period, customarily between the ages of 17 and 24 ... Until [completion of the apprenticeship], rules bound them from plying their skills (and hence earning real money) separately from their masters. Any performing beforehand, and *a fortiori* composing, would have been pointless for any budding performers.'<sup>7</sup> This may largely explain why so little information exists of Lawes's early life.

The first official record of a court post for Lawes is dated 30 April 1635. It is likely that he participated in the Royal Music for several years before this in an unofficial capacity; he appears to have contributed music to Ben Jonson's *Entertainment at Welbeck* performed for the Earl of Newcastle on 21 May 1633, and was well enough known to receive the prestigious commission later that year to compose some of the music for the elaborate Inns of Court masque *The Triumph of Peace*, performed in February 1633/4. Part of Lawes's remuneration for the masque included £5 for

<sup>4</sup> The following biographical summary is based on that in *LefkowitzWL*. See also A. Ashbee, 'Lawes, William', *BDECM*, ii, 710–12; D. Pinto, 'Lawes, William', *GMO* and *ODNB* (accessed 10 August 2009); I. Spink, *Henry Lawes: Cavalier Songwriter* (Oxford, 2000), 1–6. Little new information has been uncovered since *LefkowitzWL*. For an excellent discussion of the supposed portrait of Lawes in the Music School Collection at Oxford University, see C. V. R. Blacker and D. Pinto, 'Desperately Seeking William: Portraits of the Lawes Brothers in Context', *EM* 37 (2009), 157–74.

<sup>5</sup> See A. Ashbee, 'Lawes, Henry', *BDECM*, ii, 706–9.

<sup>6</sup> *FullerW* ('Wiltshire'), 157.

<sup>7</sup> See *PintoFyV*, 9–10, at 9. Edward Seymour died in 1621, so the apprenticeship may not have continued under the auspices of the Seymour family.

'my Lord Chamberlains boy', a servant of Philip Herbert possibly apprenticed to him, though no other records of this are known. Although his modern reputation is founded on his instrumental music, Lawes was a respected song composer. No later than 1636 he was the main composer of vocal music for the royal theatre companies and 'Beeston's Boys' at the Cockpit-in-Court of Whitehall and Blackfriars. Lawes also contributed music to the court masques *The Triumph of the Prince d'Amour* (1636) and *Britannia Triumphans* (1638), as well as William Cartwright's *The Royal Slave*, a play presented in Oxford during the summer progress of 1636.

By the early 1640s the country was veering towards political meltdown. By 1639 court life was becoming increasingly disrupted by forced migrations within the kingdom brought about by Charles's increasing resort to military measures; by the autumn of 1642 the king had fled London and set up court in Oxford. Around this time Lawes enlisted as a soldier. David Pinto has persuasively suggested that Lawes was present at the Siege of York in April–June 1644.<sup>8</sup> He met his untimely death on 24 September 1645 during the Battle of Chester.<sup>9</sup> Charles I is reputed to have instituted a special mourning for Lawes, 'the *Father of Musick*'.<sup>10</sup> His death was lamented by the poets Robert Herrick, Robert Heath and John Tatham; Henry Lawes published *Choice Psalmes* in William's memory in 1648.

Some of Lawes's consort music remained popular well after his death: pieces from the Royall Consort are found in manuscripts until around 1680. By the last quarter of the seventeenth century, however, his music had become old-fashioned in the face of strong Italian influences. In the late eighteenth century his reputation received no favours from Charles Burney's disparaging analysis of the Royall Consort.<sup>11</sup> Burney's opinion of Lawes and his contemporaries did much to silence the repertoire for the next century or so. The modern revival of Lawes began in the 1890s with performances by Arnold Dolmetsch and his circle.<sup>12</sup> Dolmetsch was

<sup>8</sup> Pinto Y.

<sup>9</sup> Ring D.

<sup>10</sup> Fuller W ('Wiltshire'), 157.

<sup>11</sup> C. Burney, *A General History of Music* (1776–89), ed. F. Mercer (1935; R/1957), ii, 309–10; in that passage Burney famously described the Royall Consort as 'one of the most dry, aukward [*sic*], and unmeaning compositions I ever remember to have had the trouble of scoring'.

<sup>12</sup> For example, at a public lecture at Gresham College given by Professor J. Frederick Bridge on 'The Anniversary of the death of Sir Thomas Gresham, 1579, and of Henry Purcell, 1695', Professor Bridge 'assisted by Mr. DOLMETSCH and his pupils' performed 'Some Instrumental Music from the time of Sir Thomas Gresham to that of Purcell', which included a 'Movement from the Royal Consort'. The lecture took place on 21 November 1890. There is a copy of the programme in the Dolmetsch family library, Haslemere.

an enthusiastic promoter of Lawes's music, which regularly featured in Haslemere programmes; a performance of a six-part fantasia and ayre at the 1931 Haslemere Festival prompted Rupert Erlebach's appraisal of Lawes in 1932.<sup>13</sup> The Dolmetsch family was also first to record Lawes's music. In the mid-1930s they set up Dolmetsch Gramophone Records to produce recordings of music performed at the annual Haslemere festivals. The last record (D.R.16) included two dances from the Royall Consort.<sup>14</sup>

Scholarly appreciation of Lawes reached a peak in 1960 with Murray Lefkowitz's pioneering monograph on the composer,<sup>15</sup> which stands as the most complete study of the composer's music; after nearly half a century, however, many aspects are in need of updating. David Pinto has published the most work on Lawes in the years since Lefkowitz's study.<sup>16</sup> His edition of the five- and six-part viol consorts was the first complete collected edition of Lawes's music.<sup>17</sup> Since then Pinto has produced several articles and essays, and an edition of the fantasia-suites for the Musica Britannica series. Perhaps the crowning glory of his research on Lawes is his edition of the Royall Consort (1995), which has commendably produced an excellent text for both the Tr-Tr-T-B ('old') and Tr-Tr-B-B ('new') versions the collection.<sup>18</sup> The edition was accompanied by a monograph in which Pinto discussed the viol consorts and elaborated on several insightful suggestions into the complex issues of the rescoring of the Royall Consort.<sup>19</sup> In September 1995 a conference was held in Oxford to commemorate the 350th anniversary of Lawes's death; many of the papers given were published subsequently as a series of essays, *William Lawes (1602–1645): Essays on his Life, Times and Work* (Aldershot, 1998), edited by Andrew Ashbee. The wide range of Lawes-related topics covered in this book exemplifies the broad appeal of Lawes's music among modern musicologists.

**M**Y aim in this book has been to address several issues concerning Lawes's music not dealt with in previous studies, and to build upon the existing body of knowledge to advance our understanding of Lawes as a composer. Underlying

<sup>13</sup> R. Erlebach, 'William Lawes and His String Music', *PRMA* 59 (1932–3), 103–19.

<sup>14</sup> The Royall Consort tracks are included on *Pioneer Early Music Recordings: The Dolmetsch Family with Diana Poulton, Volume 1*. The Dolmetsch Family. The Dolmetsch Foundation and The Lute Society [c. 2005], LSDOLO01; D.R.16 is dated 29 September 1948.

<sup>15</sup> *LefkowitzWL*.

<sup>16</sup> See Bibliography.

<sup>17</sup> *LawesCS*.

<sup>18</sup> *LawesRC*.

<sup>19</sup> *PintoFyV*.

these investigations is a primary research question: what can a detailed study of Lawes's working environment and his autograph sources tell us about him as a composer, and about the function(s) and purpose(s) of the music that he composed? Chapters 1 and 2 deal with background issues relating to Lawes, namely the court and the autograph manuscripts. Chapters 6–9 comprise six shorter studies covering the entire range of Lawes's consort music and a brief conclusion.

Understanding Lawes and his music must begin with understanding the Royal Music at the early Stuart court, as this was the milieu in which he composed his most significant consort music; thus, Chapter 1 examines the 'Private Music' of Charles I. Many historical studies of the early modern court have given musicologists invaluable background. In particular, the late Gerald Aylmer's studies in court administration have provided the basis not only for many historical enquiries, but also for musicologists attempting to understand better the way in which musicians operated within the complex structure of the early Stuart court.<sup>20</sup> Several architectural studies, such as Simon Thurley's brilliant exposition of the architectural history of Whitehall Palace, *Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240–1698* (1999), have provided much valuable information on the physical structure of the palace (destroyed by fire in 1698), helping us to assess possible places of performance.

