

PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
CAMBRIDGE ANTIQUARIAN  
SOCIETY

(INCORPORATING THE CAMBS & HUNTS  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY)



VOLUME LXXII

for 1982 and 1983

IMRAY LAURIE NORIE AND WILSON

1984

PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
CAMBRIDGE ANTIQUARIAN  
SOCIETY

(INCORPORATING THE CAMBS & HUNTS  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY)



VOLUME LXXII

for 1982 and 1983

IMRAY LAURIE NORIE AND WILSON

1984

Published for the Cambridge Antiquarian Society (incorporating the Cambs and  
Hunts Archaeological Society) by Imray, Laurie Norie and Wilson Ltd, Wych House,  
Saint Ives, Huntingdon

ISSN.0309-3606

PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
CAMBRIDGE ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY

(INCORPORATING THE CAMBS & HUNTS ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY)



## THE PROCEEDINGS

1. The Editor welcomes the submission of articles on the history and archaeology of the County for publication in the *Proceedings*, but in order to avoid disappointment potential contributors are advised to write to the Editor, to enquire whether the subject is likely to be of interest to the Society, before submitting a final text. The Editor, if necessary with the advice of the editorial committee, reserves the right to refuse to publish any papers even when an earlier approval of the subject has been given.
2. Authors are reminded that the cost of printing is high and that, all other things being equal, a short and succinct paper is more likely to be published than a long one. It would also assist the Editor if contributors who know of possible sources for subventions towards the cost of printing their paper would inform the Editor of this when submitting their manuscript.
3. The copyright of both text and illustrations will normally remain with the author, and where relevant the photographer and draughtsman, but to simplify future administration contributors are invited to assign their copyright on a form that will be supplied by the Editor.

## BACK NUMBERS OF THE PROCEEDINGS

Members might like to know that a considerable stock of back numbers of the *Proceedings* can be obtained from the publishers, Imray Laurie Norie and Wilson, and that the Honorary Librarian has copies of many publications in the Quarto and Octavo series for sale.

## CONTENTS

	<i>page</i>
<i>Officers and Council of the Society 1981-82, and 1982-83</i>	
A Handlist of the Publications of W. M. Palmer, M.D., F.S.A., Part 2 J. D. PICKLES	1
Three Middle Bronze Age Finds from Bainton, North Cambridgeshire GAVIN SIMPSON	6
An Anglo-Saxon Brooch from the Cambridgeshire Fens M. D. HOWE	10
The Development and Topography of Saxon Cambridge JEREMY HASLAM	13
Churches Out of Use in Cambridgeshire ALISON TAYLOR	30
1 Gazetteer	34
2 Excavation at the Site of St Benet's Church, Huntingdon, 1980	39
3 Excavations at St John's Church, Duxford FAYE and ROBERT POWELL	44
The Moated Site at Hardwick, West Cambridgeshire COLIN HASELGROVE	48
Swavesey, Cambridgeshire: a Fortified Medieval Planned Market Town J. R. RAVENSDALE	55
Ryder's Farm, Swavesey: a Late Thirteenth-Century Timber-Framed Aisled Hall E. M. DAVIS	59
Stone at Cambridge Castle: an Early Use of Collyweston Stone Slate H. B. SHARP	62
The Repair and Dendrochronological Dating of a Medieval Granary from Tadlow, Cambridgeshire GRAHAM BLACK, BOB LAXTON, and GAVIN SIMPSON	79
A Survey of Dry Drayton Park, Cambridgeshire CAMBRIDGE ARCHAEOLOGY FIELD GROUP	88
An Ancient Christian Word-square at Great Gidding DAVID SHERLOCK	90
The Puritan Revolution and the 'Beauty of Holiness' at Cambridge: the case of John Cosin †JOHN G. HOFFMAN	94
A Failure at Cambridge: Cavendish College, 1877-1892 PETER SEARBY	106
<i>Index</i>	121

## THE PURITAN REVOLUTION AND THE 'BEAUTY OF HOLINESS' AT CAMBRIDGE

The case of John Cosin, Master of Peterhouse  
and Vice-Chancellor of the University

†JOHN G. HOFFMAN

This paper attempts to add to the understanding of the meaning of the Puritan revolution for Cambridge University through an analysis of the activities of John Cosin, a leading Laudian, and the reaction against him and the party which he represented. Cosin is of particular importance, not only as a leader of the Laudians at Cambridge, but because of the comparative wealth of information that survives about his activities there.

John Cosin, who became bishop of Durham at the Restoration, had had a long connection with Cambridge before becoming a Master there in 1635. The son of a citizen of Norwich, he won one of the city scholarships to Gonville and Caius College, and was admitted as a scholar in 1610 at the age of 14.<sup>1</sup> He would have been exposed to the various theological controversies of James I's reign at the College,<sup>2</sup> but he would have encountered the traditional scholastic approach to learning which had been very little changed by the Reformation.<sup>3</sup> This early stage of his career at the university was personally rather uneventful, though he did strike up acquaintances with various divines and fellow students who were to become members of the Laudian party. By 1617 he had proceeded to the B.A. and M.A. degrees.<sup>4</sup>

From 1617 to 1619 Cosin served as secretary to Bishop John Overall of Coventry and Lichfield. This exposed him more directly to the so-called 'Arminian' school of Anglican theology.<sup>5</sup> On the death of Overall in May 1619 Cosin returned to Cambridge, where he was rhetoric praelector in 1620-1, university preacher in 1622, and a junior fellow of Caius from 1620 to 1624. At this time he began his association with the well-known Arminians Richard Neile, then bishop of Durham, Richard Montagu, the famous controversialist and later bishop of Norwich and other members of the 'Durham House' circle.<sup>6</sup> While resident at Durham House as chaplain to Neile, Cosin tried unsuccessfully to succeed to a senior fellowship, and soon turned his attention instead to a series of preferments in the north, including the rectories of Brancepeth and Elwick, County Durham, the archdeaconry of the East Riding, and a prebend at Durham cathedral.<sup>7</sup> After his visit to Caius in September 1630 to receive his doctorate of divinity, it does not seem that Cosin was at Cambridge again until 1635.<sup>8</sup>

In the meantime Cosin won national attention by his defence of Montagu at the York House Conference,<sup>9</sup> by his popular *Collection of Private Devotions*, which regarded the Church of England as an integral part of the ancient and universal catholic church,<sup>10</sup> and by his aesthetic elaboration of the liturgy at Durham Cathedral.<sup>11</sup> He was now firmly identified with the Arminian party coming under the leadership of William Laud. As Cosin was rising to a position of some importance in the Laudian party, it was establishing a firm hold on Cambridge University. After a great deal of controversy, in 1628 the Duke of Buckingham was elected Chancellor of the University. Cosin helped by bringing a letter to Cambridge from Neile.<sup>12</sup> Though the duke was murdered that August, the turning point had come for the University: the king and the Laudians had triumphed.

But Puritanism was not yet dead at Cambridge: one Puritan preacher was forced to make a public recantation in 1628, and another was arrested in 1632.<sup>13</sup> Arminian ceremony was now being introduced. Sir Simonds D'Ewes recorded that in 1620 'none then dared to commit idolatry by bowing to, or towards, the altar, the communion table, or the bread and wine,' as they were in the mid-1630s.<sup>14</sup> The tide was definitely turning in favour of the Laudians. Despite occasional complaints about Arminian preachers, the party was steadily gaining important positions in the University. The moderate Thomas

† The Editor is obliged to Dr A.I. Doyle of Durham University for the following note on Dr Hoffman, who died in January 1981: John Hoffman, late Assistant Professor of History at Clemson University, South Carolina, took the B.A. and M.A. degrees at the University of California at Davis, and the Ph.D. at the University of Wisconsin (1977), where he studied with Professor William L. Sachse. He published "John Cosin's Cure of Souls: Parish Priest at Brancepeth and Elwick, County Durham," *Durham University Journal* (1978); "The Arminian and the Iconoclast: The Dispute Between John Cosin and Peter Smart," *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (1979); and "Another Side of 'Thorough': John Cosin and Administration, Discipline, and Finance in the Church of England, 1624-1644," *Albion* (1981).

