

TRANSCRIPTION, PERFORMANCE AND RECORDING OF
JOHANN SEBASTIAN BACH'S WORKS FOR LUTE ON A
TEN-STRING GUITAR

WRITTEN COMMENTARY

Sofia Pyrounaki

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD
at the
Royal Conservatoire of Scotland
&
University of St Andrews



Royal Conservatoire
of Scotland



University of
St Andrews

2018

Full metadata for this item is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Identifiers to use to cite or link to this thesis:

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17630/sta/13>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/21124>

This item is protected by original copyright

**Transcription, Performance and Recording of Johann Sebastian Bach's
Works for Lute on a ten-string Guitar**

Sofia Pyrounaki



**Royal Conservatoire
of Scotland**



**University of
St Andrews**

Written Commentary

Abstract

Transcription, Performance and Recording of Johann Sebastian Bach's Works for Lute on a ten-string Guitar is research that participates in the wide discourse on transcribing and performing Bach's lute works on the guitar. Building upon an examination of the primary sources and previous guitar transcriptions, but also presenting new information and points of differentiation, the research sheds new light on an area of interest that is rightly shared by performers and scholars.

The submission comprises of five elements: in the written discussion, I consider selected issues from my research, describing the course that led to specific choices, but also the concerns and lines of enquiry that influenced or derived from my practical musical experience. In the commentary upon the examination of the primary sources, I justify my editorial choices in detail, commenting further upon details that can be inferred from this examination, elements that support the interpretive process of editorial decision-making, but also the features of an editorial process that pertains to *musical* works. The transcriptions condense the knowledge derived from my editorial engagement and my performance practice, but present it in such a way that aims at, and awaits, the individual performer's further unfolding of the music. The recordings capture a possible way of completing this process, but also contribute to the argument that the use of a ten-string instrument offers new perspectives on these crucial works. Finally, facsimiles of certain primary and secondary sources are presented to further facilitate the critical reading of my choices and my concerns – to support the continued discourse in this area.

This submission is, therefore, a record of my engagement with the works in question, but also an invitation for continued dialogue.

Candidate's declaration

I, Sofia Pyrounaki, do hereby certify that this thesis, submitted for the degree of PhD which is approximately 13,500 words in length, has been written by me, and that it is the record of work carried out by me, or principally by myself in collaboration with others as acknowledged, and that it has not been submitted in any previous application for any degree.

I was admitted as a research student at the University of St Andrews and the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland in September 2011.

I received funding from an organisation or institution and have acknowledged the funder(s) in the full text of my thesis.

Signature of candidate

Date

30 October 2018

Supervisor's declaration

I hereby certify that the candidate has fulfilled the conditions of the Resolution and Regulations appropriate for the degree of PhD in the University of St Andrews and that the candidate is qualified to submit this thesis in application for that degree.

Signature of supervisor

Date



30 October 2018

Permission for publication

In submitting this thesis to the University of St Andrews we understand that we are giving permission for it to be made available for use in accordance with the regulations of the University Library for the time being in force, subject to any copyright vested in the work not being affected thereby. We also understand, unless exempt by an award of an embargo as requested below, that the title and the abstract will be published, and that a copy of the work may be made and supplied to any bona fide library or research worker, that this thesis will be electronically accessible for personal or research use and that the library has the right to migrate this thesis into new electronic forms as required to ensure continued access to the thesis.

I, Sofia Pyrounaki, have obtained, or am in the process of obtaining, third-party copyright permissions that are required or have requested the appropriate embargo below.

The following is an agreed request by candidate and supervisor regarding the publication of this thesis:

Printed copy

No embargo on print copy.

Electronic copy

No embargo on electronic copy.

Signature of candidate

Date

30 October 2018

Signature of supervisor

Date

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Stephen Brown". The signature is written in a cursive style and is underlined with a single horizontal stroke.

30 October 2018

Underpinning Research Data or Digital Outputs

Candidate's declaration

I, Sofia Pyrounaki, hereby certify that no requirements to deposit original research data or digital outputs apply to this thesis and that, where appropriate, secondary data used have been referenced in the full text of my thesis.

Signature of candidate

Date

30 October 2018

General acknowledgements

I am indebted to my colleague Marco Ramelli and to Stefano Sanzogni (Prelude, Fuga and Allegro, BWV 998) for transferring my handwritten transcriptions into Sibelius and for their precious support.

Funding

This work was supported by the Greek State Scholarships Foundation, the Alexander S. Onassis Public Benefit Foundation, and the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland.

Contents

List of musical examples	vii
Introduction	1
<i>A need to defend a choice of instrument?</i>	2
Notes on transcription	6
<i>Manuscript sources</i>	6
<i>Designated deviation from the primary sources in previous transcriptions</i>	8
<i>'Missing' information in the sources</i>	9
<i>Choosing fingerings that allow prolonging the written value of certain notes</i>	10
<i>The use of open strings</i>	11
<i>The different tone quality of strings</i>	11
<i>Use of fingerings that seem unconventional but facilitate the interpretation</i>	12
Notes on my performance practice	13
<i>Introduction</i>	13
<i>Notes in dynamics</i>	13
<i>Elements that entail or can entail a performance suggestion in dynamics</i>	14
<i>Horizontal movement</i>	16
<i>Ornaments</i>	24
<i>A thought on the improvisational character of ornamentation</i>	24
<i>Staccato</i>	25
<i>Implied polyphony</i>	26
<i>Concluding remarks</i>	32
Appendix	34
Information about the location of the manuscript sources of the lute works	34
Bibliography	43
Manuscript sources (examined from facsimile).....	43
Musical editions	44
Secondary sources	44

Musical examples

Suite in E major, BWV 1006a, Prelude, mm. 29-32. Transcription for ten-string guitar by S. Pyrounaki	15
Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998, Fuga, m. 47. Transcription for ten-string guitar by S. Pyrounaki	17
Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998, Fuga, mm. 47-51. Transcription for ten-string guitar by S. Pyrounaki	19
Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998, Fuga, mm. 51-55. Transcription for ten-string guitar by S. Pyrounaki	20
Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998, Fuga, m. 44. Transcription for ten-string guitar by S. Pyrounaki	21
Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998, Fuga, m. 52. Transcription for ten-string guitar by S. Pyrounaki	21
Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998, Fuga, m. 60. Transcription for ten-string guitar by S. Pyrounaki	21
Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998, Fuga, m. 76. Transcription for ten-string guitar by S. Pyrounaki	21
Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998, Fuga, mm. 55-63. Transcription for ten-string guitar by S. Pyrounaki	22
Suite in E major, BWV 1006a, Prelude, mm. 17-29. J-Tma Littera rara vol. 2-14	29
Suite in E major, BWV 1006a, Prelude, mm. 65-79. J-Tma Littera rara vol. 2-14	30

Transcription, performance and recording of Johann Sebastian Bach's works for lute on a ten-string guitar

Introduction

This submission deals with the answers – or at least some possible, though evidenced, answers – to a series of initial questions that were my starting point; needless to say, the course of my research brought a lot of additional questions to supplement these. I started with questions, and I have to comment that my writing during the first year of research was full of bulleted lists that reflected an anxiety to justify my research. On my first encounter with a wonderful academic, I was told: ‘You have to be a detective!’ But I am not a detective trying to find evidence that will justify a pre-determined thesis: the foundation of my research is my curiosity as a performer. I am very grateful that the focus of doctoral study, the invaluable help of my supervisors and my colleagues, and my identity as a research student in my correspondence with the libraries who preserve the valuable sources of this music, have given me motivation and have resulted in my completing the ‘first draft’, as I feel it is right to say, in a process that, as long as the curiosity is still there, will never end. Thus, my written commentary is mainly descriptive. It includes my concerns as a performer-scholar, the ideas that have influenced me or developed around my performance practice, and a number of issues that I feel a need to discuss and reflect on with honesty as part of my contribution to the well established discourse around this music.

My written discussion will be followed by a list of the manuscript sources’ location. For ease of comparison, the transcription of the works for the ten-string guitar, the critical commentary upon the examination of the primary and, in certain instances, secondary sources, and the facsimiles of certain manuscript sources, have been bound separately. The submission includes my recordings of the works, which are integral to it. The order of the pieces in the transcriptions and the critical commentary follow the catalogue order of the works, starting with the Suite in g minor, BWV 995 and ending with the Suite in E major, BWV 1006a. However, it is worth mentioning that the transcriptions and the early drafts of the critical commentary, as well as my recordings of the works, were not completed in this order. I started my research working on the suite in e minor, BWV 996. The order of the works in the CDs of my recordings reflects my ‘working’ order. My ongoing examination of Weyrauch’s tablature and the two remaining secondary sources of the *Fuga* in g minor, BWV 1000 are not included in the critical commentary and I therefore consider it to be

incomplete, since I deem it necessary also to examine certain manuscript sources of the *Fuga*'s organ version, an examination that has not yet been possible. In addition, my reading of the tablature misses an experience of performance that may have an impact on certain passages. Nonetheless, important variants between the tablature and the autograph of the *Fuga* from the first Violin Sonata in g minor, BWV 1001 are included in my transcription.

A need to defend a choice of instrument?

The debate around the performance of early music that the historically-informed performance (HIP) movement has stimulated is continuously evolving. It has been a long time since those involved in historically-informed performance (or, as Bruce Haynes also aptly calls it, 'historically-inspired performance'¹) felt they had to justify their involvement. Indeed, the weight of justification increasingly fell elsewhere: performers on non-period instruments were likely to feel the need to explain their choice of medium of performance. The practice of performing baroque music on non-period instruments was no longer the mainstream, although it remained, and it will continue to hold a place alongside HIP practice and as long as 'the world of performance is a pluralistic one'². Nonetheless, there is no doubt that the HIP movement resulted in an increasing awareness of performance choices on the part of non-period performers. In 2002, in the preface to his exceptional second edition of Bach's lute works for the six-string guitar, Frank Koonce notes:

During the 1980's guitarists of my generation were starting to become aware of stylistic concerns in the interpretation of early music. There was a movement towards stylistic authenticity, an attempt to re-discover the original intentions of early composers and recreate the aesthetic elements that were appropriate to their music. (Many style-conscious players today no longer think of being "authentic" – a concept unattainable both in theory and in practice – and prefer, instead, to use the term "historically informed".) This growing movement is what first prompted me to research the lute music of Bach and to develop my own edition of it. I tried to find performance solutions on the guitar that were as faithful as possible to the original music and to clearly delineate any necessary editorial alterations.³

When we refer to historically-informed *performance*, we assume that the performer has made a certain choice of instrument. However, a historically-informed *performer* may decide to perform on that instrument, or on another of his or her choosing. There need not be an assumption of

¹ Bruce Haynes, *The End of Early music: A Period Performer's History of Music for the twenty-first Century* (New York, 2007), p. 14.

² Peter Kivy, *Authenticities – Philosophical Reflections on Musical Performance* (Ithaca and London, 1995), p. 159 and p. 285.