In recent years much research has been done on music at the English court; several publications in particular have significantly increased our understanding of this area. The majority of the documentary evidence cited here from court records was made accessible by the pioneering work of Andrew Ashbee, whose nine-volume series *Records of English Court Music (RECM)* and the accompanying two-volume *Biographical Dictionary of English Court Musicians (BDECM)* have done much to facilitate the study of music at the English court. In the early Stuart court there were three main secular divisions to the Royal Music: the violin band, the wind bands and the Private Music. The first two groups have been dealt with previously. Peter Holman's seminal study *Four and Twenty Fiddlers: The Violin at the English Court, 1540–1690* (Oxford, 2/1995) has shown what can be achieved when musical meat is put onto the bare bones of court documents; this wide-ranging work is essential reading for anyone researching music in early modern England and sets a high standard to which many subsequent studies will undoubtedly aspire. David Lasocki's doctoral dissertation, 'Professional Recorder Players in England, 1540–1740' (University of Iowa, 1983) is an intriguing and comprehensive account of the development of the wind bands in the early Stuart court (and beyond). There is no similarly comprehensive study of the Private Music of Charles I (LVV); this is the aim of Chapter 1, which discusses the origins and

<sup>20</sup> See Bibliography.

development of the LVV, its personnel, organization, and place within the wider context of the Royal Music and the court.

Chapter 2 seeks to answer general questions relating to Lawes's autograph sources. What can the autographs reveal about the development of Lawes's hand? What is their chronology? What was their function? Can this function be related to the handwriting style? What can they reveal about Lawes's compositional process? There is a survey of Lawes's known autographs, and a discussion of his handwriting. Recent studies by Jessie Ann Owens and Rebecca Herissone have brilliantly demonstrated what can be achieved when detailed source studies are used to illuminate the wider context of how composers and musicians used the manuscripts that have come down to us.<sup>21</sup> Also influential in my assessment of Lawes's sources has been Robert Shay and Robert Thompson's recent study of Henry Purcell's musical and text hands, which has led to many breakthroughs in helping to date his works and autograph manuscripts.<sup>22</sup> A similarly comprehensive published survey of Lawes's hand has been lacking.<sup>23</sup> The number of holograph Lawes sources is unfortunately much fewer than those available to Purcell scholars. Nevertheless, the autographs reveal much about Lawes's compositional process, and I will make some suggestions regarding their chronology. Despite the limitations of Lawes's sources, there is a strong need for this kind of study. For example, in his review of Pinto's monograph on Lawes, Ian Spink questioned the issue of chronology: 'it seems a bit too pat; why some of this music cannot be later [than 1642] – Lawes did not die until 1645 – is not made clear'.<sup>24</sup> Although my analysis of the sources yields some different results from those presented by Pinto, we do agree that much, if not all, of Lawes's consort music dates to before 1642. Along with the evidence from the sources, the main reason for this dating is essentially bound up with the reasons for its creation in the first place. The argument throughout this book is that Lawes composed the majority of his consort music for the court. Naturally this does not preclude composition after the removal of the court to Oxford; we know little of Lawes's movements between then and his death in September 1645. We may imagine, however, that the commissioning of

<sup>21</sup> J. A. Owens, *Composers at Work: The Craft of Musical Composition, 1450–1600* (Oxford, 1997); R. Herissone, 'To fill, forbear, or adorne': *The Organ Accompaniment of Restoration Sacred Music* (Aldershot, 2006); R. Herissone, "Fowle Originalls" and "Fayre Writeing": Reconsidering Purcell's Compositional Process', *Journal of Musicology* 23 (2006), 569–619.

<sup>22</sup> ShayThompsonPM.

<sup>23</sup> Robert Thompson has presented some preliminary findings on the paper types and watermarks found in some of the Lawes autographs: see *ThompsonEMM* and *ThompsonP*.

<sup>24</sup> I. Spink, 'Review: D. Pinto, *For the Violls*', *ML* 79 (1998), 108–9, at 109.

new consort music was some way down Charles's list of priorities during the Civil War. More importantly, the evidence from the sources (especially the autographs) strongly suggests that the bulk of Lawes's output as it has survived was intact by c. 1640.

Chapters 3–8 deal with Lawes's music, applying the findings of the first two chapters to detailed studies of his consort music. Chapter 3 presents a short survey of the evolution and development of the lyra-viol trio (including issues concerning the instrument, nomenclature, sources and repertoire) and evaluates Lawes's lyra-viol music, solo and ensemble. Only six of his trios survive complete; many more survive in one part and afford valuable insights into Lawes's revision process. Chapter 4 deals with the Royall Consort. Although much has been written on this collection, some key issues are in need of re-examination. Lefkowitz was the first musicologist to study the collection in detail and to recognize the existence of the two versions;<sup>25</sup> since then the late Gordon Dodd and especially David Pinto have contributed much to our understanding of the collection;<sup>26</sup> any subsequent discussion is greatly indebted to their work. Chapter 4 briefly assesses the importance of the Royall Consort in the repertoire, and reassesses some of the most important issues surrounding the collection, including the reasons behind rescoring. Chapter 5 discusses Lawes's music for viol consort, focusing primarily on the issue of when they were composed, and develops further the evidence presented in Chapter 2. The following chapter discusses the fantasia-suites: when and how these pieces were composed, and their place within the consort repertoire.

Despite containing some of his finest instrumental writing, Lawes's harp consorts remain in relative obscurity. The modern neglect of the harp consort stems from the partially incomplete harp parts, and from the contentious issue of whether Lawes composed for a gut-strung triple harp or a wire-strung Irish harp, an issue discussed in Chapter 7. This chapter also looks in detail at the music of the harp consorts, and offers suggestions on issues such as internal development and chronology. Lawes's style of division-writing is also examined, especially its relationship to Christopher Simpson's *The Division-Violist* (1659). Chapter 8 explores Lawes's music for two bass viols and organ. These pieces are highly significant in our understanding of Lawes's development as a composer; indeed, from them much information can be gleaned of his compositional process. This chapter provides a brief consideration of the development of the genre, a thorough reassessment of the sources, and some suggestions on dates of composition. Some conclusions are briefly presented in Chapter 9.

<sup>25</sup> LefkowitzWL.

<sup>26</sup> LawesRC; PintoNL; PintoFyV, 34–69.

## Acknowledgements

OVER the course of writing this book I have received information, encouragement and advice from many people. I owe my greatest debt to Peter Holman, my doctoral research supervisor, who has encouraged the book from its very earliest stages. It has been my great privilege to work with Peter, from whom I continue to learn. He remains overwhelmingly generous in giving his time, encouragement and advice; without his encyclopaedic knowledge and unfailing wisdom this work would have been much the poorer. To him, my sincere thanks. My thanks are also due to Peter and his wife Tricia for their hospitality during several visits to Colchester. Another significant debt is due to Harry White. As an undergraduate at University College Dublin, his lectures on Baroque music were a revelation to me; they sparked my interest in musicology generally and seventeenth-century English music in particular. Over many years Harry has been unwaveringly generous in giving his encouragement and support; he also responded to a late draft of the book with typical wit and insightfulness. To him also, my sincere thanks.

I am extremely grateful to Christopher Field, Jane Troy Johnson, Layton Ring, Jonathan Wainwright and Bryan White for reading and commenting on earlier drafts of the book in whole or part. I would especially like to thank David Pinto and Andrew Ashbee for their advice and stimulating correspondences on many Lawes-related topics, and for their comments on drafts of several of the chapters; Andrew also kindly shared his forthcoming monograph on John Jenkins ahead of publication. I am also grateful to the following for providing me with help and encouragement in various ways: Anastasia Belina, Barra Boydell, Máire Buffet, Martin Butler, Stuart Cheney, Melissa Devereux, Robin Elliott, Michael Fleming, Kerry Houston, Min Jung Kang, David Larkin, Richard Rastall, Thérèse Smith, Robert Thompson and Andrew Woolley. And, of course, any study of William Lawes inevitably owes much to the research of Murray Lefkowitz; this book is no exception. I am indebted also to the Music in Britain, 1600–1900 series editors Rachel Cowgill and Peter Holman, and to Caroline Palmer, Michael Middeke, Catherine Larner, David Roberts and the editorial staff at Boydell & Brewer for their advice, support and professionalism at every stage of this process.

