Millennial fever seems to have infected even the sober arena of musicology and music manuscripts. We have heard the cry of ‘Musicological Event of the Century’ too frequently in recent years, trumpeting everything from the discovery of the autograph of Mozart’s Fantasy and Sonata in C minor (K. 457 and K. 475) in a seminary in Pennsylvania, to the recent sale of the Haydn score of four of his op. 50 string quartets found in Australia, the reappearance of a Schumann symphony autograph, or (at the opposite extreme) last year’s scandal of the six ‘lost’ Haydn keyboard sonatas, which were quickly revealed to be open forgeries.

The sale of what in the late seventeenth century would have been a perfectly normal household keyboard book took on the trappings of a Hollywood epic last year, when part of it was shown to be written in Purcell’s hand. The identification of Purcell’s ‘round hand’ script, made in late 1993, after the volume had been analysed by Robert Spencer, was effectively announced in the press and on the B.B.C. by Curtis Price, who has since documented the discovery in the *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*. Much exaggeration followed: ‘The greatest Purcell find of the century’ (the antiquarian music dealer Lisa Cox, quoted in *The Times* 17 November 1993) was perhaps defensible enthusiasm on the part of the vendor, though *The Spectator’s* description of the volume as ‘one of the most important post Medieval manuscripts in existence’ (21 May 1994) must have caused many scholars to blink.

This unsuspecting star, so suddenly thrust into the limelight, had been part of a larger collection of music books offered for sale in 1993 by Bloomsbury Book Auctions; it was bought by Lisa Cox, who later offered it for sale at Sotheby’s (London, 26 May 1994, lot 398), where it was sold to a private collector in Paris for £276,500, setting a new record for a British music manuscript. It was, in fact, the first substantial Purcell autograph to be sold publicly since 1917, when the score of ‘The Yorkshire Feast Song’ (now Egerton MS. 2956) was purchased for the British Museum at the sale of W. H. Cummings’s library at Sotheby’s in May of that year. Once the national importance of the manuscript was realized an export licence was withheld for four months while private and public funds were mobilized to match the sale price, and in January 1995
the owner agreed to sell the manuscript to the British Library. Under the new system of accession numbering it holds the honourable position of BL, MS. Mus. i.

The keyboard book contains twenty-one pieces in Purcell’s hand, at least three previously unknown, and (starting at the opposite end) seventeen in the autograph of his contemporary, Giovanni Battista Draghi; of these pieces, four were previously unknown. The volume is oblong quarto, a common format for keyboard books of that period, with 43 leaves 8” × 11” (20.5 × 27.5 cm.) bound in what is probably its original blind-stamped panelled calf (fig. 1); the pages are ruled on both sides with three pairs of six-line staves, ruled with a two-stave rastrum with an overall span of 49 mm. (the two staves measure 17 mm. each, with a gap of 15 mm. between them).

From the form of writing as it approaches the gutter, it is clear the volume was bound before it was used, although folios have been removed; at the Draghi end this clearly occurred before copying, since the Allmand in G minor (no. 2) continues without a break despite two missing folios between ff. 39v and 40. However, the missing folio between ff. 7 and 8 may have contained more music by Purcell, although the one small ink spot on the remaining stub is tantalizing but hardly conclusive. The volume was originally unfoliated: it was first numbered beginning at the ‘Draghi’ end (the foliation used by Curtis Price, op. cit.), but has since been refoliated by the British Library beginning at the ‘Purcell’ end.

The publicity for the Purcell pieces has rather overshadowed Draghi’s contribution, though the two ends of the book offer material of similar quality and pose similar
problems; a few pieces by each composer are completely new, but many of the others offer unexpected variants on familiar pieces. It is not yet clear which composer used the book first, or indeed why they shared the same volume. Nevertheless, even at this early stage, there are important revelations to be deduced from this discovery and considerable mysteries to probe, particularly in dating and provenance.

The manuscript consists of high-quality ‘Royal’ paper, characteristically marked with the Strasbourg bend on a shield, fleur-de-lys above, together with the Jesuit countermark IHS and the initials of the paper-maker, PB, who is known to have operated from mills in Jesuit territory around Angoulême. Like many of the expert makers of the Angoumois area, PB worked for the factor Abraham Janssen, who commissioned paper and advanced payment for its production: BL, Add. MS. 33234, for instance, contains a foolscap mark with the countermark PB and, below the foolscap, Janssen’s initials ‘AJ’. No factor’s initials appear in the paper of the Purcell/Draghi manuscript, which suggests a date of manufacture before 1679 when Janssen seems to have commenced adding his mark.