³ Frank Koonce, *Johann Sebastian Bach: The Solo Lute Works: Edited for Guitar by Frank Koonce – Second Edition* (San Diego, 2002), p. iii.

instrumental choice when referring to historically-informed *performers*. What for many performers, whether 'period' or not, could seem problematic, though, is that an individual choice of instrument could indicate a general preference for this instrument, over the unchosen. In 1987, András Schiff wrote in the liner notes to his influential recording of *The Well-Tempered Clavier, Book II*:

In this age of 'Authentic Music Making', many people consider it a mortal sin to play Bach on the modern piano. There are others, however, who swear that the piano is the only instrument that can do full justice to Bach's keyboard works. The debate will never end, but could we not close the subject and let 'authentic' and 'non-authentic' performers live side by side in peaceful co-existence?⁴

We could now hardly listen to any claim of 'Authentic Music Making' or 'authentic' and 'non-authentic' performers in the sense that the term was used in the 80's. However, the debate on instrumental choice remains vibrant, and the medium of performance inevitably takes a prominent role in discussions on the performance of early music. Can we really close the subject, then, if the debate will never end? More importantly, would we really want to, notwithstanding the strong opinions expressed on all sides? Strong opinions are provocative; they stimulate responses; likewise, polemics can be inspiring.

Polemics are very much in evidence in the early treatises. Douglas Alton Smith's introduction to Ernst Gottlieb Baron's book *Study of the Lute*, published in 1727, reads:

The first chapter of Part II is a polemic against Mattheson, whose biting sarcasm had been directed at the lute in two of his publications. Baron's desire to rebut Mattheson's opinion point by point is directly responsible for the publication of the *Study*.⁵

It is really fascinating to read Baron's responses to Mattheson. Baron must have been disappointed that such an acclaimed music theorist and composer as Mattheson held these opinions about his beloved instrument: perhaps we owe as much to Mattheson as to Baron for the publication of the only German baroque treatise on the lute.

Positions such as those mentioned by Schiff may now be seen as extreme, but they were part of the debate and are still echoed in frequent references. There is, I would argue, more to this than the simple attractiveness of extreme or strong opinions. They may mark out the field of the debate and

⁴ András Schiff, 'Playing Bach on the Piano', booklet to the CD: *J.S. Bach: Das Wohltemperierte Klavier II: The Well-Tempered Clavier, Book II*; András Schiff (Decca, 1987), pp. 15-16.

⁵ Ernst Gottlieb Baron, *Study of the Lute* (1727); trans. into English by Douglas Alton Smith (California, 1976), p. iii.

help us to refine our own position; they may stimulate influential responses; they may encapsulate someone's passion. What HIP's pioneers began, was something out of the ordinary in its time. It is due to the movement's extraordinary achievements that period and non-period performers now 'live side by side', and I wholeheartedly concord with Schiff's implication that his choice of instrument does not represent a stance for or against those who take a similar or different approach.

Engagement with early music from a variety of angles keeps its performance practice alive and boosts the evolution of research. In many key questions, such as the reading of a particular passage in a particular manuscript, there are no clear-cut answers to be found (yet?), and in aesthetically-driven questions, such as whether a given performance is persuasive or not, there are no wrong answers to be found. These questions remain open to all of us who are involved in the performance of early music: thus, we can be sure that the performance practice of early music will be kept alive, and we can be surprised at how our own and other's efforts to answer such questions may change our artistic direction. A performer's engagement with the music entails a curiosity – a positive step forward stimulated by artistic doubts.

Would it be possible to argue for a 'best' choice in performance? We performers ask ourselves what seems the best choice for us, at a given moment, influenced by the surrounding musical milieu. The range of choice with respect to the medium of performance and questions of performance style is wide, but to this we add the distinct and individual personal musical milieu and taste of the performer, which ensures that the choices available are weighted differently for each of us.

I can only imagine how rich with possibilities a performance of Bach's lute works of Stephan Schmidt or Paul Galbraith would have been on the baroque lute, but the same goes of Hopkinson Smith on playing on a multi-string guitar. When I listen to their actual recordings⁶, in their variety, I hear their readings of the music, fresh deliveries which reveal meanings so persuasively; it is as if they were 'left there' to be revealed by their interpretation.

⁶ Stephan Schmidt, *Bach: Lute Works: Original Versions, 10-string Guitar* (naïve, 2000); Paul Galbraith, *Bach Lute Suites: BWV 995 – BWV 998; arr. Galbraith for 8-string Guitar* (Delos, 2000); Hopkinson Smith, *L'Œuvre De Luth* (naïve, 2009).

Bach's so called⁷ lute works are well established in the guitar repertoire. I position my research among the numerous transcriptions and performances of these works on the guitar, which testifies to their centrality in the repertoire, but also crucially testifies to their capacity to continually pose questions for the performer. In this sense, I view my work as a continuation of prior research, differentiated at certain points from previous work in my readings of the sources and my approach to transcription; it is also an effort to bridge a huge gap of a missing transcription of the works for a multi-string guitar created by those influential performers who have opted for such an instrument and the reasons that prompt them to do so, mainly the major modifications of the works due to the limited bass register of the six-string guitar. Finally, the research also documents my approach to the performance of these works, presenting what were my 'best' thoughts in realizing this beautiful music.

⁷ Among the numerous discussions on the instrumentation of the works see Paolo Cherici, 'The Lute Works of Bach: Context, Authenticity and Performance Problems' in *J. S. Bach, Opere Per Liuto* (Milan, 1996), pp. XXII-XLI; Frank Koonce, 'Sources and Historical Data' in *Johann Sebastian Bach: The Solo Lute Works: Edited for Guitar by Frank Koonce – Second Edition* (San Diego, 2002), pp. iv-ix.

Notes on transcription

Manuscript sources

In transcribing the lute works for the ten-string guitar, my critical engagement in the inevitable editorial *choices* demanded that, so far as was possible, I worked from the manuscript sources – this approach was also necessary to ensure that any errors that remained in my transcriptions were not a result of copying from another source that was itself in error. I could simply say that this fairly conventional editorial process resulted in a musical text upon which I added my fingerings for the ten-string guitar. But I would argue that my process of fingering is more significant than this summary implies: in the introductory comments of performance editions, the fingering process is sometimes separated from the editorial process, as though it were something subsequent to the preparation of the text, involving the artistic judgement and performance experience of the editor. I could say that the performer's role in the reading of the sources is as important as the scholar's role during the fingering process, but even this separation of qualities does not feel totally right. During the editorial process, the thoughts of an editor are at certain moments more scholarly or more artistically directed – but, crucially, throughout the editorial process all the faculties of an editor are awake. In comparing two primary sources I notice a beautiful legato mark missing from one and I immediately phrase this passage in my mind's ear. In commenting on a mark that impedes the reading, I can see at the same time the scribe dipping his pen just a moment before, leaving a mark of ink on the manuscript. In trying to understand a mistake or a peculiarity in notation, I try to understand the reason for it, not looking only at the detail itself, but considering the scribe's position that resulted in it. I gradually start to sense the man behind the notes; I start to feel an intimacy that is of extreme value to me when I perform the pieces, when I realize fingerings or ask interpretive questions. Yes, fingerings will be added, and the fingering completed after the reading of the manuscript sources, but the *process* of fingering has begun in the very moment of reading the manuscripts. In this respect, I question transcriptions that are based on urtext editions, rather than an examination of the primary sources. In addition to the danger that errors will be duplicated, there is something valuable lost if an editor does not have the chance to sense the person behind the notes as part of the creative process of transcription.

When I made the final revisions to fingerings in my transcriptions in preparation for this submission, it highlighted for me the long process of engagement in the music represented by the edited text. It is my wish that, somehow, part of this engagement can also be perceived by the reader. I chose to

describe and document this process (within inevitable limitations), since it is not only the outcome that is valuable: in ethical terms, it is the process behind the result that will give the reader the opportunity for informed disagreement. I do not suggest that an edition should always be accompanied by a written and critical commentary. However, acknowledging that the reader chooses what to read, I do feel that we editors have to support the freedom that an understanding of the available choices permits.

Continuing the same line of thinking, I would like to expand upon my decision to present comprehensive fingerings in my edition, reflecting, also, upon an observation I made in reviewing available transcriptions: some performance editions of Bach's lute works for the guitar include very few fingerings. Tilman Hoppstock's six *Spielversion für Gitarre* are largely unfingered. In his 'notes to Suite BWV 995' he writes (mirroring the notes of his other performance editions): "The present practical edition for guitar is based upon the scientific urtext edition by the same publisher [...] Fingerings have mostly been omitted to avoid obstructing general readability⁸". Why should a *performance* edition exclude – with very few exceptions – the fingering suggestions of the editor in the name of 'general readability'? And why should 'general readability' of a *performance* edition pay so little attention to how a performer reads the music on the guitar? Hoppstock's contribution to the performance of Bach's lute works, both as a scholar and a performer, is outstanding. My conviction is that his fingering suggestions would have made a *further*, significant contribution to the field. József Eötvös explains his decision to 'add very precise fingering' in his edition – indeed, almost every note of the seven works is fingered. However, his initial comment on fingering renders his following explanation a somewhat apologetic character: "*I admit I do not like adding much fingering! Only if absolutely necessary and in special cases*"⁹. Precise fingering in an edition that delineates the editor's scholarly engagement, as in the case of Eötvös, need not imply an editor's wish to assume a paternal role, as perhaps Eötvös wanted to clarify. On the contrary: taking into consideration that urtext editions of the works exist, and that an edition is designed to be actively *used* by a performer (who may, after all, change the fingerings at certain points, or even add or omit a note), the reason why performers who want to be challenged (the performers to whom the above mentioned editions are addressed) choose to read a particular edition, is to allow themselves both to be influenced by and have the possibility of rejecting, an existing view of the performance of the music. In other words, to satisfy their own musical and intellectual curiosity.

⁸ Tilman Hoppstock, *Johann Seb. Bach: Das Lautenwerk im Urtext: Band 1: Spielversion für Gitarre, Suite a-moll, BWV 995* (Darmstadt, 1999), p. 16.

⁹ József Eötvös, *J.S. Bach: the Complete Lute Works: Transcribed for Guitar by József Eötvös* (Heidelberg, 2002; rpt. 2007), p. vii.

More information does not necessarily result in a more passive participation. More importantly, well presented information opens a dialogue. To conclude these initial comments on transcription, I can now describe my research objective: in all this work, even more than supporting the active choice of a reader, or satisfying her musical and intellectual curiosity, I desire to continue the dialogue on transcription, hoping that I will have the chance to learn from what the reader's view might be.