My thanks also to the staff of the various libraries in which my research has been conducted; I am grateful for permission to reproduce photographs of their holdings (as specified): Cambridge, MA, Houghton Library, Harvard University (Figs 2.10*b*, 2.13*b*, 2.29, 2.30*a*, 2.30*b*, 2.30*c*, 2.30*d*, 2.31, 2.32*a*, 2.32*b*, 2.32*c*, 2.33, 2.35, reproduced



by permission of the President and Fellows of Harvard College. Thanks to William Stoneman, Florence Fearington Librarian of Houghton Library); Dublin, Marsh's Library; Dublin, Trinity College; Dublin, University College Dublin; Haslemere, Dolmetsch Library (Fig. 3.4. Particular thanks to Jeanne Dolmetsch for her enthusiastic responses to my research and for her generous hospitality during several visits to Haslemere); Hatfield House, Hatfield (Fig. 2.3, reproduced by permission of the Marquess of Salisbury. Thanks to Vicki Perry, Assistant Archivist, for photographing the document at very short notice); Leeds, University of Leeds, Brotherton Library; London, the British Library (Figs 2.1c, 2.6b, 2.7a, 2.7b, 2.8b, 2.9a, 2.9b, 2.10a, 2.10d, 2.10e, 2.11a, 2.11b, 2.11c, 2.12b, 2.19b, 2.26, 2.27, 2.28, 2.34b, reproduced by permission of the Trustees); Warminster, Longleat House (Fig. 2.5, reproduced by permission of the Marquess of Bath, Longleat House, Warminster, Wiltshire. Thanks to Kate Harris, Curator); New York, New York Public Library; Oxford, the Bodleian Library (Figs 2.1a, 2.1b, 2.1d, 2.2, 2.4, 2.6a, 2.8a, 2.10c, 2.10f, 2.12a, 2.13a, 2.14, 2.15, 2.16a, 2.16b, 2.17, 2.18, 2.19a, 2.20, 2.21, 2.22a, 2.22b, 2.22c, 2.22d, 2.23, 2.24, 2.25, 2.34a, 5.1, 8.1a, 8.1b, reproduced by permission of the Bodleian Library, University of Oxford. Thanks to Martin Holmes, Music Librarian); Oxford, Christ Church Library (Figs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, reproduced by permission of The Governing Body of Christ Church, Oxford. Thanks to Janet McMullin, Assistant Librarian). My thanks also to Susan Clermont, Senior Music Specialist (Music Division), of the Library of Congress, Washington, for providing me with a copy of the Library's Cummings sale catalogue.

The writing of the earliest drafts of this book was generously funded by a National University of Ireland Travelling Studentship in the Arts and Humanities, the final stages by an Irish Research Council for the Humanities and Social Sciences Post-Doctoral Research Fellowship, which I held at the School of Music, UCD; I am grateful to all at UCD for providing a welcoming and stimulating research environment. My thanks are also due to the trustees of the Musica Britannica Trust, from whom I received a Louise Dyer Award, which allowed me to visit the Houghton Library, Harvard University to examine Lawes's autograph *lyra-viol* book. I am extremely grateful to the Music & Letters Trust for their generous subvention to help finance the publication of this book.

It gives me great pleasure to record my thanks to Declan Mulligan for his many deeds well beyond the call of duty (over longer than either of us would care to admit); thanks too to my sister Siân and brother Cian. My most personal and heartfelt thanks are to Susan Jane Flynn for forbearance, support and oft-needed perspective. Finally, I would like to thank my parents for their continued support, without which this book could never have been started; to them it is dedicated.

*Dublin, September 2009*

# List of Abbreviations

## GENERAL

b.	born
d.	died
INV.	a portion of a MS written from the end with the volume inverted
LVV	'Lutes, Viols and Voices' (Private Music of Charles I; see Chapter 1)
n.	note
om.	omitted

## INSTRUMENTS

A	Alto
B	Bass
Bar	Baritone
Bc	Continuo (unfigured, unless stated otherwise)
BV	Bass viol
LV	Lyra-viol
T	Tenor
Tr	Treble
v(v)	Voice(s)

## LIBRARY SIGLA

(Following the RISM system as used in *GMO*)

### AUSTRIA

A-ET	Ebenthal bei Klagenfurt, Privatbibliothek Goëss
------	---

### FRANCE

F-Pcnrs	Paris, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique
F-Pn	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France

### GERMANY

D-Hs	Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek
------	---

### GREAT BRITAIN

GB-Cfm	Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum
GB-Ckc	Cambridge, King's College
GB-Ctc	Cambridge, Trinity College
GB-CHER	Chester, Cheshire Records Office
GB-En	Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland
GB-Eu	Edinburgh, University Library
GB-HAdolmetsch	Haslemere, Dolmetsch Library
GB-Lam	London, Royal Academy of Music
GB-Lbl	London, British Library

GB-Lcm	London, Royal College of Music
GB-Lpro	London, Public Records Office
GB-Mp	Manchester, Public Library
GB-Ob	Oxford, Bodleian Library
GB-Och	Oxford, Christ Church Library
GB-W	Wells, Cathedral Library

## IRELAND

IRL-Dm	Dublin, Marsh's Library
--------	-------------------------

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

US-CAh	Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Library (Houghton Library)
US-Cn	Chicago, Newberry Library
US-NH	New Haven, CT, Yale University, School of Music Library
US-NHub	New Haven, CT, Yale University, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library
US-NYp	New York, New York Public Library
US-SM	San Marino, CA, Huntington Library
US-Ws	Washington, DC, Folger Shakespeare Library

## FREQUENTLY CITED JOURNALS, SERIES &amp; ORGANIZATIONS

<i>AcM</i>	<i>Acta Musicologica</i>
<i>AHJ</i>	<i>American Harp Journal</i>
CEKM	Corpus of Early Keyboard Music
ELS	English Lute Songs, 1597–1632
<i>EM</i>	<i>Early Music</i>
<i>EMH</i>	<i>Early Music History</i>
<i>FAM</i>	<i>Fontes Artis Musicae</i>
<i>GSJ</i>	<i>Galpin Society Journal</i>
<i>HLQ</i>	<i>Huntington Library Quarterly</i>
IMS	Irish Musical Studies
<i>JAMS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Musicological Society</i>
<i>JCAUSM</i>	<i>Journal of the Canadian Association of University Schools of Music</i>
<i>JLSA</i>	<i>Journal of the Lute Society of America</i>
<i>JRMA</i>	<i>Journal of the Royal Musical Association</i>
<i>JVdGSA</i>	<i>Journal of the Viola da Gamba Society of America</i>
<i>LSJ</i>	<i>Lute Society Journal</i> (Great Britain)
MB	Musica Britannica
<i>ML</i>	<i>Music and Letters</i>
<i>MQ</i>	<i>The Musical Quarterly</i>
PRBVCS	PRB Productions, Viol Consort Series
<i>PRMA</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association</i>
<i>RES</i>	<i>The Review of English Studies</i>
<i>RMARC</i>	<i>Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle</i>
RRMBE	Recent Researches in Music of the Baroque Era
VdGS	Viola da Gamba Society (Great Britain)
<i>VdGSJ</i>	<i>The Viola da Gamba Society Journal</i>

## OTHER WORKS FREQUENTLY CITED

- AshbeeHM1 A. Ashbee, *The Harmonious Musick of John Jenkins*, vol. 1: *The Fantasias for Viols* (Surbiton, 1992)
- AshbeeHM2 A. Ashbee, *The Harmonious Musick of John Jenkins*, vol. 2: *Suites, Aires and Vocal Music* (forthcoming)
- AshbeeJB A. Ashbee, 'Instrumental Music from the Library of John Browne (1608–1691), Clerk of the Parliaments', *ML* 58 (1977), 43–59
- BDECM *A Biographical Dictionary of English Court Musicians, 1485–1714*, 2 vols, ed. A. Ashbee and D. Lasocki, assisted by P. Holman and F. Kisby (Aldershot, 1998)
- CrumEL M. Crum, 'Early Lists of the Oxford Music School Collection', *ML* 48 (1967), 23–34
- CrumOMSC M. Crum, *The Oxford Music School Collection at the Bodleian Library, Oxford: A Guide and Index to the Harvester Microfilm Collection* (Brighton, 1979)
- CunninghamLVT J. Cunningham, '"Let Them be Lusty, Smart-Speaking Viols": William Lawes and the Lyra Viol Trio', *JVdGSA* 43 (2006; published 2008), 32–68
- CunninghamMPC J. Cunningham, 'Music for the Privy Chamber: Studies in the Consort Music of William Lawes (1602–45)' (PhD diss., University of Leeds, 2007)
- ES1600–75 *English Song, 1600–1675: Facsimiles of Twenty-Six Manuscripts and an Edition of the Texts*, 12 vols, ed. E. Jorgens (1986–9)
- FieldCM C. D. S. Field, 'Consort Music I: Up to 1660', in *Music in Britain: The Seventeenth Century*, ed. I. Spink (Oxford, 1995), 197–244
- FieldCW C. D. S. Field, 'The Composer's Workshop: Revisions in the Consort Music of Alfonso Ferrabosco the Younger', *Chelys* 27 (1999), 1–39
- FieldFR C. D. S. Field, 'Formality and Rhetoric in English Fantasia-Suites', in *William Lawes (1602–1645): Essays on his Life, Times and Work*, ed. A. Ashbee (Aldershot, 1998), 197–249
- FieldJCH C. D. S. Field, 'Jenkins and the Cosmography of Harmony', in *John Jenkins and His Time: Studies in English Consort Music*, ed. A. Ashbee and P. Holman (Oxford, 1996), 1–74
- FullerW T. Fuller, *A History of the Worthies of England* (1662)
- GMO *Grove Music Online*, ed. L. Macy (www.grovemusic.com)
- HawkinsGH Sir J. Hawkins, *A General History of the Science and Practice of Music*, 2 vols (1776; R/1877 and 1969)
- HolmanD P. Holman, *Dowland: Lachrimae (1604)* (Cambridge, 1999)
- HolmanFTF P. Holman, *Four and Twenty Fiddlers: The Violin at the English Court, 1540–1690* (Oxford, 2/1995)
- HolmanH P. Holman, 'The Harp in Stuart England: New Light on William Lawes's Harp Consorts', *EM* 15 (1987), 188–203

