

## The Patricke Manuscript - a new (old) way to do English Country Dances

By Arglwydd Dafydd Cyhoeddwr

In June of 2004, Carol G Marsh presented a paper at the Rothenfelser Tanzsymposion titled "The Lovelace Manuscript - A Preliminary Study". It revealed to many the existence of a manuscript housed in the Houghton Library at Harvard University (MS Eng 1356) variously referred to as the Patricke Manuscript or the Lovelace Manuscript. The manuscript contains instructions, without music, for 32 English Country Dances, some of which are clearly the same as, or closely related to, dances in John Playford's 1<sup>st</sup> edition of *The English Dancing Master* (or subsequent editions thereof). It is also clear that neither is a direct copy of the other, as there are startling, indeed revealing, differences between the dances presented.

After studying the dances in the Patricke manuscript (which contains many more pages than those devoted to the hand-written dance instructions), and reconstructing as many of them as it is possible to, I have come up with my own "preliminary study" which goes somewhat deeper than Ms Marsh's, while contradicting some of her statements.

One of the interesting things I noticed when looking at the body of dances that seem to cross over between Patricke and Playford is that they are all long-lived, and thus presumably popular, dances. While it is possible to match up twenty-three of the Patricke dances with versions somewhere in Playford's editions, only twenty of them actually end up being similar enough to call them the same dance (two of these, Bobbing Jone(/Joan/Joe) and Jack Pudding are also present in the Sloane manuscript). Of these twenty dances, seven lasted from the first to the eighteenth editions, which was published in 1728. One went from the second edition (1652) to the eighteenth edition, two lasted until the sixteenth edition in 1716, five existed until the tenth edition in 1698 with a further one that didn't come in until the fourth edition (1670) but lasted until the tenth edition. And finally, five more lasted until the eighth edition, published in 1690. The overwhelming popularity of these cross-listed dances makes the utter obscurity of the other nine (or possibly eleven) dances in the Patricke manuscript so odd - we don't even have a referent to what music most of them might have been done to!

Ms Marsh made reference to the 'looseness' of the language in the Patricke manuscript, and this is one of the most obvious and clear differences between Playford and Patricke. The latter manuscript is far more permissive of letting the dancers decide how to direct the dance, from providing mere hints as to how many times to repeat a section, to describing additional flourishes that can be done. There are seeming adjectival additions to the text - leading someone up softly, or soundly turning, or even "then all men and woemen turne round as before as fast as they can" (Trenchmore, mms page 20)! Playford has removed these uncertainties from his publications, and I wonder, as does Ms Marsh, whether in doing so he was suppressing a valid method of doing these dances.

Here are a few more general observations before I turn to comparing individual dances. First, it seems clear from the dances in Patricke that the common verse trinity in Playford (up a double and back, side twice, arm twice) was not always so universal. Not only is there a fourth verse action - the half-turn, which is in one case allowed to be substituted for arming, and in another is simply stated as the last verse - but quite often, the entire third part of the dance is a repeat of what went before, usually in the first part, which means that arming gets left out completely (unless we assume that the instruction does not apply to the verse, and so the arming (or half-turn) gets done before going back to repeat the first chorus, all of which is admittedly a pretty sketchy assumption).

Second, there are places where assumptions must be made as to what the author of the Patricke manuscript meant. Ms Marsh concluded that since the phrase "set and turn" is never actually used in the manuscript, that "set" does not mean "set and turn". This is fairly easy to refute both in comparing those cross-listed dances that have a "set and turn" instruction in Playford and just a "set" in Patricke and realizing that dance names usually came from dance tunes, so the same music that Playford wrote down is very likely to be the music that Patricke dances are done to. Thus, where there is time for a set and turn, it makes sense that a set and turn is done. Also, it is very common for the author of Patricke to instruct the dancers to lead up twice without telling them to fall back as well. Clearly, the author is expecting the reader to understand the unwritten portion of the instruction.

Last, and moving into more of a speculative framework, the dances in Patricke clearly represent as rich a spectrum of "types" of English Country Dances as even the 1<sup>st</sup> edition of Playford does. There are simple dances that fit completely into the basic structure, and there are dances that stretch the boundaries wildly. There are square dances and line dances for as many as will. And there are hybrid dances that cross "types" freely. The range of different types of dances in Playford clearly indicates that by the time he created his 1<sup>st</sup> edition, the style as a whole had been around long enough to evolve and grow. That this same kind of diversity of types is present in Patricke indicates that whenever that manuscript was written, it was in the middle of the same kind of evolution and growth of the style.

So to the dances! Some of these cross-listed dances warrant individual articles comparing the two versions, so I will not delve quite as deeply into these as I might. But I would like this to be an introduction to each of the Patricke dances, so I will comment on all of them in some way.

**Moll Peatlye** is the first dance in the manuscript. It is a longways dance for 8 people, or 4 couples. It follows the basic standard practices of the ECD form - three parts, verses of doubling, siding, and arming, and choruses which are symmetrical and self-contained. It does, however, contain two seemingly non-standard items: first, giving the dancers permission in the third verse to either arm "or halfe turne", which, as we will see, seems to be an alternate third-verse action; and second, the permission to continue the dance beyond the written end, thus: "and soe on as you please". What never quite becomes clear is just exactly what that means - continue dancing this dance, perhaps replacing the top couple with the next so that other people get to be active? Or maybe just dance another dance?

The dance exists in Playford as Moll Peatley in the 4<sup>th</sup> edition, and Mall Peatley in the 5<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> editions, and is exactly the same except for the half turn in the third verse. The Playford version of this dance seems to clarify the last instruction in the Patricke version: Playford says "cast of(f) and meet below" at the very end of his instructions. My take on that line is for the top couple to cast off and become the bottom couple as the dance begins again, giving men two and three something to do in the choruses of the dance by eventually becoming the first and last men. How unusual this is in later editions of Playford I don't know, but it rarely happens in the 1<sup>st</sup> edition.

