

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

COMMENTARY UPON THE EXAMINATION OF
MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

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

Commentary upon the examinations of manuscript sources

- ❖ **The use of bold font indicates points of special interest.**
- ❖ **Long commentaries appear on separate sheets due to spatial reasons.**

Suite in g minor, BWV 995									
Prelude								Comment	
Measure	Position	II 4085	III.11.3	P 269	P 804	P 289	5007	B 35	In the commentary of the <i>alla breve</i> section of the <i>Prelude</i> , the beat is set to crotchet.
1		A slur from <i>d</i> , beat 2, position 2, that possibly reaches measure 2, position 1 (chord).	There are four short 'lute' slurs that comprise two and three notes.	The slur does not reach the chord of m. 2. In Anna Magdalena's copy, m. 2 belongs to a different stave.	The slur does not reach next measure.	The slur does not reach next measure.	There is no slur.	There is no slur. B35 is the only printed score among the manuscript sources of the cello suite, BWV 1011. It was edited in Paris in 1824.	The interestingly long slurs found in the first section of the <i>Prelude</i> in the autograph and, also, the manuscript sources of the cello version follow the melodic phrase of the upper voice. It is interesting that the slur in the autograph seems to reach the first position of m. 2. Even though the melodic phrase concludes there, in all similar passages the long slur does not comprise the concluding note placed on the next measure, which is obviously part of the phrase. Thus, the reason why the slur cross the measure and reaches the chord is not a matter of a suggested differentiation in performance. Generally, the position of the slurs is frequently imprecise and even though this lack of precision usually pertains to a smaller than expected slur, here it could also be possible that the slur was longer than it was meant to be. Whatever is the case, the longer slur corresponds with what a slur that would have been finished in the last note of m. 1 would suggest in performance. In order to avoid any confusion resulting from a differentiation of the notation of this single slur, and since the ending position of the slur is not clear-cut, a slur that does not reach the next chord was opted for in the transcription.
4	Bass stave	Two half note rests.							There are two half note rests. However, in the middle of the measure there is a change of stave. In m. 8 Bach marked a whole note rest. A whole note rest was opted for in the transcription.
2	1	The three upper notes are dotted.							It is interesting to observe which notes Bach chooses to dot in chords, which could give us a hint of voicing differentiation, although chords are a point of adding voices as 'chordal' polyphony. However, it is interesting to have a notion of 'the upper voice', which here includes more than one note. Probably though it is not a case of thoughtful consideration, since there are differences in the way of writing in different measures. In m. 11, for example, Bach chooses to dot only the <i>b</i> .
10	Chord	There is a mark in the autograph. The only clear notes are the upper <i>a</i> and lower <i>d</i> . There is also a sharp in the position of the note <i>f</i> .	The letters and their placement in the tablature correspond to the notes <i>a</i> , <i>f</i> sharp and <i>d</i> .	<i>D</i> and <i>g</i> , no <i>b</i> natural (cello version in <i>c</i> minor).	<i>D</i> and <i>g</i> , no <i>b</i> natural.	The mark in the autograph is perhaps an erasure of a mistake. The clear sharp mark indicates the missing note <i>f</i> . Correspondence with the tablature source indicates that <i>f</i> (sharp) is the only missing note, something that has already been indicated from the harmony and the fact that <i>d</i> is the lowest note. In the sources of the cello version there is no <i>b</i> natural (<i>g</i> : <i>f</i> sharp). In addition, the fact that there is a line that belonged probably to the crotchet line of the erased note, and correspondence with the similar rhythmically first 2 beats of m. 6, indicates that the <i>f</i> sharp is most likely a crotchet.			
12	1	Cautionary accidental (natural) on the <i>c</i> .							

22-25	Slurs	Most likely a single long slur. Stave changes at m. 23. Its starting position is questionable. Notes are beamed by 4.	There are few short 'lute' slurs.	There is no slur at m. 22. Slurs that comprise 8 notes appear at m. 23, beat one, position one, up to the 2nd beat of m. 24 (3 in total). In mm. 23-24 notes are beamed by 8.	Slurs that comprise 8 notes appear at the 3rd beat of m. 22, position 1, up to the 4th beat of m. 24 (5 in total). In mm. 23-24 notes are beamed by 8.	The first slur starts at the 3rd beat of m. 22, position 2. The rest of the slurs appear as in the previous source, P 804 (5 in total). In mm. 23-24 notes are beamed by 8.	As in P 804, slurs that comprise 8 notes start at the 3rd beat of m. 22, position 1, up to the 4th beat of m. 24 (5 in total). In mm. 23-24 notes are beamed by 4.	There is a slur that comprises the last three notes of the 2nd beat, m. 22. The next slur starts from the 2nd position of the 3rd beat until the end of the measure. Next slurs comprise 8 notes as in the previous sources. At m. 25 there is also a slur that comprises 8 notes starting from beat 1, position one and another slur that comprises the last three notes of the measure (8 in total). In mm. 23-24 notes are beamed by four like in the autograph and unlike the manuscript sources of the cello version.	It is very likely that the slur starts on the 2nd beat, position 2, as the previously notated slurs. In this case Bach clearly began the slur to the right. It could also be suggested that the slur begins on beat 3, position 1, like two of the manuscript sources of the cello version. It is worth considering the 7th upward jump on beat 3 that creates a phrase separation from the conjunct notes of beat 2, unlike all previous measures comprised by a long slur. The <i>g</i> of beat 3, position 1, can be seen both as the concluding note of middle voice's gesture (and the <i>f</i> of second position as the implied continuation of the upper voice) and also as the start of a figuration in the upper voice, which introduces the 'on-the-beat' rhythmic quality of the figurations to follow from m. 23: the 'one breathing' phrase to 'absorb' the music's figurations could be considered to start from beat 3. Nonetheless, the first hint of approaching the end of the first section of the <i>Prelude</i> comes from the absence of a notated dotted rhythm from the <i>second</i> beat, considering m. 21. Moreover, if we suggest that the slur starts on beat 3, Bach marked it somewhat to the left, unlike most of the slurs found in the autographs of the lute works. In the autograph there is a change of stave in m. 23; however, I presume that if the slur in m. 23 was not a continuation of the slur started in m. 22 it would have been followed by other slurs like in the cello sources. John Butt (1990) comments that "the most striking slur of all in BWV 995 is that found bb. 22-5 of the <i>Prelude</i> . This suggests a fairly free run to be played 'in one bow' with as little intermediate articulation as possible. Clearly this long-term grouping of notes has something in common with later concepts of 'phrasing' "(p. 181). A single long slur starting on the second beat of position 2 was opted for in the transcription.
23	Beat 1, position 3	Sharp above the c.							Possibly Bach forgot to mark the accidental and added it later even though it could be considered obvious, remaining faithful to the baroque accidental conventions.
26									There is no bar line before the new time signature of <i>très vite</i> . Although in all the sources of the cello version there is a bar line before the new time signature, it does not seem to be an omission. In Walther's and Gerber's manuscript copies of the Suite in e minor, BWV 996, believed to stem from a lost autograph, there is also no bar line after <i>Præludio's Passaggio</i> . In the transcription the change of time signature is not preceded by a bar line.
27									Tempo indication: ' <i>très vite</i> .'. The accent is missing. There is no tempo indication in the manuscript sources of the cello version. The printed source B35 has the tempo indication ' <i>Allegro moderato</i> '.
42	Upper and lower voice								The quavers of the lower voice and the semiquavers of the upper voice are not beamed together due to the change of stave, as correspondence with previous and subsequent measures indicates. In the transcription the notes are beamed together.
43	Beat 2, position 2	Natural sign above the note <i>b</i> .							In this case I think that the reason of marking the accidental above the note requires careful consideration. There is not any particular space limitation that would force Bach to mark the accidental above. We could assume that he forgot it and marked it afterwards, the moment he realised. However, the manuscript sources of the cello version indicate that the lost autograph of the cello suite most likely did not have an accidental at this point. This could indicate that Bach firstly wrote the note as in the cello version and the accidental is an addition, an alteration, not a correction. This could further suggest that the accidental is not just an alteration but a point of preference, the significance of which is therefore higher compared to if he had written the accidental from the beginning.
57	Upper voice, position 1								The note head of the <i>f</i> is rather big. Perhaps it is a correction of a mistakenly written <i>e</i> .
65	Upper voice								The notes of the upper voice are not beamed together due to change of stave.
74-75, 94-95	Upper voice								Quite often in the baroque notation, different direction of stems are found among notes that are beamed together, facilitating the perception of different phrases within the same voice and the perception of implied polyphony. The reason of use of this notation is probably, in most of the cases, a spatial matter. However, when this notation is used, the notes are not moving stepwise, in most of the cases. These are moments that often indicate a phrase separation or an implied voice. In the sources the notes have a visual separation that often coincides with the musical flow, which is not so apparent in modern notation. There are plenty of examples in the <i>très vite</i> and throughout the lute works. MM. 74-75 and 94-95 of the autograph are interesting examples.

87	4								There is an obvious omission of the natural sign on the <i>e</i> . A natural sign was opted for in the transcription.
92	Slur								It is the first slur of the <i>très viste</i> . It is interesting to observe where Bach has chosen to mark the few slurs found in the <i>très viste</i> . In m. 92, the slur above the upper's voice gesture seems to delineate a gathering momentum in the music. Bach seems to want to draw attention to the performer's eye of m. 92 that functions as an 'intermediate' between previously upbeat quality gestures and a new passage to be introduced by syncopated measures. The slur of m. 101 seems to denote the end of this section and the upbeat quality of the gesture. The slur of m. 92 is marked somewhat to the right.
99		There is no natural sign on the last <i>e</i> . There is a cautionary flat on the first <i>e</i> of next measure.	All the <i>e</i> are natural.	There is no natural sign on the second and third <i>a</i> (written as <i>b</i> because of the scordatura). There is a cautionary flat on the <i>a</i> of next measure.	There is no natural sign on the second and third <i>a</i> . (Kellner notates the actual pitch of the notes). There is a cautionary flat on the <i>a</i> of next measure.	There is no natural sign on the second and third <i>a</i> (written as <i>b</i> because of the scordatura). There is a cautionary flat on the <i>a</i> of next measure.	There is no natural sign on the second and third <i>a</i> (written as <i>b</i> because of the scordatura). There is a cautionary flat on the <i>a</i> of next measure.	Only the first <i>a</i> (written as <i>b</i> because of the scordatura), has the natural sign. This later source does not use the baroque accidental conventions. There is, also here, a cautionary flat on the <i>a</i> of the next measure.	The failure to notate accidental(s) could not be considered merely as an omission in this occasion. On the one hand, the reason for the 'omission' could be that such obviously resolved matters were not always explicitly written, as we have seen in many cases, even in the hand of precise scribes. On the other hand, the implied polyphony in both the lute and cello versions (this measure is slightly different in the cello version), brings closer the three <i>e</i> and <i>a</i> respectively. In this additional layer of the upper voice, there is no need for an accidental repetition, since there are no other notes in between. That could bring an interesting thought about implied polyphony, no matter that in similar measures - as regards to an additional layer of a voice - Bach repeats the accidental (m. 146). The conventions of notation becomes a habit that you usually follow. If this is a case of a deliberate omission and not, to borrow an apt phrase by Colin Booth (2010), a case of "economy of time and effort" (p. 11), it could also tell us something about the admirably precise approach to the very tiring and difficult process of musical notation. The cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>e</i> of next measure is also marked in the transcription.
115	4	There is a smudge on the head of the note.							The smudge does not cause any problems in the understanding of the note. It is obviously <i>d</i> .
116	4	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>e</i> .							It is interesting that here there is a cautionary accidental not because there was a natural sign on the previous <i>e</i> but so the performer could go for a change in the major mode.
120	Upper voice	There is a quaver note, a semi quaver rest and two quaver rests.							It is interesting that at mm. 117-124, the concluding note of the figuration of the upper voice is a semiquaver, while the concluding note of the same figuration in the bass is a quaver. Since the <i>b</i> natural of m. 120 is the concluding note of upper voice's figuration and there is a semiquaver rest, it seems that the mistake is the omission of a second line on the <i>b</i> natural. A <i>b</i> natural semiquaver instead of a quaver was opted for in the transcription.
147	1	There is a smudge in the lower part of the stave and a sign above the <i>a</i> .							The smudge seems to be an erasure of a previously lower written note in the bass. The note head of the <i>a</i> is rather big and the small sign above the note is probably the letter <i>a</i> to clearly identify the note. It seems that Bach wrote by mistake a stepwise continuation of the bass and wrote a <i>g</i> initially.
157		The notes of the upper and the notes of the lower voice are not beamed together.							This separation was made due to stave change.
165	2,3	Cautionary accidental (natural) on the <i>f</i> and (flat) on the <i>e</i> .							

173	4	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>e</i> .							The cautionary accidental is marked, like in m. 116, to prevent the performer going to the major mode.
176-179	Lower voice								Bach probably made a mistake at the bass notes. He corrected the notes and since they are not very clear he wrote in the empty space of the stave the notes in letters in order to facilitate the reading.
184, 186, 188	Slurs								There is clearly a slur in m. 184. There are two marks in mm. 186 and 188 (more clearly in m. 188) that could, very possibly, be slurs as well. The marks that Bach's correction left on mm. 176 and 179 are very close and prevent the reader of the manuscript from seeing the slurs clearly. I consider that these marks do not belong to the correction marks of mm. 176 and 179, but they are slurs, corresponding, moreover, with the cello version. It is interesting to note that no slurs have been marked in the urtext editions (BGA, NBA, Tilman Hoppstock, Paolo Cherici) in mm. 186 and 188.
204	1	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>e</i> .							
209		Cautionary accidental (natural) on the <i>f</i> .							
214	Lower voice								It is very interesting that Bach, initially, seems to have written a <i>c</i> in the bass instead of a <i>g</i> , which makes sense. He then smudged the note and replaced it with a <i>g</i> that is written an octave higher than the previous measures, as in the cello version, starting an upward stepwise bass motion instead.
218	<i>e</i>	No natural sign.		There is a natural sign on the <i>a</i> (<i>c</i> minor).	There is a natural sign on the <i>a</i> .	There is a natural sign on the <i>a</i> .	There is a natural sign on the <i>a</i> .	It is interesting to note the altered passage in source B 35. The upper voice of the previous chord reads a <i>c</i> instead of a <i>b</i> (flat). In the passage in question there is an additional ornamental note (<i>b</i> natural) that creates an unusual augmented 2nd interval. Instead of two 16th notes of <i>a</i> natural and <i>g</i> , there are two 32nd notes of <i>b</i> natural and <i>a</i> (flat), followed by a 16th note <i>g</i> . The rest of the notes are the same.	In the cello version there is an <i>a</i> natural instead of an <i>a</i> flat (<i>c</i> minor), apart from the altered version of source B 35.
220-222		There are three pairs of slurred notes in m. 221.	In the lute tablature, there are only two 'lute' slurs in m. 220 and not in m. 221. These slurs comprise the first and the last two semiquaver notes of the group.	In Anna Magdalena's copy there is one additional note in m. 220, seven semiquavers instead of six (!). Correspondence with the lute version and the remaining cello sources shows that this note is the fourth semiquaver. The exact starting position of the slurs is not clear. However, the first and last slurs clearly cross the measure and therefore I assume that the four slurs that comprise two notes, start at the last note of m. 220 (four in total).	In Kellner's copy the slurs start from the beginning of m. 220, on the beat, until m. 221 (six in total), thus the third and sixth slur does not cross the measure.	The slurs in source P 289 are very unusual. They clearly start on the beat at m. 220 and the last slur clearly crosses m. 221, comprising the first note of m. 222. The slurs are seven in total (!). It seems that the last note of m. 221 is the last note of the fifth slur and also the first note of the last slur.	As in the previous source, there are seven slurs, each comprising two notes and in total comprising thirteen notes (!). It seems that the last note of m. 220 is the last note of the third slur and also the first note of the fourth slur.	There are six slurs that comprise two notes, starting from <i>e</i> flat (written as <i>f</i>), second position of the 1st beat (<i>g</i> : <i>b</i> flat). So the last note of both mm. 219 and 220 is connected to the first note of the next measure.	The urtext editions disagree as to whether the three slurs of paired notes start on, or after, the beat of m. 221. The disagreement may derive from the examination of the sources of the cello suite, the stepwise motion of the notes <i>c</i> #- <i>d</i> , <i>a</i> - <i>b</i> flat and <i>f</i> #- <i>g</i> and the fact that the phrase concludes at the note that is placed at a stronger metrical position, something that may have caused the peculiarity in the notation of the slurs in some of the manuscript sources of the cello version, as noted. In the autograph of BWV 995 the three slurs are clearly within m. 221. The last slur does not cross the measure. The first slur is written somewhat to the right, as in many other instances. Still, though, it seems to comprise the first two notes of the measure. Moreover, there is a space limitation for the marking of the first slur due to the quaver rests of m. 213 written above the first beat of m. 221. Any uncertainty in the position of the slurs in the autograph is rather clear. In the transcription the slurs are marked within m. 221, starting with the note of the first position.