Designated deviation from the primary sources in previous transcriptions

Here I refer not to transcriptions that deviate from the manuscript sources without indication, but to those where the deviations are flagged by the editor. Furthermore, I do not refer to the necessary alterations that were made in order to accommodate the range of the six-string guitar, but to deviations of other kinds that were the choice of the individual editor. In each instance there is a primary choice and this is what the editor has determined the main musical text should include, with the alternative relegated to an *ossia* stave or footnote. Of course, we will welcome the chance to consider an alternative and the editor, who has undoubtedly studied this passage, does not disapprove of an alteration that will possibly be made by the performer. I have, nonetheless, two concerns: firstly, the frequency at which playable notes of the manuscript sources are omitted in some transcriptions to facilitate the performance poses a question as to whether these frequent avoidable omissions are only the result of a thoughtful editorial choice, or, also, pertain to the fact that frequent unavoidable octave displacement (limited bass range of the six-string guitar) lightens the editorial concern that should be placed before choosing a further, avoidable, note omission or passage alteration; secondly, whether this possibility could also be responsible for the editor choosing to prioritise the pragmatic alteration in the main text instead of suggesting the altered passage as a second option in an *ossia* or footnote. Koonce's exceptional edition of the lute works contains a small number of note omissions in mm. 17-18 of the *Giga*, BWV 996 in the main text. His alternative suggestion in an *ossia* stave contains *further* omissions. The playable passage is technically demanding and the editorial choices are certainly thoughtful. I am concerned though, that the editor includes a reading of the sources in the end notes of the movement and without any fingering suggestions, in a passage where the technical demands render fingering suggestions all the more important. Not all deviations have the same impact. For example, the omission of a chordal note that does not affect the voicing of the passage could be justified if its performance would impede the phrasing of the passage. However, previous transcriptions include alterations that change substantially the musical passage. They were made to facilitate the performance in technical terms, but they obstruct the interpretation, since we are prevented from hearing something that

was meant to be there for a reason, and instead we hear, for pragmatic reasons, something that was not meant to be there. The frequent alteration of the long passage mm. 63-78 of the *Prelude* BWV 1006a, where the pedal note is written one octave lower than it appears in the autograph, has a rather important impact, both in the altered passage, but also in the phrase that follows in m. 79. I have chosen, with very few exceptions, not to deviate from the manuscript sources when this deviation is avoidable: this decision arises from my belief that an edition is for *use* – it is a starting point from which an individual performer may themselves ‘deviate’. This is not to suggest that my editorial choices do not always reflect my performance suggestions. On the contrary, in such a subtle situation as an alteration of a passage, my suggestions centre on how the passage can be performed without alteration; if an alteration is to be made then this is a well-weighed choice that the performer makes according to the palette of his or her individual technique: the change (and perhaps significantly the means of concealing it) will accommodate the performer’s individual potential.

‘Missing’ information in the sources

A certain freedom of deviation exists within the baroque convention of musical notation. This freedom relates to a handwritten musical text and to the fact that scribes, in certain instances, considered the notation of information that is implied to be superfluous – or added information in order to avoid a possible misunderstanding or to facilitate reading. In my commentary, I have noted the omission of implied accidentals and the notation of cautionary accidentals in the manuscript sources. In some cases, I have also further commented on an implied omission or a deliberate addition. Regarding the omission of rests, in my transcriptions I have chosen either to preserve what appears in the sources, or to add a rest that is ‘missing’ in the sources in a smaller size than the notated rests. This choice of notation of rests in my transcriptions and the mentioning of accidental omissions and additions in my commentary does not reflect a mere adherence to the sources: it supports performers’ familiarity with common notational practices of the era, and also with individuals’ idiosyncratic notational practices, as can be seen in the noted differences in notating accidentals between the different scribes of the sources of the Suite in e minor, BWV 996. It also supports awareness of the different conditions under which a particular manuscript had been written: the notational differences we can observe among the autographs of the lute works promote an understanding of the relationship between the sources, where the autograph of the Suite in E major BWV 1006a, for example, seems to be a final fair copy, unlike the autographs of the Suite in g minor BWV 995 and the Prelude, Fuga and Allegro, in Eb major BWV 998. It also avoids the loss of a

very important possibility: the possibility that an apparent notational omission could add, rather than subtract, information. Maybe, in certain instances, the omission could mean something more than ‘the rest, or the natural sign, is obviously there’. Two examples of possible intended omissions are the missing of the natural sign on the *d*, in the autograph of the *Prelude* from the Suite in E major BWV 1006a (m. 74) and the missing of the crotchet rest in m. 14 of the *Courante* BWV 996, in Gerber’s manuscript and Source C. I have commented on these omissions in the ‘commentary upon the examination of manuscript sources’. Where I have not identified such a possibility, then, the omission could mean ‘the rest or the accidental is obviously there’, or, there may be another reason that I have not yet been able to identify.

Choosing fingerings that allow prolonging the written value of certain notes

In the section ‘Implied polyphony’, below, I explain the reasons why I might wish to prolong the written value of certain notes. I also note that this prolongation does not always pertain to the implied polyphony. In the choice of fingerings, this is of extreme importance, since the subsequent note of any prolongation has to be performed on a different string and the choice of subsequent fingerings should allow this prolongation. My choice of fingerings, in these instances, follows something that I think is suggested in the music, not in the notation. Where, in other words, there is a difference in my perception, between what is written and what is suggested for the performance, this difference is rendered in the choice of the fingerings. This is something that I have observed in existing transcriptions: the choice of fingerings in certain instances clearly suggests the prolongation of a certain note’s duration. However, this approach may not persist throughout the piece. In similar passages, the choice of fingerings may not allow the prolongation of the note. This usually happens when the prolongation would be more technically demanding, or when the fingerings would appear idiosyncratic. I believe that most editors are unwilling to choose unusual fingerings, even if they would be musically consistent with something that has already been introduced in their previous choices, or something that will be introduced later. This is, I think, the case even if the unusual fingering is not technically more demanding, since the written value of the notes is preserved (and here we see a preference to avoid notating something ‘strange’ when the more ‘usual’ choice still follows what appears in the notation). MM. 73-96 of the Allegro BWV 998, is a remarkable passage where the melodic line of implied voices brings together numerous figures delineated in the notated upper voice as the music unfolds. Right from the start of the passage the fingering choices in Jerry Willard’s edition demonstrate beautifully his wish to bring out the implied voice introduced by *d-c* natural-*b* (Eb: eb-db-c). This is evident, I think, as the *b* is shown to be performed on the 3rd string,

allowing the prolongation of the noted duration. In m. 75, however, the prolongation of the written value of *e* is not possible, since the next note is shown to be performed on the same string. In my approach to fingering, I have considered it as important to choose fingerings that allow the prolongation of a note where the music, in my perception, requires this, as it is to choose fingerings that allow the performance of the written value of the notes. The way of realizing fingerings therefore remains consistent throughout the piece. My choice of fingerings in the *Prelude* BWV 1006a and the *Allegro* BWV 998 exemplify this way of working, since these are the movements that require, I suggest, the most frequent prolongation of the written value of certain notes. My recordings of these movements demonstrate these choices.

The use of open strings

The use of open strings is really important in the fingerings, since it can facilitate the interpretation in important ways: continuing my previous line of thinking, when the prolongation of the written value of a note can be rendered by an open string, this facilitates the performance from a technical perspective, since it does not require the use of a left-hand finger. For that reason, it can also increase the time available to changing hand positions, or allow a smoother connection between difficult left-hand positions. The utilisation of open strings further justifies the choice of scordatura in the transcriptions of the *Suite* in g minor, BWV 995 and the *Fuga* in g minor, BWV 1000.

The different tone quality of strings

The different tone quality of open strings and the different timbres of the different strings of the guitar are important tools to unify but also, equally important, to differentiate musical elements: the similar timbre of fretted notes performed on the same string can be used to give a coherent timbral character to selected elements, while the decision to use an open or different string will create a distinct colour. My comments in the previous two paragraphs refer mainly to the prolongation of the written value of certain notes – such prolongation will result in a differentiation of the tone quality of the prolonged note compared to the ones to follow, since they have to be performed on a different string, which, in this case, is not unwelcome. The use of an open string though, will necessitate a further differentiation of tone quality between the prolonged note and the ones that precede it, which may also serve an artistic purpose, depending on the reason for the prolongation.

In some cases, notes have to be performed on a different or an open string, and this does not always relate to the prolongation of a note's duration. Even though this is inevitable, in most of the cases there is an element of choice – even if rather limited in many cases – as to where exactly the change of string or the use of an open string will happen. In most of the cases, this choice entails the thought 'what element of the music this choice will *not* support'. Every case is unique, and it is a matter of prioritising what we consider to be most important.

Use of fingerings that seem unconventional but facilitate the interpretation

I rarely encountered the use of unconventional fingerings in the transcriptions I examined. I believe, as I have already mentioned, that most of the editors are hesitant to use fingerings that appear unusual at first sight. However, if the musical passage allows more than one choice, it really could make sense (to use one example), that the index finger of the left hand be followed by the little finger, where it would usually be followed by the middle or the ring finger, providing the next note is fingered in such a way as to be performed further to the left of the position that the index finger had. What might seem unusual can be underpinned by the musical logic of the passage in question.

It is evident, but worth noting, that to a certain degree, the choice of fingerings reflects my interpretive suggestions.

Notes on my performance practice

Introduction

These notes on my performance practice originated in the notes that I made in the margins of my transcriptions or in the margins of prior transcriptions, and on any kind of paper I found near me while practising the works. Initially, they represented the unstructured thoughts of (I believe) a careful listener whenever something drew her attention while practising. Subsequently, I elaborated upon them and organized my notes into categories in an effort to examine their content more coherently. In addition, some further notes were taken after reflecting on my recordings, trying to position myself on the audience's side. A great number of my thoughts pertain to implied polyphony and horizontal movement, two issues that are closely connected, as we shall see. Some of my notes more properly referred to different stages of my transcription process and I have included them in the relevant sections above. Still other notes have been omitted. I found this process really beneficial, both as a performer who feels a profound need to preserve a discursive approach, but also as a scholar who, when performing, needs to be able to choose to set these concerns aside temporarily.

Notes in dynamics

I started my notes in dynamics after working on some specific passages of the *Fuga* BWV 998, including the first 'lonely' solo entry of the theme, trying to understand *why* I perform them in the way I do, in terms of the dynamic level; how, ideally, I would *want* to perform them and *why*; and whether there is a notable difference between these two that I need to address and so rethink my answers, my performance decisions, and possibly even my starting points.

Even when I put aside the question of technical limitations, it was and remains impossible for me to fully understand why I perform a given note the way I do, in terms of dynamic intensity; why I perform it *differently* from the notes that were heard immediately before and the notes that will follow. However, I can clearly perceive some elements that might have an effect on the dynamic level, and I wanted to reflect on these in an effort to help myself understand better what I cannot express verbally, whether because I am unable to define it or am unaware of its being there.

Some elements are obvious, and some are more connected to my particular perception of the music. Before I start, however, I should clarify few things: firstly, the use of dynamics in a particular instance

can be to work against a given element to achieve a surprise effect, possibly very beautifully if effectively realized. By this I mean that the performer might choose *not* to follow what the musical element 'naturally', or perhaps 'traditionally' suggests. To acknowledge that we feel a surprise if a performer gradually *lessens* the sound intensity of an upward melody, is to acknowledge the fact that the rising phrase entails a performance suggestion, otherwise there would be no surprise. Additionally, the use of dynamics in relation to the other, less obvious elements, can also achieve a surprise effect, since these elements entail a performance suggestion in the performer's individual perception of music. Briefly, the moment we realize certain features in the music is at the same time a moment of choice.