**Noahs Flood** is the next dance in the Patricke manuscript. It is also a longways dance for 8, and also, like Moll Peatlye, is what I call a limited participation dance where there is really only one (or maybe two) active people or couples in the dance, and the rest are just there to fill it out. In this case, the verses are always the same (leading up and falling back, twice), while each chorus consists of a sop to the other dancers wherein each man does something with his partner in turn (the odds set without turning, because the evens end up turning their partner in the next measure), and then the first man takes two more repeats of the chorus to go get the last woman, and bring her up to be his partner for a short time. The dance continues until the first man has fetched up his original partner, whereupon they fall (cast) off to the bottom and, "if you think so fitt, you may proceed", continuing the dance with a new first couple.

Once again here we see some of that adjectival language (when fetching a new partner, the first man leads her up "softly", which may mean slowly since he has three measures to do it), and the non-prescriptive language (when the first man reaches his new partner at the bottom of the line, he turns her and then "salutes her (if he pleases)", and, of course, continuing the dance with a new lead couple if the dancers "think so fitt"). Saluting is clearly kissing, since when the first man gets his new partner to the top of the set he "salutes her on the other (cheek (the word isn't entirely clear in the manuscript))". Another uncommon word is used here as well - congee, which means to bow, though Playford never uses that version of the word.

There is no Playford version of this dance, though it shares sharp similarities to both Hockley in the Hole and Staines Morris with the 'fetch the last woman up', or kidnapping, motif. As far as the name, beyond the obvious Biblical reference, there was a cycle of mystery plays famous in Chester that date back at least to the early part of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. They still existed in Queen Elizabeth I's time, when the English Church outlawed them as 'popery', not that that stopped people from performing them, and they have been revived in modern times by the people of Chester, who have performed them right up into this century (in fact, one that shares a name with this dance was turned into an opera by Benjamin Britten in the 20<sup>th</sup> century).

**Tenn Pounce** comes next, a dance filled with problems and laden with controversy by Ms Marsh. It would seem to be a longways dance for as many as will ("the more the merrier", according to Patricke), but somehow a significant portion of the instructions for the first chorus are missing - the instructions end about two thirds of the way down the page, in the middle of a sentence. Looking at the photos of the manuscript itself, it looks for all the world as if the author had another piece of parchment laying over the bottom of the page and just kept writing up onto the extraneous material which, when it fell out or was taken away, took the rest of the dance with it. It's fairly clear that the bottom of the page wasn't erased or scraped, and you can see the bleed-through from the next page very clearly. I can't fathom another likely explanation for stopping in the middle of a word, and then picking up at the top of the next page at a completely different section of the dance.

From the remaining evidence, it would have been a three part progressive dance with the regular verses (actually, for the third verse all that is given is "and soe the 3<sup>rd</sup> time" which isn't exactly crystal clear as to what is supposed to happen) and the same progressive chorus each time. Unfortunately, there just isn't enough of that chorus' instructions to make a dance out of it.

Ms Marsh linked this dance to Ten Pound Lass, which appears in Playford from the 4<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> editions, with a completely different version appearing in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> editions. The first version in Playford is a longways for 8 with the last two couples improper, and none of the instructions match between Playford and Patricke. The second version in Playford is, in fact, a progressive dance for as many as will, but it is a normal two-couple set inverting themselves type progressive with no verses to separate the figures, so again, no match can be made. While it may be possible to do the Patricke dance to the Playford music, there really doesn't seem to be any other link between them at all, to the point that I can't reasonably say that these are the same dances.

The fourth dance in the manuscript is **The Milking Payle**, for 6 or 8. While the name has no direct match in Playford, Ms Marsh provides us with a link via broadside ballads to its Playford version, The Merry Merry Milkmaids. This link is in Claude M Simpson's The British Broadside Ballad and its Music (New Brunswick, NJ, 1966), where on pages 490-493, the author explains the somewhat complex link, in broadside and ballad terms, between The Milkmaids (a tune from about 1634) and its alternate names, The Merry Milkmaids and The Milking Pail. The music linked to the ballads is noted to be the same as in Playford's first edition, linking the two dances in a rather roundabout way.

The two dances only have their verses in common, though, sharing the standard verse figures (though the Pattricke dance uses the "half turn" instead of arming as the third verse) split by sets and turns. All three choruses in The Milking Payle are the same except for who starts it in the second chorus, while the Milkmaids choruses are all very different figures.

Without the musical link between these dances, reconstruction of the Milking Payle would be much more difficult due to the fact that Pattricke never uses the phrase "set and turn", and we have to find a way to resolve a hey for either three or four people, depending on how many couples are doing the dance. Fortunately, we know that the chorus is six measures long, which means that not only can we accommodate setting and turning with ease, doing so leaves four measures for the hey, which is enough time for either three or four people to complete it.

Though this is a very subjective judgment to make, it seems to my ear that the chorus of The Merry Milkmaids music is more aptly suited to this dance, than the Playford version: because the chorus has two sub-phrases, a two measure phrase and a four measure phrase, and it could even be said that the latter phrase sounds like music for a hey, the tie between these figures and the music is very tight. The Playford figures don't even always line up with the sub-phrases, making the dance ill-suited (at least in comparison) to this music.

**The Highway to Westminster**, the fifth dance in the manuscript, has no analog in Playford, nor does it seem that the original music still exists. The dance has three parts with verses of doubling, siding, and doubling again, each split by sets and turns, and a four part chorus that displays some amazing complexity and symmetry - proof this this is not some kind of early type of English Country Dance but a fully-realized example of the form.

The lack of music means that the exact interpretation of the instructions is unclear. Taking the "set" instruction in the verses to mean set and turn, we follow that with another group of sets in the first half of the chorus that we cannot automatically transform into sets and turns because we don't know how many measures of music this part of the dance must take up. Because four-bar phrases are more common than six-bar phrases, I've chosen to reconstruct these sets without their turning, but I could well be wrong.