The volume, ready bound, was almost certainly supplied by John Playford, who held a virtual monopoly of ‘all sorts of Rul’d Paper for Musick, and Books ready Bound up’. In the 1690s Playford’s advertisements make specific mention of such six-stave books, suggesting that he held surplus stock of these ready-bound volumes. At this period, when the traditional sources of supply of good paper were closed to English merchants by the Nine Years’ War, and the only alternative was a rather inferior Dutch product, a composer’s best chance of obtaining decent paper was to buy a ready-made book from the previous decade. This was especially necessary for a composer with a strong hand such as Purcell, to allow for erasures and corrections, and the use of fine paper does not automatically indicate a rich or aristocratic patron. It may, however, help to account for the apparent difference of some ten years between the date of the paper and the writing of the contents, though it does not determine which composer first used the volume.

The datable Purcell music in the volume comes, in its theatre form, from the years 1692/3 and his handwriting is typical for the latter years of his short life. Draghi’s music, although not published till 1707, may well be the earlier contribution, since he suffered from ‘gout’ – a term then used to cover a whole range of rheumatic and arthritic conditions – at the end of his life, and it is assumed that his handwriting would have suffered. Here his script is particularly bold and confident, but the sequence of copying is far from clear. Nor is it known for whom the book was written or why it was shared. Even the division into separate ends is confused by Draghi’s ‘musical address’ preceding the Purcell end of the volume rather than his own music.

Of various theories proposed – that the volume was donated by one composer to the other, or even that they used it simultaneously – the most plausible is that the volume belonged to a family which at different times employed both Purcell and Draghi to give musical tuition. This could account for the varying difficulty of the repertoire – Purcell’s initial elementary pieces (where simplicity of technical demands even takes precedence over good musical grammar) give way to full suites, and in turn to Draghi’s
rather more demanding style. On the other hand, for teaching purposes Purcell would hardly place the Gibbons Preludium, a piece which requires some considerable dexterity, before a simple prelude with fingering like no. 18; conversely, the fingering supplied for the prelude would hardly be needed by a player who had just completed the Gibbons without fingering.

One possible explanation is that Purcell’s contribution (or possibly the second portion of it) represents an attempt to gather repertoire for publication, following the manner of, say, the opening pieces in Locke’s Melothesia, or anticipating the scheme of The Harpsicord Master (1697) which opens with a fully fingered prelude. In this connection one should note a common didactic link between the two composers; Purcell taught royalty and the children of the aristocracy (the Howard family, for instance, between February 1694 and April 1695) and Draghi had been engaged as music master to the daughters of James II, Mary and Anne (later Queen Mary and Queen Anne). In the year of Purcell’s death, a proposal was made for the creation of a Royal Academy to improve the teaching of the arts and sciences, including music, and in the published advertisement ‘Mr. Purcell’ and ‘Baptist’ head the list of teachers for organ and harpsichord.

THE PURCELL SECTION

Most characteristic features of Purcell’s script can be seen in figs. 3–5; the bold and open style, the upright tails, the distinctive time-signatures, the formation of the minim and semi-breve, the carefully placed bold accidentals, and the use of a well-loaded quill can
be compared with his script in other late texts such as the Gresham College song-book (now London, Guildhall Library, MS. Safe 3).\textsuperscript{12} Table I sets out the content of this section.\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{number} & \textbf{folio} & \textbf{title} & \textbf{ref.} \\
\hline
1 & I & [Draghi’s musical address] &  \\
2 & 1v & Prelude &  \\
3 & 2 & [Minuet] &  \\
4 & 2v & [Air] &  \\
5 & 2v & Minuet & Z. 592/7  \\
6 & 3 & ['Thus happy and free'] & Z. 629/44a  \\
7 & 3v & [Air] & Z. 607/4  \\
8 & 4-5 & Prelude [Orlando Gibbons] & Z. 592/9  \\
9 & 5v & [Hornpipe] & Z. 629/1b  \\
10 & 6 & [Hornpipe or Scotch Tune] &  \\
11 & 6v & [Trumpet Minuet] & Z. 611/8  \\
12 & 7 & ['La Furstenburg'] & Z. 611/9  \\
13 & 7v & [Minuet] & Z. 611/7  \\
14 & 8 & Prelude [Suite in A minor] & Z. 663/1  \\
15 & 8v-9 & [Almand] [Suite in A minor] & Z. 663/2  \\
16 & 9v & Corant [Suite in A minor] & Z. 663/3  \\
17 & 10 & [Jig] &  \\
18 & 10v & Prelude &  \\
19 & 11-10v & [Almand] [Suite in C] & Z. 666/2  \\
20 & 11v & [Corant] [Suite in C] & Z. 666/3  \\
21 & 12 & Sarraband [Suite in C] & Z. 666/4  \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