Comber became Master of Trinity, a defeat for the Puritans considering the tenor of the college; Laud's chaplain Edward Martin was made President of Queens' and received his doctorate by royal mandate; Henry Butts, Master of Corpus Christi, committed suicide and was succeeded by Dr Richard Love by royal command; and William Beale became Master of Jesus in 1632 and moved to the headship of St John's in 1634.<sup>15</sup>

Outside powers tried to intervene in the University's affairs. Laud insisted that all university orders and injunctions be approved by him,<sup>16</sup> and he tried unsuccessfully to replace the afternoon lecture at Trinity with catechizing. Charles I provided a set of 'injunctions, orders and directions,' for the 'better government' of the University, more tightly regulating morality and administration. On the other side, the House of Commons responded to the increased royal influence over university appointments with an act 'to prevent Corruption in Presentations and Collations to Benefices and in Election to Headships, Fellowships, and Scholars Places, in Colleges and Halls,' but was dissolved before the act received a third reading.<sup>17</sup>

By June 1634 Dr Ward, Master of Sidney Sussex, was complaining to Archbishop Ussher that he never knew our university affairs in worse condition...; new Heads are brought in, and they are backed in maintaining novelties and them which broach new opinions...; others are disgruntled and checked...for favoring Puritans.<sup>18</sup>

Ten years later William Prynne was to echo Ward's complaint: Laud, since his greatness by his extraordinary power brought in Divers of his Creatures, Chaplains to be heads of houses and Vice-Chancellours...who within the space of ten years introduced the several Popish Innovations.<sup>19</sup>

One of those distasteful to the Puritans was Dr Matthew Wren, who was to spend seventeen years in the Tower and was the uncle of the famous Sir Christopher. He had been appointed Master of Peterhouse in 1626 by royal order over the wishes of the fellows. At Peterhouse he provided for the better care of the college records and was very active in the building of the chapel. A Puritan pamphlet accused him of attacking sermons and of 'bowing to the sacrament, and elevating it above his head... as the Priest used to doe in the Masse.'<sup>20</sup> In 1634 Wren became bishop of Hereford, and the College, no longer opposed to him, nominated his brother Christopher, the father of the architect, to be his successor. Instead, the bishop of Ely named the northern candidate John Cosin on 8 February 1635.<sup>21</sup>

Cosin's activities at Durham and elsewhere had not gone unnoticed at Cambridge. In March 1628 Joseph Mead wrote that Cosin was 'a most audacious fellow and I doubt scarce a strong Protestant, and takes upon him impudently to bring superstitious innovation into our Church.' Mead had been shown a letter from Durham by Dr Ward, which reported Cosin's use of candles and images there.<sup>22</sup> The controversies over Cosin's *Devotions* and Smart's sermon would probably have been common knowledge at Cambridge.

Soon after Cosin was installed a new dispute of major proportions broke out. According to Laud's chaplain and biographer, Peter Heylyn, despite the fact that by 1636 many chapels had been beautified and furnished with altars, rails and plate, and the proper reverential behaviour put in use, nevertheless 'in most Colledges, all things stood as they had been formerly.' Laud was particularly upset that some colleges reportedly lacked chapels altogether or used unconsecrated places for services. This could only lead, in Heylyn's view, to the opinion among students that consecrations were indifferent, and ultimately to the positive determination

that the continued series of Divine Duties in a place set apart to that purpose, doth sufficiently consecrate the same. And what can follow thereupon in some tract of time, but the executing of all Divine Offices in Private Houses, the Ruine and Decay of Churches, the selling of their Materials, and alienating their Glebe and Tithes to the next fair Chapman?

Laud therefore found it 'expedient' to conduct a visitation of the University.<sup>23</sup> The bitterly contested visitation question began with a notification from Laud to Vice-Chancellor Beale of his intention, initiating a long correspondence with the University.<sup>24</sup> The University's tactic was to delay, and to argue that because it was a royal foundation, and since a series of papal bulls had exempted it from archiepiscopal or episcopal visitation, only a royal or legatine commission could have powers of visitation. Laud refused to come as a royal visitor: 'I desire to have my own power.' He intended to investigate the University as a whole and 'every scholar that is in it, for his obedience to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England.' Laud's argument was that the University was not a royal

foundation in the same sense as particular colleges, and that bishoprics and archbishoprics were also royal foundations. Papal bulls counted for nothing in England.<sup>25</sup>

Both sides petitioned the king, but Laud won the contest. In June 1636 at Hampton Court the Earl of Holland, Chancellor of the University, presented Cambridge's case, while Laud was supported by Sir John Banks, the Attorney General. The archbishop declared that such immunities as the University claimed had been, next to purgatory, the chief source of the enrichment and corruption of the papacy; he reminded everyone that three of the college chapels were unconsecrated; and he produced a document sent to Henry VIII by the Vice-Chancellor and heads of the colleges that renounced all papal privileges. King and council ruled unanimously for Laud, though the universities were preserved from episcopal or archidiaconal visitation. Nevertheless the visitation was never conducted: during his trial Laud wrote that 'my troubles began then to be foreseen by me.'<sup>26</sup> Still, Heylyn claimed that the loss of the University's case prompted the further decoration of churches, the railing of altars and a new reverence among worshippers.<sup>27</sup>

This issue caused a brief fracture in the Laudian party, for Cosin, like others sympathetic to the archbishop, took the University's side against his old companion Laud: he signed a statement from the Vice-Chancellor and heads that 'we conceive the University of Cambridge exempt from the metropolitically jurisdiction and visitation of the see of Canterbury.' But once the University had lost its case, he or Dr Sterne, Master of Jesus College, drew up a long paper endorsed by Laud as 'certain Disorders in Cambridge to be considered of in my next visitation.' This memorandum was composed in September 1636 and directed attention to such abuses as irreverent behaviour to superiors, excessively long hair and unapproved clothing, which had already been mentioned in the consistory court orders of March 1636.<sup>28</sup> Such general offences were cited as the fellows' neglect of public prayers, disorderly disputations, chapel services and university sermons, the non-observance of Fridays and fast days, and the disrepair and misuse of parish churches and college chapels. At every commencement St Mary's Church became a theatre with 'profane and scurrilous jests' and the rest of the time it was a lumber house and storeroom. The service performed by members of Trinity College was improperly conducted. The liturgy was disliked and neglected:

We have such private fancies and prayers of every man's own making (and sometimes sudden conceiving too) vented among us... [that] our young scholars are thereby taught to prefer the private spirit before the public... To such liberty are we come for want of being confined to a strict form.

The colleges were even worse. At Trinity some fellows almost never came to chapel, and in some popular tutors' chambers 'the private prayers are louder and longer by far than they are in the Chapel in the evening.' Some of the choristers 'never could nor ever meane to singe a note.' At prayers everyone sat or knelt as he pleased, few would bow at the name of Jesus, 'and when the Creed is repeated many of the boyes by some men's directions turn towards the west doore.' Fellows' and scholars' and officers' places were sold. The fellows of Emmanuel ignored the Prayer Book in their services, did not wear surplices, and received communion sitting. Here the communion loaf was pulled from one hand to another and the members drank the cup 'as it were to one another'. At Emmanuel and Corpus Christi the fellows sang psalms of their own choosing. At Caius communion was administered to a sitting congregation, the celebrant did not wear the surplice, and one fellow in consecrating the sacrament said, 'This is my bread,' instead of 'This is my body.' Sidney Sussex, Emmanuel and Corpus Christi had unconsecrated chapels, and at these three and at Trinity and St Catharine's the communion table stood in the body of the building. Clare and Magdalene seemed tolerable, while St John's, Queens', Pembroke, Jesus and Peterhouse 'endeavour for order, and have brought it to some good pass.' Their few shortcomings involved apparel and fasting-night suppers.

