

МУЗЫКА

UDC 781.15

**Performing Ornaments in English Harpsichord Music.
Part II***A. A. Panov¹, I. V. Rosanoff^{1,2}¹ St Petersburg State University,
7–9, Universitetskaya nab., St Petersburg, 199034, Russian Federation² St Petersburg Rimsky-Korsakov State Conservatory,
3, Teatralnaya pl., St. Petersburg, 190000, Russian Federation

For citation: Panov, Alexei, and Ivan Rosanoff. “Performing Ornaments in English Harpsichord Music. Part II”. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Arts* 12, no. 1 (2022): 4–33.
<https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu15.2022.101>

This article continues a series of publications on problems pertaining to performing ornaments on keyboard musical instruments in England of the 17th–18th centuries according to historical documents of that time. The authors consider the history of the publication of the ornamentation table with thirteen embellishments compiled by Charles Coleman and published in the treatises *The Division-Violist* by Christopher Simpson (1659) and *A Brief Introduction to the Skill of Musick* by John Playford (1660). Among other matters, various aspects in the *Rules of Graces* worded by Henry Purcell (*A Choice Collection of Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinet*, 1696) are discussed. In particular, in the table published by Simpson, special attention is paid to a comprehensive review of the realization of such ornaments as “[The] Backfall shaken” and “[The] Shaked Beat”. In “Rules of Graces” contained in Purcell’s *A Choice Collection*, the authors turned to the ornaments called “[The] beat” and “a plain note & shake”, as well as to the following well-known instruction formulated by the famous musician: “observe that you allway’s shake from the note above and beat from y^e note or half note below, according to the key you play in <...>”. In the course of the research, numerous errors and inaccuracies were discovered and noted in the scientific and reference-encyclopedia literature of the 20th century concerning the interpretation of ornaments in England in the second half of the 17th century and in the content of English musical treatises of that time.

Keywords: English baroque harpsichord ornamentation, performance practice, Charles Coleman, Christopher Simpson, John Playford, Henry Purcell.

* First part see: Panov, Alexei A., and Ivan Rosanoff. “Performing Ornaments in English Harpsichord Music. Part I”. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Arts* 11, no. 3 (2021): 381–92. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu15.2021.302>.

observe that you always
shake from the note above and
beat from y^e note or half note below,
according to the key you play in.

Henry Purcell¹

The table with the execution of ornaments, included by Christopher Simpson in his *The Division-Violist* [2, p. 10]², contains thirteen different examples with the realization of ornaments. Not all ornaments from Simpson's table were discussed in our previous article, and not all matters have been dealt with accordingly. We showed that in the bottom of the table, Simpson expressed his obligation "to the ever famous Charles Colman Doctor in Musick" for it [3, p. 387]. However, this fact was only mentioned, but it did not receive detailed discussion. Thus, in this paper we continue to consider Simpson's table on the realization of ornaments and then turn to the next items.

There is something enigmatic about this table. It is well known that John Playford also included a table on the execution of ornaments in his numerous editions of *A Breefe Introduction to the Skill of Music* and *An Introduction to the Skill of Music*. To be precise, the table was included by Playford only in the 1660 edition of his treatise [4, p. 79], in the part titled "A Brief Introduction to the Playing on the Viol de Gambo"³. At first glance it looked practically the same as the table in Simpson's work (see the illustration with the title page) (fig. 1).

It is generally accepted that the table printed in Playford's treatise is a copy of Simpson's table. However, some scholars, as will be discussed below, take the opposite view, that Simpson used Playford's 1654⁴ table and published the latter in his work. Somehow this last conviction does not coincide with what Playford wrote in 1660, prefixing the table. His consideration and comments, as far as we know, were not noticed previously in scholarship. Playford clarifies some points, but after reading his explanations, many questions arise that are, according to available contemporary information, cannot be answered. While writing about the "Holding the Viol and Bow, the Fingering and Motions of the Hand", Playford explains why he does not





Fig. 1. Playford, *A Brief Introduction...*

¹ From: "Rules for Graces" in: [1]. The cited text is rearranged in space by the authors, so that it could fit the page.

² The table is given in full in our previous article [3, p. 386].

³ In all the next publications this table is printed in the part titled *Instructions for the Treble Violin*.

⁴ In the previous article it has already been shown that in the 1654 edition of Playford's treatise there is no table with the interpretation of ornaments. Therefore, even by virtue of this circumstance, it is clear that Simpson could not have used Playford's early publications and borrowed the table.

consider it necessary to delve into the details in this section of his book. He notes the availability of a publication on these issues in Simpson's treatise. The text in full reads: "<...> pains herein may be spared, it being already done and lately published by a more Able and Knowing Master on this Instrument, viz. Mr. Chr. Simpson, in his excellent Book, entitled, *The Division Violist: or, An Introduction to the Playing Extempore upon a Ground*. However, I am unwilling to omit any thing that may be a furtherance to the ingenious Practitioner, having found <...> an Excellent *Table* of the several *Graces* used on the Viol, framed by the Eminent *Charles Colman* Dr. in *Musick* <...> you have his *Mark* over the Note Plain, next the Gracing of the note is explained by Notes. The long Strokes thus () which are over 3 or 4 Notes, is that those Notes in Playing of those Graces, are to be done with one Motion of the Bow" [4, p. 78].

On the next page Playford includes Coleman's "Table". The first thing which comes to mind is that Playford's words confirm that he might have borrowed the table with the execution of ornaments from Simpson's treatise because the latter was "an Able and Knowing Master". On the other hand, the fact that Playford addresses the reader to Simpson's publication where the "Holding the Viol and Bow, the Fingering and Motions of the Hand" are abundantly discussed shows nothing more than his awareness of the publication of Simpson's special work, but the reader is not informed whether Playford was acquainted with Simpson's Table. Playford simply notes that there is a well-founded publication by Simpson dedicated to the division practice on the Viol. Playford continues, and in the next maxim, typed in small print, it is said that the author has "**found** extant an excellent Table of the several Graces used on the Viol" (our bold font) compiled by Charles Colman [Coleman]. Since Playford intended, as he says, to present anything that could be useful to an "ingenious Practitioner", he placed Dr. Coleman's Table on the following page of his "Introduction". Based on this information, one may assume that Simpson and Playford had access to Colman's Table separately, thus they independently published it in their works. However, it is difficult to imagine that Playford, giving a brilliant description of Simpson's treatise, would not have seen the Table with the realization of embellishments placed in the section entitled "Of Gracing Notes" [2, p. 10]. If everything that Playford wrote about finding Colman's Table corresponds to the events described, then it is clear why he did not print Simpson's annotation at the bottom of the publication of the table compiled by Colman. But why did Playford exclude from all his further editions of his *Introduction* the text where Simpson and Dr. Colman are mentioned? In the 1666 edition and further on in the next editions, nothing more besides the next passage is present: "As for the several Graces and Flourishes that are used, as shake, back-fall, and double-Relishes, this following Table will be some help to your practice; for there is first the Note plain, and after the Grace expressed by Notes at length" [5, p. 95]. Still more: how is it possible that two musicians copying Colman's Table admit discrepancies to the point that even the order of the last two ornaments (see lower) were changed? There is no reasonable answer to these questions except a hypothetical: Playford or his copyist was trying not to mention the fact that they took advantage of Colman's or perhaps Simpson's Table. We would not like to think that this hypothesis has grounds: there may be other answers to these questions, but it is not possible to find them after more than 360 years have passed. So, the question of a convincing attribution of the "Excellent Table of the several Graces" in Playford's *Introduction* hangs in the air. In the discussion of this topic only one matter is definite: Simpson's Table, borrowed from Colman and mentioning its author, was first

published in *The Division Violist* in 1659, and its appearance in Playford's *A Brief Introduction to the Skill of Music* came forth a year later, i. e. in 1660.

Nevertheless, beginning from Dolmetsch's research (1915), one may find mistakes concerning Colman's/Simpson's table that are later seen in works of other authors. Dolmetsch attributes Simpson's table as "being an exact reproduction of that given in Playford, except that the examples are in the alto clef instead of the treble" [6, p. 97]. Thereafter Dolmetsch states: "In Playford's 'Introduction to the Skill of Music', first edition, 1654, the table of 'Graces proper to the Viol or Violin' gives appoggiature from below and above. <...> In Christopher Simpson's 'Division Viol', published 1659, there is a table of graces..." This statement, formulated in other words, is repeated, for example, in connection with the slide: "In the Table of Graces [Simpson's table] which follows, and which is written by 'the ever-famous Charles Colman, Doctor in Musick', the signs and explanations given are precisely the same as those of Playford" [6, p. 240]. In the musical example taken from Playford's work with the explanation of perforating slides, Dolmetsch specifies the date of the publication as 1655⁵ (also without naming the page number). Along with this, the author refers here to Simpson's work of 1659, indicating the page number (see Ex. 1).