- HolmanOA* P. Holman, “‘Evenly, Softly, and Sweetly Acchording to All’: The Organ Accompaniment of English Consort Music”, in *John Jenkins and His Time: Studies in English Consort Music*, ed. A. Ashbee and P. Holman (Oxford, 1996), 353–82
- IMCCM1* A. Ashbee, R. Thompson and J. Wainwright (compilers), *The Viola da Gamba Society Index of Manuscripts Containing Consort Music*, vol. 1 (Aldershot, 2001)
- IMCCM2* A. Ashbee, R. Thompson and J. Wainwright (compilers), *The Viola da Gamba Society Index of Manuscripts Containing Consort Music*, vol. 2 (Aldershot, 2008)
- Index* *Viola da Gamba Society of Great Britain: Thematic Index of Music for Viols*, G. Dodd (compiler), with revisions and additions by A. Ashbee (2/2004)
- LefkowitzWL* M. Lefkowitz, *William Lawes* (1960)
- MaceMM* T. Mace, *Musick’s Monument* (1676)
- ODNB* *The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. L. Goldman (www.oxforddnb.com)
- PintoAS* D. Pinto, ‘William Lawes’ Consort Suites for the Viols, and the Autograph Sources’, *Chelys* 4 (1972), 11–16
- PintoFyV* D. Pinto, *For ye Violls: The Consort and Dance Music of William Lawes* (Richmond, 1995)
- PintoMVC* D. Pinto, ‘William Lawes’ Music for Viol Consort’, *EM* 6 (1978), 12–24
- PintoNL* D. Pinto, ‘New Lamps for Old: The Versions of the Royall Consort’, in *William Lawes (1602–1645): Essays on his Life, Times and Work*, ed. A. Ashbee (Aldershot, 1998), 251–82
- PintoY* D. Pinto, ‘William Lawes at the Siege of York, 1644’, *MT* 127 (1986), 579–83
- PlayfordCC* H. Playford, ‘A Curious COLLECTION of Musick-Books, Both VOCAL and INSTRUMENTAL’ (1690) (GB-Lbl, Harl. 5936/nos. 419–20)
- RECM* *Records of English Court Music*, 9 vols, ed. A. Ashbee (Aldershot, 1986–96)
- RingD* L. Ring, ‘Wednesday, 24 September, 1645 – The Death of William Lawes during the Battle of Rowton Heath at the Siege of Chester’, in *William Lawes (1602–1645): Essays on his Life, Times and Work*, ed. A. Ashbee (Aldershot, 1998), 155–74
- RobinsonCP* A. Robinson, “‘Choice Psalmes’: A Brother’s Memorial”, in *William Lawes (1602–1645): Essays on his Life, Times and Work*, ed. A. Ashbee (Aldershot, 1998), 175–98
- ShayThompsonPM* R. Shay and R. Thompson, *Purcell Manuscripts: The Principal Musical Sources* (Cambridge, 2000)
- SimpsonDV* C. Simpson, *The Division-Violist* (1659)
- SpringL* M. Spring, *The Lute in Britain: A History of the Instrument and its Music* (Oxford, 2001)

- ThompsonEMM* R. Thompson, 'English Music Manuscripts and the Fine Paper Trade, 1648–1688' (PhD diss., London, King's College, 1988)
- ThompsonP* R. Thompson, 'Paper in English Music Manuscripts: 1620–1645', in *William Lawes (1602–1645): Essays on his Life, Times and Work*, ed. A. Ashbee (Aldershot, 1998), 143–54
- TraficanteMS* F. Traficante, 'Music for Lyra-viol: Manuscript Sources', *Chelys* 8 (1978–9), 4–22
- WainwrightCC* J. Wainwright, 'The Christ Church Viol-Consort Manuscripts Reconsidered: Christ Church, Oxford, Music Manuscripts 2, 397–408, and 436; 417–418 and 1080; and 432 and 612–613', in *John Jenkins and His Time: Studies in English Consort Music*, ed. A. Ashbee and P. Holman (Oxford, 1996), 189–242
- WainwrightMP* J. Wainwright, *Musical Patronage in Seventeenth-Century England: Christopher, First Baron Hatton (1605–1670)* (Aldershot, 1997)
- WallsM* P. Walls, *Music in the English Courtly Masque, 1604–1640* (Oxford, 1996)
- WilletsJB* P. Willets, 'John Barnard's Collections of Viol and Vocal Music', *Chelys* 20 (1991), 28–42
- WoodMfP* J. Wood, 'William Lawes's Music for Plays', in *William Lawes (1602–1645): Essays on his Life, Times and Work*, ed. A. Ashbee (Aldershot, 1998), 11–68

## EDITIONS FREQUENTLY CITED

- CoprarioBV* *John Coprario: Twelve Fantasias for Two Bass Viols and Organ and Eleven Pieces for Three Lyra-viols*, ed. R. Charteris, RRMBE 41 (Madison, WI, 1982)
- FerraboscoCM* *Alfonso Ferrabosco the Younger: Consort Music of Five and Six Parts*, ed. C. D. S. Field and D. Pinto, MB 81 (2003)
- JacobeanCM* *Jacobean Consort Music*, ed. T. Dart and W. Coates, MB 9 (2/1971)
- LawesCS* *William Lawes: Consort Sets in Five and Six Parts*, ed. D. Pinto (1979)
- LawesCVM1* *William Lawes: Collected Vocal Music Part 1: Solo Songs*, ed. G. Callon, RRMBE 120 (Madison, WI, 2002)
- LawesCVM2* *William Lawes: Collected Vocal Music Part 2: Dialogues, Partsongs, and Catches*, ed. G. Callon, RRMBE 121 (Madison, WI, 2002)
- LawesCVM3* *William Lawes: Collected Vocal Music Part 3: Sacred Music*, ed. G. Callon, RRMBE 122 (Madison, WI, 2002)
- LawesCVM4* *William Lawes: Collected Vocal Music Part 4: Masques*, ed. G. Callon, RRMBE 123 (Madison, WI, 2002)
- LawesFS* *William Lawes: Fantasia-Suites*, ed. D. Pinto, MB 60 (1991)
- LawesHC* *William Lawes: The Harp Consorts*, ed. J. Achtman, et al., PRBVCS 62 (Albany, CA, 2007)
- LawesRC* *William Lawes: The Royall Consort* ('Old' and 'New' Versions), 3 vols, ed. D. Pinto (1995)
- LawesSCM* *William Lawes: Select Consort Music*, ed. M. Lefkowitz, MB 21 (2/1971)

## Editorial Conventions

Original spelling, capitalization and punctuation have been retained in transcriptions of original written sources. Most of the archival documents cited have been transcribed from *RECM*, where some documents are summarized in modernized spelling; duplicate records in *RECM* have not been recorded. Specific titles of musical forms in Lawes's music have been regularized (as Aire, Alman, Corant, Fantazia or Fantazy, In Nomine, Pavan and Saraband) based on his general usage: original spellings are given in the manuscript inventories.

In folio numbers, the verso portion of a page is given the suffix 'v', the recto side 'r': e.g. fols 23v and 24r. Unnumbered folios are identified by a Roman numeral referring to the previous numbered folio, e.g. fol. 21/iii. Items on a page are indicated with a colon; thus, fol. 24v:2 indicates the second piece on folio 24v.

Routine dictionary entries (*GMO*, *ODNB*, *BDECM*) for individuals are not referenced unless directly quoted or specific reference is required.

Place of publication is London, unless otherwise stated.

The music examples are intended as simple transcriptions from the sources rather than critical editions, so obvious errors have been corrected without comment; where practical, the bar numbers of music examples correspond to a modern edition(s). Original key and time signatures have been retained, except for triple time pieces where '3i' signatures have been uniformly rendered as '3'; accidentals have been modernized and last to the end of the bar, with cautionary or editorial accidentals in round brackets; editorial additions are indicated by small font or square brackets; original clef changes have been followed, although non-standard clefs have been silently emended; barring, beaming and stem directions have been regularized.