Laud's annual account of his province to Charles I in 1639 complained of the still unconsecrated chapels, the neglect of cures and the profanation of churchyards in benefices whose impropriations were held by the University. He suggested the intervention of the High Commission if an admonition failed to amend matters. Charles's marginal note agreed: 'It must not be. You ar in the Right, for if faire meanes will not, power must redresse it.'<sup>29</sup>

Despite this increasing if inconsistent pressure from the church hierarchy, objections were still raised when individual Arminians carried the new ideas too far. Cosin was involved in the defence of two preachers whose stress on the catholic nature of the Church of England antagonized more Calvinist

scholars. John Normanton was charged with popery for a sermon in January 1636 in which he upheld fasting and penance and referred to Thomas Aquinas as a saint. Cosin thought the sermon 'vndiscreete' and felt that Normanton should be censured, 'but as for popery or any propension thereto he discovered none' and thought it acceptable to refer to the greatest of the scholastics as a saint.<sup>30</sup>

In June 1637 a fellow of Peterhouse, Sylvester Adams, preached at Great St Mary's. From the text, 'Whose soever sins ye remit...', Adams argued that confession of sins to a priest was required for absolution and necessary for salvation. Citing the Fathers and schoolmen in support, he declared auricular confession to be apostolic practice and Anglican teaching. Vice-Chancellor Comber took no disciplinary action, but his successor Brownrigg tried to force the heads to impose a recantation. After an initial failure a carefully timed meeting condemned Adams's opinion. Cosin argued that confession to a priest was tacitly permitted by the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer, and was a question best left undetermined. Adams refused to recant and withdrew from studies for the B.D. degree, though no proceedings were taken against him.<sup>31</sup> Prynne was highly incensed at Adams's remarks and his light treatment.<sup>32</sup>

Cosin's principal contribution to Caroline Cambridge lies in the aesthetic direction that he gave to the Laudian movement there. The first half of the seventeenth century at Cambridge was notable for architectural developments.<sup>33</sup> A self-conscious Gothic revival began in England at St John's College in 1624, and though an 'unself-conscious survival' of that architectural form continued, by the time Cosin became Master of Peterhouse many men were aware of different styles and could choose between the gothic of their ancestors, the classicism of Inigo Jones, or something in between.<sup>34</sup>

The period of great architectural activity at Peterhouse began with Wren's mastership: 'seeing the Publick Offices of Religion less decently perform'd, and the service of God depending upon the Courtesy of others, for want of a convenient Oratory within the walls of the College,' he erected and beautified a chapel partly at his own expense. It was dedicated in March 1632.<sup>35</sup> The Chapel is in a transitional style from gothic to Renaissance motifs and it totally changed the appearance of the College.<sup>36</sup> Wren provided the windows and some interior furnishings, but in general he followed the sensible plan of erecting the Chapel and fitting it for use as quickly as possible, leaving most of the decoration to be provided as time and funds permitted. The total expense of the work came to £2,484, with subscriptions amounting to £2,365.

The exterior facings of the Chapel covering the brickwork were entirely the work of Cosin. His wife provided the pavement. The ceiling, its design and the gilded suns, like those of the chapel at Caius, were also a product of the 1630s.<sup>37</sup> Perhaps the most notable attraction is the great east window above the altar. Based on Rubens's 'Le Coup de Lance' of 1620, it was a gift made in 1639 by Luke Skippon, a Peterhouse fellow, and was fortunately preserved from the Puritan depredations of 1643.<sup>38</sup> Richard Crashaw, a fellow of the College and curate of Little St Mary's, assisted with the interior decoration and wrote two poems requesting contributions: *Votiva Domus Petrensis Pro Domo Dei* (Prayers of Peterhouse for its House of God) and *Ejusdem in caeterorum Operum difficili Parturitione Gemitus* (The groans of the same on the difficult travail for the rest of the work).<sup>39</sup> Cosin's principal role in the embellishment of the Chapel was the encouragement that he gave to others to contribute to a common effort and the aesthetic sensitivity which he applied to the task of creating a devotional mood.

An anonymous and undated manuscript in the British Library, entitled 'Innovations in Religion and abuses in Government in ye Vniversity of Cambridge,' gave an unsympathetic account of 'Novel practices in particular colledges,' in which Peterhouse was the foremost offender.<sup>40</sup> According to the complainant, since Cosin became Master the Chapel 'hath bene soe dressed vp and ordered soe Ceremoniously, that it hath become ye gaze of ye Vniversity & a greate invitation to Strangers.' Prynne related that students of other colleges came to Peterhouse out of curiosity or to learn and practice popery.<sup>41</sup> Prynne's description of Peterhouse Chapel, as related by Mr Wallis, 'a Scholler and Graduate of the University,' and by Nicholas de Griese, a former student, seems to have been drawn from the anonymous manuscript, probably drawn up between December 1640 and June 1641. Prynne's account has been the basis of modern discussions.<sup>42</sup>

It is possible to give a detailed account of the interior of the Chapel at the height of Cosin's influence at Peterhouse. The pavement below the steps leading to the altar was of unpolished marble; the marble above the steps was polished and no one was allowed to tread on it, for either it was covered by a carpet or the officiants wore slippers. The altar was covered with bright silk, and its rich furniture was changed

for special occasions, when incense was burned. Above the altar a dove represented the Holy Ghost, with cherubim above it, and behind the altar were painted hangings with eagles and the words *In quod cupiunt Angeli*. The east window bore the stained-glass picture already described. St Peter was carved in wood outside the door. Singing, bowing to the altar, and the occasional use of Latin characterized the services. A series of orders, *Monita pro Sacello*, prohibited the wearing of gloves, sneezing, nose-blowing, head-scratching, yawning, spitting and so on, in the Chapel and regulated the conduct of the liturgy. Prynne reported that the man who replaced Cosin as Master had deposed that before Cosin came, none of these innovations 'were so much as known or used there,' though this man, Lazarus Seaman, had attended Emmanuel and his testimony may not have been trustworthy. Prynne also charged that Cosin had introduced the practice of his *Devotions* at Peterhouse.<sup>43</sup>

Despite the obvious prejudice of Prynne and the anonymous informant, many of the charges were certainly true. A bill for plate dated 1638 and totalling nearly £100, included over £58 for two gilt embossed candlesticks and over £14 for a 'sencor.'<sup>44</sup> A manuscript entitled *Expensae Sacelli* shows payments in July 1636 of nearly £6 for, among other things, two pairs of shoes and shoe strings, new silver gilt clasps for the chapel books, eighteen yards of red silk ribbon and thirty-four yards of blue silk ribbon, candlesticks, six cushions, 5s. for 'prickt songes', and odds and ends for the organ. In November 1637 £20 was still owed for the chapel roof and the organ.<sup>45</sup> In June 1650 an inventory was made of the decorative items found hidden in the library. These included two satin altar-cloths embroidered with gold and silver, four yards of red velvet with satin letters interwoven with cloth of gold and silver, pieces of serge and taffeta to cover the walls and altar, several pieces of broadcloth, organ pipes of wood and metal, a green cotton carpet with a worsted fringe and a picture of St Gregory. Several of these were taken to London the next month to be sold 'to ye advantage of the Colledge.'<sup>46</sup> The list of chapel benefactors drawn up by Cosin not only listed *Iohannes Cosin Magister Collegij, & Socii* as donating £300 *ad ampliorem, structuram, ornamentum, & sacram supellectilem* and his friends £180, but had separate listings of £20 each for Cosin's northern friends William Easdall and Gabriel Clarke. The sum of £74 was spent on silver candlesticks for the altar.<sup>47</sup> Cosin noted that in 1639 there was still wanting a 'frontispiece' for the altar, seven windows depicting sacred history, ornamentation for the organ, stone facing for the east face of the Chapel, and other decorations.<sup>48</sup>