Secondly, the separation of musical elements in my list below can only be made in the abstract. A *real* note belonging to a piece, generally entails more than one of these elements, and these elements do not always occur together in consort, as, for example, in the case of a consonant chord preceded by a dissonant chord that is placed on a weaker pulse. What it is interesting, though, is that it is not always easy to understand which element might prevail in such cases.

Elements that entail or can entail a performance suggestion in dynamics

1. Melodic motion

The upward motion of the melody aligns with an increase in dynamic level.

2. Rhythm

According to the rhythmic distribution of the meters, the strong pulses or sub-pulses of the meter entail a dynamic stress.

3. Harmony

a. Consonance and dissonance: dissonances (and here I am not referring to unaccented passing and neighbour tones) hold more tension than consonances, involving a dynamic stress.

b. Tonic centre: the pull of the tonic centre creates tension that implies a dynamic increase.

d. Harmonic motion: an increase in dynamic level supports the effect of musical tension created by the enrichment of the harmonic motion.

4. Structure

- a. Differentiation of musical sections: points of tension before cadences and towards the end of musical parts.
- b. A break in melodic, metrical or harmonic symmetry: the performer may wish to further emphasize with a dynamic change something unexpected.

5. Articulation

Use of dynamics as a form of articulation, to unite or single out musical elements – thus differentiating them from others, supporting the clarity of the performance.

6. The element of repetition

Dynamics have a prominent role in the character of musical repetitions. Depending on the musical placement of the repeated section, the repetition could have an 'echo' role or an 'emphatic' role (repeating decisively what was said before); it could indicate the end of a musical section or a long phrase (the last important words), or invite the listener or a performer to a more personal hearing or performance (this is familiar). Regarding the 'echo' and the 'emphatic' roles, I would suggest that quite often in the lute works one repetition attributes an 'echo' element to the passage. However, when the section is repeated twice, this repetition tends to be emphatic, as if the music says 'listen to me', 'listen to me!' **'listen to me!'**. I will use an example from the *Prelude BWV 1006a*, mm. 29-32 since, in a relatively small passage, I find these two different functions of repetitions. In m. 29, the motif including the notes *e-f#-g#*, starting in the third position of the 1st beat, is repeated only once, on the same position of beat 2. The repetition of the notes on the 3rd beat is not to be seen as a second repetition of the motif, since the *g#* does not function as the concluding note of the motif in the second repetition (m. 30, beat 1, position 1). Similarly, in m. 30, the motif *g#-a-b*. However, in mm. 31-32, the motif *b-c#-d* natural, is repeated twice, since in the second repetition the *d* natural does function as the concluding note of the motif. As I perceive the music, the repetition of the motif in mm. 29 and 30 has an 'echo' role while in m. 31, the repetitions are emphatic.

Suite in E major, BWV 1006a, Prelude, mm. 29-32

7. Polyphony

The dynamic level of a note will also relate to any other voices that may take place at the same time.

8. Phrase destination

The use of dynamics can support denoting the position of a note within a phrase: from where the note derived (what was heard before), what it supports (what we are listening to now), and where it will lead to (what we know or expect to follow)?

9. To where does the note belong?

From the moment a note is part of a musical piece, it belongs to a melodic, rhythmical and harmonic structure. However, in our trying to answer the question 'to where does this note belong', our thoughts try to find something additional, something that the structure of the music entails. Is this note part of one or more phrases, is it part of a motif, a musical figure, or, is it part of a subject of a fugue? The four notes of a motif, as I perceive it, are not the melody, or a section of the melody, but an additional characteristic of this section of the melody. What perhaps justifies that and also makes it very interesting in terms of the choice of dynamics from the part of the performer, is that this additional element can be overlooked. It is there, but it can be missed.

Horizontal movement

Regarding horizontal movement, I think it is worth speaking about certain aspects of the nature of the guitar, both as a polyphonic and a plucked instrument. It is interesting to consider one specific difference between the guitar and keyboard instruments, a difference that could apply to plucked instruments in general, in relation to their common categorization as polyphonic instruments: this is the way of performing the notes on the guitar, where the right hand is generally responsible for the start of the note's sound production, thus allocating to the thumb the main responsibility for the lower register. This fact favours the performance of pieces where the lower voice is not so agile, where the bass has mainly a rhythmic and harmonic supporting role. Perhaps due to performance and listening habits, I believe it is, if not more difficult then at least less easy, for a guitarist, compared to a keyboardist, to perceive where there is a bass melodic line or a horizontal movement in the bass, even if the melodic line of the bass can be easily supported by the right hand technique. It is worth mentioning that the choice of the ten-string guitar, an instrument with seven bass strings and three treble strings, attaches additional importance to the bass notes, and I do not mean in comparison to the trebles. For a guitarist, the moment of choosing to perform on a ten-string guitar

is a moment of adding a new means of performance. This choice presupposes thought and this thought includes undoubtedly a focus on the lower register. From that moment, the performer may come closer to a new way of seeing the polyphonic nature of the guitar. The ten-string guitar allows the guitarist to develop an additional 'sensitivity' towards lower voices. However, what may stand out as being different in our hearing experience when performing on this instrument, is not just this additional sensitivity, but also our being allowed to give a more balanced allocation of weight in the different voices and their direction, their movement. This support is an important companion in performing the lute works, where movement can appear in all the voices, where phrases of the bass line (already a proof of its horizontal movement), do not start or conclude at the same metrical place as the upper voices (an unquestionable proof of its horizontal movement) and where phrases are moving from higher to lower registers, offering a richness of sound palette that is inevitably downscaled on the six-string guitar.

Nonetheless, the ten-string guitar remains a plucked string instrument and is therefore fundamentally different to the bowed strings when we consider horizontal movement. If a note is seen to belong to a melodic line, it has to 'go somewhere'. On the guitar, a change of dynamic levels of a melodic line cannot be gradual: it is always accompanied with an inevitable falling off sound between the notes. In performing two notes, you clearly perceive the decreasing dynamic/intensity envelope of each note. When the note has to 'go somewhere', as in a continuous phrase, this journey, less easily perceived on the guitar, is of great importance. The nature of the guitar entails an additional effort, but as we shall see, it also facilitates our interpretation.

An interesting passage to comment on is from the *Fuga* BWV 998, mm. 47-63. The movements of the notes and the phrases of the different voices presented to me an interest that I noted while practising and want to share.

Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998, Fuga, m. 47

As indicated by the arrows in the example above, the phrases of both voices start with the note *subsequent* to the first note of the 1st beat. So, it is the most active voice's phrase that starts first,

the soprano, in a different metrical level from that of the bass, which starts on the 2nd beat, since, unlike the soprano, there are no subdivisions that fall between the beats. That entails the possibility of focussing my performance attention on the soprano voice that starts first and realizing a 'vertical' performance for the notes of the bass, seeing them only as a rhythmic and harmonic support. If I conceive of both lines as melodic voices, the performative decisions multiply. What do I want to stress? Both melodic lines? If yes, and I stress them both equally, will the listener hear them as equal? It is interesting to think about the following parameters: a. the phrase that is heard first attracts attention; b. If I am thinking of the listener, he or she probably follows melodies of higher pitch as a listening habit, since higher voices generally have a more melodic structure and, whether we emphasize its melodic aspect or not, the bass does also operate, as a rhythmic and harmonic support; c. The listener will probably tend to follow the notes of the higher voice where the bass does not move. These 'lonely' notes in the higher voice attract 'naturally' the attention of the listener or could draw attention away from the bass melodic line. Consequently, I may need to consider *further* supporting the listener if I am aiming to have him or her following the bass *line*, in the sense that the movement of a more quickly moving voice is more easily followed.

In terms of drawing attention to *both* melodic lines, things become more interesting if we consider the phrases and sub-phrases, their metrical placement and duration. Especially interesting is the fact that the long phrases of the different voices conclude together, whereas we observe sometimes a difference in the duration in their individual sub-phrases and a breaking of symmetry, which holds a special significance in the music.

mm. 47-63

i. mm. 47-51

Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998, Fuga, mm. 47-51

The first complete phrase starts immediately *after* the first note of the 1st beat and concludes *on* the downbeat of m. 51, in both voices. The sub-phrases of the bass last for four beats: they are placed in the same metrical level as the subject of the fugue, the first three being melodic variations of the *first* phrase of the subject, and the last one of the *second*, beautifully connecting these four-sub phrases and also denoting the end of the first complete phrase. Regarding the more active voice of the soprano, it has sub-phrases of a different duration. The smallest ‘unit’ of musical information that *reaches* a destination consists of four notes, equal to one beat. These four notes are rather like *one* word that constitutes a part of a sentence. The sub-phrases of the soprano consist of two of these figures, equal to two beats. I liken these sub-phrases to two words that constitute part of a sentence, giving additionally a meaning on their own. So, in the sentence ‘I love these books’ are the words ‘I love’, or ‘these books’. The connection between the sub-phrase ‘I love’ and the sub-phrase ‘these books’ is importantly further denoted when relating them with the longer sub-phrase of the bass that takes place at the same time. The significance of perceiving the independent movement of different voices is somehow lost if we do not perceive their interrelatedness. While the sub-phrases of the bass preserve a durational and metrical symmetry, the durational and metrical symmetry of the soprano is broken (the voices move independently). It is interesting to consider the *g* sharp note

of m. 49 of the soprano: it is both the end of the sub-phrase and *also* the start of the next one. Thus, the next sub-phrase starts at a different metrical level (on the beat), and its duration – denoted by the implied additional line of the leading note of every semiquaver group that is moving stepwise – exceeds the duration of the bass sub-phrase, lasting for six and a quarter beats. The soprano phrase, however, meets the bass voice at the end of the first complete phrase at m. 51 (connecting the independent movement of the voices). It is this break in metrical symmetry that the *g* sharp introduces on the 3rd beat of m. 49, which often results in performances of the *Fuga* in the displacement of the two last bass sub-phrases, as the *b* of the bass (where we hear the *g* sharp in the soprano) is performed as though it were start of the phrase and not a melodic continuation of the previous *d*.

ii. mm. 51-55

Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998, Fuga, mm. 51-55

During the second complete phrase the smallest sub-phrases of the bass again lasts for four beats. Here there is an evident element of question-and-answer, and we could also perceive a longer sub-phrase lasting eight beats (question: four beats – answer: four beats.) The duration of the sub-phrases of the soprano, denoted by the implied polyphony, are longer and coincide with the sub-phrases of the bass. The ending of the second complete phrase, though, holds a special interest. Whereas it would be expected to end immediately after the downbeat of m. 55, is prolonged for one more beat that is heard like an ending repetition, having already been introduced earlier in the

development of the *Fuga* (m. 33 and m. 37). Thus, there is again a disruption to the sub-phrase's durational symmetry and the next complete phrase starts and is divided in different metrical levels. This ending repetition will become a significant figure of the melodic texture of the soprano in the following complete phrase. Moreover, the bass at that point is not moving: there is a crotchet rest, which gives the appearance (the sub phrase of the bass ended on the 1st beat) of a rather important ending coinciding with the second complete phrase of the different voices. This crotchet rest, however, that will be repeated on the following complete phrase at the same metrical level, will *be* part of the bass phrase. We thus observe elements of the one complete phrase repeated in another, making a connection between the phrases, giving at the same time a compositional variety as they function differently. We can observe more of these connections and differentiations throughout. I would like to mention one of them that I like particularly. There are five instances throughout the development of the *Fuga* where two figures are incorporated in a single figuration. This phenomenon firstly appears in m. 44, then in mm. 52, 54 and 60, relating to the passage I am commenting on, and lastly in m. 76.

Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998, Fuga, m. 44

Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998, Fuga, m. 52

Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998, Fuga, m. 60

Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998, Fuga, m. 76

In m. 44, the melodic motion continues beautifully in the middle voice, while the soprano sings crotchet notes of stepwise motion. In m. 52 and m. 54, this musical figure is placed at the same metrical level. In m. 60, however, the figure crosses the bar line, creating the conditions for the subject to reappear on the 2nd beat of m. 62. In m. 76, the figure is placed again in a different metrical level and we hear a melodic variation of the figure, which incorporates part of the subject and follows the upward-downward motion that we found earlier on the piece – such a beautiful connection before the recapitulation.

iii. mm. 55-63

Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998, Fuga mm. 55-63

55

57

59

61

63

Continuing our discussion of this passage, the third complete phrase starts at m. 55 and continues until the end of the passage in question in m. 63. Here the duration of the sub-phrases of the bass is longer and they start on the 3rd beat, as we previously saw, lasting for eight beats. The third sub-phrase does not conclude on the 2nd beat of m. 61, but there is the feeling of an incomplete phrase

since the next phrase starts where the crotchet rest was before, on the 2nd and not on the 3rd beat, supporting the forward movement of the piece at this significant moment, where the soprano will continue as middle voice, and a new upper voice will sing the subject of the *Fuga* (this is where we find the figure I was referring to before). In the soprano, the phrase starts from the second semiquaver of the semiquaver group of the 2nd beat. There is again the smallest musical information of four notes, the 2 beat sub-phrase and the larger 8 beat sub-phrase. The longer sub-phrase that starts from m. 59 in the *a* of the second group of semiquaver notes, concludes in the first *e* of the 2nd beat of m. 61, with the difference, however, that this *e* is, in addition, the start of the next sub-phrase. Thus the metrical level is changed again following the subject's reappearance. In m. 63 the *d* is not a crotchet and beautifully, the middle voice unperceivably disappears.

If now, in the passage in question, I hear the soprano, additionally, at different levels, I also hear additional phrases, as if there were two and at certain passages three soprano voices that sing the soprano line. It is very interesting that throughout the lute works we very often find long passages where these additional layers comprise notes that are moving stepwise. The notes that create these additional layers are usually significant notes of the phrasing of the soprano's written monophonic line (concluding or starting notes of small phrases, depending on whether the phrase starts on the beat – starting note, or immediately after – concluding note), placed usually in a significant metrical position, on the beat or its strong subdivisions. Others are obviously singled out, since the remaining notes of the melodic passage that they belong to are repeated to add harmonic and rhythmic support or because they give out a particular motif or figure.

Perhaps if the phrase of my verbal simile continues like: 'I love these books, because they are presents, from someone that I miss, my lovely mother', then it would be like I would hear this sentence, together with the sentence 'I love my mother'. Another performer, or me, some other time, would hear at the same time the sentence 'I love books', or 'I love presents', or 'presents of my mother' or 'I miss my lovely mother'. And here I hope I am not doing what Peter Kivy has aptly criticized:

Now if I am permitted to pick any point in a melody I wish, leave out or add any notes I wish, of course I can get motif IV from measures II and I2 [...] It is the well-known fallacy of finding what you want to find by putting on your 'finding' technique no restraints at all except the restraint of never allowing it to fail to 'find' what is wanted.

(Peter Kivy, *Music Alone* (Ithaca and London, 1990), pp. 136-137)

I do not single out notes that will form something that I want to hear, but in listening, I do find things that stand out. Here perhaps there will be some doubts regarding whether these elements exist in the music itself. I can only say again that I deal with performance acts and thoughts, both involving an individual interpretation. However, what really interests me, in addition to the fact that every single interpretation is different and there are potentially infinite ways of interpreting, is that there is, nonetheless, a common place where performers and audience meet: 'I books mother' does not make any sense.

Ornaments

Ornamentation is always present in my *practising*, not in the sense of how frequently I use it, but in the sense that I do not restrict myself if I feel like using it. In my decisions pertaining to the use of ornamentation in my *performances*, I did not feel any additional responsibility other than the responsibility to show my own view of the music, since there are no ornamentation symbols in my transcriptions other than those that the sources indicate, with very few exceptions in editorial brackets (implied cadential trills).

Ornaments, as their name indicates, decorate the notes they are applied to. It is interesting to note however, that this function has other important consequences. It is the *passage* that the ornamented note is part of which is enriched melodically, rhythmically and, depending on the ornament, also harmonically, with the use of ornamentation and, furthermore, the ornament's frequent use or not, attaches a character to the whole movement. It is also interesting to note that the common use of certain ornaments in specific instances gives an additional message. When I listen to a cadential trill, perhaps more than listening to a decoration of a note, I hear a declaration of the end of a long phrase or a musical section, or a movement.

A thought on the improvisational character of ornamentation

The element of differentiation, attributing variety in the piece, is one of the reasons why ornamentation is used, as in a varied repeated passage or section. It is also interesting, though, to note the imitative character that ornamentation may also have, creating further musical unity. Written or added ornamentation can be inspired by what was heard before. Could added ornamentation be, also, inspired by what is known to be heard after? Would that undermine the improvisational character attached to added ornamentation? I was thinking of these questions when

I subsequently realised that some of my added ornamentation was inspired from what I knew would follow it (m. 23, Gavotte en Rondeaux, BWV 1006a).

It is interesting that some of the cautionary accidentals that appear in Bach's autographs and the manuscript sources of the lute works do not reflect the needs of a performer who *knows* the piece. In playing the subsequent notes the performer would understand, if not from the beginning, whether this note remains flattened, sharpened, or natural. This could indicate that these works were performed *prima vista*, or it could show Bach's wish to facilitate the performer (since there is always a *prima vista*, either in the performer's practice, or in a public performance). It also denotes a common notational practice of the era, where *prima vista* being an integral part of musical practice has affected the notation (although this type of cautionary accidental is apparent also in pieces that probably would not have been publicly performed *prima vista*).

Whatever the situation was, it is substantially different from the position of a contemporary performer. The lute works are well established in the guitar repertoire and their public performances are at least studied, if not well prepared. If the pieces were to be played without being practised, this would be the 'exception rather than the rule'. Even in such a case, the performer would very probably be aware of the piece. Moreover, it is not only the performer that knows the continuation of a piece, but very possibly the audience to which his or her performance is addressed as well.

The improvisational character of the performance of these works is substantially different from what it could be in the baroque era. If performers welcome their spontaneous reaction upon what the music 'tells' them, then, 'knowing the piece' can, inevitably, be part of it.

Staccato

It is interesting to think of staccato almost as a kind of ornamentation when it is applied to a single note, a harmonic interval, or a chord. It seems that when staccato is used, it fits better before a strong beat, before an accent, sometimes before an ornament (I am not, of course, referring here to staccato as a means to give character to a whole musical passage). Staccato rhythmically enriches a passage and has beautifully (and frequently) been used in performances of the lively-titled dances of a Suite. I am wondering, however, if there is something more to it than the rhythmical enrichment that singles out musical elements. It is interesting, because staccato differentiates (and so accents in a way) the note *before* the one that we want to single out, or the one that falls on a strong beat.

Perhaps it is this silence in between that stresses the note to follow. Perhaps it is because when a particular sound draws our attention (staccato in this instance), this moment has already gone and the attention is given to the next one, like when someone calls our name first, in order to tell us something that he or she wishes us to hear.

Implied polyphony

Seeing polyphony in a monophonically written passage is something that draws our attention, since it is not written – on the contrary, it is hidden in a way, it is subject to our interpretation, and it therefore involves us. This welcoming attention may nonetheless result in our emphasizing the polyphony. Our performing approach to implied polyphony should I think stress an equal emphasis in the word ‘implied’, not in the sense of *what* our performance choices would be, but in the sense of our *choosing* in performing to say explicitly something we believe is implicitly, though perhaps quite strongly, suggested. Following my comments regarding the nature of the guitar in the earlier discussion of horizontal movement, I think that performing implied polyphony on the guitar holds a special place. I perceive that there is something in between implied polyphony and overt polyphony that can be beautifully realized on plucked strings in particular. By this I mean you can actually play the implied polyphony, sustaining an ‘implied’ character; you can give a polyphonic attribute to a monophonic passage; you can single out notes, sustaining their melodic connection with their neighbouring ones; you can hold the sound of a note and continue its phrase in a different string without breaking this phrase. It is exactly this ambiguously perceived direction of the sound after its execution due to its inevitable falling off, that can create a positively connoted ‘vagueness’, in holding the sound of a note more than its written value. The *Prelude* BWV 998 is, in this regard, a representative example where I found something that I felt was missing when an unhelpful emphasis in favor of either monophony or polyphony was realized in performance.

In being able to follow our performance choices around any implied polyphony, the nature of the guitar is not a limitation. The way of executing a note, both in terms of differentiation of its sound quality and volume – our choices in the use of articulation and dynamics – more than supports a performer who wishes to delineate an additional layer in the written music. In the seven works, there are passages where this additional layer creates a beautiful and at times rather long phrase, the polyphonic perception connecting the relatively smaller sub phrases of the monophonic passage, also interacting with the longer phrases of the less active voices, further differentiating the musical parts of the movement. Naturally, the increased coherence of the piece, that you feel ‘it really

means something', reinforces our sense of the 'strength' of the implication that underpins the additional line.

Singling out a note creates the illusion of a pause in the unfolding of the piece, giving a significance both to the moment when the note appears, but also to its direction, until it reaches the next note that is also connected.