Musical pitches in the text are indicated by the Helmholtz system: *c'* denotes middle C on a modern keyboard, with octaves above as *c''*, *c'''*, etc. and octaves below as *c*, *C*, etc. Major keys are indicated by capitals, minor keys by lowercase (not italicized). Clefs are indicated using the system where the treble, alto and bass clefs are given as *g*2, *c*3 and *F*4.

Throughout the text, numerals in curly brackets {} indicate the number accorded to the piece in the Viola da Gamba Society's *Index*. Only items from the Harp Consorts are not referred to by their VdGS number; instead these are referred to by their numbering in the autograph partbooks, and are prefixed by 'HC', followed by the corresponding number: HC23, etc.

In sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England, dates in official documents were reckoned from Lady Day (25 March), not from New Year's Day (1 January). Therefore, in the seventeenth century '1638' ran from 25 March 1638 to 24 March 1639. This system has been retained throughout the book. Thus, the overlapping period receives two years: e.g. 24 February 1637/38.

The old system of English currency has been retained: there were twelve pence (d.) to a shilling (s.) and twenty shillings to the pound (£ or l.)



## CHAPTER 1

### The ‘Lutes, Viols and Voices’

CHARLES I was one of the greatest patrons of the arts to sit on the English throne. His reign began on 27 March 1625, after the death of his father, James I; the first time an adult male had directly succeeded to the English throne since Henry VIII in 1509. Born in 1600, Charles was William Lawes’s senior by two years. By the time Lawes gained a post in the royal household in 1635 Charles had been ruling without parliament for six years. The so-called ‘personal rule’ lasted until 1640, by which time Charles – largely through a mixture of ineptitude and circumstance – managed to bring about a political climate that would result in civil war and regicide.

Charles was an aesthete. He spent a king’s fortune amassing one of the most impressive art collections in Europe, and commissioned the leading artists of the day such as Peter Paul Rubens and Anthony Van Dyck. Also a lover of music, according to John Playford, Charles was taught to play the bass viol by John Coprario.<sup>1</sup> His musical tastes were strongly influenced by his elder brother Henry, who died unexpectedly in 1612. Upon his accession, Charles inherited the existing royal musicians and their organizational structure. The changes that the Royal Music underwent during Charles’s reign were significant in many ways, but perhaps the most important innovation was the formation of the group variously known as ‘Lutes, Viols and Voices’ (LVV), in which Lawes was later employed.<sup>2</sup>

THE main residence of the Tudors and early Stuarts was Whitehall Palace. Royal residences were also kept at Hampton Court, St James’s and Greenwich; wherever the monarch resided he/she brought the administrative structure with them.<sup>3</sup> The structure of the court had to change in 1603 to accommodate the new king. Unlike Elizabeth I, James VI of Scotland (now James I of England), had a

<sup>1</sup> J. Playford, *An Introduction to the Skill of Musick* (10/1683), p. [x]. The fourth to seventh editions refer to Charles’s performing ability but not to his having been taught by Coprario; editions subsequent to 1683 repeat the version of the tenth edition.

<sup>2</sup> The information in this chapter is largely drawn from material in *RECM*.

<sup>3</sup> For a succinct background to the development of the court, see *HolmanFTF*, 32–57; also N. Cuddy, ‘Reinventing a Monarchy: The Changing Structure and Political Function of the Stuart Court, 1603–88’, in *The Stuart Courts*, ed. E. Cruickshanks (Gloucestershire, 2000), 59–85.

consort and children. The main household was now that of the king. His wife, Queen Anne of Denmark, also had her own household, as did the royal children (Henry, Charles and Elizabeth) as they came of age. Each of these establishments had its own staff, including musicians, and essentially mirrored the structure of the main household.<sup>4</sup> In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the English court was divided into three main areas: the Stables, the Household (the service areas 'below stairs') and the Chamber (the living areas etc. 'above stairs').<sup>5</sup> The Lord Chamberlain was the administrative head of the Chamber; his counterpart below stairs was the Lord Steward. For most of Charles I's reign Philip Herbert, fourth Earl of Pembroke and first Earl of Montgomery, served as Lord Chamberlain, holding office from 1626 to 1641. As Lord Chamberlain, Montgomery

controlled all musical activities at Court and all payments for them had first to be approved by him. There were no appointments made (except exceptionally by the King himself), liveries granted, instruments bought, or duties arranged without his approval and authority. In addition he acted as a mediator in any disputes concerning Court servants. His orders were conveyed by means of a written warrant, signed, stamped or sealed by his office and directed to the appropriate person or department.<sup>6</sup>

The Chamber consisted of several linked rooms proceeding from public to private: the Great Hall, the Guard Chamber, the Presence Chamber, the Privy Chamber, the Privy Apartments, and the Bedchamber. The Privy Apartments were the innermost sanctum of the court. Apart from its staff, only high-ranking courtiers and guests were usually allowed access, especially after the accession of Charles I.

The Royal Music was a microcosm of this complex structure.<sup>7</sup> It consisted of several distinct groups, all under the Lord Chamberlain's authority. The Chapel Royal, the oldest and largest of the groups, provided the daily choral music at the court chapels, and 'Doubtless, its members also contributed a good deal to informal music-making throughout the Tudor and Stuart period'.<sup>8</sup> Secular music

<sup>4</sup> For diagrams of the layout of Whitehall Palace etc., see S. Thurley, *Whitehall Palace: An Architectural History of the Royal Apartments, 1240–1698* (1999).

<sup>5</sup> For a detailed discussion, see G. Aylmer, *The King's Servants: The Civil Service of Charles I, 1625–1642* (2/1974), 26–32.

<sup>6</sup> *RECM*, iii. pp. ix–xiii, at ix.

<sup>7</sup> A good general introduction to music at the court of Charles I is provided by J. Wainwright, 'The King's Music', in *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, ed. T. Corns (Cambridge, 1999), 162–75.

<sup>8</sup> *HolmanFTF*, 36. For the Chapel Royal, see *The Old Cheque-Book or Book of Remembrance of the Chapel Royal from 1561 to 1744*, ed. E. Rimbault (1872; R/1966); D. Baldwin, *The Chapel Royal, Ancient and Modern* (1990); *HolmanFTF*, 389–414.

at court was provided by three main sections of the Royal Music: the wind bands, the violin band and the Private Music. These groups were distinguished by instrumentation and function. Each group had a distinct repertoire, function and place of performance within the palace at Whitehall. The functional distinction between the public and private music groups was basic common sense, stemming from the medieval distinction between *haut* and *bas* instruments. The violin and wind bands were suited to larger and more ceremonial entertainments, and loud enough to be heard above the din at meal times.

Until 1630 the wind band was divided into three sections: shawms and sackbuts; recorders; flutes and cornetts.<sup>9</sup> The duties of the wind band, however, often led to the intermixture of members from different sections resulting in their official reorganization in 1630, although David Lasocki notes that in practice reorganization may have occurred much earlier.<sup>10</sup> The wind bands provided music for ceremonial events, meal times, masques and for the Chapel Royal. The violin band consisted of thirteen men by 1625.<sup>11</sup> Established during the reign of Henry VIII, its ranks grew steadily in number until the Restoration.<sup>12</sup> Like the wind bands, the violin band was expected to provide music for social gatherings, such as meal times; its main function, however, was to provide dance music. Instruments such as lutes, viols, harps and keyboard instruments were naturally suited to more intimate settings, and were grouped into an ensemble often referred to as the 'Private Music' as they performed in the private and semi-private parts of the court. Although 'Private Music' is often applied to the earlier part of the century, it is only found in court documents and literature from the Restoration period. The earliest reference dates from 16 June 1660, noting the 'Private Musick sworne Ju: 16<sup>th</sup> by my Lord [Chamberlain]';<sup>13</sup> Thomas Fuller used the term in 1662.<sup>14</sup> For ease of reference, 'Private Music' will occasionally be used here to refer generally to the various incarnations of the LVV.

In many court documents from the reign of James I the private music (which mostly consisted of singers and lutenists, but also a harper and several viol players) is referred to as 'the Consorte'. In modern usage 'consort' is generally understood

<sup>9</sup> For the wind bands at the early modern court, see D. Lasocki, 'Professional Recorder Players in England, 1540–1740' (PhD diss., University of Iowa, 1983); D. Lasocki, 'The Recorder Consort at the English Court, 1540–1673', *The American Recorder* 25 (1984), 91–100, 131–5.

<sup>10</sup> Lasocki, 'Recorder Players', i. 105–12.

<sup>11</sup> *RECM*, iii. 2–3.

<sup>12</sup> *HolmanFTF* is the definitive account of the violin at the English court.

<sup>13</sup> *RECM*, i. 2.