The second part of the chorus is so different from the first, that it seems likely that there are actually three musical phrases in this music: an A phrase of four measures (16 beats) repeated once for the verse, a B phrase of probably four, but possibly six, measures repeated twice for the setting and then turning your partner part of the chorus, and finally a C phrase, played twice, for the backing-up-while-congeeing then switch part of the chorus. This last part of the chorus is also quite possibly a four bar phrase if the congee while stepping back takes one full measure, rather than three quick back steps with bowing that fills a single measure. There are examples of six bar phrases and two bar phrases in Playford, so the best I can do is to guess what the music might have been and reconstruct to that model.

**Ladyes Piller** is the next dance, and it has a match in Playford - Lady Spellor, appearing in the 1<sup>st</sup> to 8<sup>th</sup> editions (to 1690). Also of note is that, while the 1<sup>st</sup> edition Playford version of the dance is called Lady Spellor, in the contents the dance is referred to as "Lady Spillers".

These two dances are identical in spirit, if somewhat different in execution. While Lady Spellor is a four couple dance, and Ladyes Piller is for as many as you please, both have the standard verses split by sets and turns (though the Pattricke version says that the third part is like the first, so doubling instead of arming forms that verse), and both have choruses that have the line of couples moving to the side and

then back again. They differ in exactly how that happens, but they remain similar enough to call them related to each other.

**The Cherping of the Nightingall** also has a match in Playford, but it is just as clear that these are not the same dances. The version in editions 1 through 8 of Playford is a circle dance, for as many as will, "dance with" progressive where each couple dances the progressive figure with every other person in the circle (i.e. couple one with man two, then with woman two, then with man three, etc). The Pattricke version is a longways dance for a limited, though variable (6 or 8), number of people with a figure that consists of a verse of doubling, followed by setting, and a chorus of bringing up the last woman as the new partner, making it one of the kidnapping style of dances. There aren't any points of similarity between these dances at all.

The Pattricke version of the dance is very interesting in its own right, however. It is one of the several limited-but-variable couple dances, but it has a chorus with a very different construction than our last similar dance (The Milking Payle): there is one person active, man one, with a specific sequence of other people to dance with before he brings up the last woman as his new partner. This means that the manuscript actually has separate instructions on what to do if there are three versus four couples! The different configuration requires different ways to fill the space in the tune, and these differences are spelled out. Perhaps this is why this version of the dance never appeared in Playford?

If we postulate that there must be a reason for the nearly exact match between the dance names, then that reason is, quite possibly, the music. However, the utterly different structures of the two dances mean that even the music must be rearranged to fit each dance separately. For the Pattricke version, we need to repeat the verse music four times (because the Playford version's verse does not have setting and turning it it), though the chorus music can stay at a simple two repeats. Thus, one individual repeat of the dance would have the music be AAAABB. Because the object is to bring up each woman in turn, the number of repeats of the dance varies by how many couples participate, three or four. And then, the instructions would seem to indicate that it is allowed for each of the men participating to get their turn as the active man, which would further extend the dance to a further variable number of repeats: (((AAAABB) x3 or 4) x 3 or 4). Something to keep the musicians on their toes, I suppose?

**The Wind Mille** is an odd square dance in that it is not all-around symmetrical. This dance, which has no Playford version, is a three part dance with the (it seems) usual verses of double, side, double (because the third part is the same as the first part), and the chorus has top and bottom couples exchange before the sides "runne round" both ways in the middle (perhaps the windmill of the title?). Whether the "bottom" couple is the third or fourth depends on whether this is a line or a square dance - the diagram used is a square with a circle at each vertex, but "leade up twice" is not usually a square dance figure. Perhaps this is why it is such an odd square dance, without the universal symmetry being displayed. And, as usual, exact steps are not given and without music, we can't really know how long the "4 that are in the middle" have to "runne round, and then back again".

**The Gipsys**, the ninth dance in this manuscript, has an obvious, if not exactly matching, relationship to the Playford dance "The Spanish Jepsie" which appeared in the 1<sup>st</sup> through 18<sup>th</sup> (1728) editions. The Pattricke version is for 6 or 8, while the Playford version is for 8, but since only the top and bottom couples in this dance do anything, how many couples are in between isn't really important. The verses are remarkably similar, with the choruses being somewhat less so, especially in that there are only two people, rather than two couples, doing the fancy footwork in this version. The chorus length is maintained in this way - instead of the Playford version's first and last couples pairing, and then the second and third couples pairing, the first man and last women pair, then the last man and the first

woman pair. The relationship cannot be ignored or discounted, so it would probably be reasonable to call the Patricke version a precursor of Playford's - somewhat simpler; a small evolutionary step away.

The music for the Playford version has a rather complex pattern - A verse of "ABBB", and a chorus of 2x(ABB), all repeated three times. The Patricke version, amazingly enough, follows exactly the same pattern (or, possibly, it can be fit into the same pattern), showing yet another point of similarity.

The best part of this dance, though, is the clear description it gives of the controversial 'back to back' figure. While Playford's use of 'back to back' is often clearly enough stated to separate it from either a "do si do" or a modern "gypsy turn", Patricke is particularly clear: "then they all turne their backs, both men, and woemen, towards one another, and then turne themselves as they were before, all their faces together"

One final thing to note about the dance: at the end, the instructions are "and then leade of, and let others proceede if they please". What this seems to indicate is that this is not one of those "do it forever" dances - that even though pretty much only the top and bottom couples get to do anything in the choruses, you don't have either an implied or explicit instruction to switch who gets to be which couple and do the dance again. Instead, the dancers are told to lead off - leave the dance floor - so that others can dance whatever they want to next. Considering how permissive most of the other dances in Patricke are, one wonders why this one may only be done once?