Measure	Position	II 4085	Comment
Allemande			The Allemande is notated <i>alla breve</i>. In the commentary the beat is set to crotchet.
	title		In the manuscript copy of Anna Magdalena of the cello version, there is the wrong title <i>Courante</i> instead of <i>Allemande</i> .
2	upper voice, position 1		Bach wrote the <i>b</i> flat as a crotchet in the beginning, as in the cello version. In order to change it to a minim, he marked a bigger empty circle on the black head of the crotchet.
4	upper voice, 1st beat, position 2	<i>e</i> with a natural sign	In the autograph the <i>e</i> has a natural sign, unlike the cello version. It is interesting to observe the implied polyphony in the cello version at this point: the <i>a</i> flat (<i>g</i> : <i>e</i> flat) can be seen, also, as the continuation of the <i>a</i> flat of the previous measure (beat 3) that resolves in <i>g</i> (<i>g</i> : <i>d</i>), at the 2nd beat of m. 4. In the 'thicker' lute version we hear the resolution (<i>d</i>) on the 1st beat of m. 4, in the added bass. If the <i>e</i> would be flat, like in the cello version, it would sound exotic.
5	middle voice, 3rd beat		There is a crotchet rest that appears faint and a minim rest. Possibly Bach scratched the paper where there is the crotchet rest and replaced it with the minim rest. If this is the case, it is interesting to mention Bach's accuracy of notation at this point, choosing to scratch the paper and add a minim rest, instead of adding another crotchet rest.
14	upper voice, position 1		The downward stem is placed on the right part of the note head that is bigger than usual, indicating, perhaps, a correction of a wrong note. That makes the most likely rising appoggiatura that precedes the note unclear. A rising appoggiatura has been chosen in the transcription.
16	lower voice, 3rd beat		There are two unidentifiable curved lines: one small curved line appears between the natural sign and the note head of the <i>e</i> , and a longer curved line above the note head.
17	upper voice, 2nd beat, position 4	there is no natural sign on the <i>e</i>	It is either an omission or the repetition of the accidental was considered superfluous.
19	appoggiatura	small slur	It is the only instance in the <i>Allemande</i> where Bach marks a small slur between the grace and the main note.
19	3rd beat, position 2		Cautionary accidental (natural) on the <i>e</i> .
21	2nd beat, position 3		The height of the note head, in comparison to the previous and the following notes, the continuation of the musical phrase and correspondence with the cello version, indicates that the note is <i>a</i> and not <i>c</i> . Bach accidentally added another ledger line to the note.
22	1st beat		There is an unidentifiable mark below the middle voice of the chord. Perhaps Bach had written another note – possibly <i>b</i> – that he smudged.
26	4th beat		There is a large mark on the manuscript. It seems to be a drop of ink. Possibly Bach dipped his pen in the inkpot around this point.
29	3rd and 4th beat		The head of the notes <i>g</i> and <i>f</i> is rather big. This possibly indicates a correction of something that was written before.
Courante			
6	3rd beat, position 2, upper voice		There is an erasure smudge on the manuscript below the <i>c</i> and a small vertical line on the left side of the note head. Above the note there is the letter <i>c</i> to clarify the identity of the note. Some editors have misinterpreted the letter as a <i>t</i> to indicate a <i>tr</i>. It is an unusual place for a <i>tr</i>: a <i>tr</i> would be expected to be above a dotted crotchet, like the other ornaments in the <i>Courante</i> and all the appoggiaturas, instead of on the last quaver of the measure, which is, moreover, preceded by a dotted crotchet.
7	3rd beat, position 1, lower voice		There is an erasure smudge below the <i>d</i> .
18	1st beat, position 1, lower voice		It seems that Bach initially marked an <i>f</i> minim in the lower voice, which also makes sense, and then he changed his mind and instead added an <i>a</i> flat crotchet and an <i>f</i> crotchet.
18	2nd beat, position 2, upper voice		The note <i>c</i> is not clear. Bach wrote the letter <i>c</i> above the note to facilitate the reading.
19	2nd beat, position 4, upper voice		Cautionary accidental (natural) on the <i>a</i> .
21	3rd beat		Bach wrote out in full the termination of the <i>tr</i> (<i>d</i> and <i>e</i> natural). The letter <i>t</i> to indicate a <i>tr</i> is placed, as usual, above the note. The curved line of the slur is a continuation of the small curve at the bottom of the letter <i>t</i> to indicate no break before the termination of the <i>tr</i> . In m. 56 of the <i>Gigue</i> , Bach also writes out in full the termination of the <i>tr</i> . However, due to lack of space, the letter <i>t</i> is placed below the note. Thus, the slur that is written as a continuation of the letter <i>t</i> to indicate, again, no break before the termination of the <i>tr</i> is not as visible as in this case. This slur in m. 56 of the <i>Gigue</i> is missing from the urtext editions.
22	2nd beat, upper voice, position 3		There is a mark above the crotchet <i>g</i> . Probably Bach initially wrote an upward stem on the <i>g</i> and added three vertical lines on the stem to cancel its value. Possibly he did not want to differentiate the direction of the stem of this single note, since the previous notes have downward stems and, also, the notes to follow in order to leave space for the marking of the slurs.
Sarabande			
7	upper voice		Bach changes stave on the 3rd beat. Correspondence with m. 15 suggests that if there would be no change of stave, all the quavers would have been beamed together. The six quavers are beamed together in the transcription.
15	1st beat, upper voice, position 2		Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>e</i> .
18	1st beat, upper voice, position 2		Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>e</i> .

Gavotte Ire			The Gavotte Ire is notated <i>alla breve</i> . In the commentary, the beat is set to crotchet.
4	3rd beat, lower voice		The sign of the crotchet rest is rather big. Possibly Bach wanted to hide a note he had written initially following where the bass notes were metrically placed in the previous measures.
8	4th beat, lower voice		Probably Bach wrote the note <i>f</i> above a previously written <i>b</i> . He marked a thick sideways line over the note head of the <i>b</i> to cancel its value. He wrote the letter <i>F</i> above the corrected note to clarify its identity.
16	3rd beat, upper voice, position 1		There is a cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>e</i> . This marking is interesting since the previous <i>e</i> is, also, flat. The marking of the accidental is to prevent the performer from repeating the second major interval that appears in the same position of the 1st beat.
18	1st and 3rd beat, upper voice, position 2		The two 'signs' below the two <i>d</i> are the letter <i>d</i> . The same writing of the letter appears also in the autograph of the <i>Prelude</i> BWV 998, m. 12, beat 6. The writing of the two letters was made to facilitate the reader, since Bach notated two <i>f</i> firstly. As in m. 8, Bach marked sideways lines above the noteheads of the two <i>f</i> to cancel their value. It is interesting, because Bach initially continued an upward stepwise motion of the implied voice (<i>e</i> flat on the previous measure).
22	4th beat, upper voice		The note head of the <i>e</i> is rather big, perhaps in order to cover a previously written note. There is an unidentifiable sign or letter above the note (it does not look like an <i>e</i>). The colour of the note head, unlike the stem, is somewhat faint, like the previous note and the last note of the next stave. Has the faint colour to do with the folding of the manuscript book?
25	4th beat, upper voice, position 1		There is a mark above the quaver <i>g</i> , similar to the mark found in m. 22 of the <i>Courante</i> . <i>G</i> and <i>d</i> are beamed together with downwards stems. It seems that initially Bach accidentally wrote a crotchet <i>g</i> with an upward stem and he added two vertical lines on the stem to cancel its value.
31	1st beat, upper voice, position 1		Cautionary accidental (natural) on the <i>f</i> .
31	3rd beat, upper voice, position 1		Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>e</i> .
Gavotte Ilde en Rondeaux			The Gavotte Ilde en Rondeaux is notated <i>alla breve</i> . In the commentary, the beat is set to crotchet.
1	3rd beat, lower voice		There is an erasure smudge on the manuscript. Perhaps Bach wrote initially the <i>f</i> sharp one octave higher.
2	4th beat, lower voice		There is the letter <i>a</i> , further indicating the bass note. This indication was made probably to facilitate the reading of the corrected bass notes of the next measure, which are moving stepwise.
3	lower voice		Bach initially wrote the note of the 1st beat a major 6th above, as a <i>g</i> , the notes of the 2nd and 3rd beat one octave higher and the last note one octave lower. There are erasure smudges over the note heads of the initially written notes of the 2nd and 3rd beat and an erasure smudge over the note of the 4th beat. There is an unidentifiable mark above the note of the 1st beat.
4	2nd beat		A ledger line is missing from the bass note. Bach accidentally wrote <i>b</i> instead of <i>g</i> . He did not spot the mistake.
7	4th beat, upper voice position 3		Bach omitted to repeat the natural sign on the <i>e</i> .
12	4th beat, lower voice		Probably Bach firstly wrote the <i>d</i> one octave higher and in order to hide it he made the line of the upward stem of the lower <i>d</i> thicker.
13	2nd beat, upper voice, positions 1 and 2		Cautionary accidental on the <i>f</i> (natural) and on the <i>e</i> (flat).
15	1st beat, deleted upper or middle voice		A very interesting point: there are smudges below the notes of the upper voice to hide notes that were written. After the <i>c</i> (position 1), Bach initially continued in a lower octave, whether as a continuation of the upper voice or introducing a middle voice. It is clear that the deleted notes are <i>b</i> (flat), <i>a</i> flat and <i>g</i> (first position of the 2nd beat), which are the same notes that follow the <i>c</i> of the upper voice, an octave lower from the corrected notation. The possibility of the introduction of another voice is reinforced by the fact that there is something in the first position, under the <i>c</i> of the upper voice, that could possibly be a quaver rest. This 'erased' continuation in a different octave is further denoted from the visible separated flag of the first note (<i>c</i>) that was marked initially. These details further denote the polyphonic character of the monophonic passage, already implied by the music as subsequently written, even if in the corrected version the <i>b</i> flat is a stepwise continuation of the <i>c</i>.
17	1st beat, lower voice		Cautionary accidental (natural) on the <i>a</i> . This accidental could also be considered essential, since, even though there is a crotchet rest before, the last note of the lower voice is an <i>a</i> flat and accidentals also affect repeated notes of the next measure.
after the last measure			Bach added another measure after the last measure of the <i>Gavotte Ilde</i> , where, instead of notes he wrote ' <i>Gavotte Ire</i> ' indicating the performance repetition of the first <i>Gavotte</i> .
Gique			
18	lower voice		Bach seems to have written initially the notes <i>d c b</i> instead of <i>b a g</i>. Above the corrected notes he added the letters <i>b a g</i> to facilitate the reader. We have seen a few times in this suite Bach changing his initial compositional idea: it is very interesting to follow his thoughts. In addition, this could strongly suggest that, even if the manuscript is quite clear and seems to be carefully written, there was not an initial draft of the lute version. The changes he made to his previous version for the cello were made as he was writing this manuscript.
21	upper voice		Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>e</i> .
31	3rd beat, lower voice		The quaver rest of the lower voice is rather big in order to hide an initially written <i>g</i> .
33	1st beat, lower voice		Probably Bach had initially written the first <i>d</i> one octave higher. The line of the upward stem of the lower <i>d</i> is quite thick in order to hide the initial note.
56	<i>tr</i>		See comment m. 21, <i>Courante</i> .
after the last measure			There is the word ' <i>fin.</i> '.

Suite in e minor, BWV 996						
Measure	Beat	Position	Walther	Gerber	Source C	Comment
Initial comment						See separate sheet, p. 31
<i>Præludio</i>						
2	2	4	e	deleted c #/e	e	Gerber accidentally wrote a c # that he crossed with a line to cancel its value. He added the e.
5	2		slur below the notes	no slur	no slur	A slur is marked in the transcription.
5	3	1	no appoggiatura	appoggiatura from below (in red chalk) on the higher e	no appoggiatura	To facilitate the execution of the chord with its ornamented upper voice, the appoggiatura is marked in the transcription.
5	4	2	trill	mordent	trill or prepared trill	In Source C there is usually a vertical line in the beginning of the waved line of the trills (prepared trill) to indicate an appoggiatura, a prolongation of the starting note of the trill. In this instance the vertical line is not so evident. A trill was opted for in the transcription.
6	1	1	trill	appoggiatura and trill (both in red chalk) on the d #	prepared trill	The appoggiatura in Gerber's copy is not mentioned in the listed differences found in Öhm-Kühnle's article (p. 59). A trill was opted for in the transcription.
6	3	1	no appoggiatura	appoggiatura from below (in red chalk) on the higher e	no appoggiatura	The appoggiatura in Gerber's copy is not mentioned in the listed differences found in Öhm-Kühnle's article (p. 59). No appoggiatura is marked in the transcription.
7	3	1	trill	appoggiatura (in red chalk) and mordent	prepared trill	According to Öhm-Kühnle, there is an appoggiatura from above on the a #. In the scans this is not clear. A trill was opted for in the transcription. The upper note of the chord is notated without an appoggiatura.
8	2	2	c	c# (the sharp in red chalk)	c#	Since there is a <i>corrected</i> c# in Gerber's manuscript, the c that misses the sharp sign in Walther's manuscript is possibly a copied omission from the autograph.
8	2	upper voice	no slur over the notes	no slur over the notes	slur over the notes	No slur is marked in the transcription.
8	3	upper voice	slur over the notes	slur over the notes	slur over the notes	The slur that appears in Walther's manuscript appears faint. Perhaps it was added subsequently. A slur is marked in the transcription.
9	1	1	no ornament, no appoggiatura	appoggiatura from above on the g # and trill (both in red chalk)	no ornament, no appoggiatura	The appoggiatura in Gerber's copy is not mentioned in Öhm-Kühnle's article (p. 60). No appoggiatura or ornament is marked in the transcription.
9	3	1	no appoggiatura	appoggiatura from below on the a	no appoggiatura	No appoggiatura is marked in the transcription.
10	1	1	the g # of the 1st beat is a quaver and is beamed together with the dotted quaver g # and the semiquaver g # of the 2nd beat	the g # is a separated semiquaver	the semiquaver g # is beamed together with the dotted quaver g # and the semiquaver g # of the 2nd beat	Walther accidentally notated a quaver g # as the bass note, since g # is part of the chord and it is preceded by a semiquaver rest. He also connected the 'quaver' g # with the next 2, unlike measures 7 and 9, and unlike Gerber's manuscript. The scribe of Source C connects these 3 notes as well, and also does so in m. 9, unlike Walther and Gerber, and not in m. 7, similarly to Walther and Gerber. This differentiation in the notation found among the different manuscripts and also within the same manuscript is not to suggest a differentiation in performance. A separate semiquaver g # was opted for in the transcription.
10	3	1	no appoggiatura	appoggiatura from above on the c # (in red chalk)	no appoggiatura	The appoggiatura in Gerber's copy is not mentioned in Öhm-Kühnle's article (p. 60). No appoggiatura is marked in the transcription.
10	3	1	A / e / b / c #	A / e / b / c #	A / e / b / c #	There is no difference among the three manuscripts; however all the editions examined notate an a here instead of a b. The only edition to include, in a small stave below the page, the chord as appears in the manuscripts, is Paolo Cherici's urtext edition. However, he has chosen to include the chord with an a instead of a b in the main musical text. Jonathan Leathwood pertinently suggested that we might understand the b as a 9-8 suspension over bass a (prepared in the 6/5 sonority over g sharp). The note is not altered in the transcription.
11	3	1	no appoggiatura	appoggiatura from above on the d # (in red chalk)	no appoggiatura	The appoggiatura in Gerber's copy is not mentioned in Öhm-Kühnle's article (p. 60). No appoggiatura is marked in the transcription.
12	1	1	there is no ornament	mordent (in red chalk)	there is no ornament	No ornament is marked in the transcription.

12	1	3	c	c#	c	In baroque notation altered notes do not retain their alteration throughout the measure. The accidental must be marked again, unless the altered note is immediately repeated. A study of manuscript sources shows that this exception is not a strict rule. In most cases where there is only one note between the altered notes, in all three manuscripts, in Walther's and Source C more so, the accidental is not marked again. Recurring motifs render the repetition of the accidental superfluous. For example, in m. 24, beat 3 of the <i>Presto</i> , the sharp on the <i>d</i> has not been marked again in all three manuscripts; it is implied. The altered note is part of the ornamental motif that dominates the <i>Presto</i> and is heard for the first time in m. 18. It is interesting to note another point in the <i>Presto</i> : a new motif is introduced in m. 65 (semiquavers). In measures 65 and 67, in Walther's and the Source C manuscripts, the sharp next to the <i>d</i> is marked on beats 1 and 2, and is omitted on beat 3, while in Gerber's manuscript is omitted both on beat 2 and beat 3. The marking of accidental on the second beat in Walther's and source C manuscripts may be due to its being the motif's first appearance, although its presence could be inferred. The same motif belongs to a different harmony in relation to beat 1 in measures 69 / 70 / 71. While in measures 65 / 67 the chord on the first beat is retained throughout the measure, in measures 69 / 70 / 71 it changes on the second beat. In m. 70, Gerber has marked the accidental in all beats, while in m. 71 the accidental of the 3rd beat is implied. The way the accidentals are marked indicates that no strict rules apply and this gives interesting information both about individual scribes but also about what was expected from the reader of the manuscript. In most of the instances, where this 'rule' is not followed by the scribe, the presence or absence of accidentals is implied, as in this case in Walther's copy and Source C.
12	2	1	no appoggiatura	most likely an appoggiatura from above on the <i>d</i> # (in red chalk)	no appoggiatura	There is most likely an appoggiatura in Gerber's copy. It appears quite faintly in the digital scan of the manuscript. If this is the case, it is not mentioned in Öhm-Kühnle's article (p. 61). No appoggiatura is marked in the transcription.
12	3	1	no appoggiatura	appoggiatura from below on the higher <i>e</i> (in red chalk)	no appoggiatura	The appoggiatura in Gerber's copy is not mentioned in Öhm-Kühnle's article (p. 61). No appoggiatura is marked in the transcription.
12	4	1	trill	mordent with a <i>nachschlag</i> (the <i>nachschlag</i> in red chalk)	mordent or prepared trill	In Source C it is difficult to understand whether the vertical line belongs to a mordent or to a prepared trill. If the ornament is a mordent, it could be due to the different 32nd notes that precede the ornament. In Source C the descending stepwise motion of the 32nd notes after the tied <i>e</i> starts from a <i>d</i> instead of a repeated <i>e</i> . Thus, the note that precedes the ornamented note <i>b</i> is, also, <i>b</i> . According to Öhm-Kühnle, the mordent in Gerber's manuscript is with a <i>nachschlag</i> in red chalk. Indeed, in the scans a curved line that is a continuation of the sign of the mordent appears faint. A trill was opted for in the transcription.
13	1	1, 3	erased ornament and erased unidentifiable mark	no ornament	no ornament	There is an erased ornament in the handwriting of Walther (probably a trill) and an erased unidentifiable marking in beats 1 and 3 respectively, in Walther's manuscript. This ornament and marking appears faintly in the manuscript. Possibly the manuscript is scratched in order to erase the ornament and marking. If there would be an ornament on the <i>b</i> of the 1st and 3rd beat, it would probably be a different from a trill ornament. On the preceding and following beats, there is a trill on the same note. Therefore, an exact repetition would not ornament the note, but 'impoverish' it. A different ornament could have served the performance. In the 1st beat there was either a mordent or a trill (the vertical line of the mordent is not visible but it may have been erased completely from the scratching). However, I presume that Walther accidentally noted a trill on the first instead of the second beat and then he scratched the paper, since there are notated trills on the 2nd and 4th beat. It would be very unlikely that Walther's manuscript contain ornaments in all the beats or in 3 of the 4 beats, unless it was accidentally done. Moreover, Gerber's manuscript (and Source C) does not contain any ornament signs on the 1st and 3rd beat. The marking on the 3rd beat is placed where an ornament would appear. However, it does not look like a trill or a mordent sign. Oddly, it looks more like two small quaver notes, but this would be quite improbable since there is not such a marking throughout the Suite in the manuscript. I cannot decipher what there was in the manuscript before the scratching. In the transcription no ornaments have been marked on the 1st and 3rd beat, like in Gerber's and Source C manuscripts and in Walther's 'corrected' manuscript.
13	2	1	trill	mordent	prepared trill	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
13	2	2	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i> #	<i>d</i> #	The sharp in Walther's manuscript is implied. Perhaps an accidental is not necessary, since there is only a quaver rest preceding a <i>d</i> # in the 1st beat.
13	4	1	trill	mordent	prepared trill	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
14	1	1	trill	appoggiatura from above in red chalk on the <i>a</i> # (in red chalk) and mordent	prepared trill	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
14	2	1	no appoggiatura	appoggiatura from below (in red chalk) on the <i>b</i>	no appoggiatura	No appoggiatura is marked in the transcription.
14	3	3	<i>g</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>g</i>	There is no difference among the three manuscripts, but this point was noted because in some transcriptions there is an added sharp on the <i>g</i> , changing the chord to E major, causing a tonicisation in a minor (the chord of next beat), which, <i>also</i> , makes sense. The <i>g</i> (natural) is not to be seen as a mistake. The note is not altered in the transcription.
14	3		one dotted quaver and three 32nd notes	one dotted quaver, one 32nd note and two 64th notes	one dotted quaver and three 32nd notes	See separate sheet, p. 32
14	4	1	there is no ornament	trill (in red chalk)	there is no ornament	No ornament is marked in the transcription.
15	3	1	mordent	mordent (in red chalk)	prepared trill	A mordent is marked in the transcription.
16	1		no appoggiatura	appoggiatura from above on the <i>f</i> # (in red chalk)	no appoggiatura	No appoggiatura is marked in the transcription.