<sup>14</sup> *FullerW* ('Wiltshire'), 157.

as a small ensemble of instruments with usually one person to a part, and by extension the instruments played. The etymology is confused and confusing. 'Consort' seems to have originated from the Italian *concerto* meaning an ensemble of voices or instruments: the French *concert* appears to have had a similar meaning.<sup>15</sup> Warwick Edwards has convincingly shown that from about 1575–1625 'consort' was used to describe a mixed group of instruments.<sup>16</sup> References to broken and whole consorts (respectively implying mixed and homogeneous ensembles) are rare and do not appear until after 1660.<sup>17</sup> Even here the meaning is not clear. In music references in seventeenth-century England, 'broken' was most commonly applied to divisions where the given melody or ground was 'broken' into shorter notes.<sup>18</sup>

Upon his accession, Charles I retained most of his father's musicians and simply added the musicians from his household as Prince of Wales.<sup>19</sup> The 'Consorte' was modified and became generally known as the 'Lutes, Viols and Voices' or the 'Lutes and Voices'. 'Consort' is retained in some documents, where it appears to be interchangeable with LVV etc.: e.g. when Lucretia Friend (or Frend) was granted denizenship in June 1631 she was described as 'the wife of John Frend, one of the Consort of his Majesty's musicians'.<sup>20</sup> And when Robert Tomkins replaced Robert Kindersley in March 1634 it was in 'the office of musician for the Consort'.<sup>21</sup> In June 1629, however, a warrant was granted 'for a hayle for ye Consorte' and 'for the lutes & voices',<sup>22</sup> suggesting that 'ye Consorte' may have referred to a particular group within the LVV. (A 'hayle' appears to be derived from a secondary meaning of the word 'hale', in origin a doublet of 'hall', which according to the *Oxford English Dictionary* refers to 'A place roofed over, but usually open at the sides; a pavilion; a tent; a booth, hut or other temporary structure for shelter'.)<sup>23</sup> Friend, Tomkins and Kindersley held places as 'Musicians for the Violls', associated with the LVV but

<sup>15</sup> W. Edwards, 'Consort', *GMO* (accessed 27 February 2009); *HolmanFTF*, 132.

<sup>16</sup> See also W. Edwards, 'The Sources of Elizabethan Consort Music' (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 1974), i. 36–57.

<sup>17</sup> For example, a warrant dated 13 February 1662/3 includes a reference to the 'Broaken Consort': *RECM*, v. 41.

<sup>18</sup> For example, see *SimpsonDV*.

<sup>19</sup> See also *HolmanFTF*, esp. 32–57; D. Pinto, 'Music at Court: Remarks on the Performance of William Lawes' Works for Viols', in *A Viola da Gamba Miscellany*, ed. J. Boer and G. van Oorschot (Utrecht, 1994), 27–40; A. Ashbee, 'William Lawes and the "Lutes, Viols and Voices"', in *William Lawes (1602–1645): Essays on his Life, Times and Work*, ed. Ashbee (Aldershot, 1998), 1–10.

<sup>20</sup> *RECM*, iii. 61.

<sup>21</sup> *RECM*, iii. 77–8.

<sup>22</sup> *RECM*, iii. 45.

<sup>23</sup> *The Oxford English Dictionary* (Oxford, 2/1989), vi. 1026.

not in the group proper. In 1625 the viols group consisted of Friend, Alfonso Ferrabosco II, Roger Major (replaced by Kindersley in 1626) and Daniel Farrant.<sup>24</sup> It seems likely that the bowed string players (perhaps with others) were occasionally referred to as 'the consort', distinguishing them from the main body of the LVV, which mostly consisted of what can be best described as singer-lutenists. At this time most singers played the lute and most lutenists sang. To what degree musicians were apt at both varied; for example, Nicholas Lanier was a talented singer and lutenist, but Robert Johnson, John Lawrence, John Kelly, Edward Wormall and Jonas Wrench seem to have been primarily employed as lutenists. Many of the important singers, such as Henry and William Lawes, Anthony Robert, John Wilson and Angelo Notari, were also lutenists.

The LVV was officially formed by letters patent dated 11 July 1626.<sup>25</sup> According to the patent, each member of the group was to be paid for one year from Lady Day (25 March) 1625, and then for life from Lady Day 1626, suggesting that the group was formed upon Charles's accession but that there was an administrative delay in granting the official patents, presumably because the group was an innovation. The patent lists seventeen musicians, most of whom were originally employed in Prince Charles's household. In addition, Nicholas Lanier was appointed 'Master of the Musick', and Ferrabosco II received a grant to replace Coprario as 'Composer of our musicke in ordinary'.<sup>26</sup> Fourteen of the group received £40 a year. Alfonso Bales and Robert Marshe received £20 a year. They also received this sum in Prince Charles's household, half that of most of the other musicians. Bales was also a London Wait. His salary may have been based on his ability to attend court;<sup>27</sup> perhaps Marsh held a similar arrangement. Thomas Ford received £80 a year, 'being £40 for his former place and £40 in place of John Ballard, late deceased'.<sup>28</sup> In addition to the initial places, several musicians associated with the LVV, e.g. Johnson and Nicholas Lanier, also held posts as musicians for the 'Lutes'. Several new posts associated with the group were also created during Charles's reign. Thus, the loosely defined LVV consisted of twenty-nine musicians (18 singer-lutenists, 1 harpist, 2 keyboard players, 4 viol players and 4 violinists). This number was largely maintained throughout the period 1625–42.<sup>29</sup> The most notable aspect of the group was its capacity to perform a broad range of vocal and chamber music:

<sup>24</sup> *RECM*, iii. 9.

<sup>25</sup> *RECM*, iii. 19.

<sup>26</sup> A post that added £40 per annum to Ferrabosco's wages: *RECM*, iii. 21.

<sup>27</sup> Suggested in A. Ashbee, 'Balls, Richard', *BDECM*, i. 57.

<sup>28</sup> *RECM*, iii. 19. Thomas Day received a further £20 a year for keeping a singing boy, and Robert Johnson the same amount extra for strings.

<sup>29</sup> Tables listing the members of the 'Consort' and the main group of 'Lutes, Viols and

the preponderance of lutenists suggests that they would have performed in mixed consorts.<sup>30</sup>

Queens Anne (wife of James I) and Henrietta Maria (wife of Charles I) had their own musical establishments separate from the main household. Henrietta Maria's establishment was in effect a scaled-down version of that of her husband.<sup>31</sup> Most of her musicians were French and Catholic, and generally better paid than Charles's. The average wage of the LVV was £40 per annum, whereas the majority of Henrietta Maria's musicians received £120. This was probably linked to attendance. It is likely that the queen demanded almost daily attendance from most of her musicians, whereas the king could afford (and needed) to operate a rota system given his large number of musicians. Foreign musicians in the king's household generally commanded better salaries than their English colleagues. For example, Adam Vallet received a salary of £60 a year, and Jacques Gaultier started on £50 a year in 1622, which increased to £100 in 1624. The highest-paid English musician (for a single post) was Thomas Ford, who in 1634 was granted an extra £20 a year, bringing his income to £60 per annum.<sup>32</sup> Only Lanier as Master of the Music earned more for a single post. Although Lanier's £200 a year was considerably more than the wages of the average court musician, it is put into context when considered against the wages earned by many high-ranking officials such as the Lord Steward, who in the late 1620s earned over £2,000 annually.<sup>33</sup> Several members of Henrietta Maria's music (Gaultier, Richard Dering, Anthony Robert and Nicholas Duvall) also held posts in the main musical establishment. Such pluralism was a common feature of court life. A notable example is Ferrabosco II, who held four court posts by the time of his death in 1628.

THE historian Neil Cuddy has noted that James I was obsessive about security, and transformed the internal subtleties of access to the monarch of his predecessor's reign into hard, institutional distinctions.<sup>34</sup> The staff and functions of the Privy Chamber and Bedchamber were separated. The Bedchamber

Voices' during the early Stuart period are given in Ashbee, 'Lawes and the "Lutes, Viols and Voices"', at 2–3.

<sup>30</sup> See *HolmanFTF*, 197–224, esp. 200–1.

<sup>31</sup> See I. Spink, 'The Musicians of Queen Henrietta-Maria: Some Notes and References in the English State Papers', *AcM* 36 (1964), 177–82.

<sup>32</sup> *RECM*, iii. 79.

<sup>33</sup> This was his total income; his official salary was £100: for a table of incomes of selected court officials, see Aylmer, *King's Servants*, 204–10.