Next we have **The Goddisses**, which also appears in Playford's 1<sup>st</sup> through 16<sup>th</sup> (1716) editions. These two dances are so much the same that they both even end up with eleven repeats, even though this version leaves out two of the Playford verses (the everyone circle, and the double hey), replacing them with two backwards-circle figures. The last difference is, when each line goes around in an arc, instead of holding hands and slipping, Patricke indicates that you "shall follow each other, the first [person] leading" - so you are walking in a column, not slipping sideways. (Admittedly, Playford's "Men goe downe on the outsides of the We." doesn't exactly specify slipping sideways.)

At one point in Patricke, the author gets lazy and instead of spelling everything out exactly, as Playford does, he just writes down what the men do. Fortunately, he redeems himself with a final note: "after every one of the mens parts the woemen doe the same."

**Lightly Love** comes next. There is no match in Playford, though Ms Marsh does indicate a broadside ballad linkage, much like The Milking Payle, this time to a tune called "Light o'Love". This tune has an A part and a B part, each of which is 16 beats long, which is a help in structuring the chorus of this dance.

This dance is for as many as you please, and is one of the 'kidnapping' style dances (just like Patricke's Cherping of the Nightingall and Noah's Flood). However, the 'for as many as will' nature, plus the figures that precede the kidnapping, prove somewhat perplexing when it comes to the specifics of reconstruction. Fortunately, we have a musical framework that, with some other reasonable decisions, helps to make the reconstruction work.

The essence of those "reasonable decisions" is stretching out the actions in the chorus even though this requires repeating the musical phrase for the chorus six times. The result seems to work well, however, in enabling the first man and the last man in the set to compete to see who will win the last woman, at least until the basic figure starts again and the first man goes hunting for another new partner.

The manuscript's author even seems to get into the spirit of the contest that is embodied in the dance. At the end, these instructions allow the addition of a bit of spice: "only if he please, he may at

some setting, or turning salute the lady, that he dances with, (if he like her,) ... but if he doe so, the last man must doe the same", perhaps to be sure that the competition remains fair?

**Trenchmore** is next. This dance did not make it into Playford's 1<sup>st</sup> edition, but lasted from the 2<sup>nd</sup> (1652) edition to the 18<sup>th</sup> (1728). The popularity of this dance makes one wonder why Playford left it out of his 1651 edition.

The Pattricke version of Trenchmore is not quite the same dance as that in Playford - in fact, the differences are such that it becomes not so much a "version 0", but more of a close, but not direct, blood relative, maybe a cousin version. Both dances share some basic patterns (the first two progressive figures - setting down the line, then turning down the line), but there are elements in the Pattricke version that have vanished from Playford's (turning your partner as a figure introduction, and the final weaving element). These differences are enough to separate the dances from each other quite a bit, though they are still obviously related.

That figure introduction consisting of turning your partner is an interesting element of the dance because of how Pattricke gives the instruction. After leading up twice and setting twice, "then every man shall turne his mayde as long as he please, on way, and then backe agayne, the other way". But what does "as long as he please" mean? Do the musicians just vamp the music as everyone spins wildly, only stopping when they're dizzy enough? Or do they only get their two measures to turn each way, and so it is up to the dancers to spin faster so that they get in more revolutions, and thus have spun as "long" as they want?

The thirteenth dance in the Pattricke manuscript is **The Old Man with a Bed Full of Bones**, which matches closely, both in name and in instructions, to the Playford dance 'An Old Man is a Bed Full of Bones' (and several variants thereof) which appears in his 1<sup>st</sup> through 18<sup>th</sup> editions. This is another 'kidnapping' dance, but in this one the last man steals back his partner by the end of each chorus, so it is not a complete example of the sub-type and the dance does not go on forever and ever.

The Pattricke version is for 6 or 8, but because only the end couples really do anything individually, the number of couples between them isn't very important. It varies further from the Playford version by having the last couple beginning the kidnapping figure in the middle chorus, instead of the slight variation to the first chorus that Playford suggests (leading down and back up with crossed hands), and finally using the half turn figure as the third verse instead of arming. The final chorus even has the same variation as Playford - the spin and kiss ("if you like your mate") as you lead. These are very definitely closely related - as in, nearly identical, dances.

There is something of perhaps vital importance hidden in this dance, however. The instructions for the third part begin "Doe the first part over agayne,". As I've noted, the third verse is not leading up, and this is how the author indicates this: "after halfe tune, just like as is described before". The question is whether he was always intending to say 'do the first chorus over again with this variation' (which follows the 'described before' clause), or is he actually confirming that the verses will always be a progression from leading/doubling, to siding, to arming (either full or half) even if the instructions say "doe the first part over agayne", and he just added the 'after the halfe turne' because of how he was intending to continue the instructions? It is an intriguing thought, but perhaps not quite enough from which to form a theory.

There is only one dance among all 32 dances in Pattricke where music is in some way suggested in the manuscript. While we have used name similarities to link broadside ballads to the dances, and of course, the Playford links also suggest music, only this dance actually has a named tune: Cook Laurel.

The Song of Cock Lorel is a piece composed by Ben Jonson as part of the masque he created for the Marquess of Buckingham, George Villiers, in 1621, called *The Gypsies Metamorphos'd*. (Info from [http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/dance\\_research/v025/25.2ravelhofer.html](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/dance_research/v025/25.2ravelhofer.html)) The music the ballad was performed to is unknown, though several have been proposed. The article referenced notes that it is popularly linked to Packington's Pound, but that a more likely pairing is *An Old Man is a Bed Full of Bones* from Playford's *The English Dancing Master* (to which it was associated in the 1700 edition of *Wit and Mirth*). It would seem, though, that this linkage might not be the first association at all.