16	3	1	there is a tempo marking of <i>presto</i>	there is no tempo marking	there is no tempo marking	The first page of the <i>Præludio</i> in Gerber's manuscript ends in m. 16, (including the first measure in the time signature of 3/8). Gerber notes ' <i>prestissimo volti</i> ' to indicate a very quick (page) turn, at the end of the page and there is no tempo marking. Although an indication of <i>Presto</i> could be expected after the <i>Passaggio</i> , the fact that is missing from Gerber's and Source C poses a doubt as to whether there was such an indication in the lost autograph. If Walther's and Gerber's manuscript are both derived from the lost autograph, one of the scribes misread, or missed what appeared in the autograph. If the first page of the <i>Præludio</i> in the autograph would approximately fit the length of the <i>Passaggio</i> , it could be very possible that Bach continued the writing of the <i>Præludio</i> in another page, exactly after the first measure of the new time signature, facilitating the performer in the page turn that would be probably made after the performance of the first chord, as it appears in Gerber's manuscript. In the 3 surviving autographs among the 7 lute works, we find the indication <i>volti</i> after the <i>Prelude</i> 995, in m. 35 of the <i>Prelude</i> 998 and in the end of the 1st part of the <i>Gigue</i> 1006a. We would though expect that if there were such an indication in the passage in question it would also include the word <i>presto</i> , like the indication that appears in the <i>Ciaccona</i> of the second violin partita (V S: <i>volti presto</i>). If this is the case, Walther interpreted <i>presto</i> as a tempo indication and Gerber slightly changed the indication notating <i>prestissimo volti</i> . This possibility could be reinforced from the fact that if there was a tempo indication, Gerber did not see, or omitted to copy it, which is a quite serious omission. However, the autograph could include both words not to be read together. <i>Volti</i> as an indication for the page turn and <i>presto</i> , possibly not exactly aligned with the word <i>volti</i> , as a tempo indication. This is a possibility that I consider justifies better the different readings in the manuscripts. <i>Presto</i> is marked in the transcription with the indication: ' <i>The indication of Presto appears only in Walther's manuscript. See commentary</i> '.
24	1	1	tied <i>e</i>	untied <i>e</i>	untied <i>e</i>	In Walther's manuscript, the syncopation in the middle voice follows beautifully a syncopation in the upper voice. However, in the subsequent similar passage, the <i>b</i> in m. 30 is untied in both Walther's and Gerber's manuscripts, while it is tied in Source C manuscript. In m. 40, the <i>e</i> is tied in all manuscript sources, which suggests that wherever there is not a tied note, it is either a copying error or a copy of an omission in the lost autograph. In the transcription a tied note in measures 24, 30 and 40 was opted for.
24	3	1	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	The sharp is implied.
30	3	1	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	The sharp is implied.
31	3	1	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	The sharp is implied.
33	3	1	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	The sharp is implied.
43	3	1	<i>g</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>g</i>	The sharp is implied.
55	3	1	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	The sharp is implied.
57	1	1				Gerber accidentally started the second line of the flag from the first instead of the second note of the upper voice. The first <i>b</i> is obviously a quaver.
60	2	2	<i>c #</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>c #</i>	Apparent omission of the sharp by Gerber.
60	3	1	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	The sharp is implied.
61	3	1	<i>G</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>G</i>	The sharp is implied.
65	2	2	<i>d #</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>d #</i>	The sharp is implied in Gerber's manuscript.
65	3	2	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	The sharp is implied.
67	2	2	<i>c #</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>c #</i>	The sharp is implied in Gerber's manuscript.
67	3	2	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	The sharp is implied.
70	3	2	<i>c</i>	<i>c #</i>	<i>c</i>	The sharp is implied in Walther's and Source C manuscripts.
71	3	2	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	The sharp is implied.
73	3	upper voice				Gerber accidentally notated a quaver instead of a semiquaver <i>e</i> .
74	1	1	there are no fermata signs at the end of the piece	there are fermata signs at the end of the piece	there are no fermata signs at the end of the piece	No fermata sign is marked in the transcription.
Allemande						
2	2	3	<i>d</i>	<i>d #</i>	<i>d #</i>	The sharp is implied in Walther's manuscript.
2	3, 4	lower voice	quavers beamed by two	quavers beamed by four	quavers beamed by two	There are other instances where, in all manuscript sources, the bass notes are beamed in groups of 4. Where there is a difference, the bass quavers are beamed by four in Gerber's manuscript, while they are beamed by two in Walther's and Source C manuscript. The longer group of notes in the bass signals its melodic line and also the upper voice's longer phrase comprised by smaller units - upper voice's figurations. Where there is a differentiation in the notation Gerber's version was opted for in the transcription.
3	3, 4	lower voice	quavers beamed by two	quavers beamed by four	quavers beamed by two	See previous comment.
3	4	1	the <i>f #</i> belongs both to the upper and middle voice, as a semiquaver and as a crotchet	the <i>f #</i> belongs only to the upper voice, as a semiquaver	the <i>f #</i> belongs both to the upper and middle voice, as a semiquaver and as a crotchet	The middle voice continues beautifully in the next measure (<i>f # - g</i>). In the transcription the <i>f #</i> belongs to both voices.
3	4	3	<i>d</i>	<i>b</i> corrected to <i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	The error was spotted by Gerber. In order to avoid a smudge on the manuscript, Gerber draws a ledger line under the <i>b</i> of the soprano C clef, suggesting that the note is <i>d</i> .
7		lower voice	quavers beamed by two	quavers beamed by four	quavers beamed by two	See comment m. 2, beats 3, 4.
12	4	1	<i>f # / c #</i>	<i>f # / a # / c #</i>	<i>f # / a # / c #</i>	The additional note <i>a #</i> in Gerber's and Source C manuscripts makes the cadence more complete adding the 3rd of the F Major chord. The additional note is marked in the transcription.

13	2	3	trill	there is no ornament	there is no ornament	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
14	1	4	the semiquaver <i>e</i> has an upward stem	the semiquaver <i>e</i> has two stems, both upward and downward	the semiquaver <i>e</i> has an upward stem	In m. 14, in m. 15, beat 1 and m. 16 in all the beats, Gerber notates the last note of the beat with two stems, while in Source C and Walther's manuscript is notated with one. Both notations were introduced earlier in all the manuscript sources. The transcription follows Walther's and Source's C readings.
14	2	3	trill	there is no ornament	there is no ornament	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
15	1					See comment m. 14, beat 1.
15	2	3	trill	there is no ornament	there is no ornament	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
16	1 to 4					See comment m. 14, beat 1.
16	1, 2					Until the beginning of beat 2, m. 16, Walther has copied again m. 15, an error he corrected himself. Although the wrong notation is faintly visible, the corrected notes, values and rests are fairly clear. A study of Gerber's and Source C manuscripts clarifies the notes, values and rests in perfect accordance with Walther's corrections, apart from the difference in the rhythmic notation between Walther's and Source C manuscripts, and Gerber's manuscript (see comment m. 14, beat 1, position 4).
16	3	1	the <i>c</i> has one downward stem	the <i>c</i> has two stems	the <i>c</i> has one upward stem	A <i>c</i> with one stem was opted for in the transcription.
17	2	1	the <i>b</i> is not tied	the <i>b</i> is tied	the <i>b</i> is tied	Probable omission of the tie by Walther. The repeated 1st chordal note in beat 2 is always tied in the movement. Gerber's / Source's C version was opted for in the transcription.
17	2	2	<i>c</i> #	<i>c</i>	<i>c</i> #	Apparent omission of the sharp by Gerber. A <i>c</i> # was opted for in the transcription
17	2.3	lower voice	quavers beamed by two	quavers beamed by four	quavers beamed by two	See comment m. 2, beats 3, 4.
Courante						
1	2	1	trill	there is no ornament	there is no ornament	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
3	2	1	trill	mordent	mordent	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
4	1	1	<i>g' / e' / e</i>	<i>g' / e</i>	<i>g' / e' / e</i>	In the transcription the <i>e'</i> is marked, as a resolution of the <i>d'</i> # on m. 3, beat 3.
5	1	2	the <i>d</i> is beamed together with the quavers of the next beat	the <i>d</i> has a separate flag	the <i>d</i> is beamed together with the quavers of the next beat	A nice subtlety in the notation is found in Walther's manuscript and Source C: <i>d</i> is the last note of the 1st beat in the upper voice, but the starting note of upper voice's figuration. This notation was opted for in the transcription.
6	3	1	trill	mordent	mordent	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
7	3	1	trill	mordent	mordent	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
9	2	3	<i>g' / c # / E</i>	<i>g' / e' / c # / E</i>	<i>g' / c # / E</i>	In Gerber's manuscript an additional middle voice is introduced just in this beat. The notation of the additional <i>e</i> distracts the direction of the upper voice and 'impoverishes' the effect of the large leap (<i>b - g</i>) of the upper voice that moves mainly in conjunct motion throughout the movement. The same melodic interval is heard only once more in m. 21, towards the end of the <i>Courante</i> . Walther's / Source's C version was opted for in the transcription.
9	3	1	trill	there is no ornament	there is no ornament	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
11	1		a vertical waved line precedes the chord	there is no vertical waved line	a vertical waved line precedes the chord	A vertical waved line to indicate an arpeggiated chord was opted for in the transcription.
11	2	3	trill	there is no ornament	trill	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
12	2	3	trill	mordent	mordent	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
13	2	3	trill	there is no ornament	trill	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
14	1	1	the <i>a</i> has two stems	the <i>a</i> has one upward stem. There is no crotchet rest in the upper voice	the <i>a</i> has one upward stem. There is no crotchet rest in the upper voice	The notation in Walther's manuscript is more accurate since there are three voices and there is no crotchet rest in the other manuscripts. Interestingly, though, the <i>d</i> in the upper voice in the second position, could be seen also as a continuation of the <i>c</i> , the last note of the previous measure. This could suggest that the missing crotchet rest is not an omission. The readings of Gerber's manuscript and Source C was opted for in the transcription.
15	1	<i>d</i>	trill	mordent	mordent	In the transcription a mordent rather than a trill is marked, smoothly connecting the notes of the upper voice (ascending leap of a fourth). Nevertheless, it is marked within parentheses, because the position does not allow for its execution.
15	3	1	trill	mordent	no ornament	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
16	1	1	minim <i>a</i> in the bass	dotted minim <i>a</i> in the bass	dotted minim <i>a</i> in the bass	A dotted minim <i>a</i> has been used in the transcription, completing the values in the bass. However, I do not consider the missing dot in Walther's manuscript to be an omission. Though the crotchet <i>e</i> of the middle voice is ascended to the the minim <i>a</i> , is also somewhat intertwined with the downward conjunct motion in the bass starting from the <i>g</i> .
16	3	1	there is no ornament	mordent	mordent	No ornament is marked in the transcription.
17	3	upper voice	there is a trill in position 1 and a slur over the notes of the upper voice	there is a mordent in position 1 and no slur over the notes of the upper voice	there is a mordent in position 1 and no slur over the notes of the upper voice	Although the written out termination of the ornamented note found in all manuscripts suggests a trill, most likely long, the omission of a slur in Gerber's and Source C manuscripts may indicate the execution of a shorter ornament. The slur found in Walther's manuscript clarifies the execution of a long trill that continues over the last chord of the measure. The execution of a long trill is extremely difficult on the guitar, unless the performer omits note(s) of the upbeat chord. Both ornamentation symbols are included in the transcription. A slur is also marked with the letter indication <i>W</i> (Walther). This is a point of particular importance, because the <i>a</i> (ornamented note) is written one beat before the ending of the long ascending melody in the soprano (<i>b</i> , m. 18). If the performer opts for a short trill, the <i>b</i> will be heard earlier, but also be silenced rather quickly, somewhat interrupting the momentum of the music, which a long trill or a mordent better preserves.

18	2	3	dotted minim <i>d</i> # in the bass	minim <i>d</i> # in the bass	dotted minim <i>d</i> # in the bass	Omission of the dot by Gerber. A dotted minim <i>d</i> # was opted for in the transcription
18	higher middle voice	2	semiquaver <i>d</i> #	quaver <i>d</i> #	quaver <i>d</i> #	In Walther's manuscript, the writing of the <i>d</i> # as a semiquaver, prolongs the rhythmic value of the <i>d</i> on position 1, and so the <i>d</i> # is not heard simultaneously to the <i>g</i> in the bass. The writing of the <i>d</i> # as a quaver in Gerber's and Source C manuscript, retains the rhythmic value of the <i>d</i> as it is, therefore <i>d</i> # and <i>g</i> are heard simultaneously. Walther's version was opted for in the transcription.
18	higher middle voice	3	trill	mordent	no ornament	This is another case where the ornamented note is followed by a written out termination (see also m. 17, beat 3). Both ornaments are marked in the transcription, although the position better supports the execution of a mordent.
18	higher middle voice	6, 7	minim <i>f</i> # / crotchet <i>f</i> #	dotted minim <i>f</i> #	minim <i>f</i> # / crotchet <i>f</i> #	Walther's / Source's C version was opted for in the transcription.
18	upper voice					See separate sheet, p. 33
20	2,3	middle voice	on the upbeat of the 2nd beat there is a crotchet <i>b</i> tied to a crotchet on the 3rd beat. Stave changes on the 3rd beat	on the upbeat of the 2nd beat there is a dotted minim <i>b</i> and one unidentifiable sign made with a different ink	on the upbeat of the 2nd beat there is a minim <i>b</i>	The dot in Gerber's manuscript is placed further to the right than expected even though there is no space limitation. It almost looks as an appoggiatura from above on the <i>a</i> (last chord), which it is obviously not. It corresponds to Gerber's ornate writing of the dots. An identical one is found on m. 18 on the <i>f</i> # (see what Gerber's manuscript reads in m. 18, higher middle voice, position 6-7). The dot in Gerber's manuscript is an error. The crotchet <i>a</i> of the last chord is a continuation of the <i>b</i> . We could not argue that <i>a</i> belongs to another middle voice and that <i>b</i> is still in force there. There is also an unidentifiable sign, a circular mark placed in between the <i>b</i> and the <i>a</i> , that looks like a dot, though does not resemble Gerber's ornate writing. This dot appears somewhat darker. It is not clear whether this dot has been marked above another sign. Maybe Gerber wanted to correct the placement of the dot that he notated initially and he marked another dot. It could be also possible that Gerber corrected the placement of the dot, then he spotted that a dot is not valid here and he marked another circular smudge above the corrected dot to nullificate it. That could explain the somewhat darker colour and that the circular mark does not resemble Gerber's ornate writing of dots. In both cases though I would expect that Gerber would have made erasure marks on the dot that is placed righter. Probably the different notation in Walther's manuscript is due to the stave change. A minim <i>b</i> is chosen in the transcription.
21	2	upper voice	there is a slur	there is no slur	there is no slur	A slur is marked in the transcription.
21	3	1	trill	mordent	mordent	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
22	1	3	<i>g</i>	<i>g</i> #	<i>g</i> #	On the first beat of m. 22 there is no third in the chord, so it could be either an E major or an e minor. Walther retains the tonality of e minor until just before the final chord. In Source C and Gerber's manuscript, the tonality is changed to E major from the first beat, where a sharp is marked on the <i>g</i> . Both versions are included in the transcription.
22	1	2, 3, 4	there is a slur over the notes of the soprano	there is no slur over the notes of the soprano	there is a slur over the notes of the soprano	A slur is marked in the transcription.
22			there is a fermata at the end of the piece	there is no fermata at the end of the piece	there is no fermata at the end of the piece	A fermata has been marked in the transcription.
Sarabande						
1	1	bass	dotted minim <i>e</i>	dotted semibreve <i>e</i>	semibreve <i>e</i>	The chord remains e minor throughout the measure, and the <i>e</i> in the middle voice is a dotted semibreve. Gerber's version was opted for in the transcription.
1	1	upper voice	minim <i>b</i> tied to the next beat	untied dotted minim <i>b</i>	untied dotted minim <i>b</i>	The dot in Gerber's and Source C manuscript is obviously an error. Metrically, it should be a minim <i>b</i> , as in Walther. A tied minim is used in the transcription.
4	1	1	trill	mordent	mordent	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
7	2	1	mordent	there is no ornament	there is no ornament	A mordent was opted for in the transcription.
7	3	1	trill	there is no ornament	there is no ornament	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
7	3		there is a slur over the 16th notes in the soprano	there is no slur over the 16th notes in the soprano	there is no slur over the 16th notes in the soprano	A slur is marked in the transcription.
8	1	1	mordent	there is no ornament	mordent	A mordent was opted for in the transcription.
10	3	upper voice	five 16th notes	three 16th notes and two 32nd notes	three 16th notes and two 32nd notes	See separate sheet, p. 32
11	1	1	there is a marking indicating an arpeggiated chord	there is no marking indicating an arpeggiated chord	there is a marking indicating an arpeggiated chord	In the transcription the indication is included.
11	2	1	trill	there is no ornament	probably a mordent. It seems that the scribe used the upward stem of the note as the vertical line of the mordent	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
13	1	1	trill	there is no ornament	there is no ornament	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
13	1	2	<i>g</i> #	<i>g</i>	<i>g</i>	Apparent omission of the sharp in Gerber's and Source C manuscript. A <i>g</i> # was opted for in the transcription.
13	1	3	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	The sharp is implied.

13	3		seven 32nds	four 32nds the two of which are probably altered to 16ths, one 16th and two 32nds	four 32nds, one 16th and two 32nds	The gap between the space created between the second and third flag is filled in in the 3rd and 4th notes of the figuration, probably to alter the 3rd and 4th 32nds to 16ths. It is hard to understand whether this alteration was made by Gerber himself. The 'filling in' appears somewhat darker in the scans, but the amount of ink used here could explain the somewhat different intensity of the colour. In either case, this alteration does not seem to be made in order to alter the figuration to an intentional 'imprecise' figuration, but to one that is mathematically accurate. Ironically, it is the figuration <i>without</i> the alteration that is mathematically accurate. Regarding the differentiation between Walther's and Gerber's version see separate sheet, p. 32.
14		bass	dotted semibreve c #	semibreve c #, minim c # deleted with a red chalk and faint minim c # (in red chalk)	dotted semibreve c #	Gerber subsequently corrected his misplaced minim at the second beat by drawing deleted lines on the head note and by adding a c # on the 3rd beat. No repetition of the bass was opted for in the transcription.
14	1	1	small ornament-note <i>b</i> (semiquaver) connected with a slur to the note of the soprano	small ornament-note <i>b</i> (quaver) and an additional small- ornamented note <i>b</i> (crotchet) just below it	small ornament-note <i>b</i> (semiquaver) with a tie on the <i>b</i> of the higher middle voice	It is difficult to understand the reason why there are two small notes <i>b</i> (done in red chalk) that precede the chord at position 1 in Gerber's manuscript. There is also a <i>b</i> at the same pitch in the middle voice of the chord. If this has to do with their rhythmic differentiation, then Gerber initially wrote the quaver since he could just add the quaver flag on the crotchet. If this is the case, I do not understand the reason of the rhythmic correction in the <i>ornament</i> -note, moreover so, since in Walther's and Source C manuscripts is a semiquaver. Perhaps Gerber added the note that appears higher (quaver) to clarify its connection with the <i>e</i> of the upper voice. The scribe of Source C seems to have misread the slur as a tie and the ornament-note belongs to the middle voice. A small ornament-note connected with a slur to the <i>e</i> of the upper voice was opted for in the transcription.
14	2	<i>e</i>	trill	there is no ornament	there is no ornament	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
15	1	1	there is no ornament	mordent	Probably a mordent. It seems that the scribe used the upward stem of the note as the vertical line of the mordent	No ornament is marked in the transcription.
17	1	<i>d</i>	slide	there is no ornament	there is no ornament	A slide was opted for in the transcription.
17	2	1	trill	mordent	mordent	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
18	3	1	trill	there is no ornament	there is no ornament	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
19	2	1	trill	mordent	there is no ornament	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
20	2	middle voice	there is not any crotchet note on the upbeat of the 2nd beat	crotchet note on the upbeat of the 2nd beat (in red chalk)	there is not any crotchet note on the upbeat of the 2nd beat	In a subsequently look at his manuscript, Gerber probably paid attention to the bass stave, not seeing the dotted minim belonging to the upper voice, but to the middle voice. He started adding a crotchet note (in red chalk) on the upbeat of beat 2, probably another <i>b</i> . This note is not clear. It is possibly an incomplete addition due to Gerber's realisation of his oversight. No crotchet note was opted for in the transcription, as the <i>f</i> (1st beat) of the middle voice is a semibreve and the dotted minim (1st beat) belongs to the upper voice.
20	2	upper voice	there is a slur over the notes	there is no slur over the notes	there is a slur over the notes	A slur is marked in the transcription.
22	1	1	mordent	there is no ornament	there is no ornament	A mordent was opted for in the transcription.
22	3	1	trill	there is no ornament	there is no ornament	A trill was opted for in the transcription.
22	3	upper voice	the slur seems to comprise all the three notes of the soprano	the slur seems to comprise only the two quavers	there is no slur	Perhaps the difference between Walther's and Gerber's manuscript is due to the fact that there is no trill on the downbeat of beat 3 in Gerber's manuscript. Walther's version was opted for in the transcription.
23	1	2	dotted minim <i>e</i> in the middle voice	minim <i>e</i> in the middle voice	dotted minim <i>e</i> in the middle voice	Apparent omission of the dot by Gerber. A dotted minim <i>e</i> was opted for in the transcription.
Bourée						
15	3	1	trill	there is no ornament	there is no ornament	A trill is marked in the transcription.
Giga						
2	3	bass	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i> #	<i>d</i> #	In Walther's manuscript, the chord changes from B major, (first two beats), to b minor. It is most probably an omission of the sharp by Walther. The change in the quality of the dominant chord in the start of the <i>Giga</i> does not seem plausible. Gerber's / Source's C version was opted for in the transcription.
2	7	bass	minim rest	there is no rest	minim rest	The rest is implied in Gerber's manuscript or its reading follows what looks like a brief disappearance of one voice.
4	2	upper voice	quaver <i>e</i>	crotchet <i>e</i>	quaver <i>e</i>	Apparent error by Gerber.
5	1	middle voice	either a crotchet <i>g</i> or a dotted crotchet <i>g</i>	crotchet <i>g</i>	crotchet <i>g</i>	It is unclear whether there is a dot or a smudge next to the <i>g</i> in Walther's manuscript. If we assume a dotted crotchet, then the <i>b</i> natural on the 3rd beat would belong to a separate middle voice. However, there are no rests that would make such an intention clear. Moreover, in the repetition of the sequence on the 7th beat, the lower voice follows the rhythmic pattern crotchet-quaver. A <i>g</i> crotchet was opted for in the transcription.
7	9	1	<i>b / g / e / c</i>	<i>b / g / e</i>	<i>b / g / e</i>	The enriched chord in Walther's manuscript adds to the bass line a beautiful ornamental character. The colour of the note head of the <i>c</i> does not seem to be the same as the rest of the notes. It appears lighter. It is difficult to understand from the scans of the manuscript but it is possible that the note has been added subsequently, possibly from Walther, as it corresponds with his handwriting. Walther's (additional?) version was opted for in the transcription with the indication: 'The lower note <i>c</i> appears only in Walther's manuscript. See commentary'. The additional <i>c</i> has not been notated in any of the examined editions (even as a version to be ruled out).