Christopher Simpson, in the "Division Violist", 1659, says:—
Page 11:

Example 1. Arnold Dolmetsch [6, p. 240]

Dolmetsch was certain that for the first time the ornamentation table was engraved in Playford's 1654 edition (and later in the 1655 edition), but there is no printed table in Playford's publications before the 1660 issue. Concerning the year of publication and the page-number of Simpson's *The Division-Violist*, Dolmetsch is also mistaken. The quoted passage from Simpson's work does not refer to his 1659 publication, but to the 1665 edition. It is in the second edition of Simpson's *Division-Violist* (1665) on page 11, where the text given by Dolmetsch is found.

Let's move on for one moment from the publication of Dolmetsch's monograph to the beginning of the 21st century. Such an authoritative publication as the article "Verzierungen", written by the outstanding scholar Georg von Dadelsen, notes: "English Textbooks of the 2nd half of the 17th century, such as J. Playford's Breefe Introduction to the Skill of Musick for Song and Viola (1654). Chr. Simpson's Division Viol (1667 [sic. 1659!]), M. Locke's Melothesia (1673) and Th. Mace's Musicks Monument (1676) give long ornamental tables with sometimes quite complicated ornaments" [7, col. 1538]. Surprisingly, the same error is found in another authoritative edition, *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, in the article "English Baroque" written by Kah-Ming Ng. The author states: "The earliest published tabulation with written-out realizations of ornaments was for fretted

⁵ The date "1655" is also indicated by Dolmetsch in the section dedicated to the "Shaked Beat."

and bowed instruments. Compiled by Charles Coleman, the ‘Table of Graces proper to the Violl or Violin’ appeared in John Playford’s *Breefe Introduction* (1654) and Christopher Simpson’s *Division-Violist* (1659)” [8, p. 718]. As noted above, this table was *not* printed in Playford’s *Breefe Introduction* of 1654, but was entered in the *Brief Introduction* issued later in 1660.

In connection with the discussion of this Coleman’s compilation of the ornament table, it is noteworthy to mention that the touching eulogy in honor of Simpson was written by Charles Coleman and was placed first among many other ones entered in the beginning of Simpson’s treatise (1659). Below is a short excerpt from Colman’s eulogy, “To Mr. *Christopher Simpson*, upon his Excellent Treatise of Playing *Division* upon a *Ground*”.

<...> Musick *her self*, with all her *Concords fraught*,
Adorn’d with every Grace which you have taught;
And help’d by all whom Numbers do enflame
To Sing a Panagyrich to your Name; <...>

Charles Colman, Dr. in Musick⁶

Along with John Wilson and Charles Colman (both, as is said, “Doctors in Musick”), there were other “Excellent masters” who took part in composing “Select Ayres and Dialogues For One, Two, and Three Voyces to the Theorbo-Lute or Basse-Viol”, which was published in the same 1659 year as Simpson’s treatise (illustration below) (fig. 2).

In this edition even the engraving of the letter “T” is the same as in Simpson’s publication (a part from the beginning of the dedication addressed to Sir Robert Bolles in Simpson’s work beginning with the letter “T” is in the next illustration) (fig. 3).

All this evidence shows how close the musical contacts between Simpson and Colman were. It goes without saying that the musicians communicated with each other, and Colman’s table was of practical interest to Simpson, as he decided to publish it in his instructional work. Returning to Playford, it is hard to say where he could have found Colman’s Table. Until now, scholars’ efforts have not yet found Colman’s MS of his Table or any correspondence between the two musicians.

Another aspect of the problem discussed requires consideration: the realizations of ornaments in Simpson’s and in Playford’s publications. Here an error of a more substantial nature occurs in Dolmetsch’s work, when the author claims that the tables printed in Simpson’s and Playford’s works are “exact reproductions” of one another, or are “precisely the same” (see texts quoted above: [6, p. 97, 240]). A study of Simpson’s table and the one placed in Playford’s treatise shows significant discrepancies. This matter will be considered separately in the discussion of each of the ornaments under question in the tables.

In the previous part of our study, only two ornaments from Simpson’s Table were discussed: the first, from the category of “*Smooth Graces*”, named *Beat*; and the second (derived from the first) from the category of “*Shaked Graces*”, the *Shaked Beat* of which represents a multiple repetition of the *Beat*. In contemporary musicology it is usually called the “prepared mordent”⁷ [11, p. 140].

⁶ As Sir John Hawkins informs “Dr. Charles Colman, gentleman of the private music to king Charles I. <...> taught in London, improving the lyra-way on the viol” [9, p. 63].

⁷ See also: [10, p. 42].



SELECT
AYRES
 AND
DIALOGUES


For One, Two, and Three Voyces;
 TO THE
 THEORBO-LUTE or BASSE-VIOL.

Composed by *John Wilson* } Doctors in Musick,
 Charles Coleman }
 Henry Lawes } Gentlemen and Servants to his late
 William Lawes } Majesty in his Publick and Private
 Nicolas Lanzone } Musick,
 William Webb }
 And other Excellent Masters of Musick.


LONDON,
 Printed by W. Godbid for *John Playford*, and are to be sold at his Shop
 in the Inner Temple, next the Church doore. 1659.


Fig. 2. *Select Ayres and Dialogues...*

To complete the consideration of this issue it is necessary to comment on the rarely discussed part from Simpson's *Division Violist* dealing with the "Shaked Graces", and printed before the table. Here it reads, "The *Beat* is the same in Nature with the *Plain-Beat*⁸ or *Rise*; the difference, only a short shake of a Finger, before we fix it upon the Place designed. This, as also the *Plain Beat*, is commonly made from the *Half-Note*, or distance of one *Frett*" [2, p. 9]. On the right side of the margin, it is written "Shaked Beat", indicating that the considered explanation refers just to such an ornament. However, the text of the explanation given above needs some explanation otherwise it might be erroneously understood: firstly, the term "Beat" in the beginning of the sentence does not mean an

appoggiatura, but stands for the "Shaked Beat", i. e. ⁹, marked by an oblique dash representing the "Plain Beat" (appoggiatura) and the three dots following

⁸ Neither Simpson nor Playford use the word "plain" in connection with the *Backfall* while discussing this ornament. Simpson uses it here to distinguish the *Backfall* from the *Backfall shaked*.

⁹ The smallest inaccuracy in quoting this example from Simpson's Table, which occurs in the preface of the "Anthology" published by H. Ferguson, to a certain extent, distorts the real situation. In the next example from the Anthology ("Ex. 11 Shaked beat "), the dots denoting the trill placed

above or somewhat before the oblique dash may indicate that the latter should be taken at the beginning of the realization, and then follows the appoggiatura, which is incorrect, because the oblique dash representing the appoggiatura, should be printed before the dots as:  [12, p. 12].

To His, and the ever Honored Patron of *MUSICK*,
 Sr. *ROBERT BOLLES*, Baronet.


SIR,



His Treatise now upon the point of becoming Publick, doth first (as in Duty it ought) address it Self to kiss Your Hands. All the Motives that can Beget, Oblige, or any wayes Endear a Dedication, point towards You, as so many Lines unto their Centre. The Subject, is That Branch of Musick You most Affect; and also Perform.

Fig. 3. Simpson, *The Division-Violist...*

it indicate the multiple repetition of the two neighboring notes/sounds used for an appoggiatura; secondly, the wording “Plain-Beat or Rise” should be understood as the one-note *Beat* representing a “Smooth grace” (an appoggiatura from the note below marked by the




above mentioned oblique dash), i. e.

Beat. exp: ; third, the wording “fix it upon

the Place designed” means: stop on the main note; lastly, the word “This” in the beginning of the second sentence should be understood as: **this** [*Beat*] which is performed as a “short shake of a Finger”, In other words — the above shown *Shaked Beat*.

If one looks closely at the sign of the *Shaked Beat* and its realization by itself



one will be able to detect a subtle element of ambiguity. It turns out that the realization of the *Beat* (i. e. the appoggiatura) is actually absent. The *Beat*



namely the two notes of its realization () are simply shaken (repeated multiple times) as one complex. The *Beat* by itself is not shown realized alike in other compound



ornaments¹⁰. For example, as in the *Elevation* where the *Beat*

() is realized after the *Elevation*. In the sign of the *Elevation* () the plus-mark (+)


represents the *elevation* () and the dots surrounding it stand for the shake with a caudential ending/termination¹¹.

¹⁰ A similar comment may be applies to Simpson's *Backfall shaken*.

¹¹ Robert Donington classifies this ornament as an “Ascending trill with or without turned termination” [13, p. 730, ill. no. 7] (see: John Playford, “*An Introduction to the Skill of Musick* <...>”. London: printed for John Playford, 1655).

But according to Simpson's opinion the sign of the *Shaked Beat* and its realization correctly express this ornament, and we must agree with his professional decision, especially having in mind, that he is not the true author, but is obliged, as he writes, "to the ever famous Charles Colman Doctor in Musick" for the table.