At the bottom of the page on which this dance ends in the *Patricke* manuscript (page 23), there is a section separator, followed by a line on which is written "Tune:", which is followed by four more lines of poetry. These lines are very hard to interpret even though they are in the same hand as the rest of the dances. The first line seems to be "Cooke laurel would needs have the divill his guest", and the subsequent three lines are remarkably similar to the same lines of the poem, though there are absolutely differences (reference the text of the ballad at: [http://www.archive.org/stream/roxburgheballads07chapuoft/roxburgheballads07chapuoft\\_djvu.txt](http://www.archive.org/stream/roxburgheballads07chapuoft/roxburgheballads07chapuoft_djvu.txt)) It would seem that that 1700 reference is incorrect. In light of the differences in the text quoted, though, I wonder whether this might put a more firm date on the manuscript itself. Could it have been written as early as 1621? I suppose, though, it couldn't have been written before then.

**A Maiden Fayre**, the next dance, matches to Playford's *Once I Loved a Maiden Fair* (also shortened to just *Maiden Fair*) in his 1<sup>st</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> (1698) editions. The dances in the two sources are very nearly identical: both are progressive dances with three figures, though the *Patricke* version is only for 6 or 8 people, rather than as many as will. The first pattern is identical between the two, and the following two patterns are nearly identical in concept, but different in execution, between the two sources.

**Cuckles all a Row** comes next. Playford also has *Cuckolds all a Row* in his 1<sup>st</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> (1728) editions. Both versions of the dance are for two couples and both versions have essentially the same structure, though there are small differences. The first chorus in *Patricke* has the men circling the women four times, so there's no back to back section and apparently the women don't move at all. The second part, verse and chorus, is essentially the same between the two. The third part, though, differs in two ways. First, the verse is an arming verse, but the men get the option of which woman to turn first, their partner or their opposite. Second, after the pushing and pulling, there is a couple switching section rather than the "racetrack" chase of Playford.

The last chorus poses a question for me, though. *Patricke* explicitly states that in the repeat, the men "shall draw them contrary to that as they did before", in other words, "he that drew his woeman upward before, shall now draw her downward". The problem with this is that "draw" implies pulling, and you can only pull in one direction. There is no side switching in the passing through part of the chorus, so how can you pull or draw in a different direction than you did before? I can't tell whether the instructions are mistaken, or whether I am reconstructing *Patricke*'s words incorrectly here.

*Patricke*'s next dance is **Tom a Bedlam, or Grayes Inn Maske**, and it is, interestingly enough, for 2 or more people, which perfectly illustrates the 'never interact with anyone but your partner' nature of this dance. There is a match in Playford, from the 1<sup>st</sup> edition's *Graies Inn Maske* through various spelling of "Gray's" and an appropriate alternate name of *Mad Tom*, to his 10<sup>th</sup> (1698) edition, though in Playford this is a four couple dance.

These two dances share many similarities, including the most telling one - the length and complexity of the chorus. Specifics differ - in the verses, the common actions of leading up, siding, and arming are split not by setting and turning but by casting and inverting the line; the individual actions in

the long chorus differ slightly; and while the Playford chorus remains totally the same in each of the three parts, the Patricke version alters by switching who begins each time (first chorus, the men begin, second chorus, the women begin, third chorus, they both act at the same time). Still, the two dances are enough the same to be done to the same music, and are certainly directly related to each other.

**St Johns** comes next, and is a square dance only for eight (complete with a fancy diagram of a square in the manuscript). It very clearly links to a Playford dance with an only slightly similar name - Dull Sir John (perhaps he was so dull because he was so saintly?), appearing in the 1<sup>st</sup> through the 18<sup>th</sup> editions (1728). Despite the tenuous name tie, the two dances are actually very closely related: most of the pieces correspond, though some are switched around (the first and second choruses, for example), and some are altered totally (the third chorus' do-si-do is changed to a set and fall back pattern).

The next two dances in the Patricke manuscript are incomplete, but not in the manner of the previous Tenn Pounce, where it looks as though something covered the bottom of the page and was written on instead of the actual page. In both of these cases, the instructions go from the top of the page to the bottom, but don't continue on the next page even though the dance is obviously not over. Did the author get bored with the dances, or get distracted after flipping the page over and forget where he left off? I doubt we'll ever know.

Dance number 18, **Boone Companion**, for 6 or 8, has no match in Playford (though it does exist in Sloane). Although there is a musical correspondence between Boone Companion and Fine Companion, a Playford dance, this dance does not resemble the Playford version. It splits the verses by having the first couple go to the bottom, and then back to the top, and it shares the "set and fall back" figure with St Johns. It gives a full set of nice instructions for the first part, and finishes the instructions for the second verse, complete with a separator line, before ending at the bottom of page 36.

**Step Stately**, dance 19, does have a Playford version of the same name that appears in the 1<sup>st</sup> through the 10<sup>th</sup> (1698) editions. The two dances are very similar, though the arcing and curling in Patricke is more free-form than in Playford, and remain so until the Patricke instructions end in the middle of a sentence describing the second half of the second verse at the bottom of page 37.

While it might be possible to postulate a reasonable completion to Boone Companion, following symmetry rules (have the second chorus copy the first, but with the women starting), and previously seen conventions (have the third part be the same as the first part), we don't really know that the dance wasn't supposed to have three different choruses. And Step Stately, both versions, is so far from the ordinary form of an English Country Dance that there's really no telling how it should have proceeded. It would seem that these two dances will have to remain curiosities, rather than actual dances.

**The Picking of Sticks** is the next dance, and very closely resembles its Playford counterpart that appeared in his 1<sup>st</sup> through 10<sup>th</sup> (1698) editions. Both dances are for three couples, and the first part of both dances are identical. The Patricke version, however, uses leading up and falling back as the only verse action, instead of Playford's USA verses, and the hey is done in the middle, with the circling and pistoning at the end, where the circling couple runs around the set "as long as they please" (again, long probably = fast, since the music isn't going to go on forever).