Purcell’s end of the volume divides into two sections, separated (probably unintentionally) by a missing folio. Pieces 1–13 consist mainly of simple didactic exercises and theatre tune arrangements, plus Orlando Gibbons’s \textit{Preludium} from \textit{Parthenia} (1612/13), the most well-worn teaching piece of the century; nos. 14–21 make up variant versions of two known suites in the simplest keys, A minor and C major (Z.663 and 666, both in the printed \textit{Choice Collection} of 1696), but including an unknown and fully fingered prelude, and a Jig only previously known from two anonymous sources.

The opening didactic pieces appear to be a graded sequence; the first prelude is in the tradition of scalewise exercises set by Matthew Locke at the opening of \textit{Melothesia} (1673), but the second piece, a Minuet, is melodically more gauche and contains such patent parallel fifths and octaves that one might suppose that Purcell was simply copying out a student’s attempt at composition. The excuse for the grammatical errors could well be that he saw the piece as a demonstration of the simplest form of left-hand harmonization in thirds. Purcell also includes his distinctive C clefs in the left hand staves of ff. 1–2 and 3v in addition to the F clef, probably to assist a novice in these opening pieces.

The status of keyboard transcriptions has for years been a major source of difficulty in establishing a ‘canon’ of Purcell keyboard music. Current ideas of categorization are very different from those of Purcell’s contemporaries; the idea of a seventeenth-century
performer asking ‘Who made this transcription?’ is as anachronistic as imagining that they should insist on a whole suite being by a single composer. We possibly ask for more evidence of Purcell’s hand in the transcription of his own music than his contemporaries would have expected, but the problem is compounded by a paucity of such arrangements issued under Purcell’s supervision. *The Second Part of Musick’s Hand-Maid* (1689) was the only keyboard volume published in the composer’s lifetime and claimed to be ‘carefully Revised and Corrected’ by Purcell himself; at least sixteen pieces are identified as being his, though he possibly had a hand in other anonymous ones as well.14

*A Choice Collection of Lessons for the Harpsichord or Spinnet* (posthumously published in 1696 by Purcell’s widow) contains the eight suites, plus six arrangements (presumably by Purcell) from theatre music added at the end, apparently to fill up the last gathering. Manuscript sources were used by later editors to supplement the canon according to differing and subjective criteria. Ernst Pauer, in Volume 5 of *Old English Composers* (1879), created extended versions of the suites by adding other pieces in the appropriate key, thus ‘swelling out the suites to, perhaps, double their size and very much altering their character’, as Percy Scholes later complained.15 In Volume 6 of the Purcell Society Edition (1895) William Barclay Squire made the first attempt to assemble the complete keyboard music of an English composer, but was more frugal with manuscript material (to some he was refused access, and other pieces he dismissed as ‘poor’ or ‘feeble’). Nearly three-quarters of a century later, Howard Ferguson (1964) extended the range and decided to print ‘any transcription that at least sounds effective on the keyboard’, together with an appendix of ‘Doubtful and Spurious’, and his edition remains to date the latest attempt to codify this repertoire.
Since 1964 several new sources have come to light; Robert Klakowich identified manuscript versions in the Clarke Library, Los Angeles, which had not been used by Ferguson, and in 1977 a unique copy of the first book of The Harpsichord Master (1697) was located in New Zealand. Other transcriptions can be found in manuscript sources in London, Oxford, Aylesford, Durham, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Cardiff, Brussels, Tokyo, Washington D.C. and several private collections.

The transcriptions in this autograph relate to music used in the theatre between 1692 and 1693 (from The Double Dealer, The Fairy Queen, The Old Bachelor and The Virtuous Wife), much of it already known in unattributed keyboard versions, and the discovery of this source gives fresh impetus to the need to reassess all anonymous transcriptions. Most importantly it highlights the difficulties of locating concordances and pinpoints the lack of comparable locator indices for late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century repertoire in general, be it vocal, theatre or keyboard material. The formula used by earlier editors (‘Is it effective on the keyboard?’) will not serve when there are several idiomatic versions of the same piece, nor can a work in the composer’s own hand be ruled out on grounds of ‘effectiveness’.