I will continue this discussion on holding the sound of a note more than its written value, following more a continuity of idea rather than an adherence to the title of this section. To avoid confusion, I am not speaking here about delaying the time I perform the next note. Rather, I am focusing on holding the sound of a note whether or not I delay the performance of the next one. At times, I choose to prolong the sound of a note because not to do so feels like a peremptory interruption of that precious moment I feel I need after something important was said. This might be the case for concluding notes of figures or motives inside a passage. At other times, I prolong the sound because it feels that I would otherwise omit a perceived punctuation mark or comma between two phrases in the piece. This is directly connected with the decision not to prolong the sound of a note where there is no perceived comma, especially where we might usually find one. In so doing, I feel I support the break in symmetry that I see in the music. In the music of Bach, these moments are rather significant, as I have previously discussed in the section on horizontal movement, giving a forward momentum between sections and phrase transitions, unifying the musical texture within longer phrases. In terms of interpretation this can be of great significance since a desire to denote the end of a section and the transition into another, has not, as I see it, to do with the way we perform the last note, but with the way we perform the previous ones, the way we arrive at that last note. It seems obvious, but in terms of its sense of direction, performing a note that functions both as the end of one phrase and the start of another phrase, is by definition to perform it as a start of a phrase, simply, but significantly, because the piece continues. At other times, I single out chordal notes of a passage that they do not create a different layer, when I want to enrich the harmonic connection of a melody, or notes that belong to a stronger metric subdivision to create additional rhythmical enrichment. It is interesting to note that in treatises of the time, these notes were named 'good' notes:

You must know how to make a distinction in execution between the *principal notes*, ordinarily called *accented* or in the Italian manner, *good* notes, and those that *pass*, which

some foreigners call *bad* notes. Where it is possible, the principal notes always must be emphasized more than the passing.¹⁰

These observations are directly connected with the way I realize fingerings and present I think the point of the most notable differentiation between my transcriptions and previous performance editions.

It is interesting to note here, an idiosyncrasy of baroque notation. Groups of notes that share a common beam do not necessarily have stems in the same direction. This usually happens when the notes have a considerable pitch difference, moments that a performer may learn to pay attention to, whether as moments of implied polyphony, or as moments of a phrasing separation, that may attract our performance attention. In baroque notation, these moments are more evident visually, as the notes are, in a way, separated, while keeping at the same time the important connection that their common beam attaches to them. Even in groups of notes that do have stems in the same direction, as in standard modern notation, notes can still be more visually separated, as the length of the stem depends on the scribe's individual writing or, perhaps, intentions. The autograph of the *Prelude* BWV 1006a is a wonderful example where all of these possibilities are clearly demonstrated.

There are two similar passages that drew my attention: mm. 17-28 and mm. 67-78. The reason for this is that they are quite unique in terms of the unchanged placement of the note that can be considered to create an additional layer, which is the *last* note of *every* semiquaver group, together with the fact that the passage is rather long and the sustained note of the pedal point is separated from the group of semiquavers that in these passages unites three instead of four notes under the same beam. We see these notes as creating an additional layer not only because they are moving stepwise: the note of the upper voice of the measure to follow these passages is clearly a continuation of the perceived additional line, from *f* sharp to *e* (m. 29) and from *b* to *a* (m. 79), the concluding note being on the beat, starting a new phrase, as the piece moves forwards. When I looked at the manuscript I was surprised to notice a very interesting detail: although not evident in the first passage, throughout the second passage (mm. 67-78), wherever the stems of these notes have the same motion as the rest of the semiquavers, that is, when there is not an evident visual separation, the stem of the note extends beyond the beam in a proportion that could strongly suggest it was made on purpose. In the remaining autographs of the lute works, there are a lot of instances where the stem of the note extends beyond the beam, as would be expected in a

¹⁰ Quantz, J. J., *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen* (Berlin, 1752); trans. into English by Reilly E. R. (London, 1966; pbk. ed. 1976; 2nd ed. 1985; reissued 2001), p. 123.

manuscript, but not in such proportion with an immediate repetition. I would speculate that these passages are unique in these terms. Thus, Bach seemed to be especially concerned with the clarity of notation evident within notational rules (for example the separated sustained note) and very possibly beyond the usual rules (in the extension of the stem), suggesting that this concern may pertain to guiding the performer's interpretative reading. In the autograph of the violin version, the stem prolongation of these notes is still evident, and it is also quite evident in the second passage. Still, though, the second passage of BWV 1006a remains unique, since Bach, in both passages of BWV 1006, used many more times this note having a stem with a different direction, and thus being visually separated. It is interesting that in the violin, in both passages, the relationship between this note and the note of the measure that follows the passages in question (and which is placed on the beat) is very clear, since that note has a different stem direction (rather than an extended stem) which also corresponds with the stem direction of the connecting note: their connection is very clear to the eye. Furthermore, in the second passage, the ledger line Bach uses for this note exceeds the bar line to be used in the next measure, further visually connecting these notes. In the first passage, Bach uses the different stem direction in both manuscripts in the last measure, but in BWV 1006a he changes stave, so that the connection to the next note is clearer in the violin manuscript.

Suite in E major, BWV 1006a, Prelude, mm. 17-29



Suite in E major, BWV 1006a, Prelude, 2nd beat of m. 65-2nd beat of m. 79



Moving to the less active voice of the bass, holding the sound has mainly the function of sustaining the harmonic support. The follow comments refer to a further peculiarity in notation that may relate to the sustaining of notes, and an important effect that adherence to the notation may have on the phrasing of the active upper voice.

Looking at the manuscripts of the lute works, I noticed that it is very rare that the duration of the bass exceeds the duration of the beat. The *Sarabande* of the Suite in e minor, BWV 996 is one of the very few exceptions, however, in this instance, the importance of the 2nd beat and the significance of the polyphonic relationship between the bass and middle voice requires rhythmic precision. In the titled dances of simple triple time, I included the performance pulse¹¹ (*crotchet*-quaver in 3/8). It worth mentioning that in the compound rhythms, if a dot could be used (the bass does not move within the beat or the rest does not last less than a beat), the dot is used *only* in rests. Instead of a dotted crotchet note, there is always a crotchet and a quaver rest. The only exception where the dotted beat is used in the bass notes as well, is the *Fuga* BWV 997 and this is due to contrapuntal correspondence. The instances where the bass exceeds the duration of the beat can be easily recognized as belonging to a few categories:

¹¹ By performance pulse here I am referring to the way the beats of the measure are brought together, due to a prevalent rhythmical unit that incorporates more than one beat as it is strictly defined by the time signature.

- Homophonic chordal texture, mainly in the end of movements or parts.
- Last bar of the movement or parts.
- Approaching the final cadences, or at the final cadences of the end of movements or parts (I include m. 77 of the *Prelude* BWV 995 in this category).
- When the bass value exceeds the duration of a whole measure.
- When there is syncopation either in the bass or upper voice.

The only two exceptions are both found in the Suite in e minor, BWV 996. In m. 68 of the *Præludio*, the duration of the bass exceeds the duration of the beat, probably because in measures 64 and 66 the bass value exceeds the duration of the whole measure. I have not found a plausible explanation for the second exception, which occurs in measure 3 of the *Allemande*,¹² since in similar passages of the same movement the bass duration does not exceed the beat, as expected.

It is striking that *whenever* the predominant role of the bass is a harmonic and rhythmic support and it does not move within the beat, this exact function is interrupted. By this I mean that there is always a rest after the beat duration (or before in compound rhythms), before a change of harmony. Whether these rest(s) are meant to be followed can be further questioned. Moreover, if the rest(s) are to be followed, this would accent the suddenly lonely sound of the active voice. In the *très vite* of *Prelude* BWV 995 there are several instances where this indirect accent does not correspond with the phrase of the passing notes of the soprano, which has started before the bass rest (e.g. mm. 64-70). This is even more apparent when the notes of the soprano are embraced by a slur (m. 184). The *Prelude* of the suite in E major, BWV 1006a, where the bass functions mainly as harmonic and

¹² Even though the duration of the notes is not notated in a tablature, Weyrauch's tablature, the primary source of the *Fuga* BWV 1000, probably suggests a minim duration in the bass notes of mm. 39-42 (This fact is reinforced by the reading of the manuscript D-LEm III.11.4, Faszikel 2, derivative of Weyrauch's tablature, which notates minims in the duration of the bass notes. As expected, the manuscript D-LEm Poel. mus. Ms. 30, Faszikel 2, derivative of D-LEm III.11.4, Faszikel 2, also reads minims.) However, precisely because there is no durational notation in a tablature, what is *suggested* notation-wise, can entail a performance suggestion. If there was an autograph of the *Fuga* BWV 1000, what would have been the duration of the bass notes in these measures? Correspondence with the autograph of the violin sonata BWV 1001, strongly suggests minim as well. Nonetheless, mm. 39-42 of the *Fuga* (mm. 37-40 in the violin version) is not an exception: even though that the *written* beat of the *alla breve* fugue is crotchet, apart from where the theme occurs, here is the only occasion in the autograph (together with m. 35 and m. 36 in the violin version where is interesting to note that there are minims in the upper voices), where, without a theme's appearance, Bach groups four quavers instead of two; the notational beat symmetry is still followed. It is interesting to note that Weyrauch notated one bass note in m. 43, probably suggesting a duration of a semibreve in the bass (the direct and indirect manuscript derivatives of Weyrauch's tablature also read a semibreve note), unlike the two minims that appear in the autograph of the violin sonata, reflecting the implication of the tablature that I mentioned above. I will further comment that suggested semibreve in Weyrauch's tablature, providing that the notation of a single bass note was intended. Whether the notation of a single bass note was Weyrauch's or Bach's decision, this reflects an *alternative* suggestion, since in m. 43, we could expect two minims (or suggested minims). If there was a minim in m. 43, it would be followed by another minim.

rhythmic support, is a representative example of this peculiarity in notation and, reviewing my recordings, I would now prefer not to follow exactly the duration of the bass in certain measures were I to re-record this movement.

Colin Booth notes that ‘throughout pre-Classical music, the notation defines reasonably clearly where a note starts, but not where it ends’¹³. It can be assumed that Bach preserved a beat symmetry in the notation of the bass notes, the duration of which may have a *notational* function.

Concluding remarks

In performing the lute works on the ten-string guitar, the performer can enter into a beautiful engagement with the music and its notation: what is written, what may be derived from what is written, what might not be as it appears, and what might not be meant to be followed. In any case, it is the reading of the manuscripts that will help us find what we are looking for. Perhaps Patricia Kopatchinskaja meant something similar when she said: ‘If you do what’s written in the notes, then it’s more than enough. But you shouldn’t hide behind them’.¹⁴

Matters such as implied polyphony and ‘significant’ notes, are, to a degree, dependent on individual perception, albeit that perception can be more, or less, justified. In relation to practising and performing Bach’s music, I have heard on a number of occasions the phrase: ‘Every time I practise, I see something different’. While I concur with the sentiment expressed, it is very difficult to understand whether it is the music that somehow speaks to us differently each time we engage with it, or it is something in the state of our mind and emotions that means we find ourselves attracted to something different in this rich music. Perhaps there is no difference. Whatever is the case, the conscious element of choices that a performance inevitably entails, shapes what we chose to say from what we hear. In our minds we add, but choice entails something that we leave apart.

¹³ Colin Booth, *Did Bach Really Mean That? Deceptive Notation in Baroque Keyboard Music* (Wells, 2010), p. 41.

¹⁴ *A Day in the Life of Patricia Kopatchinskaja*. Dir. Claus Wischmann. Westdeutscher Rundfunk, 2012. Film.