The hey in Patricke is quite different as well. First, the men's hey and the women's hey is separated by a repeat of the verse's leading up and falling back twice. The instructions for the hey don't equate to the complicated 'sheepshead' hey from Playford, though I'm not entirely sure exactly what the description is trying to say. First, "all the men shall dance the hays about the woemen, and the last man shall come about the third woman, and having thus done, the first man shall runne about all the woemen,

and having thus done, they shall all come into their places", all in eight measures of music (or some multiple thereof). Perhaps it means simply that the men hey by winding through the women, and once the last man has finished going around the last woman the first man should naturally be back at the top of the line of women, so instead of just fading back into place, he is instructed to run down (presumably) the outside (right side) of the women, around the bottom of the line, and back up into place - one would guess the rest would follow, though they are not instructed to do so. Of course, the women are instructed to do the same as the men when it is their turn.

**Jack Pudding** comes next, and not only does it appear in Playford's 1<sup>st</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> (1690) editions, but also in Sloane (although there it is incomplete). In both Pattricke and Sloane, each being handwritten and not limited to the strictures of Playford's printing process, the unique triangular arrangement of the couples is made clear - in Pattricke, it is even reinforced by an extra diagram later in the description. The interesting fact about this is that it becomes clear that Playford's version of the dance should also be arranged like this, but his circles and arcs just couldn't be rearranged enough to form that vital triangle.

There are differences between Pattricke and Playford, and while they do make the dances specifically different, they are still essentially the same. The biggest difference would probably be the final chorus, where Playford is able to switch the couples around in just a normal repeat of the chorus music. In Pattricke, in order to accommodate the requested changes, it takes a full four repeats of the chorus music, which is unusual but not unique, by any means (see Nonesuch and Scotch Cap, and even Picking of Sticks in this manuscript).

**Roses white, and roses red** comes next in Pattricke. This circle dance for as many as will has a somewhat more complex version in Playford called The Rose is White, the Rose is Red, included in the 1<sup>st</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> (1690) editions. Both are progressive "dance with" dances and share the actual progressive figures (more or less, and not in the same order), but the Playford version has the regular double, side, arm verses between each progressive figure, while the Pattricke version only has an intro figure. Thus the dances are very definitely related, with the Pattricke version more of an ancestor than a closer match.

Dance number 23 is **Harts Ease** for 2 couples facing, which is a very close match to the Playford version, Hearts Ease, appearing in the 1<sup>st</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> editions. The Pattricke dance has all of the important components of the Playford version except that there is no partner sharing in the verses, though the choruses, unchanging in Playford, switch who gets turned first in Pattricke.

The next dance in Pattricke has no Playford equivalent. **The Fumbling of Jone** may or may not be the actual title (I find it very difficult to tell the difference between the first letter in "\*umbling" and "\*one", which means I would call it The Jumbling of Jone if I was the first to ever see the manuscript, but I would also believe "Tumbling" or maybe "Fumbling"), but that's what Ms Marsh has labeled it and it makes as much sense as anything else.

The dance is for four couples in a line and has the basic verses of doubling, siding, and arming. The phrase "turn round singly" is used here as part of the verses, unaccompanied by sets, and cause just as much of a problem as the lack of such an instruction elsewhere that set is used. In the second and third verses, the instructions say side/arm twice, and then turn single, but the first verse gives no such extra instruction. The verse music would seem to be an eight beat phrase repeated twice, but that leaves us in the cold as to how to accomplish siding and turning, or arming and turning in eight beats. There are ECD tunes of twelve beats, which would accommodate the required figures nicely, but then what is to be done with those extra beats in the first verse?

Without music, we are left at a loss as to how to accurately reconstruct this dance, which is a shame, since the chorus is quite elegant in its symmetry, making the dance quite nice even in its simplicity.

**Greenwood** is the next dance, and it is a very close ancestral match to the Playford version of the same name, appearing in the 1<sup>st</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> editions. It is for three couples, with the center couple improper, just as in Playford. This version only has two parts, a hey part and a circle part, each preceded by the same verse figures. The instructions for the choruses of the dance are interesting in that each one basically says to do that chorus' action "as many ways as you can": for the first chorus, it says "dance their hays, all ways as you may 3: or 4: or 5 times, and then all into you places after you have dandcd it as many ways as you can", and similar (with better enumeration of those ways) for the circling chorus. So, as in Playford, the heys can be done in each line, on the ends, and then by gender, which makes five repeats of the music for the chorus. Similarly for the circles - each line circles, then circling on the ends, then opposite ends, and then perhaps by gender (individually), giving five different ways to circle. The instructions specify groups of three in any one circle, so however many ways you can divide the six people up into threes is how many circling choruses you need to do.

Playford's version of the dance ends up doing most of these choruses, plus several others, though he separates each one out with verse motions in between, making the dance longer and more complex. Whether this makes it more fun is, I suppose, left up to the dancers themselves.

**Natly** comes next, another longways dance for as many as will and lacking a Playford counterpart. It has an intro figure and three progressive figures set to what is probably a verse chorus, AABB structured piece of music, though we don't know that for sure (my guess is based on the structure of each basic figure - 32 beats split between a "progress" sub-figure in two parts, each eight counts long, and a "marking time" figure in two parts, each also eight counts long).

Dance number 27 is **A Helth to Betty**, a progressive dance for as many as you please that matches nearly exactly with the Playford version A Health to Betty in the 1<sup>st</sup> through 18<sup>th</sup> (1728) editions. Both dances have the usual three verses, split by sets and turns, each followed by a different progressive-figure chorus. These progressive figures are somewhat less refined in Pattricke, certainly less specific than in Playford, but everything that needs to happen does somehow. The only substantive difference between the two dances is that while the Pattricke dance has the second and third progressive figures starting out the same way, Playford's version has the second figure starting differently.