There are three special cases where the material is ‘non-Purcellian’, and their pedigree repays examination:

No. 8, the Prelude by Orlando Gibbons. Gerald Hendrie (Musica Britannica, vol. xx, no. 2) lists twelve sources for this Prelude, including Parthenia (1612/13). Purcell’s version is closest to one that Hendrie did not consider a principal source, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Conservatoire Rés. 1186 bis, pt. i, p. 5 (one of several sources with fingering); otherwise the nearest related sources are Christ Church, Oxford, Music MS. 47 and BL, Add. MS. 22099. Purcell’s ending, however, which is rewritten to make use of the low C and G of a late seventeenth-century keyboard, is unique, as are some of the extra consecutive fifths created by his textural revisions. From the editorial point of view, however, the piece is sufficiently different to justify inclusion as an appendix to a new publication of Purcell’s keyboard works.

No. 10, a Hornpipe or Scotch Tune, is known from two other sources: Apollo’s Banquet (1701) where it is listed as a ‘Scotch Tune’ attributed to John Eccles, and Oxford, Bodl., Tenbury MS. 1580, f. 68v, where another keyboard version is given as ‘Hornpipe. Mr Jon Eccles’. Its presence here is not sufficient to justify it as anything more than a Purcell arrangement, pending the discovery of further concordances.

No. 12, the Air known as ‘La Furstenburg’, is another example of what is probably a borrowed tune. Although used by Purcell as an act tune in The Virtuous Wife (Z. 611/9), it was not included in the posthumous Ayres Compos’d for the Theatre. In keyboard terms one right-hand ornament (at the end of bar 19) that is particularly awkward raises a momentary doubt in the player’s mind; it is unlike Purcell to create such an uncomfortable moment in keyboard music designed for amateurs. In the same place in an alternative setting (in A minor) the alto part is omitted at this moment (Inglis 94, ff. 27v–28) and in the ‘Babell MS’ (BL, Add. MS. 39569) there is no inner part at all in this section. Possibly this was a Purcellian oversight, since from
the differences in ink in the autograph it is clear that the filling part was written later than the outer parts (fig. 4).

Of the 'new' Purcell pieces, neither the keyboard version of the Hornpipe from The Fairy Queen (no. 9) nor the Jig (no. 17) can strictly speaking be called 'unknown'. Both exist in alternative sources, the Jig in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Mus. Sch. E 399 (ff. 8v–9r), and Cambridge, Fitzwilliam MS. 653 (p. 88), while the Hornpipe differs very little from another keyboard version of this same piece preserved anonymously and without title in Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland, MS. 3343/Inglis 94 (ff. 54v–55r). In fact a comparison of the few differences between the new autograph and the latter version (see ex. 1) could easily lead to the conclusion that both might be the work of Purcell, since none of the slight changes to be found in the left hand part of Inglis is any more substantial than the differences between the autograph and printed versions of the Purcell suites, and the right hand parts are identical.

The two suites show significant differences, both of detail and overall design, when compared with the familiar published versions of 1696. The A minor suite lacks the
Saraband of the published version, but includes the unpublished Jig (no. 17), found in the Bodleian and Fitzwilliam sources mentioned above, in the first of which it is preceded by an anonymous [Purcell?] Almand in the same key. Clearly neither version of the suite can be designated as 'incomplete', but both movements could effectively be included in performance. Oddly, Purcell mistook the time-signature for this movement; he first wrote 6/4 and corrected it to 6/8; the following piece (no. 18) also has a correction in
the left-hand stave from 6/8 to *alla breve*, as though Purcell was one movement out. Could he have been copying from a score which contained a 3/4 movement (a Saraband?) which he decided to omit, but half remembered the time-signature?

The C major suite suggests an even more fluid attitude to the demands of the form; a version of it first occurs in *The Second Part of Musick's Hand-Maid* (1689), where a simple style *brisé* prelude (also found in the ‘Powell’ manuscript) precedes an Almond, Corant and Saraband; a Jig (without title or composer) ends the volume and is generally assumed to be part of the intended scheme. In the 1696 *Choice Collection*, however, the Prelude is neither that of *Musick’s Hand-Maid* nor of the present autograph, but a more Italianate piece in the bravura trumpet manner; the Alman, Corant and Saraband are versions of the movements in the autograph, but there is no Jig in either of these sources. (Since the Saraband is the last item in the present manuscript in Purcell’s hand, it is arguable that he may have intended to continue the suite.)