9	8	2	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i> #	<i>d</i>	Most likely, the sharp in Walther's and Source C manuscripts is implied. Upper voice's figuration is a written out ornamentation of the root note of the chord. A <i>d</i> # was opted for in the transcription.
10	2,3	upper voice	two quaver rests	no quaver rests	no quaver rests	The rests are implied in Gerber's and Source C manuscript or their readings follow what looks like a brief disappearance of one voice in the next figuration. Rests have been marked in the transcription.
11	1	upper voice	there is no rest	minim rest	minim rest	In the first measure of the second section of the <i>Giga</i> , Walther introduces the upper voice on the 3rd beat. No rest has been marked in the transcription.
14	12	upper voice	semiquaver <i>g</i>	quaver <i>g</i>	semiquaver <i>g</i>	Apparent error by Gerber. A semiquaver <i>g</i> has been used in the transcription.
15	3	2	indistinct note in the soprano, either a <i>g</i> or an <i>f</i> #	<i>f</i> natural	<i>f</i> natural	There are three possibilities concerning Walther's manuscript: 1) if there is a <i>g</i> that would probably be a copying error, or a copy of an error. A sequence begins in m. 15. The note in question belongs to the sequence pattern. From the two repetitions of the sequence, it seems that the note is an <i>f</i> or <i>f</i>#. 2) It is very possible that there is an <i>f</i># (Major 7th). In this case the note is not placed in the exact position. It is not clearly a <i>g</i>, but it is closer to the position of a <i>g</i> rather than an <i>f</i> (#). 3) It is also possible that the accidental was omitted by mistake, a possibility reinforced by Gerber's and Source C manuscripts. I have noted several variants between the 2 primary sources. However, these variants pertain to notes in very few occasions. Nonetheless, it is less possible that an omission of an accidental would have been made by Walther in such a crucial position and, therefore, I believe that Walther's manuscript meant to read an <i>f</i>#. Both versions have been included in the transcription.
15	4, 5, 6	upper voice(s)	the <i>e</i> has an upward stem and the <i>c</i> has a downward stem. There are two quaver rests on the 6th beat	both <i>c</i> and <i>e</i> have an upward stem and there is a quaver rest on the 6th beat	there is no <i>c</i>	Walther separated the higher voices by using stems pointing to different directions, as expected, and by inserting two quaver rests, although there are no rests for the middle voice on the remaining beats of the measure. It is interesting that Gerber uses an upward stem for both <i>c</i> and <i>e</i> , since these notes are both notated in the upper staff and they are very close. Gerber's writing seems to not introduce a third voice, using stems pointing to the same direction and one quaver rest. The <i>c</i> in the higher voice belongs to the sequence pattern beginning in m. 15. Because in the repetitions of the sequence there is no middle voice, <i>d</i> and <i>e</i> respectively, Gerber's version was opted for in the transcription.
16	5	1	<i>c</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>b</i>	From the repetitions of the sequence, it seems that the note is <i>c</i> rather than <i>b</i>. Moreover, Walther's reading is more interesting, as it enriches harmonically the passage, an enrichment very well suited here, immediately followed by upper voice's syncopated rhythmic patterns that propel us towards the <i>Giga</i>'s last moments of tension before the figuration of the 3rd group of notes in m. 18 signals approaching the end of the movement. Walther's version was opted for in the transcription.
18	2	1	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>d</i>	The sharp is implied.

Suite in c minor, BWV 997		
Measure	Beat	Comment
		All my comments indicate what there is in the primary source ms. Bach P 650, the copy of Johann Friedrich Agricola, which is believed to stem from the lost autograph. The suite BWV 997 has 20 manuscript sources, 2 of them privately owned. The editors of the NBA have estimated the sources' affiliation, although in the commentary of the sources the manuscript with the signature 34998,2 is missing. Ms. 34998,2 dates from the 18th century, from an unknown scribe. Its title page is written by Johann Nikolaus Forkel, according to the information included in 'Bach digital'. A more detailed examination of this manuscript is needed before I can make a justified estimation of its derivation. My first estimation is that it is a copy of Agricola's manuscript (ms. 1322, the estimated direct derivative of Agricola's manuscript, has a later date). The possibility that it stems directly from the lost autograph is not ruled out. Due to time limitation, I have examined the manuscript only in the most dubious passages of the Suite. The manuscript corresponds with the readings in Agricola's manuscript. I will certainly return to the examination of this important Source to make a more assured judgement of the Source's affiliation. I managed to acquire the digital scans of 19 of the manuscript sources, omitting only one of the privately owned manuscripts (Wensiecki). In addition to the manuscript sources I have also acquired the digital scans of the personal manuscript of Alfred Dörffel, the editor of several volumes, including the lute works, of the first complete edition of Bach's works (BGA). This manuscript is very interesting as it contains Dörffel's notes that accompany the musical text. In certain passages of my commentary I have examined and indicate what is notated in the acquired manuscript sources. When there is not such an indication, the comment pertains to Agricola's manuscript.
<i>Prelude</i>		To facilitate the commentary the beat is set to crotchet. All editors agree that the upper voice is notated an octave higher. The unusual distance between the upper voice and the rest of the voices creates an unbalanced composition. Presumably this notation was made for reasons of notational clarity.
4	3	Flat on the <i>a</i> (<i>a</i> : natural on the <i>f</i>). This is a copy of a flat that was required in the source from which Agricola made his copy, but which is unnecessary in this case. See next comment.
8	3	There is no natural sign on the <i>a</i> of the second position. It could be an omission on the part of Agricola, or an omission in the autograph from where Agricola is believed to have made his copy. The 3-semitone interval does not make sense. However, throughout the examination of Agricola's copy of the <i>Prelude</i> , there are several instances where an <i>a</i> lacks a natural sign. In most of these instances the missing accidental is a genuine omission and not something that the scribe would consider superfluous to add. Moreover, <i>throughout</i> the piece, there are suspiciously numerous instances where an <i>a</i> is preceded by a cautionary accidental (flat). If Agricola's copy, indeed, stems from the autograph, I believe that Bach's lost autograph was written in c minor with two flat signs in the key signature, in Dorian mode, without an <i>a</i> flat, similarly to the notation of the first violin sonata in g minor, BWV 1001, that has 1 flat in the key signature. During the examination of the piece, certain noted cases reinforce this assumption. If this assumption is true, Agricola did not make the necessary alterations in these instances.
8	3,4	There is a natural sign on the <i>b</i> (first position) of the 3rd and 4th beat (<i>a</i> : g#). The other two <i>b</i> miss the natural sign. The missing accidentals are apparently implied, with the first one altering the last note of a characteristic ornamental motif that first appears in m. 7, and the second altering the note belonging to an implied voice (its previous note being a <i>b</i> with a natural sign).
9		There is no tie on the <i>e</i> (flat) of the upper voice (<i>a</i> : c). It seems to be an omission. The tie introduces a syncopation on the upper voice (the downbeat carried over from the upbeat) which is repeated up to m. 10. This type of syncopation is found several times throughout the piece. However, in the corresponding passage at m. 45, the <i>a</i> (flat) misses, also, a tie (<i>a</i> : f). This poses a question as to whether the missing of the ties is an apparent omission of Agricola. If Agricola's manuscript stems from the lost autograph, these ties were probably missing there as well: from the 20 sources of the Suite, 12 or 13 contain the <i>Prelude</i> (see initial comment). Among the 4 manuscripts that do not include a tie is the tablature from Weyrauch, which may also stem from the lost autograph according to the editors of the NBA. It is interesting to note that the ms 1322, estimated to have derived from Agricola's copy, has a tie both in m. 9 and m. 45. Interestingly, however, it seems to have been marked by a different pen: it is an addition. A tied <i>e</i> (<i>a</i> : tied c) was opted for in the transcription with the indication: 'P 650: No tie'.
9	4	The natural sign on the <i>a</i> is missing (<i>a</i> : sharp on the <i>f</i>). Agricola accidentally omitted to make the necessary marking of the accidental that is rightly missing in the source from which he copied his manuscript. See comment m. 8, beat 3.
10	3	The natural sign on the <i>a</i> is missing. See comment m. 8, beat 3.
15	2	The natural sign on the <i>a</i> is missing. See comment m. 8, beat 3.

16	2	It seems that Agricola, initially, had not written the natural sign on the <i>a</i> (a: f#) and he added it later, since it is placed a little above the note and it seems to be squeezed in between the notes, compared to the other accidentals. Moreover, there is not any particular spatial problem in this measure. If this assumption is correct, then the proposal that the autograph was notated in c minor with only two flats in the key signature becomes even more plausible. See comment m. 8, beat 3.
17	1	Another omission of the natural sign on the <i>a</i> . It is interesting that in the exact repetition of the upper voice in the next two measures a natural sign has been marked on the <i>a</i> . I am almost certain that the source from which Agricola copied his manuscript was written in c minor with two flats in the key signature.
20	2	The accidental is not placed before the note and seems to have been added later. See comment m. 16. However, here there is the possibility that Agricola marked the accidental at this position because there is a space limitation: he changes stave and he wants to include all of the 2nd beat before the stave change.
26	3, 4	Agricola marked the flat on the <i>d</i> of the first position (a: b flat) and not on the <i>d</i> of the 3rd position in both beats. The flat is implied (see comment m. 8, beats 3-4).
32	1	This is the most interesting point in the <i>Prelude</i> : all the examined editions give a <i>c</i> flat (a: a flat) on the second position. This must be a misreading (or a copy of a misreading) of Agricola's manuscript, and for a good reason: in Agricola's copy, the natural sign on the <i>c</i> has a faint downward line and, thus, could be misread as a flat sign. However, this is not this only reason for the misreading. The natural sign is a cautionary accidental, both since the <i>c</i> in the previous measure (4 positions before) has a flat sign and, also, because a <i>c</i> flat here could surely make sense. The fact that it is a <i>cautionary</i> accidental, with a faint downward line, makes the misreading of a flat very probable, since, if there had been an accidental here, it would most probably be a flat (not for musical reasons, but because a natural sign is only cautionary). Both readings do make sense musically. However, Agricola's copy does have the natural sign there. Further thoughts arise in correspondence with the similar passage of m. 51. There, the <i>a</i> of the same position remains flat, i.e. it does not have a natural sign. Would that mean that Agricola's reading here is an error, or that, taking under consideration the missing alterations of Agricola (on which I have commented above), he copied from the source an <i>a</i> without an accidental that in the source meant a natural <i>a</i> in m. 51? Moreover, if the <i>a</i> of m. 51 in the source from where Agricola made his copy is flat, then the flat was marked in the source and it could be possible that Agricola would have copied the flat as well, as we have seen in m. 5 and we will see in five more instances in the <i>Prelude</i>. However, Agricola has not notated an unnecessary flat on the previous <i>a</i> (previous beat), which signals that he was not copying an unnecessary flat in this measure. Another element to observe is that the same motion of the upper voice found in both passages is under different harmony and, moreover, its continuation differs. These important differences may explain the different versions found in Agricola's manuscript, regardless of the fact that a flattened <i>a</i> does make sense. Last but not least, if the source from which Agricola copied his manuscript notated an <i>a</i> at this point, without a flat, i.e. an <i>a</i> natural, it would very probable preceded by a cautionary accidental of the natural sign, difficult to miss from Agricola. It is most likely that Agricola did not copy the unnecessary flats in m. 51. Regarding m. 32, I believe that a notation of a natural sign of a note that was notated flat before is less likely to be an error: it is an alteration. You differentiate your notation. Regarding the second case of m. 51, it initially cast some doubts on both of my choices, which vanished after the subsequent considerations mentioned above. An <i>a</i> natural (c: c natural) and <i>f</i> natural (c: a flat) was opted for in the transcription in m. 32 and m. 51 respectively. These choices correspond, also, to my performance preference. As expected, ms. 1322 of 1836, believed to stem from Agricola's copy, and the manuscript P 308 that is believed to stem from ms. 1322, has a natural sign in m. 35 as well. Ms 34998,2 (see initial comment) and ms. P 552 that is believed to stem from another lost manuscript (NBA), notate a <i>c</i> natural as well (P 552 without the sign). It is interesting to note the reading of P 552 in m. 51: the scribe has marked the (unnecessary) flat on each <i>a</i> (position 2, beats 2,3) . Although the scribe of the manuscript from which P 552 derives is unknown, it gives an additional element that supports Agricola's not copying the two unnecessary flats that he saw in the manuscript from which he worked. It was very interesting to look at the manuscript of Alfred Dörffel: in his manuscript, there are four comments above this measure: the three of them were made with the same ink as the musical notes, presumably at the same time. Above the first beat he notes: V: mit (with) b. Above this note: IV: mit ♯. Above this note: II mit ♯ and above this note he has made a comment with a red pencil or pen, where he wrote: F. mit ♯ (I am not sure that the letter is an 'F'). These red markings seem to have been made subsequently. However, though he has made some corrections or additions with this red pencil in the musical text, the flat of the <i>c</i> remained unchanged. Whether he misread Agricola's manuscript and the natural signs correspond with his readings of other manuscripts, justifying his choice of <i>c</i> flat, or whether he decided to differentiate from Agricola's copy, remains unknown. It should be mentioned, though, that he was aware of the possibility of a <i>c</i> natural.
35	3	Flat on the <i>a</i> (a: natural on the f). An unnecessary duplication.
37	3	Flat on the <i>a</i> (1st position). An unnecessary duplication.
43	1	Cautionary accidental (natural sign) on the <i>d</i> (a: b natural).
45	3	The <i>a</i> (flat) is not tied. See comment m. 9. A tied <i>f</i> (c: a flat) was opted for in the transcription with the indication: 'P 650: No tie'.
47	4	Flat on the <i>a</i> (a: natural on the f). An unnecessary duplication.
50	4	Flat sign on the <i>a</i> . An unnecessary duplication.
51	3	The <i>a</i> does not have a natural sign. An <i>f</i> without a sharp (a minor) was also opted for in the transcription. See comment m. 32.
54	2	There is no natural sign on the <i>a</i> . Again, Agricola did not make the necessary alteration.
55	2	Flat sign on the <i>a</i> . An unnecessary copy.
Fuga		The upper voice is notated an octave higher. See introductory comment of the <i>Prelude</i> .

5	2	The lower voice is notated one octave higher until m. 6. There are quite a few instances in the <i>Fuga</i> where the middle voice is also notated one octave higher, apart from the upper voice. Since the upper voice is notated an octave higher throughout the piece, this has to do with a preference to represent the actual distance between the upper and middle voice in certain instances, even though not in the right octave, important in the contrapuntal writing of the <i>Fuga</i> . In this passage, the third voice has not yet been introduced.
6	4	The tie on the <i>c</i> is missing.
7	3	In the introduction of the third voice, the middle voice (previously the higher notated voice) is notated an octave higher until the 1st beat of m. 18.
12	5	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>b</i> .
13	5	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>e</i> (a: natural on the <i>c</i>).
14	5	The flat sign is not repeated on the <i>a</i> of the bass. See previous comment.
26	2	The middle voice is notated an octave higher until the 1st beat of m. 31.
27	3	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> . This is probably a deliberate copy of the flat sign.
32	6	The middle voice is notated an octave higher until the first beat of m. 49.
45	1	The bass note is an <i>e</i> rather than a <i>d</i> . It is obviously a copying error, or a copy of an error in the lost autograph.
55		Agricola marked natural signs on the two <i>b</i> of the upper voice, an obvious error. He crossed the first natural sign with a line to cancel its effect. He either omitted to cancel the second one or he considered that the first cancelation would imply the second.
56-57		Not all of the accidentals have been marked. They are implied.
60	2	The middle voice is notated an octave higher until m. 62.
62	2	Cautionary accidental (natural) on the <i>f</i> .
64	1	The upper middle voice is notated an octave higher until the 3rd beat of m. 71.
66	2	Cautionary accidental on the <i>b</i> (a: natural on the <i>g</i>).
74	5	There is no accidental on the repeated <i>b</i> . It is implied.
80	1	The middle voice is notated an octave higher until m. 84.
86-87		Not all of the accidentals have been marked. They are implied.
90	5	There is no flat on the <i>d</i> of the upper voice (a: flat on the <i>b</i>). From the 14 manuscripts sources of the suite that contain the <i>Fuga</i>, 2 (M 34998,2 and ms. P 308) contain the <i>d</i> without a flat. Ms. P 308 is estimated to stem from ms. 1322, a derivative of Agricola's copy. We can assume what there was in ms. 1322 where, unfortunately, part of the manuscript is lost. The <i>Fuga</i> is incomplete, containing only measures 1-54. It is interesting to note that in both versions of the <i>Fuga</i> that the manuscript sources 6138/18 and ms. P 286 contain, there is a <i>d</i> flat. The other source that is believed to stem from the lost autograph, Weyrauch's tablature, does not contain the <i>Fuga</i>, so Agricola's manuscript remains the only primary source. M. 90 is part of the passage mm. 88-92 that entails implied voices. Seeing the sub-phrases of the upper voice in quavers we have in the tonality of a minor: <i>c-b-a</i> (question), <i>d-c#-d</i> (answer), <i>b-a-g</i> (Q), <i>c-b-c</i> (A), <i>a-g-f</i> (Q), <i>b-a-b</i> (A), <i>g#-f-e</i> (Q), <i>a-g#-a</i> (A) and <i>f-e-d</i>. (The first appearance of the 'answering motif' is in an upbeat position, since m. 88 is slightly different. It is interesting to observe the next appearances of the answering motif, where the concluding note is, also, not in the first position of mm. 90, 91 and 92, but in the second position. In the first position, there is a note that belongs in another additional layer, functioning as a pedal note. The concluding note is 'heard' on the first position: it is the root of the chord that changes there and is also heard in a lower octave in the bass.) Looking at the horizontal movement of the voices, the starting note of the answering motif seems, crucially, to be the same as its concluding note. In considering the underlying harmony, however, the possibility of a flat on the <i>b</i> can be raised, regarding the note as a tonicisation of the coming F major harmony at the end of m. 90 (considering, also, that both readings are found among the sources). <i>B</i> flat (<i>c</i>: <i>d</i> flat) was opted for in the transcription with the indication: '<i>P 650: d (natural) [b (natural) in a minor]. See commentary</i>'.
93-97		The middle voice is notated an octave higher.
96	1	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>b</i> .
97	1	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> .
96-97		Not all of the accidentals have been marked. They are implied.
98	1	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> .
102		The middle voice is notated one octave higher until the 1st beat of m. 105.
106-107		Not all of the accidentals have been marked. They are implied.