The mentioned realization of the *Elevation* as one complex with a shake and cadential termination is met quite rare in later Tables. In England it is partly explained as one complex in Thomas Mace's lute treatise "Musick's Monument" [14, p.106-7]. The sign of the *Elevation* of both outstanding musicians is identical. Mace reminds that the *Elevation* (marked: (≠**a**)) "must always be Equal in Loudness; which will require a pretty *Careful Practice*: For 'tis a Hard Grace" [14, p.107]. The realization, recommended by Mace, besides the swiftness of performance, also has a rhythmic peculiarity (highlight-



ed above the staff) [14, p.106] that makes the execution more

complicated. The comma placed before the "e" (highlighted) stands for a Back-Fall. Edward Dannreuther and Janet Dodge show the next manner of interpreting Mace's elevation:

Adolf Beyschlag recommends a similar interpretation:



6. Elevation $\text{≠} a = \text{---} \overset{\text{X}}{\text{---}} \text{---}$ [16, p. 52].

A short historical survey will show first of all a popularity of similar ornaments and secondly, it reveals the evolution of this ornament. Just a few examples. An embellishment similar with the *Elevation* is found in Gottlieb Muffat's voluminous table "*Particolari Segni delle Maniere*" in his "*Componimenti Musicali per il Cembalo*" (c1739):



[17].


It is especially notable that J.S.Bach entered practically the same ornament in his Table "*Explication unterschiedlicher Zeichen, so gewisse Manieren artig zu spielen, andeu-*

ten"¹². According to the written sign Bach presents this ornament as a com-



plex ornament.


¹² Bach J.S. *Clavier-Büchlein vor Wilhelm Friedeman Bach*. Angefangen in Cöthen den 22, Januar 1720. Frederick Neumann proposes the next translation of Bach's descriptive title: "Explanation of various signs, intimating the way of gracefully rendering certain ornaments". According to Neumann's concept, Bach's table (like many others) should not be taken too seriously because of its "casualness", its "incompleteness" and its "oversimplification", being "written as an introduction for a child" [18, p.127]. It is enough




just to look at Bach's handwriting and what ornaments he explains, for example to understand that the great musician did not try to adapt his table for a child. At the age of ten, Bach's son, the gifted Wilhelm Friedemann, was already experienced enough to understand his father's handwriting and be able to deal with the problem of performing complex ornaments. Along with these arguments


pound embellishment: “*doppelt cadence u. mordant*”. Beginning with the special work by A. Beyschlag scholars in different countries state that J. S. Bach’s table exactly copies from *Marques des Agrements et leur signification* of D’Anglebert [20]. This is a judgment that is not in accordance with facts, since D’Anglebert’s table, for example, does not include the mentioned above ornament, i. e. the Bach’s *doppelt cadence u. mordant*. D’Anglebert’s



table has an ornament () that at first glance might look like Bach’s and also is with a mordent termination, but in the beginning there is no initial slide preparing the trill. This ornament is first of all termed as “Tremblem. and mordent”, in other words it is a shake with a mordent/turn. J. S. Bach’s other option for the “*doppelt cadence u. mordant*”



() is also not found in the “*Marques des Agrements*” of the French musician.

Later especially in Francois Couperin’s harpsichord music the latter compound ornament will be marked by other signs, namely by the combination of the turn and the trill:  ¹³.

Returning to the main features of the *Elevation* (consisting of the slide and the short trill with a cadential turn) they are found in Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg’s *Anleitung zum Clavierspielen* (1755, Tab. V, Fig. 10):



[22, Tab. V, Fig. 10]. As Marpurg explains, this ornament represents a Doppelschlag “von unten nach oben” and with a Nachschlag at the end. The signs denoting this ornament in Marpurg’s “example 10”, as can be noted, are numerous.

Lastly, a “shake <...> with a Turn from below” is found in John Casper Heck’s “Art of Playing the Harpsichord”:

Neumann tries to prove that in the text of the title to the table the word “*andeuten*” means “to intimate, to hint” which emphasizes “the approximate nature of the models.” In the academic dictionary of Johann Christoph Adelung (1774) the main meaning of the word “*andeuten*” is: “Eigentlich durch Zeichen verständlich machen, bezeichnen (Actually make understandable by signs, denote)”. Adelung adds that “some painters still ... [use it to express] the drawing of a figure according to the main strokes” [19, col. 249]. Thus, in Adelung’s authoritative dictionary the meanings “to intimate, to hint”, or “the approximate nature of the models” are not found. On the contrary, according to Adelung’s explanation, the word *andeuten* means “to make clear, understandable” and to show the **basic outlines**. Having this in mind, Bach’s title may be translated as “*Explanation of various signs, which make understandable how to play gracefully certain ornaments*”.


¹³ See our paper: [21].




[23, p. 14]. Despite some minor differences

between Simpson's *Elevation* and the examples given above it is clear that there obviously is a traceable connection between them even if we turn to different national schools. Certainly, this type of ornament could occur in the performance practice of various musicians, but, as was shown above, it is not often met in tables. Attention was drawn to only a few general cases.

Further Simpson continues and gives an explanation of another shaked grace: "The



shaked *Backfall* is likewise the same in Nature with the Plain *Backfall* [i. e. *Backfall exp.*]



the difference only a shake of the Finger taken off [i. e. *Backfall-shaked exp.*]". In Simpson's Ta-

ble the *Backfall shaked* is placed first in the row of *Shaked Graces*. Namely here it becomes clear to the reader that the **dot** is designed to display the shake. The comma under the dot denotes the *Backfall/appoggiatura*. It is one of the earliest authentic examples in English music theory and practice where a shake is shown executed as a multiple repetition of the *Backfall* **without** a cadential or some other melodic termination. Upper-note trills without cadential terminations as the "*Backfall shaked*" in Simpson's table were extremely rare in the virginal-harpsichord-spinet music. Not only Howard Ferguson comes to the same conclusion in his *Lecture-Recital* ("Many [shakes] are written out in full in the sources; but these are invariably shakes with an ornamental ending or beginning" [24, p. 7]¹⁴), but also Alan Curtis, who states: "Among the hundreds of written-out trills in English sources, not one simple trill (i. e., without afterbeat or some other ending) may be found" [25, p. 228]¹⁵.

A serious problem arises in connection with the study of the Simpson's (1659) and Playford's (1660) ornament table. In most cases, scholars turn to the table reproduced by Playford; but in the version which was copied by Playford from Dr. Colman, not all examples, as we presume, are carried out in full accordance with the original. Because of this, scholarly and practical publications in the 20th and 21st centuries contain mistakes that were made in the 17th century.

However, not only in the Playford table (1660), the execution of some graces diverges from those in Simpson's table, but subsequently tables contained in further editions of Playford include more and more typos and errors. Thus, in the last nineteenth edition of Playford's *Introduction* (1730), no ornament marks were entered. One can understand that by the 1730s the previous marks of ornaments became obsolete, but the resolutions without markings in the main patterns are quite senseless (see illustrations where the absence of markings is flagged) (fig. 4).

¹⁴ The same observation is found in Ferguson's "Anthology": "Many [shakes] are written out in full in the sources; but these are invariably shakes with an ornamental ending or beginning" [12, p. 12].

¹⁵ See also Curtis's published book [26].

Playford from 1660, p. 79

A Table of Graces proper to the Viol or Violin.

A Beat Explan: A Backfall Explan: A Double Backfall Explan:
 Elevation Explan: A Springer Explan: A Cadent Explan:
 Shaked Graces
 A Backfall shaked Explan: A Close Shake Explan: A Shaked Beat
 Explan: Elevation Explan: Cadent
 Explan: Double Relish Explan:
 or thus Explan:

Playford from 1730, p. 90

90 *An Introduction to*

A Table of Graces, Proper to the Viol, or Violin.

Smooth Graces:
 A Beat Explan: A Backfall Explan: A Double Backfall Explan:
 Elevation Explan: A Springer Explan: A Cadent Explan:
 Shaked Graces:
 A Backfall Explan: A Close Shake Explan:
 A Shaked Beat Explan: Elevation Explan:
 Cadent Explan: Double Relish:
 Explan: Or thus:
 Explan:

Fig. 4. Playford, *A Brief Introduction to the Skill of Musick...*

For the first time faulty examples in Playford's treatises have been quoted by Dolmetsch in his pioneering monograph: "from the middle of the 17th century the shake began to establish itself, and a long list of documents containing precise instructions on the subject is available. It begins with Playford's 'Introduction to the skill of Music',


A Backfall shaked.

1654: — [6, p. 160]. To be more exact Dolmetsch repeats the

year of publication above the examples: "J. PLAYFORD, 1654." The *Backfall shaked* in this example is indicated only by a comma sign which is erroneous, and could not be given in Colman's table because this ornament should be expressed by a comma **together** with a dot above it (see the note example placed above). Otherwise, it would simply denote a "plain" Beat. Dolmetsch overlooked that in Simpson's table and in Playford's too the sign, represented merely by a comma, stands exclusively for a plain *Backfall!* Earlier Dolmetsch himself [6, p. 96] cites the example of the (plain) *Backfall* from Playford:


¹⁶ It was shown above that Colman's table is absent in the first edition published by Playford.

A Backfall, Explan :





”¹⁷. Dolmetsch should have noticed that in Playford’s table the plain *Backfall* and the *Backfall shaked* are both marked by a comma¹⁸, which undoubtedly is erroneous. In Simpson’s table this ornament is denoted by a comma with a dot above the latter. This is the first case found in the Playford’s table, that can serve as confirmation of our belief that this table is not an impeccable copy of the Coleman table, and which can be referred to when considering the issue of executing ornaments in England in the 60s of the 17th century. In our opinion, a correctly reproduced copy from Coleman’s table is Simpson’s table published in 1659.