The filiation of these movements is typical of the situation with many late seventeenth-century ‘suites’:

---

*Fig. 5. Almand from Suite in C, MS. Mus. 1, f. 11*
Additional evidence of the ‘organic’ nature of these movements is provided graphically in the opening bars of the C major Almand (f. 11) where we can see Purcell squashing an impromptu dotted rhythm into the treble part while in the process of writing, and making a similar adaptation to the point of imitation in bar 2 (fig. 5). (Purcell is demonstrably copying from a version with a different line division; a minim at the end of f. 9v, system 2, had to be altered to a crochet tied to the new system.)

In all, there are thirteen differences (of addition or subtraction) in the first dozen bars of this movement compared with the printed text of 1696, and some sixteen in the first half of the Corant; while many of these changes of ornamentation and lay-out do not invalidate the published text, as a posthumous publication the print cannot easily overturn the readings of the new autograph. This parity of importance now needs to be represented in any new edition, which in turn will help to relax our idea of what the specification of a seventeenth-century suite might be.

**THE DRAGHI REPERTOIRE**

Giovanni Battista Draghi is assumed to have come to England after the Restoration (he is first mentioned in London in Pepys’s Diary on 12 February 1667); he was generally known as ‘Mr Baptist’. In 1673 he was appointed (as a Catholic) to be organist at Somerset House for Catherine of Braganza and in the competition of 1684 between the organ builders Bernard Schmidt (‘Father Smith’) and Renatus Harris for the commission to provide a new instrument for the Temple Church, which dragged on for nearly a year, Draghi demonstrated the Harris instrument, while Purcell and Blow performed for the opposition (Smith actually won). He was known as a virtuoso keyboard player – John Evelyn called him ‘that excellent and stupendous artist... on the harpsichord’ – and his extant original keyboard music is both more extensive and often more flamboyant than Purcell’s. In basic style, however, the two composers are relatively close and sometimes confusably similar; an Air by Draghi (Kl. 49) is very reminiscent of ‘Why should men quarrel?’ from the Prologue to The Indian Queen, and an ornamented version of the sixth Tune from Bonduca (Z. 574/6) is attributed to Draghi in Washington, Library of Congress, MS. M21 M185 (pp. 96–7) and also by Klakowich (Kl. 51).

The vagaries of Draghi’s supposed autograph hand have been effectively resolved by collating this manuscript with the various candidates in the Public Record Office; he

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Autograph</th>
<th>1689</th>
<th>1696</th>
<th>Powell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prelude A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in D major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prelude B</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prelude C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almond A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almand B</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corant</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saraband</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[by King]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jig</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>[by King]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
adds his distinctive initial ‘B’ to most of his final flourishes, and to the Almand in A (no. 7) he even adds a provocative ‘oh oh’ (fig. 6).

The variants between this source and the later printed version (1707) are akin to those found with the Purcell repertoire; some may constitute revision, others an earlier version, but the majority are simply equal alternatives. His changes of notation (especially with dotted rhythms and left-hand ornaments, octave transpositions and slight points of imitation phrases) are paralleled in the Purcell section, and may indeed be found in most variant versions of seventeenth-century keyboard music in general. But, as with the Purcell, it is hard to see in many cases why Draghi should have ignored some of his most subtle ideas when he came to presenting the printed text at the end of his life. The Draghi pieces in MS. Mus. 1 are set out in Table II.

Draghi, rather like John Blow, William Croft and Philip Hart, has been lamentably overlooked by modern editions; no co-ordinated modern print of his keyboard works existed until 1986. However, all but four of the autograph pieces are to be found in the Six Select Sutes [sic] of Lessons for the Harpsicord in Six Several Keys published by John Walsh in 1707. The four new pieces include an adventurous movement that is too long and multi-sectional to be a normal prelude, but casts back to earlier Italian toccatas (rather as Purcell in his section casts back to Gibbons). In style (particularly its opening) and range it could equally be considered as organ music and it may bear the same ‘rogue’ relationship to the rest of his output as the much-queried Toccata in A (D. 229) does to Purcell’s.