In the process of transcribing, performing and recording Johann Sebastian Bach's works for lute on a ten-string guitar, I experienced my most difficult and also my most beautiful moments as a musician. The process taught me, in the most profound way, that while questions may drive an artistic and scholarly process, they do not drive it to a final destination. This, however, was at the same time, a process of realization that any answers to the fundamental questions on performance will be *given* answers – answers, that is, which cannot be detached from the individual who gives them, and his or her time, answers that communicate one person's engagement with the music and its history, answers whose credibility ultimately rests on the success of the performance. Even if I could, I would not seek the contentment that I might feel on reaching an ending point: the beauty is in the engagement itself. I can find it in small details, like when I perform the lower *g* of the *Sarabande* BWV 995 or at the moment when I revise a choice of fingering, or I can find it in the wider project of engaging in a new way, as performer and editor, with the extraordinary body of music that is Bach's lute music.

Appendix

Information about the location of the manuscript sources of the lute works

This list provides the information collated in my effort to acquire the digital scans of the manuscript sources. The manuscript sources of the third violin partita BWV 1006 (violin version of the suite BWV 1006a), the first violin sonata BWV 1001 (includes the violin version of the *Fuga* BWV 1000), the *Fuga* BWV 539 (organ version of the *Fuga* BWV 1000) and the suite BWV 1011 (cello version of the Suite BWV 995) are also included. Scans of a considerable amount of these sources are provided by 'Bach digital' (www.bach-digital.de).

Dr Marie Cornaz (Curator)

music@kbr.be

Bibliothèque royale de Belgique

Section de la Musique

4 Boulevard de l'Empereur

1000 Bruxelles

Belgium

2 Sources

BWV 995. Autograph. Signature: Ms II 4085 Mus Fétis 2910.

BWV 996. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Ms II 4093 Mus Fétis 2960.

Dr. Martina Rebmann (Head of Music Department)

martina.rebmann@sbb.spk-berlin.de

Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preußischer

Kulturbesitz

Musikabteilung

Unter den Linden 8

10117 Berlin

Germany

32 Sources

BWV 539/2. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 282.

BWV 539/2. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 304.

BWV 539. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 517.

BWV 539/2. Scribe: Carl August Hartung, Ludwig August Christoph Hopff. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 213.

(Collection. 8 Fugues) BWV 539/2. Scribe: Carl August Hartung. Signature: Am.B 606.

BWV 996. Scribe: Johann Gottfried Walther. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 801.

BWV 996. Scribe: Heinrich Nikolaus Gerber. Signature: 55 MS 10149.

BWV 997. Scribe: Johann Friedrich Agricola. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 650.

BWV 997. Scribe: Johann Philipp Kirnberger. Signature: Mus.ms. Bach P 218.

BWV 997. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Mus.ms. Bach P 286.

BWV 997. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 552.

BWV 997. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Am.B 549-550.

BWV 997/4-5 Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Mus. ms. 30 196.

BWV 997. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 513.

BWV 997/4 Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Mus. ms. 30194.

BWV 997. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 308.

BWV 997. Scribe: Friedrich August Grasnick. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 413.

BWV 997/1. Scribe: Georg Bunte. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach St 334. (This is an arrangement of the Prelude for a string quartet).

BWV 1001-1006. Autograph. Signature: Mus. ms. P 967.

BWV 1001-1006. Scribe: Anna Magdalena. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 268.

BWV 1001-1006. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 267.

(Collection. 111 pieces) BWV 999, BWV 1001, BWV 1006 and BWV 1011. Scribe: Johann Peter Kellner. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 804.

BWV 1001-BWV 1006. Scribe: Emanuel Leberecht Gottschalck. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 968.

BWV 1001-BWV 1006. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 236.

BWV 1001-1006. Scribe: Johann Gottfried Berger. Signature: Mus.ms. Bach P 573.

BWV 1001-BWV 1006. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Am.B 70a.

BWV 1001-BWV 1006. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Am.B 70b.

BWV 1006a. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 641.

BWV 1006a. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 1158.

BWV 1006a. Scribe: Martinus Sieveking. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 1209.

BWV 1011. Scribe: Anna Magdalena. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 269.

BWV 1011. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Mus. ms. Bach P 289.

Frau Brigitte Geyer (Head of Music Department).

brigitte.geyer@leipzig.de

Leipziger Stadtbibliothek

Musikbibliothek

Wilhelm-Leuschner-Platz 10/11

04107 Leipzig

Germany

9 Sources

BWV 995. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Becker III, 11.3.

BWV 997. Scribe: Johann Christian Weyrach. Signature: Becker III. 11. 5.

BWV 997/2-3. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Peters Ms. 2a.

BWV 1000. Scribe: Johann Christian Weyrach. Signature: Sammlung Becker III. 11. 4, Faszikel 1.

BWV 1000. Scribe: Carl Ferdinand Becker: Signature: Becker III. 11. 4, Faszikel 2.

BWV 1000. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Poel. mus. Ms. 30, Faszikel 2.

BWV 1001/2. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Poel. mus. Ms.30, Faszikel 1.

BWV 1001-BWV 1006. Scribe: Johann Andreas Dröbs. Signature: Becker III.11.6.

BWV 1001. Scribe: Johann Andreas Kuhnau. Signature: Poel.mus.Ms.31.

Universität der Künste Berlin

Universitätsbibliothek

Fasanenstr. 88 (Ecke Hertzallee)

10623 Berlin

Germany

telephone 03031476473

ub-info@udk-berlin.de

1 source

BWV 997. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: 6138/18

Pernille Drost (Deputy Director)

kb@kb.dk

The Royal Library (Det Kongelige Bibliotek)

Søren Kierkegaards Plads 1

Postfach 2149

1016 København K

Denmark

1 source

BWV 997/2 Scribe: Unknown. Signature: mu 9412.0782.

Bach Archiv Leipzig

Thomaskirchhof 15/16

04109 Leipzig

Germany

info@bach-leipzig.de

2 sources

(Collective manuscript) BWV 539/2. Scribe: Eduard Grell. Signature: Go. S. 318a.

(Collective manuscript) BWV 997 and 998/1. Scribe: Alfred Dörffel. Signature: Go. S. 80.

The Library of the University of Lodz

ul. Jana Matejki 32/38

90-237 Łódź

Poland

sekretariat@lib.uni.lodz.pl

1 source

BWV 997. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: M 34998,2.

Dan Lundberg (Director of Archives and Library)

dan.lundberg@musikverk.se

MUSIK- OCH TEATERBIBLIOTEKET

P.O Box 163 26

SE-103 26 Stockholm

Sweden

1 source

BWV 1011. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Mazers saml. B:35 [Erstdruck] (*This is an early printed score*).

The British Library

St Pancras

96 Euston Road

London NW1 2DB

United Kingdom

customer-services@bl.uk

1 source

BWV 1001-BWV 1006. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Add. 32156.

Dr. Frank Pille (Senior Library Director)

pille@lmbv.de

Landesbibliothek Mecklenburg-Vorpommern

Günther Uecker

Musikaliensammlung

Johannes-Stelling-Str. 29

19053 Schwerin

Germany

1 source

BWV 1001. Scribe: Johann Peter Theodor Nehrlich. Signature: Mus.942.

Henry Watson Music Library
City Library Elliot House
151 Deansgate
Manchester M3 3WD
United Kingdom
henrywatsonmusiclibrary@manchester.gov.uk
r.edwards@manchester.gov.uk

1 source

BWV 1001-BWV 1006. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: BRm812Ba31.

Österreichische Nationalbibliothek
Josefsplatz 1
1015 Vienna
Austria

1 source

(Collective manuscript) BWV 1011. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: Mus. Hs. 5007.

Dr Marcel Atze
marcel.atze@wienbibliothek.at
Wienbibliothek im Rathaus
Rathaus
Felderstraße
1082
Austria

1 source

BWV 1001-1006. Scribe: Johann Friedrich Hering. Signature: MH 16561.

Sächsisches Staatsarchiv, Staatsarchiv, Leipzig
Schongauerstraße 1
04328 Leipzig
Germany
poststelle-l@sta.smi.sachsen.de

1 source

(Collection) BWV 539. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: 21081 Breitkopf & Härtel, Leipzig, Nr. 7375.

Mag. Dr. Eva Neumayr
eva.neumayr@archiv.kirchen.net
eva.neumayr@mozarteum.at
Internationale Stiftung Mozarteum &
Archiv der Erzdiözese Salzburg
Kapitelplatz 3
A - 5020 Salzburg
Austria

1 source

BWV 539. Scribe: Johann Mederitsch. Signature: MN 104, Faszikel 1.

Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde
Archives - Library - Collections
Bösendorferstrasse 12
A - 1010 Wien
Austria
Tel .: +43 1 505 86 81 44
office@a-wgm.com

1 source

BWV 539/2. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: VII 45327 (Q 11500) [SBQ 22500].

Bodleian Library
Broad Street
Oxford OX1 3BG
United Kingdom
reader.services@bodleian.ox.ac.uk

1 source

BWV 539. Scribe: Fanny Hensel. Signature: MS. M. Deneke Mendelssohn c. 70.

Dr Maren Goltz (Collection Curator)
m.goltz@meininger Museen.de
Meininger Museen, Sammlung Musikgeschichte, Max-Reger-Archiv
Schloss Elisabethenburg
Postfach 100554
98605 Meiningen
Germany

1 source

BWV 1006. Scribe: Richard Mühlfeld. Signature: NHs 628.

Lippische Landesbibliothek
Hornsche Straße 41
32756 Detmold
Germany
auskunft@llb-detmold.de

1 source

BWV 1006. Scribe: F. Müller. Signature: Mus - n 298.

BWV 1001-1006. Scribe: Unknown. Signature: US-R Slg. L. Goldberg BWV 1001-1006.

To date, I have not been able to confirm details of this source.

Musashino Academia Musicae
 1-13-1 Hazawa
 Nerima-ku
 Tokyo 176-8521
 Japan
 Telephone number: 0081339921121
toshokan@musashino-music.ac.jp

Responses to correspondence addressed this email have not been forthcoming, but I have gratefully received digital scans of the autograph of BWV 1006a, through my correspondence with Bach-Archiv Leipzig for the purpose of my study.

1 source

BWV 1006a. Autograph. Signature: Littera rara vol. 2-14.

Privately owned manuscripts:

4 sources

BWV 997. Manuscript owned by Ton Koopman.

I have gratefully received digital scans of this manuscript source through my correspondence with Eline Holl (Bibliotheek Ton Koopman / Amsterdam Baroque Orchestra & Choir) for the purpose of my study.

BWV 997. Wensiecki (D-Stuttgart).

To date, I have not been able to confirm details of this source.

BWV 998. Autograph. Unknown owner.

The current owner of the autograph BWV 998 is unknown. I have gratefully received scans of the autograph through my correspondence with Jerry Willard, for the purpose of my study.

BWV (1001-1006). D. Chaudière (F-Montpellier).

I have gratefully received digital scans of this manuscript source, through my correspondence with Bach-Archiv Leipzig for the purpose of my study.

Bibliography

Manuscript sources (examined from facsimile)

BWV 995, Autograph, B-Br , II 4085

BWV 995, D-LEm, III, 11.3

BWV 996, B-Br, II 4093

BWV 996, D-B, P 801.