**Bobbin Jone** is next, another virtually ubiquitous dance, in that it appears in both Playford (1<sup>st</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> (1728) editions), and Sloane. This is a long dance (according to the manuscript, though it may mean long-ways as well as long), for "the more the merryer". Despite the commonality of the name, however, and the fact that the Playford version is also a progressive dance, the actual progressive figures aren't substantively the same. While the music in Playford works for this dance, they aren't really very similar beyond that.

Reconstructing this version of Bobbin Jone (or Joan or Joe) presented a few problems. The first progressive figure wasn't an issue - in fact, the author kindly provided a clue in case his description wasn't sufficient here, saying "this chanige you shall find very perfectly described in the Mayden Fayre". However, in both the second and third progressive figures the switching is done by circling (either with hands across or hands all around) until the couples have switched positions - i.e. couple two ends up above couple one. Unfortunately, when you circle like this, everyone ends up on the opposite side of the set from where they should be and there's no instruction to switch back. Now, there are progressive figures where this is just fine - the active couple will progress down the set, switching sides each time,

and so on. But here, the progressive figure cannot continue correctly from an improper position - the active man and the woman in the next couple won't be diagonally across from each other and so won't be able to take hands across for every other repeat of the second progressive figure (this wouldn't be a problem for the third figure, though it could get messy). When I reconstructed the dance, I added a "switch back" instruction just to keep everything working correctly, but I wonder how this worked originally?

**Murry** comes next, a strange little square dance for exactly four couples. There is no Playford counterpart to this weird composition, and it may well be that weirdness that kept it out of Playford's books.

The dance has either two parts or four parts, depending on how the music for the dance was arranged. Basically, there are four parts of the dance that can be arranged verse, chorus, verse, chorus, but each part is the same basic length, so the same two or four measure piece of music could have been played just as easily as a more common AABB verse chorus pattern.

The most interesting part of the dance is that the last section (either Part 4, or Chorus 2) is a circular hey ("a kind of hay only of giving of hands" - perhaps handed heys weren't ordinarily done?) around the perimeter of the square. The instructions specify that when you are meeting anyone but your partner, you "shall turn but halfe round", yet "when they shall meete with their own again, they shall turne quite round both of them together". Whether this instruction will reverse the flow of the hey (as happens in a Playford dance or two), or it is intended just to be a celebration of meeting your partner again and thus you turn once and a half around so as to continue around the perimeter and get to dance with everyone in the square eventually, I don't know.

The dance doesn't end there, though. One repeat of the chorus part of four measures of music will take you half way around the circle (four measures, four changes starting with your corner, meeting your partner on the opposite side of the square for the celebration turn). The instructions continue with "and soe after this manner, they shall goe round as often as they please, the tune is played akording :4: or 5: going round". Several things come from this: four times around will take you around the circle twice (or at least back to your place twice even if you only go halfway around each repeat), but five times means you would end up someplace other than where you started - an interesting resolution. This is also another example of the permissiveness of Patricke in general - the "let the dancers decide" that Playford does not allow as a rule. And finally, "the tune is played akording"(ly?) may mean that the tune is a continuously repeating four measure phrase, rather than an AABB verse-chorus format, though it isn't beyond believability that the chorus would simply be played over and over and over until the dancers were done.

**Jogg on** is next, an as many as you please long(ways) dance that also exists in Playford's 1<sup>st</sup> through 10<sup>th</sup> editions where it was known by that name as well as Jog On my Honey. Patricke's dance is a much shortened version of what is in Playford, sharing an intro figure that is either exactly the same or nearly so (see below), and just one progressive figure to Playford's four.

The intro figure consists of leading up, falling back (actually specified this time) followed by setting, all of this repeated. In Playford the setting is setting and turning, but in Patricke, the instruction is "sett and fall backe". Whether this is another figure entirely, or whether it should be setting and turning, is not completely clear. The shared progressive figure in Patricke matches, more or less, the third figure in Playford, which would seem to indicate another ancestor version.

**Good Your Worship** is the penultimate dance in *Patricke*, and it is for a rather unprecedented 50 couples! If only we had any clue as to the music that should be used - unfortunately, this dance has no Playford counterpart. The manuscript may be exaggerating with its "for 100" notation, though this is a progressive dance with a single basic figure - I would imagine that it could actually be done with fewer than 50 couples (or even more than 50!).

This dance has another occurrence of "sett, and fall backe", but here it might make more sense for the full instruction to be 'set [and turn], fall back [a double]' because the next instruction is "then all shall change places", which is then repeated (and actually spelled out, rather than abbreviated into 'that again'). Once this beginning figure (which is led off with leading up and falling back twice) is done and everyone is back where they started, the progression begins with the top couple processing down to the bottom of the line of couples (and remember, that's a long, long line of couples!). Their basic path is to go halfway down, cast off to turn around, then continue to the bottom, which is followed by everyone reexecuting the set, fall back, change figure (either once or twice depending on whether you read the instructions mostly literally or conclude that setting, falling back, and changing four times total is obviously a slight goof). And then the dance starts again from the lead up part.

And that's very literally all there is to this dance ("There is nothing at all but this"). However, license is given to the 'star' couple doing the promenade to "prolong every one his part, like as in leading to the bottome, you may leade down but a little way, and then leade up again, and soe fall backe, and change between every couple", but as a note to the musicians, the author adds "that always part of the tune must be playd again, beginning where you shall sett, and fall backe, otherwise you cannot come right to your places". On careful reading, however, this isn't quite as simple as it seems!

Taken generally, this instruction could just mean 'take your time getting to the bottom of the set,' sure. But if you read closely, the pieces indicated can be assembled into 'lead down a little ways', and then the repeat of the "'lead up" [and fall back twice, set and turn], "fall back and change" [with your partner]' section of the dance. And then it says "between every couple"! That means repeating the music 49 times for every one of the 50 couples in the dance! Perhaps, however, since this is an optional inclusion, one wouldn't take such liberties if there were actually 100 people trying to dance this at once.