Draghi’s partiality for ingenious repeats is borne out in the autograph; the ‘petite reprise’, little used by Purcell, is a favourite, and he offers an unusual choice of final
endings — not only first and second times, but a third ending which leads back to the
beginning of the whole movement. Comparison of the manuscript reading with the print
does, however, reduce the credibility of the ‘dissonant chords’ and acciaccaturas which
have been called a ‘striking hallmark’ of his style. Fewer of these are found in the
autograph, and in the print it would seem that several of the most striking clashes are
simply misengravings (often by a tone) that went uncorrected.although research is in an early stage, the discovery of this manuscript has focused
attention on several areas that will affect a new edition of Purcell’s keyboard works. In
addition to providing three new pieces, many new readings and minor variants, it has
presented an alternative text to the 1606 Choice Collection, which can no longer be
considered pre-eminent or the last word. This new relationship must in turn promote a
more flexible approach to the possible content of a ‘suite’ at this period, with less
emphasis on a decisive sequence of fixed movements. By validating several new
transcriptions that had previously been ignored, the autograph paves the way for the
inclusion of more material from idiomatic sources that stem from Purcell originals; the
ouverture arrangements, for instance, that were evidently so popular in manuscript
collections but too lengthy for publication can now be reappraised.

To assist comparison, and performance, a new volume of keyboard music by Purcell
would do well to follow the usage of his time in terms of disposition. The title-page of

Fig. 6. A concluding flourish from the Draghi section, MS. Mus. i, f. 31v
Orpheus Britannicus announces that the contents are 'placed in their several Keys according to the Order of the Gamut', and many manuscript sources in England (those copied by the Babell family, for example) and abroad (the 'Bauyn Manuscript') chose to enter their collections of keyboard music in order of key. Within such a sequence existing suites would be preserved, but cross-reference, and even cross-fertilization, between such related items as the various versions of the C major suite described above, would be made practical.

Maybe not 'one of the most important post Medieval manuscripts in existence', therefore, but certainly a vital catalyst for a reappraisal of keyboard music by the man Charles Burney dubbed 'our musical Shakespeare', and the music of one of his more neglected contemporaries.

1 John Harley estimates that there would have been at least 2000 keyboard instruments owned in Britain at the end of the seventeenth century, and each owner would presumably have had at least one music book; see British Harpsichord Music (Aldershot, 1992), vol. i, p. 6.
2 See Curtis Price, 'Newly Discovered Autograph Keyboard Music of Purcell and Draghi', Journal of the Royal Musical Association, cx (1995), pp. 77-111, for a full description of the manuscript, from which many facts in this article are gratefully drawn. The present author participated in the broadcast.
3 An analysis of the paper and a full collation has been made by Robert Thompson (see Curtis Price, op. cit., p. 81) on whose research the present summary is gratefully based.
4 Durham Cathedral MS. Mus. D.2. contains the initials 'PB' in paper also dating from the 1670s.
6 Robert Spencer has pointed out that the stress falls on the second syllable of his name, in the correct Italian manner.
7 The endpapers at both ends have been used for elementary scribbling and copying in an amateur hand.
8 Several alterations show that Purcell was devising rather than copying the fingering.
14 The Second Part of Musick's Hand-Maid seems to have been a temporary home for various movements that later found a more permanent place in collected works; both Purcell and Blow extracted pieces from it to use, in altered form, in their later publications.
19 University of California at Los Angeles, Clarke Library, M678 M4 H295 1710, p. 22, where it is transposed to D major and followed by several movements also in D by Robert King.
21 Numbering taken from Robert Klakowich (ed.), Giovanni Battista Draghi: Harpsichord Music,


23 These have been transcribed by Curtis Price, ibid., pp. 103–11.

24 Barry Cooper in English Solo Keyboard Music of the Middle and Late Baroque (New York, 1989), p. 76, suggests that this was an unusual device in England at this time, which would support the theory that the Purcell pieces were entered first.


26 Suggested corrections either by reference to the autograph or by analogy would be: Kl. 2 b.19, Kl. 4 b.11, Kl. 12 b.15, Kl. 14 b.13 (missing accidental), Kl. 21 b.10, Kl. 23 b.4, Kl. 32 b.2, Kl. 33 b.10.

27 There are six alternative versions of the Overture to Timon of Athens, for instance, in early keyboard sources:- Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MS. 653; BL, Add. MS. 41205 and Hirsch III. 472; New York, Public Library, Drexel 5609; Washington, Library of Congress, M21 M185 case; Durham, Cathedral Library, E32: 60–62. With such evidence of popularity it is hard to imagine that not one of these versions circulated via Purcell.