The Chapel, with 'its negative volutes, its cherub faces, its floral decoration and arabesque lozenges, and its air of fantastic grace,' was a notable expression of the Laudians' 'large and extensive building program that sought the beautification of churches and the refurbishing of the liturgy through painting and sculpture' in an effort to 'support their commitment to uniformity...and to disseminate graphically their theological and liturgical ideas.' In this effort a 'quality of sumptuousness prevailed; images lent both dignity and beauty to the holy' and were defended as the policy of the hierarchy. At Cambridge especially, the Arminian victory of the 1630s transformed the look of the colleges. This was considered a 'return of religion to its rightful relation to nature', the logical expression of the Incarnation being the Christian Church 'which took to itself the things of this life and termed them good.' All of nature was viewed as sanctified, so that the 'beauty of holiness' enlarged the worshipper's experience of the divine in a union of grace and nature. This development had the full support of the devout connoisseur Charles I, though the king's tastes were generally far in advance of those of his Arminian subjects. The Puritan Calvinist tradition saw this development as nothing short of idolatrous, but until they got the upper hand in the 1640s, the aesthetic religion of Cosin and others continued to bear fruit.<sup>49</sup>

Cosin's contribution to Peterhouse included the musical as well as the visual enhancement of the liturgy. Peterhouse possesses a remarkable collection of pre-1660 musical manuscripts, one of the most prominent to escape the destruction of the mid-sixteenth and mid-seventeenth centuries.<sup>50</sup> Four of the manuscript books date from the later Henrician period, though they may have been acquired during the early seventeenth century. The other fifteen, plus an organ-book, date from between 1635 and 1643, the only period in which this music is known to have been used. The books were collected from other, earlier sources and may have been used at Little St Mary's before Peterhouse chapel was built. Among the better-known composers some of whose works were included in the Peterhouse collection are William Byrd, Orlando Gibbons, Thomas Morley, Thomas Tallis, and Thomas Tomkins.

The organ music was a focus of the Chapel's musical repertoire. An organist's post was established in November 1635, with the duty of instructing the poorer scholars in sacred music and playing in the Chapel on feast days and at their first evensong. The organist was generally in attendance from June 1636 to November 1643. Thomas Wilson, who contributed seventeen compositions to the collection,

and Henry Molle, who contributed six, were probably both college organists. Local contemporary organists such as John Amner of Ely Cathedral, Henry Loosemore of King's College, and Robert Ramsey of Trinity contributed their works, which seems to indicate that 'the books were assembled from miscellaneous acquisitions after the building of the chapel and the appointment of an organist.' Further evidence of the importance of Cosin's leadership is the inclusion of works by the Durham organists Richard Hutchinson, Edward Smith and William Smith. One composition each is attributed to Bishop William Juxon of London and Archbishop Laud. There was no boys' choir: all the Peterhouse music of this period was for men's voices only.<sup>51</sup>

Cosin's 'fertile and energetic revival' of the cathedral service in the college chapel lasted only from 1635 to 1643. But music in those days was an essential part of a liberal education, he was well prepared for the liturgical revival in music, and had the experience of several years of musical activity at Durham. 'In these choir-books we see the High Church revival of the reign of Charles I translated into terms of music.'<sup>52</sup> The books, Henrician and Caroline, were compiled to serve the ritualistic purposes of the Book of Common Prayer, with index headings such as *Ad Dominus Vobiscum*, *Ad Officium Altaris* and *Ad S. Cenam Domini*. By about 1600 the singing of the whole communion service had been largely abandoned, and after about five settings written in Elizabeth's reign, only one more was recorded before 1628. Five other settings are recorded as having been written by 1645, and three of these, with a bass part of a five-piece setting by Thomas Tallis from the late sixteenth century, are in the Peterhouse manuscripts. This collection by Cosin shows his intention to revive the singing of the whole communion service. In addition, music was also provided for the *Kyrie*, *creed*, *sanctus* and the *gloria in excelsis*. William Child's *Sanctus* and *Gloria in Excelsis* were the first since the Edwardian Reformation, while his manuscript Latin *Te Deum* and *Jubilate* is headed 'A morning Service in Lattin made for the Right Worshipfull Dr Cosin by Mr Child.'<sup>53</sup> The texts of the offices as well as the motets and anthems were liberally provided with Latin words, though it does not seem that Cosin intended the revival of the traditional Missal texts of Latin communion services. A complete 'unreformed' Latin mass by John Taverner (d. 1545) was apparently used only as a source for Latin anthems. Evensong, as a less academic service attended by more 'outsiders,' was apparently designed to remain in English. There was a larger number of settings for proper psalms than was appointed in the Prayer Book, and a frequent use of collects as words for anthems.

A folio Book of Common Prayer printed in 1634 gives more evidence of how Cosin intended the divine services to be adapted to music at the Chapel. Interleaved with pages of hand-ruled music-staves, many of which are filled in with the *Medius Decani* part of various settings from the Caroline part-books, the book appears to be part of a comprehensive plan which was abandoned before it was completed. The table looks finished, but many pages of music are only half-filled. Either the project was too ambitious or the upheavals of the Civil War prevented its completion. The musical selection was a basic organization to which more florid music could be added by the choir. Bound up with this Prayer Book are what may be unique specimens of the offices of morning and evening prayer in Latin. Apparently they were also designed for musical performance.<sup>54</sup> A collection of octavo Prayer Books, a chapel set dated 1639, contains Latin psalters printed abroad, including the monastic canticles. These each have a 'false title' which gives the table of psalms for the days of the month in accordance with the Prayer Book arrangement and which hides their Romanist origins.<sup>55</sup>

Cosin was supported in his musical endeavours by the college fellows, who with the Master subscribed £200 from 1634 to 1639 for a pneumatic organ and choir-books.<sup>56</sup> The conditions for the four fellowships and four scholarships of the March 1636 Parke foundation specified that 'every one of the said Fellows and Scholars shall endeavour to acquire so much knowledge in Song as to be able to perform their Parts with others that sing divine service in the Chapel.' The decretum of October 1635 forbade the admission of *pauperes scholares* who were not adept at music. In 1637 some friends of Cosin provided a small organ for the scholars' private use in the parlour. It was out of tune, but from Durham Cosin wrote to Joseph Mead that it might be useful and asked to borrow Mead's workman to put it in working order.<sup>57</sup> A Puritan critic has left a poem describing how this movement looked to the opposition:

Instead of Aristotle's Organon  
 Anthems and organs I did study on...  
 I cousen'd Dr. Cosin and ere long  
 A Fellowship obtained for a song...<sup>58</sup>

This may in part be seen as a reaction against that musical ability expected of Englishmen with a proper upbringing.<sup>59</sup>

Cosin was naturally involved in noncontroversial activities while he presided over the College. In 1635 he contributed to a collection of verses addressed to the queen on the occasion of the birth of Princess Elizabeth.<sup>60</sup> With Vice-Chancellor Beale and the other heads, Cosin pleaded with the Privy Council in September 1635 for the exemption of scholars' servants from the ship-money tax.<sup>61</sup> He is credited with encouraging various Durham youths, among them William Harvey, to come to the University.<sup>62</sup> In 1636 he arranged for the benefaction of extensive lands for the maintenance of four fellows and four scholars, the Parke foundation mentioned above. Before his ejection in 1644 he provided £79 for the refitting of Dr Perne's library and other college buildings, and £10 for restoring the roof.<sup>63</sup> In an effort to carry out a program suggested by Buckingham, he drew up a plan for a commencement house and library, for which £8,000 was subscribed, but the erection was made impossible by the Civil War.<sup>64</sup> He was of course active in the College's normal administration.<sup>65</sup>