The last dance in the manuscript is **The Fryer and the Nunne** for as many as you please in a line. This dance also exists in Playford, lasting from the 1<sup>st</sup> to the 18<sup>th</sup> (1728) editions. The *Patricke* version is truncated just before the end of page 66, with a different hand having scribbled something at the bottom of that page. There are no further instructions on the following pages.

However, what we do have of the dance is very interesting. The Playford version has a very short and abrupt intro figure, followed by two progressive figures. *Patricke* presents us with a very lengthy and involved introductory figure that not only starts differently by having everyone lead forward and fall back twice, and then the men go forward, followed by the women, then the men lead down, followed by the women (these last figures are what comprise the Playford introduction), but there is also a "chorus" following each of these sets of actions that consists of setting and once more falling back before turning your partner all the way around.

The first figures in both dances are identical, though the instructions in *Patricke* end before we are explicitly told that the progression continues. We also cannot be sure whether, given that massively more complex introductory figure, whether there was even supposed to be a second progressive figure in *Patricke* - after all, there are several examples of abbreviated version of dances in the manuscript. Still, the dance is performable, even if it is incomplete, luckily enough for us.

Distilling the above into some statistics, we can determine the following:

- 32 dances exist - of those 32:
  - 23 can be linked by name or via music to dances in Playford:
    - ◆ Editions:
      - 20 in the 1<sup>st</sup>
      - 1 in the 2<sup>nd</sup>
      - 2 in the 4<sup>th</sup>
    - ◆ Matches:
      - 21 are similar in some degree (from nearly exact, to sharing structure but not figures - Milking Payle is a verse/chorus dance that only shares the verses with Merry Merry Milkmaids, and Bobbin Jone is an intro/progressive figures that doesn't share any figures with Bobbing Joe)
      - 2 are clearly not the same dance (Tenn Pounce, Cherpung Nightingall)
  - 24 have music (the above 23, plus Lightly Love)
  - 4 can be linked by name to dances in Sloane (one of which is not in Playford)
- Breaking those 32 down into different categories, we see that:
  - 3 can't be reconstructed (Tenn Pounce, Boone Companion, Step Stately)
  - 16 are some form of "regular" verse/chorus dances
  - 9 are some form of progressive dances:
    - ◆ 3 are verse/progressive figure chorus
    - ◆ 5 have an intro figure and then some number of progressive figures
      - ◆ 1 of the above 5 (Roses Red) is a "dance with" progressive, as opposed to the "couples switch places" progressive the other 8 are
      - ◆ 1 is a "promenade" progressive, where the object is for the lead couple to end up at the bottom without any other switching being done (Good Your Worship)
  - 4 are kidnapping dances:
    - ◆ 3 of these are normal versions - the lead man steals up the last woman to be his new partner over and over, until he steals up his original partner again. These usually contain permission to continue the dance with the next couple in line becoming the lead couple.

- ◆ 1 of these (The Old Man) is a no-progression dance, because the lead man tries to switch his partner with the last woman, but the last man gives her back (which makes this dance truly boring for the one or two couples standing between the top and bottom!)
- Let's break them down by participants:
  - 1 is for one or more couples (Grayes Inn Maske)
  - 2 require two couples
  - 4 are for three couples
  - 6 are for three or four couples
  - 7 are for four couples
  - 1 is for five couples or more (Goddisses)
  - 1 is for 50 couples (Good Your Worship)
  - 10 are for as many as you please

I could continue to break these dances down by required music, by whether their verses are split, and whether that split is with sets and turns or something else, whether the verses are the double, siding, arming, or double, siding, half-turning, or double, side, "same as at first", or even whether they are all the same. These are just numbers, but they are kind of fun to play with, huh?

In conclusion, the Patricke manuscript gives us another view of what English Country Dance was all about. Unlike Playford's regimented, tightly controlled forms, the dances in Patricke show not only an even wider breadth of types of dances (such as Murry), but a dancer-centered freedom as to how a dance will be done, and done differently the next time it's begun. It acknowledges the playfulness that would seem to be natural to dancing, with the turning as long or as fast as you please, or adding 'salutes' to the kidnapping contest in Lightly Love. Dances where interpersonal figures are minimal are allowed to have three or four couples in them (or even just one, as in Gray's Inn Maske).

Whether the Patricke manuscript was written down just a few years before Playford's first edition was published, or a decade before, the dances captured within it help prove that the dance style had been growing and developing for many, many years. Patricke has just as many dances that stretch the boundaries of the style as toe the form's line, and while many of the dances seem like precursors of the versions in Playford, there are others that are as complex and fully developed as anything Playford published.

The Patricke manuscript is a source for several brand new dances, as well as variants on some old favorites. But more than that, it is a source for a completely different view of the entire English Country Dance style, one not bound by Playford's copyeditors and style guidelines, but perhaps closer to the actual sources and roots of the form. The best I can do with it is to try to present some reasonably reconstructed dances, but there is far more here for those who really want to delve into the underpinnings of ECD as a whole.

Enjoy!

Resources:

Harvard Houghton Library Catalog No. MSEng 1356

Facsimile of manuscript at: <http://www.wiglaf.org/~aaronm/scadance/>

Transcription at: <http://www.pages.drexel.edu/~white/ECD/Lovelace%20mms.htm>

Ms Marsh's article at: [http://fagisis.zeddele.de/morgenroete-pdfs/Marsh\\_.pdf](http://fagisis.zeddele.de/morgenroete-pdfs/Marsh_.pdf)

John Playford's English Country Dancing Master, pub. 1651

Facsimile and transcription available on the web at:

[http://www.pbm.com/~lindahl/playford\\_1651/](http://www.pbm.com/~lindahl/playford_1651/)

V1 - 09/27/2010

V1.1 - 09/29/2010