106-107		See separate sheet, p. 34
108	1	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>e</i> .
Sarabande		The voices on the treble clef are notated an octave higher. See introductory comments of <i>Prelude</i> and <i>Fuga</i> .
10	3	No flat sign on the <i>d</i> (position 3). It is implied.
11	1	The second note of the upper voice <i>d</i> has a natural sign that is a cautionary accidental (a: b natural). Some editors have misread, I believe, Agricola's manuscript; other editors preferred to deviate and others have noted a <i>d</i> with a natural sign. Some confusion may have arisen because of the 3 <i>d</i> of the previous measure that have a flat sign and the fact that a <i>d</i> flat sounds very convincing as well. A cautionary accidental of a natural sign has more opportunity for misreading, because of the fact that is cautionary and that it shares some similarities with the flat sign, moreover where a flat sign could make sense. It is interesting that it is not only Agricola's manuscript and its derivatives that note a natural sign on that position. However, in Weyrauch's tablature the letter indicates a <i>d</i> with a flat sign. From the 14 manuscript sources that include the Sarabande, 9 notate the <i>d</i> with a natural sign. A <i>b</i> with a natural sign (a minor) was opted for in the transcription.
22	1	The <i>c</i> of the bass is not tied (a: a). It seems that the bass note was not tied in the lost autograph, if the assumption that both Agricola's copy and Weyrauch's tablature stem from it is valid (in Weyrauch's tablature the letter is repeated). Ms. 34998.2 reads an untied <i>c</i> as well. Out of the 14 manuscript sources to include the Sarabande, 5 do not mark a tie. A tied <i>a</i> (a minor) is noted in the transcription with the indication: 'P 650: No tie', retaining the syncopation in the bass.
31	1	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> .
31	3	Cautionary accidental (natural) on the <i>f</i> .
Gigue		The upper voice is notated one octave higher (See introductory comments of previous movements).
12	3	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> .
26	4	The bass note is a <i>g</i> instead of an <i>f</i> . It is a notational error.
37	4	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>b</i> .
Double		Looking at the notational distribution of the voices in the <i>Double</i>, we understand that their distance is literal. If not totally convinced from the first measure, we are from the third. It is not something unexpected, since there are a lot of instances that one of the two voices starts a phrase to be continued from the other. This connection of the voices in some passages is probably the reason why, in the <i>Double</i>, unlike the other movements of the suite, both voices are written an octave higher (not at their actual pitch). Correspondence with the <i>Gigue</i> also justifies this. However, I will look closer at some particular passages in which the voices may, very possibly I believe, have been notated in a different octave from the one introduced in the beginning. The peculiarity in the notation that was introduced from the first movement of the Suite and also the unusual range of the bass voice of the <i>Double</i>, asks for a further alert from the part of the editor.
m9-end of the first section		Performance questions arose when I looked in the manuscript in these measures. However, it was the corresponding passage in the second part of the <i>Double</i> that indicated at the outset that a closer look is required for both passages. In order to arrive in any conclusions, I had not only to examine the corresponding passage of m. 41-end of <i>Double</i>, but also to start my examination from there, since it has some additional considerations. See commentary at the corresponding passage of m. 41-end of <i>Double</i>, pp. 35-36.
13		cautionary accidental (flat) on both <i>e</i> .
14	1	The editors of the urtext editions, with the exception of Alfred Dörffel (BGA) have misread, I believe, the second note in Agricola's manuscript. It is a <i>b</i> with a natural sign (a: g#), not an <i>a</i> with a natural sign (a: f#). The only urtext edition that reads a <i>b</i> natural is the BGA. Looking in the personal manuscript of Alfred Dörffel, he has marked two asterisks below the note. The explanation of the asterisks reads: IV fal ħa. 'fal' is probably an abbreviation of 'falsch' (false, incorrect). In m. 15, Dörffel has made another comment with the same abbreviation pertaining to the bass note <i>d</i> of m. 15: IV fal b. Indeed, in one of the manuscripts, (P 308) the bass note is erroneously repeated (b=b flat in German musical alphabet). (Possibly 'IV' then, belongs to ms. P 308, because in m. 14 the manuscript reads <i>a</i> with the natural sign.) Regarding Agricola's manuscript: the natural sign is on the height of a <i>b</i>. The note head of the <i>b</i> is a somewhat below (still though more a <i>b</i> than an <i>a</i>); however, Agricola, as is more apparent in the other movements of the suite, tends sometimes to write the notes placed in these positions (that is, above the staff) somewhat low (<i>b</i> of the bass clef and <i>g</i> of the treble clef). Correspondence with the manuscripts that are connected to Agricola's copy further justifies that the note in Agricola's copy is <i>b</i> natural. A <i>b</i> natural also makes more sense, as it belongs to the two notes (<i>b</i> natural-<i>c</i>) that remain unchanged in the previous measure, while the bass note that precedes them is moving stepwise. Correspondence with the similar passage (mm. 45-46) of the second part of the <i>Double</i> further justifies that the note is a <i>b</i> natural.
14		Agricola accidentally marked a bar line after the 3rd beat (where he changes staff) and he scratched the manuscript in order to 'erase' it.
14	5	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> .

16	1	There is no bass note at the 1st beat. In the manuscript sources that are not connected with Agricola's manuscript, there is a <i>g</i> crotchet in the lower voice followed by a quaver rest. The endings of the two parts of the <i>Double</i> differ, not only in the upper voice, but also in the motion of the bass. In the second ending, there are additional notes in m. 47 where there are quaver rests in m. 15. This not only justifies the writing of the bass note in the 1st beat of <i>Double's</i> last measure, but also justifies the omission of a bass note in the 1st beat of the last measure of the first part. In m. 15, the bass note <i>d</i> (a: b) continues at the <i>d</i> of the upper voice of m. 16 (second note), creating a beautiful additional layer in the upper voice. We may see this additional layer at the end of the piece as well, however, the additional bass notes would make the last measure sounding 'empty' without a bass on the 1st beat, unlike m. 16. I believe that in the lost autograph there was no bass on the 1st beat of m. 16, as Agricola's manuscript reads, and that the bass note of the 1st beat in m. 16, founded in the manuscript sources that are not connected with Agricola's manuscript, was an alteration in an early source, in order to 'similarize' the endings of <i>Double's</i> first and second part, subsequently copied.
17	4	Cautionary accidental flat on the <i>a</i> (a: natural on the <i>f</i>). It is interesting to look closer at the flat of the first <i>a</i> . It seems to be made with a different pen, probably later than the rest of the text. There are two similar signs later on the piece that seems to have been added in the manuscript and I will comment in the relevant measures. I presume that these signs have been made from a different hand. The last additional sign in particular does not seem to correspond with Agricola's handwriting. Moreover, I do not think that Agricola would have <i>subsequently</i> added cautionary accidentals especially in <i>only</i> these two passages. Further concerns arise from an accidental that it is not cautionary. See comment m. 41.
23	3	Cautionary accidental (natural) on the <i>d</i> .
24	3	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> .
27-28		The <i>a</i> of the 4th beat exceeds the range of the ten-string guitar (a: f). For that reason, I have changed the position of the two <i>c</i> of the next measure (a: a), so that the higher <i>a</i> precedes the lower <i>a</i> . The <i>b</i> natural (a: g#) of the bass is also unplayable for technical reasons, so it is notated an octave higher in the transcription. The octave alterations have been indicated.
32	1	Concerns arise regarding the actual pitch of the bass note at beat one. It is not difficult to estimate the actual pitch of the second bass note at the 4th beat, since it both functions as the concluding note of the upper voice's figure and also the bass note from which the new phrase of the lower voice will start at the next measure (from <i>e</i> flat to <i>d</i>) (a: c to b). Thus, the second bass note is notated an octave higher as expected, like the upper voice and the continuation of the lower voice's phrase. However, the range of the bass note at the 1st beat is extremely low if we are to suggest that the lower voice is written, here as well, an octave higher. That would exceed both the range capacity of the lute and the harpsichord. It could though make musical sense, avoiding a repetition of the bass note in the same octave and corresponding with the bass note of the last measure. However, in the last measure, there is a repetition of the bass note in the same octave if the upper voice in the last 2 measures is notated an octave higher, unlike previous measures and unlike the lower voice, as I believe. In the commentary to the corresponding passage I justify this estimation. This rise further concerns regarding the actual pitch of the first note of the last measure of the <i>Double</i> . Should I suggest that the bass note of the last measure is notated an octave higher unlike the previous bass notes creating the upward 4th interval instead of a downward 5th that is more suited here and avoiding as well the bass repetition? This suggestion would lend further support to the idea that the first bass note of m. 32 is notated an octave higher as well; however, that would cause at m. 32 a bass note repetition and that would mean that the scribe altered the notational octave of this single note in both measures. I have good reasons to believe that in this movement the scribe altered the notational octave of passages; however, I am less willing to believe that this notational alteration was made in a single note. In the <i>Double</i> I have faced the most difficult editorial decisions encountered in all of the lute works. Due to range and performance considerations, I have chosen to notate the first bass notes of both mm. 32 and 48 one octave higher. I believe that the dot of the bass note in the 1st beat of the last measure, included in the examined editions, is not forgotten and I have a hope that this indicates the necessary avoidance of the upper voice going lower than the bass.
32	rests in the upper voice	It is interesting to notice the precision in the notation of the rests, which corresponds to the beat hierarchy. Wherever there are rests with the total duration of 3 semiquavers, a semiquaver rest is followed by a quaver rest when the rests refer to the last 3 semiquavers of the 6 and a quaver rest is followed by a semiquaver when the rests refer to the first semiquavers of the 6 (m. 16 and m. 32).
33	1	Cautionary accidental on the <i>a</i> .
33	5	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>b</i> . This seems to be an addition. See comment m. 17.
34	5	Cautionary accidental on the <i>e</i> .
41-end		See separate sheets, pp. 35-36.

41	5	<p>Another controversial part of the <i>Double</i> : in all the urtext editions a cautionary flat sign on the <i>e</i> (a: natural on the c) and another flat sign on the <i>g</i> (a: flat on the e) are marked. What is there in Agricola's manuscript? There is certainly one flat sign. And this sign corresponds to the <i>e</i> (a: c) and not to the <i>g</i> (a: e). It is at the same height as the <i>g</i>, but it is placed before the <i>e</i>. It is not only its vertical alignment that suggests that belongs to the <i>e</i>. The manuscript seems to have been scratched, very elegantly, before the <i>g</i> (where an accidental would be). The colour of the manuscript is lighter there and there are faint traces of what was written before the 'erasure'. It is very likely then, that <i>g</i> had a flat sign. The cautionary accidental on the <i>e</i> is a correction of a misplaced flat sign. This also explains the space limitation that caused the flat on the <i>e</i> to appear higher. What although is problematic, is that the additional sign seems to have been made subsequently from a different hand (see comment m. 17). That suggests that the Source ms. 1322, which the NBA editors believe to derive from Agricola's copy, and which also reads only an <i>e</i> flat there, was written probably after this correction. If ms. 1322 was an early manuscript it would give more authority to this addition, in terms that this addition would have been made in a date closer to when Agricola made his manuscript copy. However, the exact date of the manuscript noted in the end of the <i>Double</i> is 1836. The indication notes: '<i>Il Fine / 1836</i>'. The earlier source ms. 34998,2 has also a flat sign just on the <i>b</i>. Even if my first estimation that ms. 34998.2 derives from Agricola's manuscript is true, that would not give enough authority to the alteration in Agricola's copy, in terms of its early date, since the exact date of ms. 34998,2 has not yet been estimated. Unfortunately, the important source of Weyrauch's tablature does not include the <i>Double</i>. Its reading would facilitate my editorial choice. Another source, possibly a derivative of ms. 1322 according to the editors of NBA, reads an <i>e</i> flat there as expected. The remaining manuscripts that include the <i>Double</i> have whether flat signs on both the <i>e</i> (a: c natural) and <i>g</i> (a: e flat) (ms. 6138/18, P 218, P286, P 549-550, P 413 and the manuscript from T. Koopman's collection) or just the flat on the <i>g</i> (ms. 30196, P 513). It is possible, then, that a subsequent addition from an unknown hand, has affected the readings of four manuscript sources - but by no means certain. I cannot say with certainty that Agricola (if he is not the one who did the alterations) was unaware of the alterations. Regarding the validity of this alteration, even if Agricola was unaware of it, the unknown hand that altered Agricola's manuscript, if it had a flat sign on the <i>g</i>, scratching the sign in order to erase it and adding a cautionary accidental, would probably have a good reason. The marking or not of a flat sign on the <i>g</i> (a: e flat) was a difficult editorial decision. I ultimately followed my performance preference: an <i>e</i> without the flat sign (a minor) was opted for in my transcription.</p>
42	5	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> .
45	3,5	Cautionary accidental (flat) on both <i>a</i> .
46	5	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> .

Prelude, Fuga and Allegro in E \flat major, BWV 998		
Measure	Beat	Comment
Prelude		
Title		Prelude pour la Luth. ò Cembal. par J. S. Bach.
12	6	There is a smudge on the manuscript. Above the unclear note <i>d</i> (D: c#) Bach wrote the letter <i>d</i> to facilitate the reader. See also commentary of the Suite in g minor, BWV 995, <i>Gavotte Ire</i> , m. 18.
16	7	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> (D: natural on the <i>g</i>).
19	6	There is probably a sharp sign in the position of the note <i>f</i> (D: e) before the second group of quavers. Possibly Bach forgot to mark the sharp on the <i>f</i> (6th beat) and he added it later on that position since there is more space.
20	6	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> (D: natural on the <i>g</i>).
37	4	It seems that Bach notated the <i>a</i> as a quaver instead of a crotchet in the beginning. There is a thick and straight line over the usually curved flag of a quaver in order to delete the value of the flag so that the note is seen as a crotchet.
40	12	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> (D: natural on the <i>g</i>).
46, 47	rests on the bass voice	It can be assumed that the 2 quaver rests in the beginning are placed on the 4th and 5th beat as they appear in the next measure. Bach may as well accidentally have written a quaver rest (2nd rest) instead of a crotchet (4th beat). In both measures a quaver rest is missing. If the quaver rests of m. 46 had been placed in the same metrical position of m. 47 I would suggest that this could have been done on purpose. A quaver rest (3rd beat) followed by a crotchet rest (4th beat) was opted for in the transcription in both measures.
46	4	The note head of the <i>g</i> (D: f#) is rather big and slightly below its line. Probably its size hides an initially written <i>f</i> .
46	7	Tilman Hoppstock's urtext edition reads <i>e</i> (Eb: f) in the middle voice with the indication: "in the manuscr. not really legible, but because of parallels, e should be orig. (not d !)". The same reading (<i>e</i>) appears in his performance edition. However, he mentioned his changing of opinion in a meeting we had in 2013 (Royal Conservatoire, Glasgow). In the manuscript, the note is clearly an <i>e</i> (flat) (D: d). It could be argued that its note head is large, however, looking throughout the movement there are several instances with similar sized note heads - in some cases even larger (and not as a result of hiding a previously written error note). Nonetheless, the size of the note head is somewhat larger compared to most of the notes in the movement. However, such an observation regarding the note in question would suggest that the note head is somewhat larger in order to hide a previously written <i>e</i> (flat) - its size therefore, should cover the position of the <i>e</i> and extended upwards to reach the position of <i>f</i> . The notehead of the note is clearly within the 3rd space of the bass stave and not even slightly extended upwards to cross the 4th line of the stave. Parallel fifths would be expected to be avoided but not in such a rigid way as to suggest that Bach errorly written <i>e</i> (flat) instead of <i>f</i> . Moreover, the fact that the parallels are not between the outer voices and the upper voice moves in between these chords, smooths out the 'strong' sound of parallels. <i>D</i> [Eb: e (flat)] was opted for in the transcription.
46	9	There is a marking that could be interpreted as a note head crossed with a line, i.e. an <i>e</i> (flat) in the bass (D: d), but it does not make sense. Moreover, it is placed in a clearly lower position than an <i>e</i> would have been. At first sight it could be seen as a note with an upward stem but the 'stem' is the lower quaver rest of beat 9. I cannot decipher what this marking is, however, it is not a bass note.