Robert Donington makes a similar mistake when he quotes the example with the


Backfall shaked from Playford as next: “” [28, p. 177]. The

sign without the dot when only the comma is written represents in particular the plain *Backfall*.

The next serious mistake is found in engraving the sign of the *Double Relish* and its other less elaborate version in Playford’s *Brief Introduction*. They are erroneously marked by the same sign. Instead of the sign of the compound ornament  as written in Simpson’s treatise, both embellishments in Playford’s publication are indicated the same manner ¹⁹. This is the second occasion in the Playford’s table, which confirms the validity of our assumption that the table of the latter should not be referred to as an infallible document.

However, Ferguson adheres to a different point of view. In the *Anthology* the author makes this comment: “In John Playford’s *A Brief Introduction to the Skill of Musicke*, 1667 and later editions, Simpson’s ornament table is reproduced almost exactly [sic]. The one significant alteration is that Playford’s sign for the *Double-relish* (‘Ex. 13’) is simply


¹⁷ Beyschlag copied Simpson’s *Backfall* making a mistake because the realization in his research is




written out in an anticipated manner:  [16, p. 99].

¹⁸ In the fifteenth edition of Playford’s “An Introduction” where the third part is titled “*The Art of Descant, or Composing Musick...*” was written by the late Mr. Henry Purcell, the “*Table of Graces, proper to the Viol, or Violin*” only the “*Beat*” and the “*Cadent*” are marked with their signs [27, p. 100]. Purcell had collaborated with Playford much earlier. In the 1697 thirteenth Playford’s edition “*The Art of Descant <...>*” is entered under the name of the “*late Henry Purcell*”. The tables in the 1724 and 1730 Playford’s editions are printed also without ornamentation signs except for the *Beat* and *Cadent*. It is safe to suggest that the ornamentation signs were omitted, since they were outdated by that time.





¹⁹ Ferguson [12, p. 12] as will be shown below — believes that the replacement of the sign of the compound ornament with a simpler one, oddly enough, will be more correct. Using *the same sign* for two different realizations as done by Playford, cannot be considered historically correct. Ferguson also didn’t notice that the sign of the *Backfall shaked* was engraved incorrectly.


 , which looks more logical.” However, in “Ex. 13” Ferguson shows this

Ex. 13 Double-Relish 

ornament correctly as given in Simpson’s table:  [12, p. 12].


The words “almost exactly” in the field of ornamentation are likely to cause problems. Along with the correct way of performing “[The] *Double Relish*”, Ferguson (or the typesetter) mistakenly changed the sequence of signs of this composite embellishment, depicting


it as  Here, if the first sign of the trill () with a descending steplike note pattern () is typed correctly above and between the notes, the location of the second trill sign () between the notes is erroneous. In addition, it is unclear how the latter trill and the sign of the *Beat* correlate in musical space. In Simpson’s version the




sequence of signs is different, namely, the trill sign is written exactly above the note () , which implies the performance of the trill on the note C and the *Beat* (accordingly) — between the notes of H and C, as expressed by Simpson in the following manner of execu-

tion: 
Double Relish exp: or.


There is still one more point in Ferguson’s explanation that deserves comment, i. e. the passage where he writes about “Playford’s sign for the *Double-relish*”, namely that the sign

of the shake represented “simply” by dots () “looks more logical”. First,

Simpson uses such a sign to mark the less elaborate embellishment in his table:  . Its interpretation is not very familiar now, because in such a musical context the shake begins by a main quarter note followed by another main eight note, and lastly the shake


enters  . Second, Ferguson’s recommendation is incorrect, because historically and stylistically it is unacceptable to propose to change ornamentation signs in a table with realizations of embellishments, i. e. to change an ornament marked by  to another one simply marked by  as Playford has done. Third, Ferguson did not pay attention — or thought that everything was right — to the signs of the less elaborate *Double Relish* and the one more elaborate in Playford’s table, which as was previously noted, are marked with the same sign. Maybe during his studies Ferguson was influenced by Dolmetsch’s views.

Back in the early 20th century, Dolmetsch obviously believed that the designation of two different interpretations of the *Double Relish* in Playford's treatise with the same sign does not contradict musical logic. Next to the examples from Playford, Dolmetsch [6, p. 308] cites the signs of these embellishments from Simpson's treatise, and accompanies the example with the following explanation: "Similar examples [as in Playford's *Introduction*] are found in Ch. Simpson's 'Division Violist', under the authority of Dr. Charles Coleman, with the only difference that the sign indicating the second version is given

thus: — ". Alongside one another, Dolmetsch cites differently designated signs of the *Double Relish* from the tables printed by Simpson and Playford, and taken from the same source, i. e. Colman's table!

Inaccuracy in the manner in vertical alignment of the *Double Relish* sign is found still earlier in Dannreuther's monograph where the sign of the shake is placed exactly above the sign of the *Beat*.



In our previous work in the part discussing Bevin's small ornament table called "*Graces in play*" it was shown that the realization of two ornaments of the latter may be compared with Simpson/Colman's *Double Relish* [3]. The two compound ornaments marked by the next signs  are practically interpreted by Bevin as later shown in Simpson's *Division-Violist* (Ex. 2). But it should be repeated that Bevin conceived this pattern as consisting of two ornaments and marked by two signs, and Simpson — indicated it by three signs.



Example 2. From Edward Bevin's "*Graces in play*" (c1630); quoted from Dolmetsch [6, p. 388]

There is still another inaccuracy in Dannreuther's work when the author places the oblique stroke in the "*Springer*" somewhat between the two notes instead of placing it directly above the first note:



the next manner: *Springer.* *exp:* . Dannreuther's placing of the oblique dash might indi-

cate a plain *Beat*, which is marked by Simpson by a dash placed between two notes. In Simpson's *Division-Violist* this ornament, as may be seen above, is named "*Spinger*". This spelling is hardly a misprint. The ornament *Spinger* is explained on the previous page before the one with the table: "There is yet another plain or smooth Grace called a *Spinger*, which concludeth the sound of a *Note* more acute, by clapping down another Finger just at the expiring of it." Thomas Mace also has an explanation of the *Spinger*: "The *Spinger*, is a *Grace*, very Neat, and Curious, for some sort of Notes; <...> which Grace (if Well done, and Properly) is very Taking, and Pleasant" [14, p.109]. In Playford's *Introduction* it is called "*Springer*".


Along with this, the order of these two last ornaments is changed in Playford's version. As we presume, the latter change of places is not a random mistake. This rotation was done deliberately, and in fact correctly, because logically the less elaborated realization, in our opinion, should be placed first, and the more elaborated one after it. In the following example we intentionally changed places of these two last ornaments given in Simpson's


Table to show how it might have looked:

Especially illustrative is the error found in work by Robert Klakowich. In his study of keyboard sources, Klakowich turns to Simpson's Table and notes that "the use of dots as an ornamental sign was not unknown in English music, as signs with dots appear in <...> Christopher Simpson's *The Division-Viol* of 1659. The table was reprinted in Playford's *Introduction* from the third edition of 1660 onwards, and is reproduced below <...>. It is clear from the table that dots apply only to the category of 'shaked graces, <...>' [29, p.25]. Everything written here is correct, but why does Klakowich reproduce in full the Table from Playford's seventh edition of 1674? This is confusing and defies explanation, because the author mentions Simpson's table, too. Is it possible that Klakowich, who notes that dots in Simpson's and Playford's tables express "shaked graces", did not notice that the signs of the *Backfall* and the *Backfall shaked* are exactly alike and both signs for the *Double Relish* (more elaborate, and less elaborate) are identical too. Beginning from Playford's third edition of *A Brief Introduction to the Skill of Music* (1660) [4] on to the eighteenth edition of 1724 these tables contain obvious errors.