In November 1639 Cosin became Vice-Chancellor of the University. He was quick to exercise his new authority: William Sancroft reported in December that Cosin had rearranged the seating in St Mary's to emphasize the hierarchical aspects of church membership. Only doctors and 'such as are allowed' were permitted in the chancel and aisles, the seats were made uniform, coloured gowns were forbidden and bachelor's gowns were made mandatory. Cosin's *Monita* here may well have been an extension of his rules for Peterhouse to the University as a whole. Sancroft also related that when a Mr Crosse of St John's and a Mr Gardiner of Benet jeered at another man for bowing to the cross, Cosin had both of them arrested. Crosse was made to recant and Gardiner was given five lashes and then recanted. Sancroft concluded, 'I thinke this will be enough to putt downe all sophistry, unless the sophs be out of their right witts.'<sup>66</sup>

Cosin spent considerable sums on Great St Mary's as part of his responsibilities to the university community: above £164 was devoted to restoration (*reparationes*), including over £105 on the choir screen and doctors' stalls as well as over £54 on liturgical paraphernalia. He also spent above £30 on the library and new books for it.<sup>67</sup> These sums far exceeded those spent by his predecessor Dr Brownrigg or his successor Dr Holdsworth.<sup>68</sup>

During the year that Cosin was Vice-Chancellor, Isaac Basire, his first biographer, was admitted to the degree of doctor of divinity 'between his hands, and with his Benediction.'<sup>69</sup> In July 1640 James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh, visited Cambridge and reported that he was 'most kindly used' by Cosin.<sup>70</sup> Lord Keeper Finch also paid a visit which was recorded in an anonymous Puritan poem. Vice-Chancellor Cosin, according to this version, kept Finch away from a Puritan Emmanuel College don, but the Lord Keeper visited Emmanuel College chapel and not Peterhouse chapel because

...hee had I'le Swear

Of the Vice Chancellour enough else where.<sup>71</sup>

According to the anonymous Puritan informant of the University's 'abuses,' Cosin used his Vice-chancellor's powers to intervene in the defence of William Norwich, a fellow of Peterhouse. In August 1640 Norwich preached a sermon which contained doctrine objectionable to the Puritans. At first Cosin took no action against him, but when some of the heads put pressure on the Vice-Chancellor, Cosin reversed the usual procedure and ordered the objecting Mr Creswell, a fellow of Trinity, to bring in his charges first, before Norwich delivered a copy of the sermon. Creswell's articles charged Norwich with favouring penance, auricular confession, justification by works, the sign of the cross, and with deriding those who did not bow to the altar and come to the rail. Cosin supposedly claimed that the power of examination was his, not the heads'. He had some support, but backed down when some of the heads threatened to protest. The Long Parliament had convened, and it was not the time for Arminians to press matters. Instead, Cosin stalled, and Norwich questioned whether Creswell, who was a layman though a master of arts, was qualified to accuse a priest in matters of religion. Ultimately, Cosin and five of the heads voted for acquittal, and five voted for censure. The minority tried but failed to have their opinion entered in the register, while 'the Vicechancellor in ye delivery of his Iudgement tooke ye advantage of saying what he pleased when noe man was to speak after him.'<sup>72</sup>

The informant reported that such 'violations' of orthodox doctrine had so increased that offences now went unnoticed, and gave a list of fourteen recent sermons tending to popery. Among these was one delivered by Cosin on Christmas Eve 1639 at Great St Mary's. It was charged that Cosin knelt to the east

on coming to the pulpit and at the doxology, declared that 'Catholick faith was saving faith,' and said that the Socinian and Puritan Antichrists were 'Locusts ascending out of the bottomlesse pit, the very forme of ye beast, hellhounds.' A crossed-out passage in the report declared that Dr Collins had claimed that Cosin had commanded bowing to the altar. Vice-Chancellor Beale had favoured popery, according to this informant, and Cosin, 'as soone as he was settled in his office,' had prohibited the use of extemporaneous prayers and insisted that ministers follow Canon 55 and exhort their listeners to pray for the holy catholic church and the estates of the kingdom. The few transgressors had been threatened with suspension, and his 'practice and comand hath so prevailed' that even though Dr Love, Master of Corpus Christi, had not used the canonical form, and though Cosin's successor Dr Holdsworth had reversed the order and personally revived the old practice, 'yet few or none in that place goe on with it.' As a result, praying at Great St Mary's had been made 'contemptible' and the Arminian liturgical practices were still followed.

Cosin was also attacked for changes that he had made at Great St Mary's. He cut two doorways into the chancel, decorated the altar lavishly, provided cushions for kneeling at the newly erected altar rails, built an elaborate choir screen and moved the reader's pew. Allegedly, the young students had nothing spent on their accommodation, for though they came to services 'for fashion's sake,' they were now excluded from the chancel, where they used to gather by the hundred, by a public command, with doorkeepers to enforce it. The reason for these and other changes was a mystery to the Puritan informant, 'vnlesse that the Altar might with more conveniency be eyed at the time of Adoration.' Kneeling to the east end had much increased. Cosin's power in the University was illustrated by his lack of consultation with the heads in these matters, which involved considerable expense. He never asked their advice about anything, or if he did, he was already determined to do things his way. He endeavoured to enforce the 1640 canons, ordering two foreign doctors of physic to take the 'etcetera oath' and conducting a search for Socinian books in several colleges. Though a constable had importuned him several times for a warrant against a Franciscan friar who sold books and crucifixes, Cosin allegedly neglected his duties here. He was charged with relying on the High Commission to enforce the Arminians' interpretation of orthodoxy.<sup>73</sup> Even his method of commemorating the University's benefactors was denounced.<sup>74</sup>

Opposition to Cosin's activities was not limited to Puritan clerics. The parishioners of Great St Mary's signed a paper protesting against the rearrangement of their church.<sup>75</sup> A petition of the corporation of Cambridge complained of the Vice-Chancellor's overbearing attitude toward the municipal administration of justice.<sup>76</sup> Puritans were not the only people to fall under Cosin's displeasure. He chose Seth Ward, later bishop of Salisbury, to be the prevaricator in 1640, but took some offence at Ward's speech and suspended him from his degree, though he restored him the next day.<sup>77</sup>

One of the most difficult duties of the Vice-Chancellor at this time must have been his responsibility to preside over the University's court, at which Cosin was a justice of the peace.<sup>78</sup> Most of the cases dealt with minor offences, but the religious and political upheavals of the time also raised important questions of discipline. On a Sunday in March 1640 some scholars of Magdalene and Sidney Sussex 'did strike divers of the townsmen & played att footeball with them,' according to the deposition of one student. The toll-gatekeeper of St Giles had overheard a scholar tell a townsman, 'Giue us the ball againe, or wee will fire your houses.' Nineteen students, including two lords, were fined 5s. each for the offence.<sup>79</sup> Others were punished for fornicating and for having their wives in the colleges. Some scholars were fined for leaving the church during the sermon. Perhaps most indicative of the times were the presentations of two men for abusing Peterhouse, the Vice-Chancellor and other officers and their authority. Both were drunk.<sup>80</sup>

The principal disciplinary problem which confronted Cosin's court concerned a disorder at the Mitre Tavern on the night of 1 January 1640. Richard Nicholls, M.A., of Corpus Christi was accused of arguing for popery: not the popery charged against the Arminians by the Puritans, but the real teachings of Rome on papal supremacy, clerical celibacy, and Purgatory. In an effort to win over John Norton, Nicholls offered him a chamber and study at Peterhouse, a place at Somerset House in London, and the loan of 'such bookes as others had not.' Norton refused, and Nicholls was made to recant.<sup>81</sup> Norton's father was upset that Nicholls was not punished more severely. He blamed this on the Vice-Chancellor and threatened to complain to Parliament or the Star Chamber in order 'to terrify others by making these some publique spectacle.'<sup>82</sup>