Fuga		
4	4	All the examined editions notate <i>f</i> (D: e) in the last note of the upper voice. In the autograph the note seems to be an <i>e</i> (flat). Its position is not clearly aligned, but, surely, it is closer to the position of the <i>e</i> than the position of the <i>f</i> . What is interesting is that this version does make sense. However, correspondence with the melodic figuration's next appearances is crucial. In the first section of the <i>Fuga</i> we find in several instances this downward melodic figuration [from <i>a</i> (flat) to <i>d</i> (D: g-c#) in m. 4], or its last part - from <i>f</i> to <i>d</i> (D: e-c#). The whole figuration is found in m. 4, m. 8 and m. 15 in the upper voice; the last part of the figuration is found in m. 12 - middle voice, m. 14 - upper voice and m. 16 - middle voice. In all these appearances, the melodic interval created between the note in question and the preceding note is a perfect fourth with the exception of m. 4. A closer look at m. 10, though, is really important: the middle voice in beat 3 entails a rhythmic variation of the melodic figure, where its melodic and upbeat rhythmic functions, however, remain the same. In m. 10 the melodic interval in question is a minor third. It is also interesting that this figuration contains identical notes with m. 4, found once more in m. 14. In m. 21 (middle voice) we see once again the melodic interval of minor third, however, the note in the examined position is the starting note of another figure: the ending of the first figuration is interrupted by the insertion of another figure in this exact position. It could be argued that it is less likely that the figuration's first appearance to be one of the two that differs. However, in the autograph there is, most probably, an <i>e</i> (flat) in m. 4, creating a minor third interval that is also found, albeit in a rhythmic variation, elsewhere. That being said, I prefer not to assume that the <i>e</i> (flat) (D: d) that is notated in the autograph is an error note. A <i>d</i> [Eb: e(flat)] was opted for in the transcription with the indication: 'See commentary'. I am grateful to Jonathan Leathwood for proposing further investigation of this point.
7	1	There is a circular mark, like a note head, in the position of <i>b</i> (flat) (D: a). Isolating the measure, <i>b</i> (flat) could make sense; however, Bach introduces the third voice in this exact position by inserting a crotchet rest. <i>B</i> (flat) would introduce a fourth voice in just the 1st beat of the measure, which cannot be considered as a case of 'chordal polyphony'. Moreover, the circular mark is missing a stem. There is no <i>b</i> flat (D: a) in the transcription.
15	3, 4	The notes of the last two beats in the upper voices are not clear. Bach initially wrote different notes and the subsequently added the notes are unclear. Above the staff he wrote the letters <i>b</i> (<i>b</i> = <i>b</i> flat) <i>a</i> (there is no letter to indicate <i>a</i> flat) and <i>g</i> , corresponding to the notes of the passage in all the examined editions.
18	4	The identity of the note of m. 18, 4th beat, is one of the disputable points of the <i>Fuga</i> . Here, Bach did not mark a sharp on the <i>f</i> of the last note of the upper voice (D: sharp on the <i>e</i>). He marked it on the repeated <i>f</i> of the next measure. In his edition (2002), Frank Koonce justifies his editorial choice (D: e): "E-natural is justified, . . . when one considers the harmonic structure of this phrase that cadences in B minor. With E-natural, beat four is a first-inversion iv chord in the key of B minor; the soprano line ascends to E-sharp in measure 19, this pitch functioning as an appoggiatura to F-sharp (root of the V chord). If one rewrites the anticipation as an E-sharp, the chord at the upbeat to m. 19 becomes an augmented 6th-chord, which is out of character with the surrounding harmonic progression" (p. 73). Among the urtext editions, NBA and Paolo Cherici's edition also read an <i>f</i> here (D: e). In BGA edition, the sharp is marked above the note to indicate an editorial concern regarding the identity of the note, similarly to Tilman Hoppstock's edition, where the sharp is within a parenthesis with the indication: "wurde vergessen (?)" (perhaps forgotten?). In his second volume dedicated to Bach's lute works (2013), however, Hoppstock acknowledges and justifies that the note should be read as it appears in the autograph, i. e. without the sharp. The question as to whether there is a sharp on the note arises from the fact that whenever, throughout the <i>Fuga</i> , the written out appoggiaturas are preceded by a chord, this chord is anticipatory. The note without alteration does make sense, but playing the upper note of the chord as <i>f</i> natural (D: e) in this particular case singles out the upbeat note creating both a phrase and a listening break, because an <i>f</i> sharp would be expected. Frank Koonce acknowledges that this choice "would be more consistent, melodically, with the usual shape of this motive (a rising or descending figure with an anticipatory upbeat)" (p. 73). I think that this choice would, also, not be out of character with the surrounding harmonic progression: m. 18 belongs to a sequential progression starting from m. 17, beat 2 and ending in m. 20, beat 1. Every sequence lasts for four beats causing a temporarily tonicisation. We could also suggest that the phrase where the note under question belongs cadences to F# major (beat 1 of m. 19), the concluding chord of the sequence, and not to b minor (beat 2 of m. 19) interpreting the chord in m. 18, with <i>e</i> #, as a dominant seventh flat five chord leading to F# major. It is a difficult editorial decision, since Bach did not mark a sharp on the note. The possibility that he accidentally misplaced the sharp on the next chord (he did not forget it as the sharp would be valid in the next chord) is not totally ruled out. We have to remember that the autograph is not a final fair copy. However, and crucially, we have to also consider that Bach is less likely to have misplaced the sharp and failed to spot the error, even in a working draft. Both versions are included in the transcription and the sharp is marked within editorial brackets with the indication: ' <i>Autograph: f [D: e(♯)]</i> '. See commentary'.
37	4	There is no flat sign on the repeated chordal note <i>d</i> (D: natural sign on the <i>c</i>). The accidental is implied. The failure to mark, accidentals that are considered obvious is more frequent in this autograph, which clearly seems to not be a final fair copy: in all the similar passages of the <i>Fuga</i> where a chordal note with an accidental sign is repeated, the repeated note does not have an accidental, with one exception in m. 75, 1st beat (in m. 34 the two chordal notes are beamed together separately from the notes in the first and third position of the 4th beat).
44	4	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> above the note due to space limitation (stave change).
47	4	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>e</i> (D: natural on the <i>d</i>).
49	2	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>e</i> of the upper voice.

49	3	There is no natural sign on the repeated chordal note <i>a</i> .
50	4	There is no natural sign on the repeated <i>a</i> and no sharp sign on the repeated <i>f</i> . The accidentals are implied (repeated chordal notes).
51	1	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> (D: natural on the <i>g</i>).
57	2	Cautionary accidental (natural) on the <i>d</i> (D: sharp on the <i>c</i>).
57	4	The last 2 notes (<i>c</i> and <i>d</i>) are not readable.
59	1	The (presumed) second <i>b</i> flat of the upper voice (fourth position) is hidden behind the two semiquaver lines of the beam. In this position, there is a <i>g</i> that seems to have a correction smudge. Probably Bach accidentally repeated the <i>g</i> that appears on the second position of the 1st beat as a repeated chordal note and then he smudged it in order to cancel its value.
66	2	See separate sheet, pp. 37-38.
68	4	Bach did not mark the natural sign on the second <i>a</i> . It is implied (repeated chordal note).
73	2	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> of the bass voice (D: natural on the <i>g</i>).
73	3	Bach did not mark the flat sign on the second <i>d</i> . It is implied (repeated chordal note).
75	1	The second natural sign on the <i>a</i> is marked below the note (D: sharp on the <i>g</i>). This is the only occasion where Bach repeated the accidental in the <i>Fuga</i> on the repeated chordal note. In addition, he may have added this obvious accidental later, since no space had been left for the marking of an accidental and although he marked it before the note, it is not aligned with the note (it is aligned with the <i>e</i> of the middle voice, though it obviously does not refer to the <i>e</i>). If this assumption is correct, I do not see any particular reason why he would want to be precise in this passage especially, using an unavoidable incorrect alignment between the accidental and the note, since an omission of the accidental, more even so a repeated omission, would not have confused the performer.
Allegro		
Bar lines		The time signature of the Allegro is 3/8. It is very interesting that Bach uses a shorter bar line in every other measure. Almost the entire movement is constituted by semiquavers. The time signature of 3/8 seems to denote each grouping of 6 corresponding with the sub phrases of the movement, and the shorter bar line seems to denote the musical flow of the movement, connecting the separate figurations. An exemplification of the function of both notational indications is the passage mm. 13 - 18. It seems that a different soprano voice sings m. 14 and the soprano voice of m. 13 continues in m. 15. Both soprano voices are equally important; however, the one that starts the dialogue is the soprano of m. 13. It is interesting to observe the connection between the bass notes in every other measure. The bass notes of m. 15 continue in an upward stepwise motion from the bass notes in m. 14, but in a downward stepwise motion from the bass notes of m. 13. There is an important forward momentum between m. 14 - m. 15 but, essentially, the longer phrase descends.
8	3	The <i>b</i> flat (last note of the upper voice) seems to have been notated over an initially written <i>c</i> . What appears above the note is probably the letter <i>b</i> to clarify that the note is a <i>b</i> flat (<i>b</i> = <i>b</i> flat in the German musical alphabet).
11	3	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> (D: natural on the <i>g</i>).
15	3	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> .
30	1	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>a</i> .
45-46	3	It seems that Bach initially notated the <i>f</i> and the <i>e</i> of the lower voice (3rd beat) in m. 45 and m. 46 respectively, one beat before (2nd). He marked the quaver rests over the misplaced notes in order to hide them.
48	1	The notes on the first position of the first beat appear somewhat faint. I cannot see an obvious dot on the bass note <i>c</i> .
54	3	The last note <i>b</i> flat of the upper voice is missing (D: <i>a</i>). It seems that a very small part of the width of the manuscript is missing from the facsimile.
77	3	The last note <i>b</i> flat of the upper voice is missing. See previous comment.

78-96		<p>From m. 78 until the end of the <i>Allegro</i>, Bach continued his notation in organ tablature avoiding using a new page for the last measures of the <i>Allegro</i>. It is quite difficult to decipher what Bach wrote, squeezing 19 measures into the empty space of the final part of the paper. In addition, it seems that the facsimile also misses a part of the length of the manuscript and the letters that were written at the bottom of the paper are cut. I can see, with difficulty, the upper voice until m. 87. For these reasons and due to the fact that I am missing experience on reading an organ tablature, from this point I based my transcription primarily on the examination of the urtext editions (BGA, NBA, Paolo Cherici and Tilman Hoppstock) and the examination of some selected transcriptions for the guitar.</p>
87	2	<p>See previous comment. Both <i>a</i> flat or <i>a</i> natural makes sense on the first position of the 2nd beat in the upper voice (D: <i>g#</i> / <i>g</i> natural). There is no natural sign on the NBA and Paolo Cherici's edition (<i>d</i>: <i>g</i> natural). In the BGA edition the natural sign is marked (D: <i>g#</i>). Tilman Hoppstock notates <i>g#</i> (Eb: <i>a</i> natural) in his urtext edition for the guitar, republished with corrections in 2004/2006 (first published-1994). However, in his revised performance edition - 2010 (first published in 1999), he notates <i>g</i> with the cautionary accidental of the natural sign (Eb: <i>a</i> flat). Frank Koonce notates <i>g</i> with the natural sign as well (Eb: <i>a</i> flat). In summary, all of these editors agree, apart from the editor of the BGA. In the organ tablature the letter <i>a</i> seems to be exactly the same as the previous letters <i>a</i> that correspond to a flattened note <i>a</i>. No additional signs seem to appear on that <i>a</i>. A <i>g</i> with a cautionary accidental of the natural sign (D major) was opted for in the transcription. It remains, though, a passage that requires further examination on my part.</p>

Prælude in c minor, BWV 999		
Measure	Beat	Comment
Title		Prælude in C mol. / pour La Lute. / di / Johann Sebastian Bach. In the bottom of the title page there is Johann Peter Kellner's signature.
Key signature		Kellner, the scribe of the only source of the <i>Prælude</i> BWV 999, notates the <i>Prælude</i> in c minor, but with two flat signs in the key signature, in the dorian mode, like the first violin sonata in g minor, BWV 1001 (with one flat in the key signature) and like what I believe was the key signature of the lost autograph of the Suite in c minor, BWV 997 (two flat signs). In my commentary of the Suite in c minor, BWV 997 I justify this proposal. It is possible that the lost autograph of the <i>Prælude</i> BWV 999 was written with two flat signs in the key signature as well.
5		In m. 5, instead of a repetition of the measure, Kellner marks the repetition dots in the end of the measure. However, he accidentally repeated the repetition dots in m. 7 and m. 8 (m. 9 if the repetition of m. 7 was valid). Probably the indication 'bis' above m. 5 is to indicate that this repetition is valid 'until' m. 5.
7	2	There is a crotchet rest; however, it appears faint in the scans of the manuscript. Perhaps the rest has been added later with a different ink, or with a chalk. The rest corresponds to Kellner's handwriting. If the rest is an addition, it has been made, most likely, by Kellner himself.
16		In the end of m. 16 Kellner accidentally notated a semiquaver rest.
17		In the positions 1 and 3 of the 2nd beat there is a <i>d</i> instead of a <i>c</i>. It is interesting that above the error written notes, there is an 'x' indicating that these notes are wrong. This 'x' appears faint, as the crotchet rest commented at m. 7. This reinforces the suggestion that this faint marks have been made subsequently.
17	3	The position of the last bass note <i>a</i> (natural), is not exact. It could be seen as a <i>b</i> (flat) - though this is obviously incorrect.
18	3	The bass note is <i>c</i> (a: <i>a</i>). It is interesting to note that all the urtext editions notate a <i>d</i> here instead of a <i>c</i>. The only urtext edition to indicate the <i>c</i> is Paolo Cherici's edition; however, in the main musical text he has chosen to notate a <i>d</i>. A <i>c</i> would not repeat identically the previous measure, but this slight variation is beautiful and does make sense. A perception of <i>c</i> being an error, would have been valid if the exact repetition of the measure could have been the only correct reading between these 2, as regards to the compositional structure of the piece (since <i>c</i> does make sense musically). The structure of the piece does not validate such a perception. There are several repetitions of measures, but there are also variations, sometimes unexpected. An unexpected variation, different from m. 18, will be commented in m. 23.
20	2	The sharp sign is not repeated on the two <i>f</i> of the 2nd beat. It is implied.
22	2	The sharp sign is not repeated on the <i>f</i> , position 4. It is implied.
23	1	The urtext editions differ at this point. The NBA and Tilman Hoppstock's edition notate a <i>d</i> here (<i>e</i> in Hoppstock's edition in d minor) and the BGA and Cherici's edition notate an <i>e</i> (flat). The bass <i>e</i> (flat) breaks the retention of the pedal note just in this measure (pedal note from mm. 17-32), however, it is exactly this differentiation that very well suits the gradual upward melodic motion up to m. 22, that gives a hint that the 'peacefulness' that the sustained pedal note wants to declare can be suspicious. Moreover, if a mistake would have been made from the scribe, that would more probably be a repetition, rather than a differentiation of a note that has been repeated many times. In addition, if the faint corrections previously discussed are subsequent corrections of notation errors in the manuscript, I assume that if the <i>e</i> (flat) was a mistake, this mistake, in such a position, would probably have been spotted. A <i>c</i> (a minor) was opted for in the transcription.
23		The sharp on the last three repeated <i>c</i> is implied.
24		Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>e</i> .
25	2	The flat sign on the last <i>e</i> is implied.

25	3	There is a flat, rather than a natural sign on the <i>e</i> of the bass. That would create a harsh relation with the <i>e</i> natural of the upper voice last heard on the 3rd position of the 2nd beat. However, the possibility of an <i>e</i> flat cannot totally be ruled out. In addition, the natural on the upper voice justifies the cautionary flat on the bass. However, there is an erroneously written accidental (natural this time) in the same position in m. 30. That could suggest a resemblance of the flat and natural sign in the handwriting of the scribe of the manuscript from which Kellner made his copy, if a cautionary flat sign on the <i>b</i> of m. 30 could be justified (the scribe notated a cautionary flat that Kellner interpret as a natural); this is not, however, to be seen as a case of marking a cautionary accidental. In m. 30, then, Kellner made a copying error, or copied an error, both suggesting a carelessness at this point. This raise further concerns regarding the flat in the bass in m. 25. A <i>c</i> # is marked in the transcription (the sharp in editorial brackets) with the indication: ' <i>The note is e flat (the flat is marked) in the manuscript (c natural in a minor. See commentary)</i> '.
28	3	Cautionary accidental (flat) on the <i>b</i> .
29		The sharp on the <i>f</i> of the 2nd beat (position 4) and 3rd beat (position 4) is implied.
30	3	There seems to be a natural sign on the <i>b</i> (a: <i>g</i>) (see comment m. 25, beat 3), placed in the position of <i>g</i> (a: <i>e</i>). There is a <i>g</i> after the <i>b</i> , but there is not any spatial problem that would cause Kellner to mark the accidental of the <i>g</i> before the <i>b</i> . Moreover, there is no need for a cautionary accidental on the <i>g</i> . Thus, the natural sign belongs to the <i>b</i> and it is a copying error, or a copy of an error that was not spotted. <i>B</i> natural (a: <i>g</i> #) does not make any sense.
32		The sharp on the <i>f</i> of the 2nd beat (position 4) and 3rd beat (position 4) is implied.
33		The sharp on the <i>f</i> of the 2nd beat (position 4) and 3rd beat (position 4) is implied.
35		The crotchet rest on the 2nd beat is faint. See comment m. 7.
35		There is an undefined mark before the last bass note.
36	2	The sharp on the <i>f</i> (position 4) is implied.
37	2	The natural sign on both <i>b</i> of the 2nd beat is implied.
38		The natural sign on the last three <i>b</i> is implied.
40		The sharp sign on both <i>f</i> of the 2nd beat and on the last <i>f</i> is implied.
41		The crotchet rest on the 2nd beat is faint. See comment m. 7.
41		In the scans the last note <i>f</i> # of the measure is missing. There is a change of stave there.
41		The sharp on the <i>f</i> of the 2nd beat (position 4), and I assume on the last <i>f</i> as well, is implied. See previous comment.
42	3	In the 1st position of the 3rd beat, Kellner accidentally repeated the <i>d</i> instead of notating an <i>e</i> . There is a cross above the note indicating the mistake, probably added subsequently. See comment m. 17.
43		The duration of the notes of the last chord is crotchet. There are no any rests. Dotted half-notes have been notated in the transcription with the indication: '<i>In Kellner's manuscript the duration of the notes is crotchet</i>'.

Suite in E major, BWV 1006a		
Measure	Beat	Comment
<i>Prelude</i>		
<i>piano and forte</i>		Among the lute works, there are only four movements where we find the indication <i>piano</i> or <i>forte</i> : the <i>Prelude</i> BWV 1006a, the <i>Bourée</i> BWV 1006a, the <i>Gigue</i> BWV 1006a and the <i>Allegro</i> BWV 998. These indications work differently from the modern notation. The dynamic indications are always in musical repetitions. There is never an isolated <i>piano</i> or <i>forte</i> . Thus, <i>piano</i> is a 'written echo' in the music. It is very interesting that the <i>forte</i> is always marked after the <i>piano</i> to indicate that the 'echo' effect is finished. Thus, <i>forte</i> does not really means <i>forte</i> , but indicates the end of the <i>piano</i> effect. In some instances, the end of the <i>piano</i> effect (<i>forte</i>) coincides with the beginning of a passage that is repeated, and this <i>forte</i> is followed by a <i>piano</i> . In all the cases, after the <i>piano</i> there is a <i>forte</i> that indicates its ending. The only exception where a <i>piano</i> is not followed by a <i>forte</i> is m. 67 of the <i>Prelude</i> BWV 1006a. This is either an omission (in the corresponding passage at m. 17 there is the indication <i>forte</i>) or it could mean 'do not cancel the <i>piano</i> ', since a rather long and 'subtle' phrase starts without a bass accompaniment.
rests		The duration of the rests is not always precise as in modern notation, especially when the rest refers to a whole measure and always when the rest of the duration of a whole measure would have been followed by a dot in modern notation. Among the lute works, the rests that fall in the last category appear in the <i>Gigue</i> BWV 995 and the <i>très vite</i> of the <i>Prelude</i> BWV 995 (semibreve rests in 3/8 key signature), in the <i>Giga</i> BWV 996 (minim rests instead of dotted minim rests), in the beginning of the <i>Fuga</i> BWV 997 (semibreve rest in 6/8 key signature), in the <i>Prelude</i> BWV 998 (minim rests instead of dotted minim rests) in the beginning of the <i>Loure</i> BWV 1006a (minim rest instead of a dotted minim rest) and, here, in the <i>Prelude</i> BWV 1006a (semibreve rests instead of dotted crotchet rests). In all of these cases the transcription follows the notation of the manuscripts.
4		In the autograph there are 3 quaver rests because the stave changes at the 3rd beat. There are other instances in the <i>Prelude</i> where three quaver rests are written due to stave change. In all these instances a semibreve rest (see previous comment) was opted for in the transcription.
30	3	The crotchet rest is missing. A crotchet rest in smaller size has been marked in the transcription.
58	3	The crotchet rest is missing. A crotchet rest in smaller size has been marked in the transcription.
65		Only the first two and the last four pedal notes are beamed together, like the rest of the notes, due to stave change. The notes of each group are beamed together in the transcription.
74		There is no natural sign on all the d, unlike the previous measure. It could be an omission or the natural signs were considered implied due to the implied polyphony. However, Bach is very precise in the rest of the measures (with the only exception being the last e out of 5 in m. 98). It would be less probable that Bach forgot to mark the accidentals or that he would chose to omit the natural signs, as being implied, on a measure change and, moreover, on all of the three beats. At first sight, we might think that if there were to be an intended omission, it would probably be on the repeated notes of the same measure. I think, however, that the missing natural sign on the first d is intended, on account of Bach's precision in less crucial positions. Since the note could not be a sharpened d, I believe that Bach wanted to emphasize the differentiation regarding the position where the last note of the semiquaver groups changes. From mm. 67-70 these notes change in every measure. However, from m. 71 until the end of the passage, these notes change in every two measures. The omission of the natural not only alerts the performer to the additional layer created from these notes, but also, crucially, the fact that the pitch of notes of this additional layer remain the same for two measures and not for one, as previously, corresponding with the musical flow of the passage and its subphrases that now, as I perceive it, connects the notes of two measures instead of one. It is worth mentioning that the 1st note of the semiquaver groups changes in every two measures as well, but in the different measure of the note of the last semiquaver group, making both these additional layers in the music and their differentiation perceivable in a beautiful way. Therefore it is very probable that in m. 74 there are intended omissions of accidentals to reflect the musical flow of the passage and facilitate the perception of different layers in the music that are moving parallel, but in different time.
81	3	The crotchet rest is missing. A crotchet rest in smaller size has been marked in the transcription.
85	2	Cautionary accidental on the <i>d</i> .