BWV 996, D-B, 55 MS 10149

BWV 997, D-B , P 650

BWV 997, D-LEm, III. 11. 5

BWV 997, PL-ŁŻu, M 34998

BWV 997, D-B, P 218

BWV 997, manuscript owned by Ton Koopman

BWV 997, D-B, P 286

BWV 997, D-B, P 552

BWV 997, D-Bhm, 6138/18

BWV 997, D-B, Am.B 549-550

BWV 997/4-5, D-B, 30 196

BWV 997, D-B, P 513

BWV 997/4, D-B, 30194

BWV 997, D-B, P 308

BWV 997/2, DK-Kk, mu 9412.0782

BWV 997/2-3, D-LEm, Ms. 2a

BWV 997, D-B, P 413

BWV 997 and 998/1, D-LEb, Go. S. 80

BWV 997/1, D-B, St 334

BWV 998, Autograph, Privately owned

BWV 999 and BWV 1011, D-B , P 804

BWV 1000, D-LEm, III. 11. 4, Faszikel 1

BWV 1000, D-LEm, III. 11. 4, Faszikel 2

BWV 1000, D-LEm, Ms. 30

BWV 1001-1006, Autograph, D-B, P 967

BWV 1006a, Autograph, J-Tma , Littera rara vols. 2-14

BWV 1011, D-B, P 269

BWV 1011, D-B, P 289

BWV 1011, A-Wn, Hs. 5007

Musical editions

Abe, Y., *Bach Anthology revised edition* (Tokyo, 1999)

Azpiazu, J., *J.S. Bach Lautensuite IV* (1969, Munich)

Boudounis, E., *J.S. Bach, The Lute Works* (Athens, 2001)

BWV 1011, S-Skma , B:35

Calderon, J., *J.S. Bach Transcriptions for Classic Guitar* (Pacific, 1999)

Cherici, P., *J. S. Bach, Opere Per Liuto* (Milan, 1996)

Chiesa, R., *Opere per Liuto* (Milan, 1991)

Eötvös, J., *The Complete Lute Works* (Heidelberg, 2002; rpt. 2007)

Golan, L., *Bach: Three Sonatas & Three Partitas for Solo Violin, BWV 1001-1006* (Pacific, 2006)

Hopstock, T., *Johann Seb. Bach: Das Lautenwerk und verwandte Kompositionen im Urtext für Gitarre* (Darmstadt, 1994; rpt. with corrections 2004/2006)

Johann Seb. Bach: Suite a-moll BWV 995 (Darmstadt, 1999)

Johann Seb. Bach: Suite a-moll BWV 997 (Darmstadt, 1999)

Johann Seb. Bach: Präludium d-moll & Fuge a-moll BWV 999 / 1000 (Darmstadt, 2000)

Johann Seb. Bach: Präludium, Fuge & Allegro D-Dur (Darmstadt, 1999, rev. ed. 2010)

Jurica, S., *Johann Sebastian Bach: Suite in E Minor BWV 996* (Prague, 2002)

Kohlhase, T. and Hartwig Eichberg eds. *Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke: Serie V: Klavier und Lautenwerke: Band 10* (Kassel, 1976)

Koonce, F., *Johann Sebastian Bach: The Solo Lute Works* (San Diego, 1989; 2nd ed. 2002)

Lorimer, M., *Johann Sebastian Bach: Cello Suite V / Lute Suite III* (New York, 1977)

Mills, J., *Prelude, Fugue & Allegro in D* (Canada, 1979)

Scheit, K., *Joh. Seb. Bach: Suite E-Moll BWV 996* (Vienna, 1975)

Tureck, R. and Sharon Isbin, *Johann Sebastian Bach: Suite in E minor, BWV 996* (New York, 1984)

Johann Sebastian Bach: Suite in C minor, BWV 997 (New York, 1985)

Wensiecki, E., *Bach Johann Sebastian Bach: Lautenmusik* (Hofheim, 1965; 12th ed. 1986)

Willard, J., *Bach Lute Suites for Guitar* (New York, 1980)

Secondary sources

Adorno, T. W., *Prisms* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1967)

Agricola, J.F., *Anleitung zur Singkunst* (Berlin, 1757); trans. into English by Julianne C. Baird (Cambridge, 1995)

- Anthony, J. R., *French Baroque Music* (London, 1973)
- Bach, C. P. E., *Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen* (Berlin, 1753); trans. into English by William J. Mitchell (New York and London, 1949)
- Baron, E. G., *Historisch-theoretische und practische Untersuchung des Instruments der Lauten* (Nuremberg, 1727); trans. into English by Douglas Alton Smith (California, 1976)
- Bartel, D., *Musica Poetica* (Lincoln and London, 1977)
- Barthes, R., *Image Music Text* (London, 1977)
- Booth, C., *Did Bach Really Mean That? Deceptive Notation in Baroque Keyboard Music* (Wells, 2010)
- Buelow, G. J. and Hans J. Marx eds., *New Mattheson Studies* (Cambridge, 1983)
- Burney, C., *The Present State of Music in Germany, the Netherlands, and the United Provinces* (London, 1773); facsimile (Montana, 2009)
- Bukofzer, M. F., *Music in the Baroque Era* (New York, 1947); (London, 1948; rpt. 1978)
- Butt, J., *Bach Interpretation* (Cambridge, 1990)
- Music Education and the Art of Performance in the German Baroque* (Cambridge, 1994)
- Playing with History* (Cambridge, 2002)
- Butt, J. ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Bach* (Cambridge, 1997)
- Caldwell, J., *Editing Early Music* (Oxford, 1985)
- Castoriadis, C., *Fenêtre sur le chaos* comp. by Enrique Escobar, Myrto Gondicas and Pascal Vernay (Paris, 2007); trans. into Greek by Ευγενία Τσελέντη (Athens, 2007)
- Collingwood, R. G., *The Principles of Art* (New York, 1938; first published as a Galaxy Book 1958; 7th ed. 1967)
- Couperin, F., *L'Art de Toucher le Clavecin* (Paris, 1717); edited and translated by Margery Halford (California, 1974)
- David, H. and Arthur Mendel eds., rev. and enl. by Christoph Wolff, *The New Bach Reader: A Life of Johann Sebastian Bach in Letters and Documents* (New York, 1998)
- Dolmetsch, A., *The Interpretation of the Music of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (London 1915; corrected ed. 1946); rpt. (Seattle and London, 1969)
- Donington, R., *The Interpretation of Early Music* (London, 1963; rev. ed. 1974; rpt. with corrections 1977)
- String Playing in Baroque Music* (New York, 1977)
- Baroque Music: Style and Performance: A Handbook* (London, 1982)
- Dreyfus, L., *Bach and the Patterns of Invention* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1996)
- Emery, W., *Bach's Ornaments* (Kent, 1953)
- Editions and Musicians* (London, 1957; rpt. with additions, 1958)

- Feder, G., *Musikphilologie* (Darmstadt, 1987); trans. into English by Bruce C. MacIntyre (New York, 2011)
- Gasparini, F., *L'armonico Pratico Al Cimbalo* (Bologna, 1722); trans. into English by Frank S. Stillings (New Haven 1963); facsimile rpt. (Charleston, 2015)
- Goehr, L., *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works* (Oxford, 1992); trans. into Greek by Κατερίνα Κορομπίλη (Athens, 2005)
- Grier, J., *The Critical Editing of Music* (Cambridge, 1996)
- Grunfeld, F., *The Art and Times of the Guitar* (New York, 1969)
- Haynes, B., *The End of Early Music: A Period Performer's History of Music for the Twenty-first Century* (Oxford, 2007)
- Hindemith, P., *Johann Sebastian Bach: Heritage and Obligation* (New Haven, 1952)
- Hogarth, W., *The Analysis of Beauty: Written with a View of Fixing the Fluctuating Ideas of Taste* (1753); facsimile rpt. (Charleston, 2015)
- Holoman, D. K. and Claude V. Palisca eds., *Musicology in the 1980s* (New York, 1982)
- Hopstock, T., *Bach's Lautenwerke aus der Sicht des Gitarristen Vol. I* (Darmstadt, 2009); trans. into English by Lindsay Chalmers-Gerbracht (Darmstadt, 2010)
- Bach's Lautenwerke aus der Sicht des Gitarristen Vol. II* (Darmstadt, 2012); trans. into English by Lindsay Chalmers-Gerbracht (Darmstadt, 2013)
- Houle, G., *Meter in Music, 1600-1800* (Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1987)
- Kenyon, N. ed., *Authenticity and Early Music* (Oxford and New York, 1988)
- Kivy, P., *Sound Sentiment* (Philadelphia, 1989)
- Music Alone* (Ithaca and London, 1990)
- Authenticities* (Ithaca and London, 1995)
- Ledbetter, D., *Unaccompanied Bach: Performing the Solo Works* (New Haven and London, 2009)
- Lester, J., *Bach's Works for Solo Violin* (Oxford, 1999)
- Little, M. and Natalie Jenne, *Dance and the Music of J. S. Bach: Expanded Edition* (Bloomington and Indianapolis, 2001)
- Neumann, F., *Ornamentation in Baroque and Post-Baroque Music: With Special Emphasis on J. S. Bach* (New Jersey, 1978; 3rd printing with corrections 1983)
- Mather, B. B., *Dance Rhythms of the French Baroque* (Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1987)
- Öhm-Kühnle, C., 'Heinrich Nikolaus Gerber's Rediscovered Manuscript of Johann Sebastian Bach's Suite in E Minor (Bwv 996): A Copy of Bach's Hitherto Unknown Revised Version', *Bach*, vol. 38, no. 1 (2007), pp. 45–66, retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/41640560
- Palisca, C. V., *Baroque Music* (New Jersey, 1968; 2nd ed. 1981)

- Quantz, J. J., *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen* (Berlin, 1752); trans. into English by Edward R. Reilly (London, 1966; pbk. ed. 1976; 2nd ed. 1985; reissued 2001)
- Restout, D., *Landowska on Music* (New York, 1964)
- Sadie, A. J., *Companion to Baroque Music* (London, 1990)
- Spitta, P., *Johann Sebastian Bach: his Work and Influence on the Music of Germany, 1685-1750*, trans. C. Bell and J. A. Fuller-Maitland, 3 vols. (London, 1889); rpt. (New York, 1951)
- Strunk, O. and Leo Treitler ed., *Source Readings in Music History: Revised Edition: Volume 4: The Baroque Era* (New York, 1998)
- Taruskin, R., *Text and Act* (New York and Oxford, 1995)
- Tormey, A., *The Concept of Expression* (Princeton, 1971)
- Tosi, P. F., *Opinioni de' cantori antichi, e moderni* (Bologna, 1723); trans. into English by John E. Galliard (1743); newly formatted, annotated and indexed by Gregory Blankenbeler (2009)
- Tureck, R., *An Introduction to the Performance of Bach* (Oxford, 1960)
- Wade, G., *Traditions of the Classical Guitar* (London, 1980)
- Wollheim, R., *Art and its Objects* (New York, 1968); reissued (Leeds, 1975); 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1980)