<sup>34</sup> N. Cuddy, 'The Revival of the Entourage: The Bedchamber of James I, 1603–1625', in *The English Court, from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War*, ed. D. Starkey (1987), 173–225.

comprised the Withdrawing Chamber, the Bedchamber itself, and the Privy Galleries and Lodgings (i.e. the private apartments consisting of libraries, closets, bathrooms, etc.).<sup>35</sup> This left the Privy Chamber staff with only ceremonial and formal duties, while the Bedchamber staff, under the Groom of the Stool, took over the intimate aspects of attendance on the monarch. The Privy Chamber and its staff were now under the control of the Lord Chamberlain. Charles, a naturally shy and introverted person, inspired by the gravity of the Escorial, took further measures to ensure his privacy, restrict access to his person, and increase formality. A new triple lock was fitted on the Bedchamber door, with names of their holders engraved on the keys: only Bedchamber staff and invited guests were allowed access under pain of banishment from the court for a year.<sup>36</sup> The restrictions put in place by the early Stuarts were the culmination of a trend begun with the Eltham Ordinances of 1526, which gradually created a restricted and private area of the court for the monarch and his/her guests to reside.<sup>37</sup> The restrictions did not have a dramatic effect on musicians, as the places in which they performed were directly linked to the instruments they played. The Presence Chamber and other public areas of the court were open to anyone respectably attired, but the Privy Chamber was closed to all except its own staff and those few individuals personally chosen by the king, which included his private musicians. 'In practice, by the early 1620s all peers and bishops also had Privy Chamber access', which was officially sanctioned by Charles I.<sup>38</sup> Although it is unclear whether the musicians were allowed access to the Bedchamber, it is likely that permission was granted as occasion demanded. This had important consequences for such privileged musicians. Power at the Stuart court was centred around the physical person of the king. The closer one was to the centre of power, the more power one could wield and the more opportunities there were for remuneration. Thus, with the accession of Charles I we find the paradoxical situation where some of the most menial employees, such as Groom of the Stool and the private musicians, were elevated in status because they personally attended the king. Ferrabosco's post as instructor illustrates the point. When appointed as teacher to Prince Henry in 1604 Ferrabosco had to be also appointed as an 'extraordinary groom of the Privy Chamber', granting him passage to the required part of the palace usually out-of-bounds to most servants and courtiers.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>35</sup> See also Cuddy, 'Reinventing a Monarchy', esp. 70–5.

<sup>36</sup> See K. Sharpe, 'The Image of Virtue: The Court and Household of Charles I, 1625–42', in *English Court*, ed. Starkey, 226–60.

<sup>37</sup> See *HolmanFTF*, 32–57.

<sup>38</sup> Cuddy, 'Reinventing a Monarchy', 67.

<sup>39</sup> *RECM*, iv. 11.

THE Exchequer was responsible for all of the court's revenue.<sup>40</sup> Most royal musicians were paid directly from the Treasury of the Chamber, although some were paid directly from the Exchequer. The Exchequer also paid occasional lump sums to various court officials, such as the Treasurer of the Chamber, the Master of the Great Wardrobe, the Keeper of the Privy Purse, and the Cofferer of the Household, who were occasionally required to pay musicians from their own resources. The records of the Exchequer and the Treasury of the Chamber are especially valuable sources in tracing payments to musicians. In 1614 the purchase of strings and instruments was transferred from the Privy Purse to the Treasurer of the Chamber, so many records fortunately survive.<sup>41</sup> Court finances generally appear to have been used for whatever purpose was most pressing, and payments did not always follow the same channels.<sup>42</sup>

Court posts were highly sought-after, and usually secured in one of three ways: in reversion; through the influence of a courtier; or (rarely) by direct command of the king. The admissions process was complex and expensive. Fortunately for us, during the Interregnum court officials faced the unenviable task of attempting to reconstruct the complex procedures of court administration; this necessitated documents being drawn up to instruct newly appointed officials how the system worked during a period of significant administrative disruption. The admissions process was set out in a memorandum entitled 'The Method (and style) of issuing Instruments under the Great Seal'; here summarized by Peter Holman:

A warrant was prepared by the Clerks of the Signet on behalf of the Attorney General for the sovereign's signature, the 'Royal Sign Manual', or his signature expressed in the form of a stamp. Once this was obtained, it proceeded through the system, carried from office to office by the individual himself, the 'party prosecutor'; he went from the Secretary of State to the Signet Office, back to the Secretary, then to the Privy Seal Office, and finally to Chancery. ...

Musicians, particularly those paid by the Treasury of the Chamber, were often appointed by a simpler method: the Clerk of the Signet prepared ... a 'Warrant to prepare a bill to pass the Privy Signet, thereby authorizing the Treasurer of the Chamber' to pay fee and livery.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>40</sup> For a succinct account of the court's financial structure in relation to musicians see Ashbee's description of the court payment procedures and their relations to the surviving records: *RECM*, iii. pp. xii–xiii.

<sup>41</sup> See *RECM*, iii. p. xii.

<sup>42</sup> See Aylmer, *King's Servants*, 32–40.

<sup>43</sup> *HolmanFTF*, 42–3. Holman quotes the memorandum (GB-Lpro, State Paper Office, 18/42/5) in full; it dates to 1653 and is discussed in G. Aylmer, *The State's Servants*:



The system of reversions further complicated the acquisition of court posts. A post could be held over, in reversion, to the holder's heir.<sup>44</sup> Reversion sometimes resulted in persons taking up positions at court for which they were ill-suited, although this was unlikely to have affected the musicians' places. Musical training was usually passed down from father to son, and it seems that one had to have a high degree of competency to gain a post in the LVV. In the LVV five sons inherited their fathers' posts: Alfonso Ferrabosco III, Henry Ferrabosco, John Taylor, Theophilus Lupo and Robert Dowland.<sup>45</sup> Within the LVV there were also familial connections, undoubtedly used to form alliances: Henry and William Lawes, Giles and Robert Tomkins, Nicholas and John Lanier. There were also familial ties between the different music groups.<sup>46</sup> There was intermarrying within the LVV (and within the Royal Music generally), strengthening the dominance of some families, especially the émigré Italian families, such as the Bassanos, Laniers and Lupos. This nepotistic structure was a microcosm of the court structure in general, which (as a consequence of the underlying theory of divine right) functioned on the premise that one's birth afforded certain privileges.

Connections were vital in gaining a position at court. Posts usually came available upon the death of the holder, if they were not held in reversion or promised to someone else. John Wilson, one of the foremost native lutenists of his day and later Heather Professor of Music at Oxford, was successful in gaining a place in the LVV in 1635 only after several attempts (although one must be cautious of hyperbole):

Dr Wilson made great and frequent sute to K: Charles, to bee admitted to be one of his private musiq: But by the envie and opposition of some at Court, was still put by. 9 petitions hee had delivered for severall vacancies, and yet still some other was preferred before him.<sup>47</sup>

Wilson may have been the person to whom the Earl of Newcastle was referring in his advice to the young Prince Charles (II) when he noted that

a merry Mutition that I knowe, desired the place of the kinges bagpiper, ...

*The Civil Service of the English Republic, 1649–1660* (1973), 436–7. See also Aylmer, *King's Servants*, 69–96.

<sup>44</sup> See Aylmer, *King's Servants*, 72–3 and 96–106.

<sup>45</sup> Dowland's place was extraordinary.

<sup>46</sup> Diagrammatic tables tracing the family relationships between court musicians can be found in *BDECM*, ii. 1225–7.

<sup>47</sup> The passage is quoted in full in Ashbee, 'Lawes and the "Lutes, Viols and Voices"', 4; it is taken from the 'manuscript notebook of a society man, c. 1640–60' currently housed in the Museum of London, Tangye collection (no reference no.; *ibid.*, 9 n. 6).

hee sayd therefore hee Hoppte to have itt, for they always gave places, to those  
That were moste unfitt, for them, as a Luteneste place, to one that playd of  
the viole, & a violest place to one that Playd of the Lute.<sup>48</sup>

A court post did not, however, guarantee the successful acquisition of further places. Following the death of Thomas Lupo in 1628, Robert Johnson unsuccessfully petitioned for his place as composer to the 'Lutes and voyces', stating that he had served for '23 yeares and never obteyned any suite':<sup>49</sup> his two court posts notwithstanding.

Occasionally new places were created in the Private Music, allowing sought-after (usually foreign) talents to be employed: additional places were created in 1625 for the infamous French lutenist Jacques Gaultier, and again in 1631 for the singer John Fox.<sup>50</sup> Another way to gain a court post was to work in an extraordinary capacity, often without fee, in the hopes of later securing a court post when one became available. For example, the violinist John Woodington appears to have served in the violin band of the main household from c. 1618, and in the group known as 'Cooperarios Musique' in Prince Charles's household from c. 1622. In both cases, it seems that he served in an extraordinary capacity without remuneration.<sup>51</sup> He did so until 1625, when he replaced Adam Vallet a violinist in the LVV; Holman has suggested that Woodington was apprenticed to Vallet.<sup>52</sup> It was clearly advantageous to serve the court even without official remuneration. Such speculative work would have had other rewards in the form of payments from the Crown's Privy Purse and gifts. It also allowed musicians to come to the attention of the king, and was one way of getting lucrative jobs with wealthy courtiers hoping to ape the fashionable court music. Many musicians, such as William Lawes, who replaced original members of the LVV seem to have begun their court careers in this way.