98	3	No sharp has been marked on the last <i>e</i> . It is implied. The last crotchet rest is missing as well. It is notated in smaller size in the transcription.
118		There is no crotchet rest on the 3rd beat. A rest in smaller size has been marked in the transcription.
120	2, 3	In the digital scans of the autograph that I have worked from, no legato seems to appear above the notes <i>d-c(#)-d</i> . However, in the facsimile that is included in Frank Koonce's edition, a legato seems to comprise these 3 notes. A legato mark was opted for in the transcription.
124		Cautionary accidental (natural sign) on the <i>a</i> .
134	1	There is no stem and dot on the lower <i>b</i> of the chord. However, it is interesting to note that on the next chord, there is a note less in the voice of where the <i>b</i> belongs (not to be considered as a separate voice as here we are concerned with 'chordal polyphony'). I do not consider the missing dot and stem as an omission, though the note is meant to be a dotted crotchet, and this was opted for in the transcription.
137	1	It is very interesting to observe the instances in the <i>Prelude</i> where the notation facilitates the performance reading. In this version Bach, in contrast to the violin version, separates the first <i>e</i> from the semiquaver group, the concluding note of the previous phrase, the next one to start on the second <i>e</i> at the same pitch.
Loure		
rests		Not all of the rests in the different voices are notated in the <i>Loure</i> . Here, the differentiation in baroque notation of notes that are included in a chord (every single note has a different stem), corresponds in several instances with the actual polyphony. Thus at some passages, some notes of a chord belong to different voices, while others belong to a different voice in <i>notation</i> . The <i>Loure</i> is written in two and three voices (excepting the instances of 'chordal polyphony'). However, the repetition of 'rich' chords at some passages seems to introduce an additional voice that disappears in the following measures. I have chosen to notate the rests as they appear in the manuscript rather than adding rests in smaller size. The chords, as in every movement of the lute works, are notated in the transcription as they appear in the manuscripts (with one exception in certain measures of the <i>Passaggio</i> of the <i>Præludio</i> BWV 996, where this alteration is indicated in the transcription).
Gavotte en Rondeaux		
slurs		It is difficult to estimate how many notes the slurs embrace in the <i>Gavotte en Rondeaux</i> BWV 1006a and the <i>Bourée</i> BWV 1006a. The position of the slurs are generally not precise in the manuscripts, however, in the <i>Gavotte en Rondeaux</i> BWV 1006a and the <i>Bourée</i> BWV 1006a there are variant slurs and this complicates the estimation of their exact position. It seems that there are both slurs that embrace the last note of a group of notes that are beamed together and slurs that do not embrace the last note of a group, where this last note could create in both cases an additional layer in the melody. There are also slurs that exceed the measure and slurs that suggest a connection of separated, in notation, flags. It is interesting to note that the urtext editions differentiate the position of the slurs in a number of instances. The position of the slurs of the <i>Gavotte en rondeaux</i> and the <i>Bourée</i> was a difficult editorial decision.
8		Bach marked the fermata symbols above the upper and lower voice since the final repetition of the rondeau theme starting in m. 92 is not written out; there is the indication 'Da Capo / e fine' instead. In the transcription there are no fermata symbols and the final repetition of the rondeau theme is written out to the end of the movement.
54		The slur does not embrace the last 2 notes of the first group of notes, unlike the previous measures and the next one. Here, though, there is a change of stave at the half of the measure. It is possible that a slur to include the same number of notes is meant here. I have to mention, however, that in m. 30 of the <i>Bourée</i> BWV 1006a, a similar slur has been notated and continues in the change of the stave. A slur that includes also the last two notes of the first group was opted for in the transcription with the indication: ' <i>Autograph: b-c(#)</i> are not included in the slur. Stave changes in the middle of the measure'.
82-85		It is very difficult for a performer of a plucked string instrument to sustain the trill for all of these measures. In the transcription shorter trills have been added in the beginning of m. 83, m. 84 and m. 85 in editorial brackets.
Menuet I re		
20		The notes of the upper voice are not beamed together due to stave change.

Menuet II de		
23	1, 2	The 4 quavers are separated into groups of two, probably because there is a change of stave in the position of the separation. 4 quavers that are beamed together have been marked in the transcription.
Bourée		
dots above the notes		This is the only movement among the lute works where few dots have been marked. In the beginning of the 2 sections of the <i>Bourée</i> , the dots seem to denote the end of a phrase. In m. 27 the dots seem to isolate the dotted note from the figure that is created by the rest of the notes that are beamed together.
6		It is interesting that Bach does not indicate the <i>piano</i> in the beginning of m. 7, but in the end of m. 6. Could this suggest a less sudden <i>piano</i> ? In the transcription the position of the <i>piano</i> corresponds with the autograph.
13		In the autograph there is the indication ' <i>f.</i> ' instead of the usual <i>forte</i> .
30		The notes of the upper voice are not beamed together due to stave change.
Gigue		
7		Again, an ' <i>f.</i> ' is indicated. See comment <i>Bourée</i> , m. 13.
end of first part		The end of the first part coincides with a page change. Bach wrote the last two measures of the first part in the bottom of the page to facilitate the performer in the page turn, since, he had a lot of space to use (the second page is only used for the second part of the <i>Gigue</i>). After the end of the first part there is the indication ' <i>Volte</i> ' to indicate the page turn.
end		In the middle of the first empty stave there is the indication ' <i>Fine</i> '.

Initial comment upon the examination of the manuscript sources of the suite in e minor, BWV 996

There are three manuscript sources of the Suite in e minor, BWV 996. The two primary sources, dating from the first half of the 18th century, are from the hands of Johann Gottfried Walther and Heinrich Nikolaus Gerber. It is very interesting that Gerber's manuscript had been lost since the beginning of the 20th century. It was recently rediscovered, after the publication of the lute volumes of NBA, and since 2009 has been in the possession of Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin. Christoph Öhm-Kühnle has investigated Gerber's manuscript. Observations, comments and manuscripts' variants (analytically just for the *Passaggio*) can be found in his article published in 2007: Öhm-Kühnle, Christoph. "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. www.jstor.org/stable/41640560.

Very interesting readings in Gerber's manuscript are the additional ornaments of the *Passaggio*, and few corrections. Gerber did not use the same ink in these additions and in the digital scans of the manuscript they appear faint. Though I spotted other additions that had been introduced in the manuscript before these additions (mordents and trills), I almost missed the very small added appoggiaturas that had not been introduced before. I spotted one appoggiatura towards the middle section of the *Passaggio* and then I went back in the beginning to discover some others that I had at first overlooked. I later found the article of Christoph Öhm-Kühnle, who has investigated the manuscript and I was able to double check the additions. During this process I found that six or seven appoggiaturas that are not mentioned in Öhm-Kühnle's listed differences found in the *Passaggio*. These omissions are noted in my commentary since I consider Öhm-Kühnle's investigation of the *Passaggio* an important point of reference after manuscript's rediscovery. In his article, Cristoph Öhm-Kühnle comments:

'In Gerber's manuscript copy of BWV 996 several ornaments are written in a kind of red color, most likely made with red chalk. The color of these red chalk markings is less opaque than and visibly different from the dark red ink used in most of the manuscript. The ornaments in red chalk appear only on the first page of the prelude; in the suite, however, several corrections in the same red chalk appear. The exemplifying ornamentation (appearing just at the beginning of the composition) suggests that the ornaments were probably written during a lesson, and that the student was expected to prepare the rest of the composition in the same manner' (p. 50).

These additions correspond to Gerber's handwriting. Any comment pertain to the additional markings will be followed by the note '(in red chalk)', following Öhm-Kühnle's comments. A considerable proportion of the differences between the two primary sources relates to different ornamentation symbols. In deciding what my editorial choice should include in my transcriptions in *these cases* (not to be seen as a 'best text' method) I considered it more important to preserve the readings found in one of the two primary sources rather than to use different readings sporadically. I believe that this choice results in a more integrated musical text. This decision was taken also considering that the different variants are listed in my commentary. I have chosen to not include the added ornamentation that appears in Gerber's manuscript in the *Passaggio* (with one exception at m. 5 due to technical considerations). Cristoph Öhm-Kühnle's suggestion that these additions were probably written during a lesson is highly plausible, since Gerber was a student of Bach when he made the copy of the Suite. If this suggestion is correct, they are extremely valuable, reflecting an example of a suggested *decoratio* of the teacher-composer or the student of the composer, beyond the one found within the notated music and the initially marked ornamentation. However, these additions seem to reflect this exact relationship of teacher – student: though extremely valuable, they do not seem to reflect what appeared in the lost autograph. Walther's version is very much ornamented as well. The *Præludio*, *Courante* and *Sarabande* of the suite BWV 996 are the most ornamented pieces among the lute works. If the additional ornamentation given in the *Passaggio* in Gerber's manuscript were suggested by Bach, they are directed, I think, to the student Gerber, and not to be seen as a revision of the suite by the composer. Moreover, it is probably an incomplete addition, since it was made only in the first movement. The earlier manuscript of Walther, estimated to be written in between 1710-1717, is more complete in that respect. The differences pertain to ornamentation symbols and in few cases where a slur is missing in one of the sources, I have chosen the readings in Walther's manuscript. The value of both manuscripts is unquestionable: both scribes were in acquaintance with Bach at the time they made their copies. In different related variants I commented upon my choice.

The unknown scribe of Source C transposed the piece into a minor. For ease of comparison, the comments pertaining to Source C follow the tonality of e minor. This manuscript belongs to a collected volume that includes compositions of Bach for keyboard instruments. It has been estimated that the manuscript dates from the second half of the 18th century. I looked at the readings of Source C more thoroughly wherever I have spotted differences between the two primary sources. Readings that are found only in Source C in places where the two primary sources agree are not mentioned in the critical commentary, since I have not examined the manuscript in detail throughout.

Commentary upon the rhythmic differentiations mainly found in the melodic flourishes of *Sarabande*, BWV 996 among the sources

There is one instance in the *Passaggio* and a number in the *Sarabande* of the suite where differences are found in the rhythmic notation among the three manuscripts. Colin Booth (2010) notes that “early notation often presents the player with more than one choice, none of which is exclusively ‘right’. Conversely, a variety of notation which at first sight will imply a complex rhythmic structure might in some contexts be best understood as the result of a composer’s attempting to write down in “normal” notation within bars, spontaneous and essentially unmeasured musical thought” (p. 222). In the written commentary of Koonce’s edition of the lute works for the guitar (2002), Richard Troeger speaks also about rhythmic flexibility:

Baroque notation, in fact, often is imprecise with regard to fine rhythmic nuances. In an age when all music was copied by hand, conventional approximations of intended rhythms saved pedantically fussy accounting for small values while giving interpretative freedom to the performer. For instance, the literal meaning of a flourish of thirty-second notes was clear, whether the flourish contained groupings such as seven or nine thirty-seconds instead of eight in the time of a quarter note. The most frequent contexts for notational imprecision involve dotted values and ensuing short notes. . . . The player should enjoy the latitude of interpretation that the notation allows; the overall style and mood of a piece and the player’s taste must determine the exact realization of the rhythms (p. xvi).

Booth (2010) discusses groups of notes of an odd number within a single beat in a subchapter entitled ‘The Limitations of Mathematics’. In discussing longer types of melodic grouping he notes that tuplets were “rarely found before the Classical period” (p. 87). The notational method used by a baroque composer usually “consisted of a mixture of long and short note values pressed together to make up the mathematically correct number, but often requiring a flexible interpretation” (p. 88). Indeed, in the *Sarabande* 996, the rhythmic differences in notation are found in groups of notes of an odd number. The different readings present either a mixture of long and short note values to make up the mathematically correct number (Gerber and Source C) or what seems to be an ‘imprecise’ notation (Walther); different but equivalent ways of notating melodic groupings that suggest a flexible interpretation or flexibility of interpretation. It is interesting to note that these different styles of notation are found within the same source. Bach’s mathematical accuracy of notation can be seen in the rhythmical notation of *Passaggio*’s flourishes. The concurrence of the readings of the different sources suggests what was written in the lost autograph. The *Allemande* of the suite in g minor, BWV 995 provides examples of Bach’s “imprecise” notation, like the one found in the *Passaggio*, m. 14, in Walther’s copy. Various readings among the sources and within a single source denote different notational methods within baroque conventions. In these instances the readings of Walther’s copy were opted for in the transcription (Source C mostly corresponds with Gerber’s manuscript).

Commentary of m. 18, *Courante*, BWV 996

Walther: if we set the beat to crotchet, then the quaver *b* clearly belongs to the upbeat of the 5th beat, and is heard before the crotchet *f#* (soprano) and the crotchet *b* (middle voice), both belonging to the downbeat of beat 6. Walther, then, seems to have made a copying error in the upper voice or copied an error from the lost autograph. If the *b* on the first beat is dotted, as it appears in all manuscripts, then the first crotchet rest is not valid, or else the dot should not appear. This is reinforced by the fact that if the crotchet rest is valid, then it is misplaced, which also results in a further misplacement made or copied by Walther in the continuation of the upper voice. This seems less likely.

Gerber / Source C: the quaver *b* clearly belongs to the upbeat of beat 6, and the *b* (middle voice) to the downbeat of beat 6, as in Walther's manuscript. The crotchet rests, then, are valid, but they are on the wrong beat, 3rd-4th, suspiciously exactly where they appear in Walther's manuscript, instead of 4th-5th, where they should belong. Given these considerations, I assume that in the lost autograph there were 2 crotchet rests, the first one written in error. Walther copied this mistake, and he also retained the metrical placement of the upper voice as it appeared in the autograph. Gerber, however, in copying the 2 crotchet rests, then 'corrected' the metrical placement of the upper voice. If we count the values of the notes and the rests in the upper voice, they equal 6 beats. At first sight the upper voice seems to be correct. However, the rests are misplaced. Another factor that could lead to the assumed false correction of Gerber is the fact that there is usually a quaver note on the upbeat of the 6th beat in the *Courante*. The false correction is a combination of the reading of 2 crotchet rests in the upper voice and the writing of an upbeat quaver on the 6th beat. The same false correction in the upper voice or its copy was also made by the scribe of Source C.

Bringing together these observations, we see that there is an error in all manuscript sources; this strongly suggests an error in the lost autograph: the main editorial choice regards the metrical placement of the higher *b*. If in the autograph the note is placed on the upbeat of 5th beat (Walther), Gerber altered or overlooked the note's placement. This accidental omission or intentional alteration follows the usual placement of a quaver on the upbeat of the 6th beat and the two crotchet rests found in all manuscripts. If the quaver *b* in the autograph is placed on the upbeat of 6th beat (Gerber, Source C), then Walther probably altered what appears in the autograph. It is less probable that Walther overlooked a 'lonely' quaver in the end of the measure or a usual placement of the note. These assumptions, however, presuppose that the voices in the autograph are clearly aligned. Perhaps the different readings of the Sources, has not only to do with a misplaced or accidentally written crotchet rest, but also with poor alignment of the voices. In the transcription, I opted for Walther's version, making the necessary omission of the first quaver rest, with the indication: *'Upper voice's placement corresponds with Walther's manuscript. See commentary.*

Commentary of mm. 106-107, *Fuga*, BWV 997

It is one of the most interesting passages of the *Fuga*. There are a lot of different versions of the bass notes and, more importantly, a note in Agricola's manuscript (and 2 other sources) that, I believe, was misread from the editors of the editions examined. From 19 manuscript sources of the suite out of the 20 that I have managed to acquire the digital scans, 5 do not contain the *Fuga* and in one manuscript the *Fuga* is incomplete (this passage is not included). Two of the manuscript sources have 2 different versions of the *Fuga*. So in total there are 15 readings of this passage in 13 sources. I will also mention the reading of the manuscript of Alfred Dörffel.

m. 106, beats 1-3: There are 2 different versions: 1. The first version reads *g* (a: e) on the second beat (3 out of the 13 manuscripts, including Agricola's copy). 2. The second version reads *a* (flat) (a: f) on the second beat (10 manuscripts including the 2 additional versions of the *Fuga*). All the editions examined include this 2nd version.

m. 106, beats 4-6: There are 2 different versions: 1: The first version reads *a* natural (a: f#) on all the *a* of the bass. 2. In the second version the natural sign on the *a* is omitted. There are only 2 manuscripts to include this error. One is the manuscript in the possession of Ton Koopman and the other is the second version of the *Fuga* of ms. P 286.

m. 107, beats 1-3: There are 3 different versions: 1: In the first version, the second note of the bass is an *a* with the natural sign (a: f#) and the fourth bass note is a *b* with the natural sign (a: g#) (6 out of the 13 manuscript sources). Second version: In the second version there is an *a* with the natural sign as well in the second bass note, but the fourth bass note *b* has a flat sign (a: g with a natural sign) and that is an error. There are 4 manuscript sources to include this version and 5 readings of this version. Both versions of the *Fuga* of ms. 6138/18 have this version, whereas ms. P 286 has this reading only in its first version of the *Fuga*. The reading of ms. 9412.0781 is very interesting. This manuscript, from an unknown scribe, dates from the first half of the 19th century and includes only the *Fuga* out of the five movements of the Suite. Whereas it reads an *a* natural (a: f#) and a *b* flat (a: g natural), the flat is crossed with a line to delete its value, and, also, below the second note there is the letter h, denoting that the *a* natural is a *b* natural, which corresponds with the third version of this passage. The alterations seem to have been made from the same pen. 3. The third version reads a *b* with the natural sign (a: g#) (4 manuscript sources or 5, if we include the altered version of ms. 9412.0781). One of the readings is the second version of the *Fuga* of ms. P 286. The manuscript of the editor of the lute works of BGA edition, Alfred Dörffel, has an asterisk on the second note of m. 106, beat 1. In the main musical text he has notated an *a* with the cautionary accidental of flat (a: f with the natural sign). In the explanation of the asterisk (mentioning of the variants), Dörffel includes the first version that the copy of Agricola reads, missing from all the editions. However, his second explanatory note, pertaining to m. 107, beats 1-3, does not include the variant of Agricola's manuscript missing in his musical text, but only the error variant (second version in my commentary). His main musical text reads the third version of my commentary. On the one hand, this suggests that he was aware of the note in m. 106 that is missing in all the editions. However, in his decision not to include it, m. 107 (where Agricola's variant is missing from his notes) has played a very important role: if he had to choose from the variants that he notes in his 'commenting' manuscript, the choice to not include Agricola's version in m. 106 makes more sense.