Sixteen years after the issue of Simpson's *The Division-Violist*, the outstanding English lutenist Thomas Mace (1676) discussed the *Double Relish*, but unlike Simpson he marked it solely with dots ($\therefore \alpha$). According to Mace, this compound ornament in his time was rarely used in musical compositions: "In *Enicient Times the Well and True Performance of It*, upon the several *Keys*, throughout the *Instrument* (either the *Lute*, or *Viol*) was accounted an *Eminent piece of Excellency*, though now, we use it not at all in our *Compositions* upon the *Lute*" [14, p.108]. The lutenist Janet Dodge in her article recommends the next realization of the *Double Relish* as recommended by Mace:


Dannreuther [15, p.79] and Beyschlag [16, p.52] adhere to a different way of executing the *Double Relish* according to Mace's instructions. The first shake begins from

the main note in their interpretation, the second — from the upper auxiliary: . It seems that these authors did not notice the oblique stroke in Mace's *Musick's Monument* before the “*a*”:



[14, p.108]. A correct “translation from

the Lute Tablature” of the Double Relish is given by Dolmetsch [6, p. 308]:



The more elaborate embellishment (as it might be called), i. e. the *Double Relish* was applied earlier as a cadential diminution formula. There is a fairly wide contemporary practice to call these diminutions, which originated in the end of the fifteenth and first quarter of the 16th centuries, “written out ornaments”. It is possible, hypothetically, to consider the diminutions as ornamentations, but such a conclusion is historically incorrect because the actual ornaments indicated by conventional signs will appear much later, and they will be realized under their own separate rules. A total confusion in science between diminution practice and ornamentation — most often leads to erroneous interpretations of ornaments. Since the diminutions are also called *written out ornaments*, there is a desire to assert that this or that diminution represents a written out trill or a written out expanded mordent etc., and thus vice versa the trills or mordents are to be interpreted as these diminutions which in both cases is incorrect. It is necessary to clearly distinguish the diminutive practice from the practice of performing ornaments indicated by conventional signs. This problem has been noted already in the beginning of the 20th century by Janet Dodge. Her article was published in 1908 in *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musikgesellschaft*, issued by the outstanding scholar Max Seiffert. The article starts by relating the next topic: “It has always been a somewhat difficult matter to separate the kind of musical ornamentation which is known as divisions, diminutions, etc., from that more special one which the French called ‘*tremblements*’ or ‘*agréments*’, the Germans ‘*Manieren*’ and the English ‘graces” [30, p. 329]. Lower some examples of diminutions will be shown which might represent Simpson’s *Double Relish*, but basically are diminutions (divisions).

In the “Hunting Galliard” composed by Thomas Tomkins, both embellishments (maybe perceived as *Double Relish*) are found as diminutions, the artistic function of which consists in creating emotional tension in the endings (see Ex. 3). These diminutions are not absolutely similar with Simpson’s/Colman’s, but the general outlines are alike, because they do not have the closing *Beat*. Simpson’s *Double Relish* is more refined due to the *Beat* at the conclusion but in Tomkins’s music the diminutions in the form of the *Double Relish* intensify the forthcoming preliminary termination.

a



b



Example 3. Thomas Tomkins. *Double Relish* in “The Hunting Galliard” [31, p. 102]

The *Double Relish* in Peter Phillips’s: *Tirsi. Di Luca Marenzio 1^a. Parte. Intavolata di Pietro Phillips* [32, p. 280, bar 10; p. 281, bar 31] (see Ex. 4a) is illuminating especially of the diminution sounding in parallel sixths (FW I [32, p. 281, b. 32]) (see Ex. 4b). His *Pavana Pagget* [lord Thomas Paget] (FW I [32, p. 295]), “perhaps dating from 1590” [33, p. 55] has a highly temperament cadence due to the application of the *Double Relish* (see Ex. 4c).



a. FW I [32, p. 280, b. 10]



b. FW I [32, p. 281, b. 32]



c. *Pavana Pagget*, FW I [32, p. 295]

Example 4. Phillips P. *Tirsi. Di Luca Marenzio 1* (a., b.), *Pavana Pagget* (c.)

The *Double Relish* in Italy is, for example, in Andrea Gabrieli's 12th Toccata del nono



In conclusion, several main points should be noted. Simson's treatise, and especially the Coleman/Simpson ornament table included in it, represent a historical document of exceptional value, not only by the almost complete for those times coverage of the available ornaments, but also by the fact that it was published eleven years earlier than the first French Chambonières' table and thirty years earlier than the expanded D'Anglebert table.

The next most important fact is that of the thirteen ornaments resolved in the table, eleven are performed according to the principle of "Subtraktion" (term by Beyschlag), that is, beginning on the beat using the time of the main note (onbeat performance), and only the *Spinger* and *Cadent* are performed according to the principle of Anticipation (prebeat interpretation).


Last, but probably the most important in the field of ornamentation performance, is that Simpson's *Backfall shaked* represents a *Shake* beginning with the upper auxiliary note, because it is in its basis a multiple times repeated *Backfall*. Not much time passed and the word *Backfall* disappeared, and only the word *Shake* remained, which was common in English theoretical and practical works, denoting, as in Simpson's treatise, a trill, performed beginning from the upper auxiliary note. In Thomas Mace's "*Musick's Monument*" (1676) the "General Rule" on the performance of shakes is formulated with the most possible precision:

<p><i>Take This General, and Certain Rule; (never to be altered) which is, That All Shakes, must be made, either from the Half, or Whole Note; according to the Aire, and Humour of your Tuning,</i></p>	<p>A General Rule, how to make All Shakes properly, and in their True places.;</p>	<p>[14, p. 103].</p>
--	--	----------------------

An embellishment, which in its features is a reversed Shake Simpson calls the *Shaked Beat*. It represents a multiple times repeated *Beat*. In fact this ornament is a mordent, which begins from the lower auxiliary note (a "prepared mordent").



Henry Purcell on Graces

Here is the exact place where it is self-evident that the topic should turn to Henry Purcell's *Rules for Graces* entered in his posthumous editions. Namely in these *Rules* the *Shake* is resolved as a trill (contemporary term) beginning with the upper auxiliary note, and the *Beat* (mordent, a term in contemporary usage) is resolved as an inversion of the shake, thus beginning from the lower auxiliary note. This correlation between the manner of performing trills and mordents in Simpson's and Purcell's instructions, is intentionally presented by us quite straightforwardly, and may seem somewhat simplified. In Purcell's examples with the execution of the beat this Grace, for instance, is expressed as a short ornament (

) , but all authors share the same opinion that the quantity of repercussions is usually (in Purcell's case too) shown approximately. After all, a comparison of the principles recommended by Simpson and Purcell for some reason did not pre-

viously attract the attention of scholars. In a mass of publications devoted to Henry Purcell and, in particular, to the execution of his ornaments, the discussion is centered on trying to understand the essence of his prescriptions, which often diverge from the established stylistic preferences that took place in the course of historical development from the end of the 17th century to the 21st century.


Even Purcell's requirement, formulated in *Rules for Graces*, to perform shakes starting from the upper auxiliary note, and mordents from the lower one, is met with distrust, and serious attempts are being made to justify logically the possibility of another interpretation option. The correctness of the requirements set out by Purcell is discussed with a degree of suspicion, as if it communicates not exactly what should have been stated there. Consideration of ornamental terminology serves well as a tool for authors holding a different point of view, and allows all kind of attempts for rethinking Purcell's instructions. Indeed, since the publication of Simpson's treatise (1659) and until the time of Purcell's publication of *Rules for Graces* (the last years of the 17th century), ornamental terminology changed significantly in England, and the language of music itself evolved to differ significantly from the previous period of the late Virginalists. The existing correlation between Simpson's and Purcell's recommendation, instead of being a helpful argument proving the correctness of the *Rules* formulated by the latter, is definitely an annoyance for authors, who adhere to a different point of view. One example illustrates this situation. In the article "England", Alan Brown finds it necessary to confirm the authenticity of the *Instructions*, being "derived from Purcell's own manuscript" [33, p. 76]. But immediately after this the author tries to find the possibility for deviations from the rules outlined by Purcell, and says "yet the interpretations of the graces are in need of some amendment". Most of these amendments pertain to objective matters, such as the confusing resolution of the *battery* in the *Rules*, and also the idea to avoid literal interpretation in the performance the number of repercussions in trills and the rhythmic exactness in playing Purcell's *fore fall* and *back fall* too, which "will be variable in performance". But further, Brown suggests to add a tie in Purcell's example with the "plain note and shake", and writes: "It is normally assumed that a tie should be added to the explanation of the 'plain note and shake' (Ex. 2.35a)" — see lower Ex. 5. This ornament is constantly a cause for controversy among scientists. Thus, in Purcell's edition of *Suites, Lessons and Pieces for the Harpsichord*, published by Barclay Squire in 1918, the "plain note and shake" is resolved with a slur connecting the first two notes

 explained thus:  [34, p. IV].

Eiji Hashimoto, it seems, was also under Ferguson's impact, but went even further in the recommendation of performing Purcell's "plain note and shake", because in the article "Baroque Ornamentation: A Guide to Correct Interpretation", this ornament shown in the

original notation like  is equated to D'Anglebert's and other authors as *Tremblement*

Example 4



appuyé [35, p. 8].

EXAMPLE 2.35.

(a) Plain note and shake



(b) beat



Example 5. Brown on the interpretation of Purcell's "plain note and shake" and the beat [33, p.77]

Another bothersome *Grace* which triggers heated debate among scientists is the *beat*, which in Brown's opinion, based on the suggestion of Howard Ferguson, may actually present a "forefall & beat", and "should be the equivalent of the continental lower mordent" being less mannered in its interpretation "that is never inappropriate in performance" (Ex. 2.35b) — see Ex. 5.

In conclusion — again relying on the opinion of Howard Ferguson — Alan Brown questions the content of Purcell's many times cited dictum, included at the beginning of our article, which asserts the need to start the shake from the upper auxiliary note, and the mordent from the lower one

observe that you always shake from the note above and beat from y^e
 ("note or half note below, according to the key you play in, and for y^e plain note and" [1])

just as Simpson explained it earlier. Brown repeats Ferguson's suggested conclusion: "but this may merely have been intended to stress that the shake is an alternation with the note above and the beat with the note below" [33, p. 152].