Cosin's tenure of office was totally disrupted by revolutionary upheaval. At the end of June 1640

convocation, of which he was a member, declared in explicit terms the doctrines of the divine right of kings and non-resistance. All masters of arts were required to take the famous 'etcetera oath' approving 'the doctrine, discipline or government established in the Church of England.'<sup>83</sup> As Vice-Chancellor, Cosin had a duty to administer the oath to the University. His Puritan enemies were already active: on 22 April a petition was read against him in the Short Parliament and a warrant issued. In September he wrote to Laud to ask about the particulars of administering the oath. 'These times,' he complained, 'are exceeding bad.' His copy of the oath omitted the word 'popish,' which he felt was a scribe's error. He was certain that at this omission and at 'the uncertainty of the &c... many froward men are likely to stick.'<sup>84</sup> In January 1641 the House of Commons ruled not to require subscription to this oath.<sup>85</sup>

The two parties in church and state were now increasingly drawn apart. In 1640 Cosin expressed his loyalty in a dedicatory epistle to Charles I in *Voces Votivae ab Academicis Cantabrigiensis*, with a poem "*Ad Serenissimum Regem Carolum*."<sup>86</sup> In the Short Parliament William Beale, Master of St John's was attacked for, among other things, causing Cosin to be elected Vice-Chancellor and encouraging him 'unto tyrannycall usurpation and publicke promulgation of that Romish religion.'<sup>87</sup> In July of 1640 the University commemorated the birth of Prince Henry, but the town of Cambridge showed a different allegiance and elected Oliver Cromwell and John Lowry to the Long Parliament in October. The University elected Henry Lucas of St John's, Holland's secretary, and Dr Thomas Eden, Master of Trinity. Both later subscribed to the Solemn League and Covenant.<sup>88</sup>

As events at Cambridge were moving beyond Cosin's control by the time that his tenure of office ended in the autumn of 1640, so national developments had outstripped the power of church and state to restrain them. It was said that in 1640

the river Cam became red as blood, and the waters being taken up in basins retained the same colour, and that many strange sights were seen in the air, as armed men fighting, &c. These were considered sad presages of the ensuing troubles.<sup>89</sup>

Reacting against the Arminian innovations, in June 1641 Parliament prohibited bowing to the altar at the universities, and in September the Vice-Chancellor and heads were ordered to remove communion tables from the east end of churches and chapels, to take away altar rails, crucifixes, candlesticks, tapers and other furnishings, to level chancel floors and to prohibit bowing at the name of Jesus or towards the communion table.<sup>90</sup> The gentry and commoners of Cambridgeshire petitioned the Lords for the 'purging of the Universities.' Though the predominantly royalist institutions were ordered to contribute to parliament's defence fund, in 1642 Cosin tried to send Peterhouse's plate to Charles I, and other colleges did the same. Unfortunately for them Cromwell captured much of it. Three heads of houses, Martin of Queens', Beale of St John's and Sterne of Jesus were sent to the Tower for sending plate to the king. In July 1642 Cosin sent £200 to the king, half of it his own and the rest either college funds or a loan raised by the fellows.<sup>91</sup> It was reported in London that in September 1642 parliamentary troops searched various colleges and took away 'such Plate and Money as they found there.' Bishop Wren was arrested.<sup>92</sup> Cosin managed to escape.<sup>93</sup>

The University had tried to arm itself, but Cromwell stopped this and fortified the town in March 1644. On the tenth the Earl of Manchester, parliamentary commissioner under the 'Ordinance for regulating the University of Cambridge, and for removing scandalous ministers in the seven Associated Counties,' ordered Peterhouse to give an account of itself. Cosin was ejected from his mastership three days later 'for opposing the proceedings of Parliament, and other scandalous acts.' Five members of the College were ejected on 8 April, and on the eleventh Manchester declared Lazarus Seaman Master in a ceremony at the Chapel. Seaman swore to the Solemn League and Covenant, and in the next four months all the College's members who would not do likewise - about twenty - were purged.<sup>94</sup>

Cosin's extensive library had been hidden but was found and seized by parliamentary sequestrators, who estimated its value at £247 10s. Seaman determined to take possession of it for the College in return for what he called the impoverishment caused by the building of the Chapel. Manchester gave the project his support. The Lords directed that the library 'may be employed and annexed' to the College, and further ordered that 'right bee done unto the scholar who enformed where the bookes were: and that...he have his allowance made unto him.' The reward was justifiable, wrote Seaman, because without this man, who had given information in other matters, the books would not have been found, 'and neither they nor anybody else would know more of it than the man in the moone.' It appears that Cosin's collection, which he had once reckoned at 1,100 volumes, now numbered only 814.<sup>95</sup>

By the time of Manchester's arrival, Cosin had already left the country, but in an aesthetic sense

Caroline Cambridge was killed in the winter of 1643-4. In August 1643 an ordinance was passed against 'all monuments of superstitious idolatry,' and the infamous William Dowsing devastated college chapels and parish churches in the following months under a commission from Manchester. Thomas Fuller reported the damages done to the University and colleges by the parliamentary soldiers, and John Worthington's diary noted on 20 December 1643 that 'this week pictures began to be taken down in Cambridge, by order of ye Earle of Manchester.'<sup>96</sup> Dowsing's diary recorded the destruction of Cosin's chapel:

We went to Peterhouse, 1643, Decembi 21, with Officers and Souldiers and...we pulled down 2 mighty great Angells with wings, and divers other Angells, & the 4 Evangelists, & Peter, with his Keies, over the Chappell Dore -- & about a hundred Cherubims and Angells, and divers superstitious Letters in gold: & at the upper end of the Chancell these words were written, as followeth *Hic locus est Domus Dei, nihil aliud, et Porta Coeli...*<sup>97</sup>

John Cosin had played an important rôle in asserting Arminian doctrine, Laudian discipline and the 'beauty of holiness' at Cambridge. His own sermon at Great St Mary's and his consistent defence of Arminian preachers expressed the anti-Calvinist belief that the Church of England was an integral part of the ancient and universal church. But it was his concern for the liturgy and its setting that drew the most attention, both at his College chapel and at the University church. His activities in this respect were consistent with his work at Durham Cathedral and in his parish, but were bound to draw more attention at one of the nation's two great centres of learning. Cambridge University's rôle as the educator of the sons of the élite in a strongly Puritan area gave Cosin's liturgical innovations a special notoriety. His ideas about the visual and musical setting of church services, and his concern for a strict regulation of the liturgy and of the behaviour of worshippers were directly at odds with most Puritan thought. To this was added his prosecution of dissenters, his apparent lack of enthusiasm for suppressing papists, and his responsibilities as Vice-Chancellor for enforcing discipline and administering the infamous 'et cetera' oath. Cosin was a prominent representative of the anti-Puritan order in a highly sensitive place at a revolutionary time. The Puritans in the University, in the town, and in the Long Parliament set themselves against him and his ways, and the outcome was a personal and an artistic tragedy.