Having noted all the different variants included in the sources, I will comment upon my editorial decision. The second source, apart from Agricola's copy, that is believed to stem from the lost autograph, Weyrauch's tablature, does not include the *Fuga*. That would add important information regarding the assumed reading of the passage of the lost autograph. Though there are lot of manuscript sources of the suite, Agricola's copy is, regarding the *Fuga*, the only one that is believed to stem directly from the lost autograph. Its reading is of extreme importance, if the editor assumes that Agricola did not make a copying error in the passage under question. The only manuscripts, apart from Agricola's copy, that include a *g* (a: e) on the second bass note of m. 106, is ms. P 308 and ms. 34998,2. As I have noted in my first notes on the suite, my first estimation is that ms. 34998,2 derives from Agricola's copy. Ms. P 308 is believed to be a copy of ms. 1322, judged by the editors of the NBA to be a copy of Agricola's manuscript. Unfortunately, there is most likely a missing page of this manuscript that included the continuation of the *Fuga* from m. 55. We can assume nonetheless what this manuscript included, from correspondence with both Agricola's copy and ms. P 308. Due to the different readings of the *Fuga*, it is believed that there were other lost manuscripts from where some of the existing sources were based. I believe that wherever, in the hierarchical order of the sources, there was for the first time a variant from what Agricola's copy reads, or the lost autograph, or a lost manuscript in m. 106, that was a copying error, transmitted to the derivatives. This copying error, easily made in m. 106, has affected the choice of readings of m. 107. I believe that some scribes misread Agricola's manuscript in m. 106 and therefore believed that Agricola's version of m. 107 was a copying error on Agricola's part (or on the part of a scribe of a lost manuscript that read the same notes). There is a good reason for misreading what Agricola's copy, or perhaps other lost manuscripts could have possibly read, in the second bass note of m. 106. The only corresponding passage of mm. 56-57, repeats the first notes of the bass, without altering the second bass note. In addition, another reason to justify both Agricola's version and the copying errors or alterations of scribes, is the peculiarity of the notation of the upper voice (notated, as I have noted, one octave higher). MM. 106-107 have a fundamental difference comparing to mm. 56-57: the actual distance between the upper voice and the bass voice is an octave lower than in mm. 56-57, thus, in the versions that differ from Agricola's version, we hear a repeated note on the second bass note, which is the same as the previously heard note of the upper voice (in its actual pitch): this makes sense, but it is a weaker alternative. This is not perceivable visually. Moreover, the editors of the NBA judged that some sources misunderstood the peculiarity of the notation of the upper voice, so did not read the second note as a repetition of the first one. This could further justify the reading in Agricola's manuscript, both avoiding a repetition of the note, but also, beautifully creating a stepwise motion between the close upper voice and the different bass notes in Agricola's version: m. 106: *a* flat-*g*-*f* (a: f-e-d) and m. 107: *b* natural-*a* natural-*g* (a: g#-f#-e). An *e* (second bass note of m. 106) and an *f#* (second bass note of m. 107) was opted for in the transcription (a minor).

Commentary of mm. 41-48, *Double*, BWV 997

Further examination of this passage is needed. At first sight, the range of some measures makes the performance of certain bass notes, either on a lute or in a harpsichord, impossible, if I presume that both voices are notated an octave higher, as at the beginning of the *Double*. To understand what could possibly make sense and suggest alterations, I have to go back to m. 41, because it possibly sheds light to the subsequent ('problematic') measures which continue a phrase that has started before. A closer look at the passage raises further concerns, as I will now explain. To make any assumptions, correspondence with the almost identical passage (a 5th higher) of m. 9 – end of first part – is necessary, and also with the same measures of the *Gigue*. It is necessary to comment on what I will *not* alter in order to justify my choices of alterations, and I will also offer some further comments, due to my deviation from the readings in the urtext editions.

mm. 41-44: the phrase of this passage is separated in two sub-phrases: 1: mm. 41-42 and 2: mm. 43-44. If I look at the line of the bass voice, I believe that not octave alterations have been made, either within the sub-phrases of the bass, or where the second sub-phrase starts. It would not make any sense to interrupt the upward motion of the sub-phrases of the bass with octave alterations within the sub-phrases (for example alter the bass of the first beat of m. 42 and make the 7th downward jump there, instead of continuing stepwise). Moreover, the 7th downward jump in the bass at the beginning of the second sub-phrase makes sense, both beautifully separating the 2 sub-phrases and supporting the 'unfinished' sense, but also elegantly connecting these sub-phrases as every bass note of the second sub-phrase is also a continuation of the bass note at the same position of the first sub-phrase. The same considerations pertain to the passage mm. 9-12. Looking at the *Gigue*, I have a further justification, since, even if the bass is moving stepwise at m. 43, its more active movement does not make this clear distinction of the sub-phrases at m. 43, starting to descend from the 6th beat of m. 43. The movement of the bass voice corresponds to the *Double*, as the bass of the *Gigue* will, significantly, meet the bass of the *Double* in the end of these sub-phrases. If the bass of the *Double* was altered in m. 43, that would be impossible, unless further alterations were made. m. 45: the non-alteration of the octave of the bass, its stepwise continuation of the phrase (next sub-phrase) in m. 45, is the only logical choice for me. Correspondence with the *Gigue* further justifies this view. There would need to be a really strong justification to alter the bass octave there (in relation to the previous measure), which there is not. **My first assumption is that the intervals of the bass notes from 41-end of the *Double* are correct, i.e. non-alteration of the bass octave should be made *within* this passage.**

I will now look closer at the actual pitch of the bass voice, its relation to the upper voice and whether any evidence could justify the alteration of the octave of the upper voice: the bass note *f* (a: d) of m. 41 could not be meant to be played an octave lower, meaning that the peculiarity of notation of both voices being notated an octave higher does not apply here to the bass. The bass note would exceed the range of both the lute and the harpsichord, if not in m. 41, then in m. 43 (e flat) (a: c). Even if I take under consideration that the range of the harpsichord was not standardised, this note would be either unplayable in most of the cases, or reaching the extreme limit of the bass range in harpsichords that had a wider than the usual bass range. **My second assumption is that the bass voice is notated at its actual octave in mm. 41-end of *Double*** and not an octave higher as in the beginning of the piece.

Looking at the upper voice in m. 41, it is obvious that it is notated one octave higher, if the widely accepted conclusion of the peculiarity of notation in the beginning of the piece, with both voices written an octave higher, is true. From the 5th beat of m. 36 the first measures of the piece are repeated and the differentiation starts on the 4th beat of m. 40. If we make the assumption that the upper voice is notated at its actual octave in m. 41, this would mean that it is notated in its actual octave in the 4th beat of m. 40, which could not make any sense. **My third assumption is that the upper voice in m. 41 is notated one octave higher, unlike the bass voice.**

Looking now at the distance between the lower and upper voice, it is obvious that this assumption could not be true for the whole of the passage, if my 2nd assumption is true. The upper voice would go lower than the bass voice in m. 44. This means that an octave alteration should be made in the upper voice. **My fourth assumption is that the upper voice is notated at its actual pitch, like the bass voice, but after the beginning of this passage (m. 41), unlike the bass voice, and surely before m. 44.**

The important thing is whether such an alteration would make any sense: only then are my assumptions further justified. I will look closer at the measure where the new sub-phrase begins, i.e. m. 43, as I did commenting on the bass line. I believe that the upper voice is notated at its actual pitch here. First of all, looking at both voices without any alterations, as they appear in the manuscript at mm. 43-44, and the monophonic (in notation) continuation of the next measure, I understand that their distance can only be literal. It is beautiful how the two voices come gradually closer until they merge in m. 45, where the implied polyphony (first notes of every figure) will smoothly disentangle them in the second half of m. 46. As I have noted above, there are good reasons why their pitch is also literal here. This means that the upper voice is notated at its actual octave at m. 43. It is very interesting to look back in the *Gigue*. This alteration of the upper voice corresponds with the motion of the upper voice of the *Gigue*, and this is an important reinforcement of this assumption.

Finally, it is interesting to see the additional layers of the upper voice in this passage. As I have commented earlier on about the bass line, similarly, if this alteration is made, the first note *a* flat (f: c) of m. 41 is connected with the first note *g* (a: e) of m. 43 as they move stepwise. This observation is not trivial. We find many instances, especially in the movements of the lute works that are comprised of equal (fast) notes in the upper voice (Prelude BWV 1006a, Allegro BWV 998) where these additional connections in certain notes of the upper voice are crucial, connecting the sub-phrases of the voice in longer phrases and giving the feeling that the piece moves at different levels. If we further continue, we can see a beautiful additional line of the upper voice that moves stepwise until the end of the piece. *A* flat-*g* (a: f-e), as previously commented, *f* (a: d), where the two voices reappear (m. 46 4th beat), *e* flat-*d* (a: c-b) (4th and 6th beat of m. 47), and, finally, *c* (a: a) (1st beat of m. 48): so beautiful! (This comment is connected with my comment further below regarding the last measure of the piece). Furthermore, this alteration makes a nice connection between the voices in m. 43, where instead of both voices moving downward, their move is antithetical.

Why then did Agricola, or the scribe of the source that he copied from, not alter the bass voice and the upper voice at the same time? I believe that he wanted to combine three important elements: showing the actual movement of the two sub-phrases of the bass that I have noted above starting in m. 41, the continuation of the phrase of the upper voice in m. 41 (previous measure an octave higher) and the actual distance between the two voices in m. 43- beginning of m. 45).

Looking now at the last two measures of the piece, I conclude that the scribe again notated the upper voice an octave higher. The continuation of the phrase justifies this. If we see the upper voice of mm. 47-48 with no octave alteration, this long phrase of the upper voice is broken. The first *e* flat (a: c) of m. 47 (4th beat) continues the implied phrase of the voice (from the *f* of the 4th beat of m. 46) (a: d), and is the concluding note of the upward melodic motion figure. These observations also apply for the corresponding passage at m. 9 – end of first part, apart from the re-alteration of the octave of the upper voice on the last 2 measures. The end of the first part of the *Double* is differentiated from the end of the second part. Here it does not make any sense to consider the upper voice to be again notated an octave higher: it would go below the lower voice. Here the scribe continued to preserve the actual distance between the voices. A look at the additional layer of the upper voice of this passage further justifies this assumption. In the passage m. 9 – end of the first part, there is no equivalent concern regarding the range of the bass voice. However, the observations I have made in the corresponding passage go beyond the problematic range of the bass voice. Actually, it was the implausible bass range that initially made me look closer at those passages. Perhaps if the passages were playable I would have overlooked these important additional considerations.

These passages are perhaps the most controversial of the lute works. The differences of opinion between editors justify the problematic notation of the *Double*. In the transcription I have made the abovementioned alterations in both passages and above the first measure of the movement there is the indication: '*Substantial changes have been made from what appears in the manuscript. See commentary for the justification of the editorial choices*'.

Commentary of m. 66, *Fuga*, BWV 998

This is a disputed point: the editors of the urtext editions disagree as to whether the note of the lower voice on the 2nd beat is an *e* without the natural sign, i.e. an *e* flat [D: d (natural)] (NBA / BGA) or an *e* with the natural sign (D: d#) (Tilman Hoppstock / Paolo Cherici). An *e* natural (D: d#) would correspond with the similar passage of m. 70, where a *b* with the natural sign appears (D: a#) (the correspondence refers to the alteration of the note – not to the melodic interval that this note creates). I would have chosen to notate a sharpened *d* in my transcription (D major) if I could be sure that in the autograph a natural sign has most likely, and intentionally, been marked in this position. It is difficult to understand what is notated in the facsimile of the autograph. A look at the real manuscript would likely facilitate the reading at this difficult point, however, it was impossible to find any contact information of the present owner of the manuscript. Therefore my comments are based upon my examination of the digital scans. (This is a point I repeat, since I have looked in detail at this mark in my effort to understand what is in the autograph: important detailed features may have not been passed on the scans.)

There is a sign preceding the second bass note *e* (D: d), in m. 66, that shares some features with a natural sign. If there were a natural sign there, however, we should also most likely be able to see its square in between the vertical lines of the sign. There is a circular mark instead, placed, moreover, on the third line of the bass staff, in the position of the *d* (D: c) rather than of *e*. In addition, if we are to assume that the circular mark is meant to be a square, then there are further inconsistencies: the upward line of the sign is a curved line, unlike the usual straight line that Bach uses in natural signs. Moreover, the downward line is clearly not placed on the right side of the ‘square’ as it should, but in between the middle and the left side of the circular mark. **My first remark is that the possibility of a natural sign should be seriously questioned**, as important features of the sign are missing (square), misplaced (downward line / position of the circular mark to be meant a square), not drawn as usually (curved upward line instead of straight), or not drawn as expected (circular mark instead of square).

It could also be argued that Bach marked a flat sign on the top of a previously written natural sign. That would explain the circular mark hiding the square and the straight downward line. However, the circular mark is quite small and, although this could indicate that it is not the empty circular mark that we would expect on a flat, but what seems to be a ‘filled in’ circular mark, its size would most likely not cover a square. We have also to consider that the circular mark is in the position of the *d*. Moreover, it is quite probable that if Bach marked a flat on top of a natural sign to cancel its value, he would also try to ‘erase’ the natural sign’s downward line somehow. There are no smudges on the downward line of the sign; however, there is another unidentifiable sign, to the left of the downward line, on the first space of the bass staff. Is there any possibility that it is an ‘X’, suggesting the nullification of the downward line? It is not clear, but my sense is that it is probably not: this indication has been used, probably from Kellner, in his manuscript of the *Praelude*, BWV 999, but not found elsewhere in any of the autographs of the lute works. What would Bach have chosen to do, if he wanted to nullify the natural? Writing a flat on top of it, or just smudge it? The first choice would give to the flat its cautionary function, even more so if Bach had marked a natural sign there. In this regard a flat sign could be justified as a cautionary accidental: in previous passages, where there are written out appoggiaturas – even though those passages do not share the same musical function – the second bass note is usually a chromatic note, one semitone lower than the next one. I do not describe the flat as a ‘cautionary’ accidental because it bears comparison with the passage of m. 70, where the second bass note is altered (cautionary accidentals are placed to avoid a misreading based on the notation of *previous* notes or phrases). I would welcome an examination of a possibility of an exception; however, it does not seem plausible in this autograph which is most probably a not final fair copy. While it is worth considering the use of a flat as a cautionary accidental, it does not apply in this case (i.e. of an originally-notated natural): there are seem to be no traces of a natural sign – apart from the downward line – that the small size of the flat would probably not totally cover; the circular mark is not ‘empty’ and, also, it is in the position of *d* (D: c); finally, there are most likely no erasure traces of the downward line. **My second remark is, therefore, that we should also seriously doubt the interpretation that this is a case of marking of a flat on top of a natural sign.**

It is interesting to note the possibility of an initially written note that was subsequently replaced by the *e* (flat) (D: d). This note (?) is disguised by the upward curved line. If we do not consider the upward line, then we could read clearly the note *d* in the bass [D: c (sharp)]. If we assume that the notation of the quaver rests (second beat) were made *after* Bach had notated the second bass note, then the vertical alignment of the ‘disguised *d*’ in relation to the upper voice could make sense. It would be expected to be more on the right but the possibility of the note is not totally ruled out on account of its alignment with the upper voice. If we do not consider the continuation of the phrase as notated (after the second bass note), the possibility of a second bass note *d* [D: c (sharp)] is worth considering. Perhaps Bach had a different initial idea that he changed, as the continuation of the phrase affirms, considering also that the autograph is not a final fair copy. There are other concerns though: the size of the note is quite small in relation to the other bass notes. In addition, are there any traces of erasure of the note, as we might expect? One could view the upward line as an erasure line to the note, but this is not convincing, since the note is totally clear – disguised, but clear. An erasure line would have made its purpose clear. **My third remark is that the possibility of an initially and subsequently corrected written note *d* [D: c (sharp)] should also be seriously questioned. I am therefore left with the possibility that none of these assumptions is correct. The sign before the second note may have meant something that I am not able to decipher. My conclusion is that none of the possibilities are convincing, but they should be raised, since there is a sign before the *e* (D: d). Therefore, my editorial choice upon the marking or not of the natural (D: sharp) is totally based as to which possibility makes more musical sense.** Frank Koonce (2002) notes:

In Bach’s manuscript, an unclear symbol appears before the second bass note that some interpret as an accidental to raise the pitch 1/2 step (from E flat to E natural in the original key). This symbol, however, is unlikely any of the other natural signs that occur in the manuscript and therefore it is suspect. The intensity of an augmented octave jump in the bass line and the resulting harmony of beat two also uncharacteristically disrupt the harmonic stability of the passage (p. 73).

On the other side, Tilman Hoppstock (2013) remarks:

The correction made to the bass line in bar 66.2 (*D* instead of *D#*) in a number of editions can also be viewed as equally fanciful [he is referring to the marking of the sharp in m. 18, beat 4] as the original manuscript displays a clear alteration at this point. What could have been the purpose of these well-intentioned “improvements”? . . . In reality, Bach has . . . notated a B major chord with a secondary dominant character . . . ; this was surely not unintentional as the dramaturgy created in tandem by the chromaticism and harmony hardly permits any other possibility. The richly dissonant sound with the doubly framed false relation (*D/d'* to *D#*) should on no account be replaced by the harmonically weak alternative (pp. 259-260).

I think that Hoppstock’s strong opinion relates on his interpreting the sign as a clear alteration and therefore any deviation as an editorial “improvement” upon the autograph. I have explained the reason why my editorial choice is dependent on looking at both possibilities and deciding upon which would have made more musical sense.

I concur with Frank Koonce’s statement that “the intensity of an augmented octave jump in the bass line and the resulting harmony of beat two also uncharacteristically disrupt the harmonic stability of the passage”. Before I arrive in my editorial choice in m. 66, however, I will look at both these, similar, crucially connected, and crucially differentiated, passages: there are many reasons to suggest that the sharp in the bass note should be found in m. 70 and *not* in m. 66 (Eb: natural): the “weak alternative” of m. 66 combined with the chromaticism of the second passage serves many purposes: first, it *reinforces* the chromaticism of the second passage, which comes at a crucial point in the *Fuga* where Bach surely wanted to create tension, as the notated chromaticism affirms: it is before the long pedal point gradually enriched with other voices before the recapitulation, like the ‘calm after the storm’. (On the performance with a six-string guitar, there is an unfortunate unavoidable octave displacement on the bass note of m. 70, 4th beat, resulting in a bass repetition, unless further alterations will be made.) There are other differences between the two passages that suggest the chromaticism of the note of the second passage only: in m. 69, 4th beat, Bach writes the anticipated chord of the written out appoggiaturas an octave higher than in m. 65 and this is also the first time that Bach does not use contrary motion between the outer voices of the anticipated chord and the resolved appoggiaturas: this certainly gives a hint of something *unexpected* to come that involves tension. Lastly, it is really worth considering the different quality of the concluding chords of the phrases of the passages under discussion: in m. 67, 1st beat, the phrase concludes on a major chord, unlike the second passage which concludes on a minor chord (m. 71). The major chord reflects a peacefulness that is poorly suited if we assume that the second bass note is altered. If the second bass note is not altered, however, the major chord reflects an appropriate peacefulness that is sustained and will be disrupted by the chromatic note of the second passage, which concludes on a minor chord before the pedal point (a hint of disruption entails also the higher octave of the anticipated chord as I have mentioned). This is my favourite minor chord found in the lute works. A *d* without the sharp sign (Eb: eb) was opted for in the transcription with the indication: ‘*There is an unidentifiable mark before the second bass note. See commentary.*’