This interpretation of Purcell's words, and in whole his *Rules for Graces* as presented by Ferguson had been exhaustively criticized in the work of Stephen Rose [10, p.142]. Merely a brief survey of Rose's arguments does not seem quite appropriate to us. Due to the importance of this fundamental issue, we believe that it is necessary to convey almost completely the critical remarks that Rose made in connection with Ferguson's new concept. "In the late seventeenth century there existed a distinctive set of English keyboard ornaments with idiosyncratic symbols and names. Yet Ferguson failed to recognize several of these English embellishments, notably the prepared mordent known as the 'beat'. By the 1990s Ferguson's re-reading of Purcell's ornaments had attained the status of orthodoxy, being followed by scholars such as Geoffrey Cox, Robert Klakowich and Barry Cooper, as well as by many performers. [Also, as had been shown, Alan Brown should be mentioned who was strongly influenced by Ferguson's new ideas.] Ferguson's theories were even repeated in Davitt Moroney's 1999 edition of Purcell's keyboard autograph, despite having been discredited several years earlier". Rose further criticizes Ferguson's view of Purcell's *Rules*: "Ferguson declared that the 'Rules for Graces' were 'not altogether reliable'. Besides correcting a misprint in the explanation of the broken chord ('BATTERY'), Ferguson emended Purcell's 'plain Note and Shake', renaming it the 'Backfall and Shake' and tying the initial appoggiatura to the following note (see Example 4.2) [example "4.2" is given lower as ex. 6]. <...> H. Diack Johnston, however, argues that Purcell's notation should be taken at face value, with a reiterated upper auxiliary, on the basis of the analogy to the



Example 6. Stephen Rose, example 4.2: “Plain Note and Shake”: (a) as defined by Purcell; (b) as emended by Howard Ferguson” [10, p. 142]

‘Forefall and Shake’ described by Matthew Locke in the prefatory material to *Melothesia* (1673). The repeated upper auxiliary can help establish a pulse on long-held notes, and is particularly idiomatic on the harpsichord.”

“Ferguson”, Rose continues, “was even more interventionist in his interpretation of Purcell’s ‘Beat’. Purcell’s ‘Rules’ define the beat as a mordent approached by a lower auxiliary. Ferguson, however, argued that the beat should be a plain mordent akin to the French *pince* (see Example 4.3). <...>, suggesting that the ‘correct explanation of the *Beat* and the name and sign for a *Forefall-~~e~~-Beat* were left out of the original engraving by mistake’. <...> Furthermore, Ferguson was convinced that the plain mordent was commonly used in seventeenth-century England. Johnston, however, once again argues that Purcell’s instructions for the beat should be taken at face value²⁰. Surveying a variety of definitions found in English manuscripts and printed treatises, he concludes that ‘prior to 1749, the simple mordent was virtually unknown in England’”.

It is interesting to note that in the year 1861, Louise Farrenc (or her father Aristide, in his edition *Le Tresor des Pianistes*) entered a table of performing embellishments compiled according to Purcell’s *Rules for graces* without any amendments or changes except only that in Nos. 2 and 3 in their table the slur signs are omitted in the resolutions of these ornaments:



[37] (p. 1 of the part where the music of Henry Purcell is printed). In the work of these authors the edition of 1696 is given as: “*Choice Collection of Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinet* (Collection choisie de Pièces pour le clavecin ou l’épinette); Londres, 1696” [37] (p. 2 of the part “Notice Biographique of Henri Purcell”), and all the pieces from Purcell’s *Collection* (eight Suites, but not called as such) are printed.

The beginning of the critical consideration and distrust of the *Rules for Graces* was laid still at the end of the nineteenth century in a special study devoted to ornamentation written by Edward Dannreuther. The author characterizes the ornament called “battery” (spread chord) as being “obviously a bundle of blunders” (partly true). Next, a false interpretation of Purcell’s “plain note and shake” is given:

²⁰ Diack Johnston, for his part, considered Ferguson’s innovations with corrections of Purcell’s recommendations not always justified and not consistent with the state of things. This becomes clear from the following passage from Johnston’s work: “As for the other ‘patent misprints’ to which Ferguson refers, I do not myself believe there are any. Yet such is the weight of his authority — and deservedly so — that the various emendations he has proposed in his book *Keyboard Interpretation* (1975) and in the editorial notes to his several exemplary editions of the harpsichord works of Purcell, Blow, and Croft have now become so firmly entrenched in the literature that they are, in my view, in some danger of being regarded almost as Holy Writ. My own researches in this area, carried out over a period of thirty years and more, lead to some rather different conclusions, <...>” [36, p. 86–7].

A plain note and shake thus:  explain'd thus:  But

unlike the previously named authors (Dolmetsch, Brown, Johnston), Dannreuther accepts Purcell's interpretation of the beat (as a mordent beginning from the lower auxiliary note) and no comments are forwarded concerning the above wording ("observe that you al <...>").

We are constantly speaking here about Purcell's collection of "harpichord lessons", the first posthumously publication of which took place in the second half of the last decade of the nineteenth century, namely in 1696. In connection with this first edition, there are various contradictory judgments in contemporary studies, thus its authorship, the authenticity of the attached *Instructions*, the correctness of the recommendations contained in these instructions. It has just been shown that L. and A. Farrenc turned to this publication still back in 1861. The same year (1696) is shown in Max Seiffert's *Geschichte der Klaviermusik* (1899) [38, p. 312] where the author exactly names Purcell's edition: "gab die Witwe heraus unter dem Titel *A Choice Collection of Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinnet Composed by y^e late Mr. Henry Purcell. London. Printed on Copper Plates for Frances Purcell, Executrix of the Autor. 1696*", die mehrere Auflagen erlebte [Purcell's widow published [the autograph materials] under the title <...>, which experienced multiple editions]; and on the next page Seiffert shows Purcell's fingering. Dannreuther [15, p. 4, 69] and Arnold Dolmetsch [6, p. 32] also address the reader to the edition of 1696 where Purcell's "Rules" are found. However the latter reasoned: "There is no proof that they [the "Rules"] are Purcell's"; the book as Dolmetsch argues "was published by his widow, one year after his death" [16, p. 32].

In the last thirty years Purcell research gathered pace. But the problem with the *Choice Collection* remained. Diack Johnston, for example, for some reason at the beginning of his article refers not to Purcell's first (1696) edition, but to the third one of 1699. The explanation for referring to the 1699 edition becomes clear from the subsequent text, in which Johnston writes, "Of the first edition issued by Henry Playford for Frances Purcell in July 1696, two copies only survive, one in the United Kingdom and one in the United States; neither contains the 'Rules for Graces', which, it would appear, were added for the first time to the second edition advertised in the *London Gazette* of 22 November 1697.²¹" (here and further our underlining. — *A. P., I. R.*) [36, p. 82–3]. This statement is not in ac-

²¹ We cannot exclude that there might exist a first edition "published in July 1696" in which there are no 'Rules for Graces'. Then again, it might be that the mentioned scholars were not acquainted with the edition of the "Choice Collection" published in 1696 where Purcell's "Instructions" were printed. A bibliographic note: we checked the "*London Gazette* of 22 November 1697" which Johnson and some other authors refer to, and have read the next advertisement: "Likewise the Second Edition of the Harpsichord Book with Additions or Lessons, and Directions for Young Beginners, will be published the same week and sold at the same Rate [as Purcell's TE DEUM] and Place [Playford's Shop at the Temple Change]." This isn't the advertisement of the "Harpsichord Master"! Most probably it is truly, as Johnston suggests, the "Second" publication of the "Choice Collections for Learners". It is possible that the author of the advertisement changed the title words, but the price does not match the price of the "Harpsichord Master", and the words "Additions or Lessons, and Directions for Young Beginners" do not coincide with the ones that are written in the latter (1697), and nothing is said that it was "taken from his owne Manuscript, never before publish'd". The most important matter is that the "Harpsichord Master" found in 1977 was published by Walsh and "sold by him and I. Hare (the "*Musical Instrument maker in Ordinary to his Majesty, at the Golden Hay & Hoboy in Catherine street near Summerset house in y^e strand, and I. Hare Musikall Instrument seller at y^e Golden Viol [?] in S^t Pauls Church yard & at his shop in Freemans yard Cornhill*")", but not by Playford and sold not at the house of the latter! Due to the lack of full access to all sources it is not possible to solve this problem, but the question has been raised here.

cordance with fact because we have just seen that in Farrenc's edition of 1861 and of other scholars the *Choice Collection* with its instructions is referred to as published in 1696. At our own disposal is a Xerox copy of this publication with the exact designation of the year "1696". Currently, both the first and third editions are freely available, and Purcell's *Rules for Graces* are printed in all of these publications.

Discussing the attribution of Purcell's *Choice Collection*, Stephen Rose makes an incomprehensible assertion in his 2012 article: "Purcell's vocabulary of keyboard ornaments is defined in the 'Rules for Graces' first published in *The Harpsichord Master* (1697) <...>. Subsequently the 'Rules' appeared in the posthumous third edition of Purcell's *Choice Collection of Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinnet* (1699)" [10, p. 141]. After the abundant information given above we believe that no comment is required.