## NOTES

1. John Venn, ed., *Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College 1349-1897, containing a List of all known Members of the College from the Foundation to the Present Time, with Biographical Notes*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1897), 3: 70-74.
2. Gonville & Caius College, Cambridge, MS 570/714, fols. 99-102, 107-110; Vivian H.H. Green, *Religion at Oxford and Cambridge* (London 1964), pp. 123-5; James Bass Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1873-1911), 2: 200-2; Harry Culverwell Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge, 2nd ed., 1972) passim.
3. William T. Costello, *The Scholastic Curriculum at early Seventeenth Century Cambridge* (Harvard University Press, 1958).
4. Norwich City Court Book, 26 January 1614; John Cosin, *The Correspondence of John Cosin, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham*, ed. George Ornsby, 2 vols., Surtees Society, vols. 52, 55, 1869-70, 1: 1-6, 11-20, 38-39; Percy H. Osmond, *A Life of John Cosin, Bishop of Durham 1660-1672* (London 1913), p. 5; Venn, *Caius* 1: 207.
5. Issac Basire, *The Dead Man's Real Speech: A Brief of the Life and Dignities of... John Lord Bishop and Count Palatine of Durham*, &c. (London 1673, Wing B 1031), p. 31; Cosin, *Correspondence*, 2: 297; Cosin, *Works*, 4: 469-70. 5: 114, 127.
6. Peter Heylyn, *Cyprianus Anglicus: or, the History of the Life and Death, of the most renowned and reverend prelate, William (Laud) ...* (London, 1668, Wing H 1699-1700), pp. 74-75; Thomas Smith, "Vita Johannis Cosini Episcopi Dunelmensis," *Vitae Quorundam Eruditissimorum et Illustrium Virorum* (London, 1707), p. 4; Nicholas Tyacke, "Puritanism, Arminianism, and Counter-Revolution," in *The Origins of the English Civil War*, Conrad Russell, ed. (London, 1973), p. 130.
7. Cosin, *Correspondence*, 1: 11-20.
8. John Caius, *The Annals of Gonville and Caius College*, ed. John Venn (Cambridge Antiquarian Society, 1904), p. 355.
9. Cosin, *Works*, 2: 17-81
10. STC 5816-9; Wing C 6352-7; John Cosin, *A Collection of Private Devotions*, ed. P.G. Stanwood with Daniel O'Connor (Oxford, 1967).
11. John G. Hoffman, 'The Arminian and the Iconoclast: the dispute between John Cosin and Peter Smart,' *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, September 1979.
12. Thomas Birch, ed., *The Court and Times of Charles I...*, 2 vols. (London, 1848), 1: 107-109; Charles Henry Cooper, *Annals of Cambridge*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1845), 3: 185-96, 198, 202-4, 206-8; John Heywood & Thomas Wright, *Cambridge University Transactions during the Puritan Controversies of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 2 vols. (London, 1854), 2: 354-5, 366-7; Thomas Fuller, *The History of the University of Cambridge*, ed. James Nichols (London, 1840), pp. 310-12; Mullinger, *Cambridge*, 3: 52-64, 72-76, 90, 667-71; Porter, pp. 415-7; J.P.C. Roach, ed., *The Victoria History of the County of Cambridge and the Isle of Ely*, volume 3, *The City and University of Cambridge* (Institute of Historical Research, 1959), pp. 194-6.

13. Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 199, 252; Heywood & Wright, 2: 361-3, 392-403; Mullinger, *Cambridge*, 3: 112-3.
14. Simonds D'Ewes, *Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Bart.*, ed. James O. Halliwell (London, 1845), I: 142; quoted in James Bass Mullinger, *Cambridge Characteristics in the Seventeenth Century* (London & Cambridge, 1867), pp. 29-32, cf. p. 49.
15. Mullinger, *Cambridge*, 3: 114-21; see also Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 202; Fuller *Cambridge*, p. 315, Mullinger, *Cambridge*, 3: 66, 77-79, 87-89.
16. Hugh Redwald Trevor-Roper, *Archbishop Laud, 1573-1645* (London, 1962), pp. 205-6.
17. Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 211-3, 221-2, 229-30; Heywood & Wright, 2: 367-8; Mullinger, *Cambridge*, 3: 114-21.
18. Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 263-4; Mullinger, *Cambridge*, 3: 113-4; cf. British Library (hereafter cited as BL): Harleian MS 7019, fols. 52, 56.
19. William Prynne, *Canterburies Doome...*, (London, 1646, Wing P 3917), p. 73; cf. Mullinger, *Characteristics*, p. 49.
20. *The Wrens Nest Defiled* (London, 1640, STC 26016); quoted in Austin Warren, *Richard Crashaw: A Study in Baroque Sensibility* (Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1939), p. 32.
21. Thomas Alfred Walker, *Peterhouse* (London, 1906), pp. 103-104.
22. Birch, I: 335-6. Mead soon changed his mind about Cosin and the two became rather close. See below, and Anthony I. Doyle, 'A New Cosin Letter,' *Durham Philobiblon*, I (1949): 64-65.
23. Heylyn, *Laud*, pp. 314-5.
24. Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 267, 275-8; Heywood & Wright, 2: 402-27; William Laud, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud, D.D.*, 7 vols. (Oxford: Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, 1847-60), 5: 555-80; 7: 317, for all relevant documents in the dispute. Cf. Mullinger, *Cambridge*, 3: 325 ff.; Trevor-Roper, *Laud*, pp. 205-8; *Victoria History of Cambridge*, 3: 198; Mark. H. Curtis, *Oxford and Cambridge in Transition, 1558-1642* (Oxford, 1959), pp. 33-34.
25. At his trial in 1644, Laud was charged with breaking the law by his intention to visit the universities, the prosecutor claiming that he had relied on "his power legatine from the Pope." Laud, *Works*, 4: 193-4; cf. Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, pp. 74-75, 478.
26. Laud, *Works*, 4: 193.
27. Heylyn, *Laud*, p. 315.
28. Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 273, 279-83.
29. Laud, *Works*, 5: 365-7.
30. Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 258, BL: Harleian MS 7019, fol. 56.
31. Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 287-8; *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I*, ed. John Bruce (HMSO, 1858; Kraus Reprint, 1967), 12: 305; cf. BL: Harleian MS 7019, fols. 57-59, 63, 65-67; John Worthington, *The Diary and Correspondence of Dr. John Worthington, Master of Jesus College, etc.*, James Crossley, ed., Chetham Society, vol. 1, 1858, p. 5.
32. Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, pp. 192-3.
33. Robert Willis & John Willis Clark, *The Architectural History of the University of Cambridge, and of the Colleges of Cambridge and Eton*, 4 vols. (Cambridge, 1886), passim.
34. Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Englishness of English Art* (London, 1956), p. 71; cf. Nikolaus Pevsner, *Cambridgeshire* (Penguin: Buildings of England, 1954), p. 124.
35. The Peterhouse scholars had previously resorted to Little St Mary's. Willis & Clark, I: 40, 40n, 42-43; C. Roman, *Peterhouse: the Chapel and College* (Cambridge: CALL, Peterhouse, n.d.) (no pagination).
36. For a description of the west front, see Roman: cf. Willis & Clark, I: 41n; and especially the print in David Loggan, *Cantabrigia Illustrata* (London 1688, Wing L 2836-7); reproduced in Willis & Clark, I: 44; and on the cover of Roman.
37. Willis & Clark, I: 43, 44n.1; cf. *Victoria History of Cambridge*, 3: 337. Cosin was to provide £260 for the freestone in 1666 and in his will. For the porch, Wren donated £30, Peter de Laune £25, Cosin £10, and the College £11.
38. Roman; Peterhouse Chapel MSS; for a colour reproduction of the painting, see Cecily V. Wedgwood, *The World of Rubens 1577-1640* (New York, 1967), p. 52; for a black and white reproduction of the window, see the back cover of Roman.
39. George Walton Williams, ed., *The Complete Poetry of Richard Crashaw* (New York, 1970), pp. 440-5; see Willis & Clark, I: 74-75, for the form of a letter soliciting subscriptions, pp. 75-76 for the accounts of fittings in the chapel, 1632-5.
40. BL: Harleian MS 7019, fols. 71-73; cf. Allan Pritchard, 'Puritan charges against Crashaw and Beaumont,' *Times Literary Supplement*, 2 July 1964, p. 578.
41. Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, pp. 73-74.
42. Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 288-9; Mullinger, *Cambridge*, 2: 208n; Osmond, pp. 81-82; Cosin, *Correspondence*, I: xxx-xxxi; Willis & Clark, I: 146. The manuscript also gives accounts of "Scandalous sermons at St. Mary's vncensored" of Messrs. Turnay, Hamsted, Normanton, Adams, Sparrow, Pocklington, Norwich and others. BL: Harleian MS 7019, fols. 52-64; cf. Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 263-4, 288, Mullinger, *Cambridge*, 3: 110-1, 113-4.
43. Prynne, *Canterburies Doome*, pp. 73-74, 208; Thomas Alfred Walker, *Admissions to Peterhouse* (Cambridge, 1912), p. 75.
44. Cosin, *Correspondence*, I: 223-4; cf. Charles Oman, *English Church Plate, 597-1830* (London, 1957), p. 161; Osmond, p. 83.
45. BL: Add. MS 4274, fols. 152r-153r; cf. Durham University Library: Mickleton & Spearman MS 97, pp. 289-90.
46. Peterhouse Chapel MSS.
47. Cf. Mullinger, *Cambridge*, 3: 141-3.; Walker, *Peterhouse*, pp. 221 ff.; Osmond, pp. 363-4.
48. Peterhouse Chapel MSS.
49. Basil Willey, *Richard Crashaw, 1612/13-1649* (Cambridge, 1949), p. 6; quoted in Porter p. 419; John Phillips, *The Reformation of Images: Destruction of Art in England, 1535-1660* (Berkeley, 1973), pp. 165-82.
50. The following discussion is much indebted to Anselm Hughes, *Catalogue of the Musical Manuscripts at Peterhouse, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1953), pp. vii-xvii, 49-51.
51. *Ibid.*, pp. xi, 10-11, 25-29, 33-37, 43-45; cf. John S. Bumpus, *History of English Cathedral Music, 1549-1889* (London, 1908), p. 95n.
52. Hughes, p. xv.