Some musicians served as apprentices to court musicians, which could also lead to a court post. Lawes was taught by (if not apprenticed to) Coprario in the household of Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford. Although this was many years before Lawes's admission to the Royal Music, such connections would have opened doors. Lawes was also fortunate to have his brother Henry employed in the Chapel Royal

<sup>48</sup> *Ideology and Politics on the Eve of Restoration: Newcastle's Advice to Charles II*, ed. T. Slaughter (Philadelphia, 1984), 57. I am grateful to Peter Holman for this observation.

<sup>49</sup> *RECM*, viii. 99–100. Lupo also held a post as composer to the violin band.

<sup>50</sup> Fox received £40 per annum 'in reward of his service in his Quality of Singing': *RECM*, iii. 60.

<sup>51</sup> See A. Ashbee, 'Coprario, John', *BDECM*, i. 296–8.

<sup>52</sup> *HolmanFTF*, 214.

from 1626 and in the LVV from 1631, allowing William easier access to the court. There appears to have been a tradition of apprenticeship among the court harpers in the early seventeenth century. From July 1618 Philip Squire received £30 a year 'to teach Lewis Evans, a child of great dexterity in music, to play on the Irish harp and other instruments'.<sup>53</sup> Further privy seals show that Squire continued to teach Evans and provide his maintenance until Evans received his own post in 1633.<sup>54</sup> Holman has convincingly suggested that Squire was himself apprenticed to Cormack MacDermott, whom he replaced in 1618.<sup>55</sup> There are also several references to singing boys apprenticed to various court musicians. The boys were primarily associated with the Chapel Royal, although they also appear to have participated in secular entertainments; in the early part of the century they also acted.<sup>56</sup> In early 1623 Thomas Day (a gentleman of the Chapel Royal) succeeded Richard Ball as instructor of a singing boy in Prince Charles's household. Day also held a place in the LVV from its inception. In addition, on 24 January 1633/4 he replaced Nathaniel Giles as Master of the Children of the Chapel. Angelo Notari received £48 a year from Christmas 1622 for keeping and training two singing boys in Prince Charles's household, formerly the job of Richard Ball. Notari was also on the initial list of LVV; payments for keeping the boys appear to have ended in 1625.<sup>57</sup> A position as a singing boy could occasionally lead to a post as a professional musician in adulthood. For example, Edward Wormal was one of two singing boys appointed to Prince Henry's household in 1610.<sup>58</sup> He was granted a place as a musician to Prince Charles in 1622 and went on to serve in the LVV until the disbandment of the court.

After the Restoration, Henry Cooke became the Master of the Children of the Chapel. In addition to his place in the LVV, he was responsible for 'ye boyes in ye private musick'.<sup>59</sup> Warrants related to Cooke give a fuller picture of what was expected of the children. Their duties were presumably similar those expected earlier in the century:

Warrant to pay £115. 10s. 6d. to Captain Henry Cooke, master of the children of his Majesty's Chapel Royal, for having the children taught Latin, to

<sup>53</sup> *RECM*, viii. 78.

<sup>54</sup> *RECM*, iii. 45; *RECM*, viii. 117; *RECM*, iii. 192; *RECM*, iii. 78.

<sup>55</sup> *HolmanH*, 194.

<sup>56</sup> See L. Austern, *Music in English Children's Drama of the Later Renaissance* (Philadelphia, 1992).

<sup>57</sup> For Notari, see *HolmanFTF*, esp. 200–11.

<sup>58</sup> *RECM*, iv. 211–12.

<sup>59</sup> *RECM*, i. 4.

write, to play on the violin, organ and lute, for stringing and penning their harpsichords, for fire and strings at the music room at the Chapel, for his disbursements for clothes for Michael Wise, late one of the children of the Chapel, and for going into the country looking after boys for the Chapel for half a year from Michaelmas 1664 to Lady Day 1665, and for nursing of three boys that were sick of the small pox.<sup>60</sup>

In the Restoration at least, the children were evidently schooled in the old bowling alley at Hampton Court.<sup>61</sup> The likelihood is that this was only for the summer months when the king was on progress, which suggests that many of the royal musicians did not attend the king on progress (see below). A permanent base for the boys at Hampton Court is unlikely: it would have been too far from Whitehall if the boys were needed for regular duty. Although taking charge of children appears to have been another way for court musicians to increase their income, the children received food, board and an education.

THE creation of the post of 'Master of the Music' was an important step in the history of the Royal Music. The post appears to have originated in Prince Charles's household, to which Nicholas Lanier was appointed in March 1624/5.<sup>62</sup> He was awarded £100 a year, whereas the usual rate was £40, suggesting a position of responsibility. The post was confirmed in 1626 with an annuity of £200. Lanier was responsible for all of the music groups at court, which apparently caused some friction. Indeed, on 6 May 1630, the Lord Chamberlain was forced to issue a statement confirming Lanier's 'freedom of diet' among the various music groups, with refusal to co-operate leading to punishment.<sup>63</sup> Holman notes that 'diet' in this case was unlikely to mean the food royal servants received when in service at court. Rather, citing a wider secondary meaning, he suggests that 'in the present context "diet" might mean regular performances or rehearsals'.<sup>64</sup> Lanier's authority was evidently questioned beyond the LVV, which suggests that prior to 1626 the music groups were largely self-governing: this in turn suggests evidence of the demarcation between the groups. The Master of the Music post suggests that there was some need for order to be imposed on the Royal Music; the attempted

<sup>60</sup> *RECM*, i. 62. See also *RECM*, i. 57.

<sup>61</sup> See *RECM*, i. 66. For Hampton Court, see S. Thurley, *Hampton Court Palace: A Social and Architectural History* (2003).

<sup>62</sup> For a detailed account of Lanier, see M. Wilson, *Nicholas Lanier: Master of the King's Musick* (Aldershot, 1994).

<sup>63</sup> *RECM*, iii. 53.

<sup>64</sup> *HolmanFTF*, 232–3, at 233.

centralization of the music groups also ties in with other court reforms and is perhaps reflective of Charles I's controlling nature.

The 'freedom of diet' request coincides with the reorganization of the wind bands, which presumably occurred under the auspices of Lanier who had close family ties to the wind bands. David Lasocki has shown that in 1630 the three traditional wind bands were officially reorganized as one group, divided into three companies.<sup>65</sup> From 1630 until 1642 the three companies alternated duties. Although their instrumentation is never stated, the 'first company seems to have been primarily cornettists, and the second and third probably players of the cornett, shawm and sackbut. The group provided music in the Chapel Royal, for masques, ceremonies and the King's dinner table'.<sup>66</sup> A warrant from the Lord Chamberlain dated 6 May 1630 outlines the way in which the three companies were employed on a weekly rota system.<sup>67</sup> It is likely that some of the other sections of the Royal Music also operated on a rota system. For example, not all members of the violin band accompanied the king on some royal expeditions.<sup>68</sup> The violin band, however, does not seem to have operated by rota in its daily duties, as its members appear to have all played together as a single orchestra.<sup>69</sup> The reorganization of the wind bands appears to have prompted a reform of the violin band, with the order dated 12 April 1631 'for the better regulating and ordering of his Ma<sup>tes</sup> Musique of Violins'.<sup>70</sup> Holman noted that this was directed at Stephen Nau (composer for the violins) not Lanier, implying that Nau exercised *de facto* control over the group and that Lanier's 'freedom of diet' request a year earlier had been successfully resisted by the violin band.<sup>71</sup>

No information survives on how much attendance members of the LVV gave at court, or whether they also attended the king on progress. It was traditional for the monarch to leave the capital and embark on progresses for approximately five months from July to November, primarily to avoid the summer stench of the raw sewage and the consequent rise in the risk of disease.<sup>72</sup> Although some court musicians accompanied the king, many did not, leaving the entertainment to local

<sup>65</sup> See Lasocki, 'Recorder Players', i. 105–12.

<sup>66</sup> Lasocki, 'Recorder Players', i. 112.

<sup>67</sup> *RECM*, iii. 52–3. There are two similar orders: *RECM*, iii. 74 and 94–5.

<sup>68</sup> See *RECM*, iii. 80.

<sup>69</sup> See *HolmanFTF*, 234 (and *passim*).

<sup>70</sup> See *HolmanFTF*, 234.

<sup>71</sup> *HolmanFTF*, 233–5.

<sup>72</sup> See also, P. Slack, *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England* (1985; R/Oxford, 1990).