Now to Purcell's original sources. The titles of the three named editions (1696, 1697²², and 1699) with the *Rules for Graces* as will be shown are all not exactly alike. We will use the 1696 edition as a starting source. The title of this edition reads:

A Choice Collection of Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinnet Composed by y^e late M^r. Henry Purcell Organist of his Majesties Chappel Royal & of S^t Peters Westminster. London, Printed on Copper Plates for M^{rs}. Frances Purcell, Executrix of the Author, and are to be sold by Henry Playford at his Shop in the Temple Change Fleetstreet, 1696.

The first edition. Earlier it was noted that the copies which are at our disposal (see title below) have the place of publication and the year in their title distinctly printed (fig. 5):




Fig. 5. Purcell, *A Choice Collection of Lessons...*

²² In 1977 Robert Petre discovered in Auckland Public Library (New Zealand) the considered lost 1697 edition of *The Harpsichord Master* (amazing). Howard Ferguson in his "review" (1983) of two publications, i. e. the Facsimile publication of Petre's discovery, and of *The Harpsichord Master*, ed. also by the named author, discusses the authenticity of the contents of the "Instructions" allegedly written by Purcell in *The Second Book of the Harpsichord Master*, in its "Third" version, and those that are available in the discovered unique edition of "The Harpsichord Master" of 1697. Ferguson considers that "The Second Book [1697] indeed contains four pages of Instructions, but they are anonymous; while those in *The Third Book* (1702), though ascribed to Purcell, are slightly different. Thus it was by no means certain that Purcell had anything to do with any of them, especially since they all contain blatant mistakes. Now [when the first edition is found], however the likelihood of their having been taken, if inaccurately, 'from his own Manuscript' is strengthened, for the newly discovered volume also contains three pieces by Purcell" [39, p. 311].

The “Third” edition. It should be specifically noted that the “third edition” of 1699, with the original copies with which we are working (see title below), have no date of publication printed but in RISM and in the contemporary publications the date “1699” is given. The Title reads:

A Choice Collection of Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinnet Composed by y^e late M^r. Henry Purcell Organist of his Majesties Chappel Royal, & of S^t Peters Westminster. The third Edition with Additions & Instructions for beginners. Printed on Copper Plates for M^{rs}. Frances Purcell, Executrix of the Author, and are to be sold at her house in Great Deans Yard Westminster [c1699] (fig. 6).




Fig. 6. Purcell, *A Choice Collection of Lessons*...

An essentially important clarification which is included in this edition is the addition of the next elucidation, stating that, first, it is the “Third Edition”, second, it is with “Additions”, and last, that it contains “Instructions for beginners” [sic]. It should be explicated here that if the two editions of 1696 and of 1699 will be compared there will be no new “Additions”, because both publications have the same “Instruction for beginners” printed. Thus, the only new indication in the title of the 1699 edition is the definition “The Third Edition”, and the place where the named *Choice Collection* was sold.

The edition of 1697. This so-called “second” edition (1697) in fact has a different title. It isn’t a *Choice Collection of Lessons*, but *The Harpsichord Master*. Both 1697 and 1699 editions are supplied by implication with the same indication of Purcell’s authorship only formulated in other words, i. e. in 1699 it is given as “Composed by y^e late M^r. Henry Purcell <...> with Additions & Instructions for beginners”, and in 1697 it reads “written by y^e late famous M^r H. Purcell at the request of a perticular friend & taken from his owne Manuscript”. It seems that when early scholars and musicians (Farrenc, Seiffert, Dannreuther and others) had at their disposal only the first edition of 1696 they believed in the it’s authorship as belonging to Henry Purcell even if the *Instructions* were not specifically noted. As was shown, the title only stated that the volume was “Composed by y^e late M^r. Henry Purcell”. However, other authors in their study of Purcell’s publication were not convinced that these “Instructions” were actually written by Purcell. Only the wording “written by y^e late famous M^r H Purcell at the request of a perticular friend & taken from his owne Manuscript” which are written in the discovered “Harpsichord Master” (1697) could convince them in the truth of Purcell’s authorship. For modern musicology, these words have great

scientific significance in the attribution of the source, but for the early period, as we risk to assume, they had another assignment, i. e. they were specifically printed to attract professional and amateur musicians to purchase this edition. The same explanation pertains to the words ‘*never before publish’t*’. The “*Instructions for beginners*” were not specified in 1696 but nevertheless *de facto* they were printed there, and it might be possible that Walsh was not aware of the “*Instructions for Lerner’s*” being already included in the first edition of 1696 issued by Playford where they were printed after the dedication “*To Her Royal Highness the Princess of Denmark*”, but, however, not specifically titled. This is one of the reasons, as it might be presumed, why many scholars, without studying the publication itself, where the *Instructions* are not mentioned, came to the conclusion that the edition did not contain the *Instructions*.

The largely expanded title of *The Harpsichord Master* (1697) reads (fig. 7):

The Harpsichord Master, *Containing plain & easy Instructions for Learners on y^e Spinnet or Harpsichord, written by y^e late famous M^r H Purcell at the request of a perticular [sic] friend & taken from his owne Manuscript, never before publish’t being y^e best extant, together with a Choice Collection of y^e newest Aires & Song Tunes Composd by y^e best Masters and fitted for y^e Harpsichord Spinnet or Harp by these that Composd them all graven on Copper Plates. Price one shilling sixpence 1697. London Printed ^{for} & sold by I. Walsh Musicall Instrument maker in Ordinary to his Majesty, at the Golden Hay & Hoboy in Catherine street near Summerset house in y^e strand, and I. Hare Musikall Instrument seller at y^e Golden Viol [?] in S^t Pauls Church yard & at his shop in Freemans yard Cornhill.*




Fig. 7. *The Harpsichord Master*...

More complicated is the problem with Purcell’s *Rules for Graces*. Notwithstanding that the realization of ornaments coincides almost in all the *Rules* published in 1696, 1697, and 1699, the other parts of the text have significant discrepancies between the initial edition of 1696 and that of 1697. Only the texts of the *Rules* from the editions of 1696 and 1699 are absolutely identical printed from the same copper plates. The *Rules* contained in the 1697 “*Harpsichord Master*” diverge significantly from the initial *Choice Collections of Lessons*, which indicates that a new setting on copper plates was undertaken. The almost complete concurrence of the first 1696 and the “*Third*” 1699 editions on the one hand and the significant discrepancies in the text of the title page, of the *Rules*, and of the musical content in the 1697 edition, on the other hand, turns out to be a problem. These discrepancies between the editions may indicate that the *Harpsichord Master* (1697) could in no way present the second edition of the *Choice Collection of Lessons*, which, if published, would

also be numbered as the “second” issue. This edition of 1697 is also not titled as the “second” one. The question arises: if the 1699 edition was published as the “Third” one, then which is the “second” edition of the *Choice Collection*? Just as before 1977 it was believed that the first edition of *The Harpsichord Master* was lost, the same might be that the second edition of *The Choice Collection of Lessons* has not been discovered yet (see note No. 62)?

In the next comparison of the *Rules for Graces* in different editions once again the initial publication of Purcell’s *Choice Collection of Lessons* (1696) with the enclosed *Rules for Graces* will be taken here as the basic one. The next copy of Purcell’s *Rules for Graces* is taken from the first edition of 1696 (fig. 8):




Fig. 8. Purcell, *Rules for Graces*...

The *Rules for Graces* published in 1697 are shown lower. The divergences from the 1696 edition are marked by rectangles (fig. 9):




Fig. 9. Purcell, *Rules for Graces*...

The comparison shows that Walsh adhered to a different spelling in his first edition of *The Harpsichord Master*. In this text practically all the words “y^e” except on the 11th line from above were changed to “the”; the word “strain” was written with an “e” in the end, as “straine”; the word “barr” found in one place is written as “bar”. However, in the 1696 edition, where this word is used for the second time, it is written with one “r”. The word “all-way’s” is changed to “always”, and the sign “S” is given with a barely noticeable change as “S̄”. The number of lines changed from 16 to 17, and along with this, the location of the text on the lines also moved. Thus, in the 1697 edition, not only is the content of the title page completely different relative to the 1696 issue, but also the changes affected the *Rules for Graces*. This comparison makes us think again that maybe the 1697 edition was not a continuation of the editions of *A Choice Collections for Learners*.

According to Purcell’s instructions, the *Graces* should be taken at face value, and in this matter our opinion coincides with that of early authors such as Farrenc and Seiffert, and of the modern Johnston and Rose. Instead of showing the interpretation in contemporary notation as done perfectly by Diack Johnston [36, p. 84] it will be given (to be distinctly historically based) as a table extracted from the original *Rules for Graces* (fig. 10):







Fig. 10. Purcell, *Rules for Graces*...