53. *Ibid.*, p. 17; Peter Le Huray, *Music and the Reformation in England 1549-1660* (O.U.P., 1967), p. 359.
54. Peterhouse, Cambridge: Perne Library G.5.30.
55. Three of the part-books were undiscovered until 1926, having lain hidden since about 1642, when the organ pipes, bellows and various articles of altar furniture were hidden in the Perne Library. Except for the three books, everything was discovered by 1650, when the master and fellows sold the organ pipes and bellows for £31 and divided the service books among themselves. Walker, *Peterhouse*, pp. 60-61; Peterhouse Chapel MSS.
56. Peterhouse Chapel MSS; though in 1661 John Francius wrote that "the expenses of making that organ did amount far above £200." *Ibid.*
57. Cosin, *Correspondence*, 1: 221; Walker, *Peterhouse*, p. 106.
58. Cambridge University Library (hereafter cited as CUL): Add MS 5820, fols. 121-3; quoted in Hughes, p. xvii; and Le Huray, p. 50.
59. See Thomas Morley, *A Plaine and Easie Introduction to Practical Musicke* (London, 1597, STC 18133-4).
60. *Carmen Natalitum* (Cambridge, 1635, STC 4479); Cosin, *Correspondence*, 1: 297; Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 271-3.
61. CSPD, Charles I, 8: 390.
62. Walker, *Peterhouse*, p. 123.
63. Willis & Clark, 1: 31-34; cf. Osmond, p. 84; in 1668 Cosin provided £58 per annum to Peterhouse for five scholarships and £28 per annum to Caius for three scholarships. Durham County Record Office: D/P 8/1.
64. Mullinger, *Cambridge*, 3: 143, Walker, *Peterhouse*, p. 105.
65. See the Peterhouse Register Book, p. 496; Walker, *Admissions*, pp. 52-75.
66. Bodleian Library, Oxford: Tanner MS 157, fol. 97; see CUL: Vice-Chancellor's Acta Curiae Book, 1636-40, V.C.Ct.I.57, fol. 197r.
67. CUL: VC 4 N 53. In the University Archives as are the Acta Curiae below.
68. CUL: VC 4 N 52 & 54.
69. Basire, p. 48.
70. *Historical Manuscripts Commission*, 4 (1947): 89.
71. Bodleian Library, Oxford: MS Rawlinson poet 26, fols. 19r-19v.
72. BL: Harleian MS 7019, fols. 61-61; CUL: Vice-Chancellor's Acta Curiae Book, 1639-40, V.C.Ct. 59, fol. 219r.
73. BL: Harleian MS 7019, fols. 63, 66-70.
74. Heywood & Wright, 2: 430-7.
75. Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 294.
76. CSPD, Charles I, 15: 259-60.
77. Walter Pope, *The Life of Seth Lord Bishop of Salisbury* (London, 1697, Wing P 2911, reprinted at Oxford by the Luttrell Society, 21 (1961): 12. A prevaricator at Cambridge delivered a satirical speech during Commencement.
78. CUL: Vice-Chancellor's Acta Curiae Book, 1636-40, V.C.Ct.I.57, fol. 206r.
79. CUL: Vice-Chancellor's Acta Curiae Book, 1639-40, V.C.Ct.I.59, fols. 163r-8v; Peterborough Cathedral: Mickleton & Spearman MS 14, §8.
80. CUL: Vice-Chancellor's Acta Curiae Book, 1636-40, V.C.Ct.I.57, fols. 197r, 198r, 200r, 200v, 201r-201v, 203v.
81. *Ibid.*, fols. 206r-212v; for the Latin text of the recantation, see CUL: 4, §11, fols. 32r-32v; cf. Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 294.
82. Reproduced from the Marvell papers in the Corporation Archives of Hull, "without signature, address, or date," though it is obviously the work of Norton's father, in Alexander B. Grosart, ed., *The Complete Poems of Andrew Marvell*. Printed for private circulation, the Fuller Worthies' Library 24 (1872): xxvii-xxviii.
83. Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 301-2; David Wilkins, ed., *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae*, 4 vols. (London, 1737), 4: 549.
84. CSPD, Charles I, 16: 39, 451; 17: 82; Mullinger, *Cambridge*, 3: 144-5.
85. *Commons' Journals*, 2; Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 309-10, 336; Heywood & Wright, *Transactions*, 2: 438, 449.
86. *Voces Votivae ab Academicis Cantabrigiensis* (Cambridge, 1640), STC 4495; Cosin, *Correspondence*, 1: 227.
87. Heywood & Wright, *Transactions*, 2: 443.
88. Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 304; Mullinger, *Cambridge*, 3: 146-7, 207-8.
89. Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 303.
90. *Commons' Journals*, 2: 191, 278, 279, 287; Cooper, *Annals*, 3: 314, 316.
91. *ibid.*, pp. 319-20, 325-8; Fuller, *Cambridge*, pp. 318-9; Heywood & Wright, *Transactions*, 2: 450-4; Mullinger, *Cambridge*, 3: 224, 229-37; Walker, *Peterhouse*, p. 108; *Victoria History of Cambridge*, 3: 199; see Charles H. Cooper, "Inventory of Plate sent to King Charles I by Queens' College, Cambridge, and Receipt for Moneys Advanced for His Service by the President and Fellows, 1642," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, 1 (1857): 241-52.
92. J.W., *A True Relation...as also Newes from Cambridge* (London, 1642), Wing W7.
93. *A True Relation of the Taking of the Earl of Northampton...and how Dr. Cousens Made an Escape* (London, 1642). [Not recorded in Wing].
94. Peterhouse MSS: Register Book, pp. 516-9; Arnold Gwyn Matthews Walker *Revised, Being a Revision of John Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy during the Grand Rebellion, 1642-1660* (Oxford, 1948), p. 39; Mullinger *Cambridge*, 3: 325-40, 280-2; Walker, *Peterhouse*, pp. 108-9; Worthington, *Diary*, p. 18.
95. *Lords' Journals*, 6: 685; Mullinger, *Cambridge* 3: 280-2; Walker, *Peterhouse*, pp. 213-8.
96. Fuller, *Cambridge*, pp. 134-5; Worthington, *Diary*, pp. 18-19.
97. BL: Baker MS 38, fol. 455; quoted in Osmond, *Cosin*, p. 109; Walker, *Peterhouse*, pp. 109-110; Willis & Clark, *Architectural History*, 1: 46.