The embellishment called “Battery” should be dealt with separately, because all authors agree that it was incorrectly presented in the *Rules for Graces*. But it is interesting that in the 1696 edition it was inadequately printed in the “Choice Collection of Lessons”



(). After checking the interpretation with the help of a “good magnifying glass”, Johnston came to the conclusion that the “curious squiggle to the left of the first three-note chord” is seen as “a tower block of four tiny semiquaver rests stacked one on top of the other”. From our side, this example was checked by augmenting it on the PC. The result did not show a “tower of rests”. In the 1700 edition of *A Choice Collection of Ayres for the Harpsichord or Spinett*, published by “Performers’ Facsimile New York, USA” based on the copy “belonging to the British Library, London”, the battery has another layout consisting of four notes without stems (not rests) placed before the three-note chord in the next manner: . The explanation in *The Second*

Book of the Harpsichord Master Containing A Choice Collection of Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinnett <...> By D^r. Blow, M^r. Barrett, M^r. Courtivall, M^r. Clark, & M^r. Croffts. London, Printed for & sold by I. Walsh Musicall instrument maker <...> 1700” where [Purcell’s *Rules for Graces* are entered] gives an example which also doesn’t remind one

of a tower block of rests. *thus* . According to the interpretation of Purcell’s

Battery, Johnston’s recommendation is fully valid: “Purcell’s intention, however, is clear enough: the chord so marked should be played, as it would normally have been on the Continent, in a deliberately arpeggiated fashion from the bottom upwards” [36, p. 86].

As for another much disputed ornament, i.e. Purcell’s “a plain note & shake”:

a plain note & shake thus  *explain’d thus*  it was resolved in the same manner in all editions mentioned above, which certainly contained the *Rules for Graces*. We do not see any reason why it would be necessary to make any changes in this interpretation, and the proposed argumentation, as if justifying the need for changes, contained in the works discussed above, was unfounded, as it was shown. The same applies to the changes in the interpretation of the Grace named by Purcell “Beat”. These interpretations, as already mentioned, fully corresponded to the style of that time, dating back to the principles set out in Christopher Simpson’s Table in 1659, and the second edition of 1665.

References

1. Purcell, Henry. *A Choice Collection of Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinnet*. London: Printed on Copper-Plates for M^{rs} Frances Purcell, executrix of the author <...>, 1696.
2. Simpson, Christopher. *The Division-Violist: Or an Introduction to the Playing upon a Ground* <...>. London: printed by William Godbid, 1659.
3. Panov, Alexei, and Ivan Rosanoff. “Performing Ornaments in English Harpsichord Music. Part I”. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Arts* 11, no. 3 (2021): 381–92. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu15.2021.302>.
4. Playford, John. *A Brief Introduction to the Skill of Musick* <...>. 3rd ed. London: printed by W. Godbid for John Playford, 1660.
5. Playford, John. *A Brief Introduction to the Skill of Musick* <...>. London: printed by W. Godbid for John Playford, 1666.
6. Dolmetsch, Arnold. *The Interpretation of the Music of the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries Revealed by Contemporary Evidence*. Ed. by Ernest Newman. London: Novello and Company; New York: The H. W. Gray Co., s. d. [1915].
7. Dadelsen, Georg, von. “Verzierungen”. In *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* <...>, hrsg. von Friedrich Blume, Bd. 13: 1544–5. Kassel &c.: Bärenreiter, 1966.
8. Ng, Kah-Ming. “English Baroque”. In *Ornaments in The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. by Stanley Sadie, vol. 8: 717–21. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 2001.
9. Hawkins, John. *A General History of the Science and Practice of Music*, <...>. 5 vols. London: T. Payne and Son, 1776, vol. 4.
10. Panov, Alexei, and Ivan Rosanoff. “Performing Ornaments in English Virginal and Harpsichord Music”. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Arts* 10, no. 1 (2020): 41–67. <https://doi.org/10.21638/spbu15.2020.103>.
11. Rose, Stephen. “Performance Practices”. In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Henry Purcell*, ed. by Rebecca Herissone, 115–64. London: Routledge, 2012.
12. Ferguson, Howard, ed. *Early English Keyboard Music: An Anthology*. 2 vols. London; New York; Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1971, vol. 1.

13. Donington, Robert. *The Interpretation of Early Music*. Rev. ed. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1992.
14. Mace, Thomas. *Musick's Monument, or, A Remembrancer of the Best Practical Musick*, <...>. London: printed by T. Ratcliffe, and N. Thompson, 1676.
15. Dannreuther, Edward. *Musical Ornamentation*. Ed. by John Stainer. 2 parts. London; New York: Novello, Ewer and Co., s. d. [c1893/95], pt 1.
16. Beyschlag, Adolf. *Die Ornamentik der Musik* <...>. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1908. (Urtext Klassischer Musikwerke).
17. Muffat, Theofil Gottlieb. *Componimenti Musicali per il Cembalo* <...>. Augsburg: Johann Christian Leopold, s. d. [c1739].
18. Neumann, Frederick. *Ornamentation in Baroque and Post-Baroque Music. With Special Emphasis on J. S. Bach*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.
19. Adelung, Johann Christoph. *Versuch eines vollständigen grammatisch-kritischen Wörterbuchs der Hochdeutschen Mundart, mit beständiger Vergleichung der übrigen Mundarten, besonders aber der Oberdeutschen*. <...> 4. Bde. Leipzig: Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf und Sohn, 1774, Bd. 1.
20. D'Anglebert, Jean Henry. *Pieces de Clavesin* <...>. Paris: l'Auteur, s. d. [c1689].
21. Panov, Alexei, and Ivan Rosanoff. "L'Ornement mystérieux' and Mark Kroll's Revision of the French Baroque Performance Practice". *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Arts* 8, no. 3 (2018): 328–55. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu15.2018.301>
22. Marpurg, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Anleitung zum vollständigen Clavierspielen, Der schönern Ausübung der heutigen Zeit gemäß* <...>. Berlin: Haude und Spener, 1755.
23. Heck, John Casper. *The Art of Playing the Harpsichord, Illustrated by a Variety of Examples to Which is Added a Collection of Lessons* <...> London: Welcker, s. d. [c1770].
24. Ferguson, Howard. "Purcell's Harpsichord Music: A Lecture-Recital". *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association* 91 (1964): 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrma/91.1.1>
25. Curtis, Alan. "Sweelinck's Keyboard Works: A Study of English Elements in Dutch Secular Music of the Goupen Eeuw". PhD diss., University of Illinois, 1963.
26. Curtis, Alan. *Sweelinck's Keyboard Music: A Study of English Elements in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Composition*. Leiden: University Press; London, Oxford University Press, 1969. (Publications of the Sir Thomas Browne Institute, General Series 4).
27. Playford, John. *An Introduction to the Skill of Musick in three Books*. <...> 15th ed. London: printed by W. Pearson <...>, 1703.
28. Donington, Robert. *The Interpretation of Early Music*. London: Faber and Faber; New York: St. Martin's Press, 1963.
29. Klakowich, Robert. "Keyboard Sources in Mid-17th-Century England and the French Aspect of English Keyboard Music". PhD diss., State University of New York at Buffalo, 1985.
30. Dodge, Janet. "Ornamentation as Indicated by Signs in Lute Tablature". *Sammelbände der Internationale Musikgesellschaft* 9, no. 3 (1908): 318–36.
31. *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*. Ed. from the Original Manuscript with an Introduction and Notes by J. A. Fuller Maitland and W. Barclay Squire; ed. and preface by Blanche Winogron. 2 vols. Rev. ed., 1899. Facsimile, New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1979–80, vol. 2.
32. *The Fitzwilliam Virginal Book*. Ed. from the Original Manuscript with an Introduction and Notes by J. A. Fuller Maitland and W. Barclay Squire; ed. and preface by Blanche Winogron. 2 vols. Rev. ed., 1899. Facsimile, New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1979–80, vol. 1.
33. Brown, Alan. "England". In *Keyboard Music Before 1700*, ed. by Alexander Silbiger, 23–89. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2004.
34. Purcell, Henry. *Suites, Lessons and Pieces for the Harpsichord*, ed. by William Barclay Squire. London: J. & W. Chester, 1918.
35. Hashimoto, Eiji. "Baroque Ornamentation: A Guide to Correct Interpretation". *The American Music Teacher* 29, no. 2 (1979): 6–10.
36. Johnston, H. Diack. "Ornamentation in the Keyboard Music of Henry Purcell and his Contemporaries". In *Performing the Music of Henry Purcell*, ed. by Michael Burden, 82–104. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
37. Farrenc, Jacques Hyppolite Aristide, éd. *Le Trésor des Pianistes* <...>. 20 vols. Paris: Farenc, Philipp; London: Cramer; Leipzig: Breitkopf & Haertel, 1861, vol. 2.
38. Seiffert, Max. *Geschichte der Klaviermusik* <...>. Hrsg. als dritte, vollständig umgearbeitete und erweiterte Ausgabe von C. F. Weitzmanns *Geschichte des Klavierspiels und der Klavierliteratur*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1899.

39. Ferguson, Howard. "The Harpsichord Master by Robert Petre". *Music & Letters* 64, no. 3–4 (1983): 311–2.

Received: September 20, 2021

Accepted: December 2, 2021

Authors' information:

Alexei A. Panov — Dr. Habil., Professor; a.panov@spbu.ru

Ivan V. Rosanoff — Dr. Habil., Professor; i.rozanov@spbu.ru