

## **JS Bach Solo Lute Discography**

*John Reeve*

### **Foreword**

The discography lists all solo music by JS Bach recorded on instruments of the lute family. Versions for guitar, mandolin, keyboard etc. are excluded, as are arrangements for more than one instrument.

This all started with John H Robinson's reaction to Jakob Lindberg's outstanding CD 'Bach on the Rauwolf Lute', which moved him to list all the recordings of Bach on the lute he knew. Tim Crawford, Chris Goodwin and I added some more, and the list quickly grew to over 90 recordings. Since then I have found new sources, added more information and validated it as far as possible.

The list now stands at 133 albums from 85 artists, with 1480 individual movements. It is not a comprehensive list of releases, but rather tries to give just one version of each recorded movement. I have listed the latest and most readily available version of each piece, which means, for example, including CD reissues where available rather than original LPs. I have also listed dedicated recitals in preference to compilations. Sometimes the same piece has been issued more than once by a player, so I have removed duplicates by listening to the recordings, by checking track timings (allowing for small variations) or by validation of the dates of recording. I am confident that the few apparent duplicates in the list are in fact different recordings.

In addition to identifying the works that are included in each release I have tried to list the year of recording. This is especially important in the case of reissues, but in some cases I can only find the year of release, which may be significantly later. These are marked with an asterisk. I have also given information about the instrument used, where possible, including type (lute, theorbo etc.), the number of courses and the configuration of the peg box (such as swan neck or bass rider). Where there is a question mark next to the type, number of courses or configuration it means that the entry is likely to be correct but is not conclusively verified. Where no information is available these entries are missing.

It would have been interesting to have given a comprehensive list of tunings and keys but this information is not generally available and cannot be deduced aurally because of different pitch standards, transposition and the use of non-standard tunings in some recordings.

No list like this is ever complete and it will be a living document with regular updates. New recordings are being released all the time and it is more than likely that I have missed some old recordings too. If you know of any, or can add to or correct any of the information, please let me know!

The remainder of these notes discusses some of the issues that players must face in arranging and recording these works and provides some insights into the data to give an overview of the recorded repertoire.

### **Issues for performance**

The first and most controversial issue to tackle is the question of "Bach's lute music". There is an extensive literature over the past 100 years that deals with the question of which of his works Bach intended to be played on the lute. I would rather not add to this<sup>1</sup>, but must deal with the question in order to illuminate the decisions that players have to make about instrument, tuning

and key. I believe it matters which works are 'lute works', conceived for the instrument by Bach himself, and there is something intrinsically valuable in seeking to come closer to the sound and performance that Bach might have heard or imagined. We can, of course, never know how close this is, but the journey is worthwhile.

Versions for the lute of his other music are transcriptions, and none the worse for that. Bach himself left us models to follow, and there are now many recordings of the solo violin and cello works on the lute, as well as some keyboard pieces.

The catalogue of Bach's works lists seven lute works:

- BWV 995, the Suite in G minor, a version of the C minor Cello Suite BWV 1011
- BWV 996, the Suite in E minor
- BWV 997, the Partita in C minor
- BWV 998, the Prelude Fugue and Allegro in E flat
- BWV 999, the Prelude in C minor
- BWV 1000, the Fugue in G minor based on the violin Fugue from BWV 1001 and
- BWV 1006a<sup>2</sup>, the Suite in E major, a version of the 3rd Violin Partita.

It is now generally believed that they were probably not all intended for the lute, but that is about as far as consensus goes. Three factors have combined to add to the air of mystery:

- The absence of really definitive contemporary tablatures
- The difficulty of the music (for either lute or keyboard)
- The relative scarcity of evidence for the lute in Bach's life

Before looking at the balance of evidence it is helpful to consider how this list arose.

Three works exist in autograph versions: BWV 995 '*pour la Luth*<sup>3</sup>, BWV 998 '*pour la Luth à Cembal*<sup>4</sup>, and BWV 1006a, untitled<sup>5</sup>. The only source of BWV 999 is a contemporary copy marked '*pour la lute*<sup>6</sup> and the main source of BWV 996 is an early copy marked '*aufs Lauten Werck*<sup>7</sup>, 'on the lute-harpsichord'. There are also three contemporary tablature versions: an anonymous version of BWV 995<sup>8</sup>, a little different from the autograph, and intabulations by JC Weyrauch of BWV 997 (movements 1, 3 and 4)<sup>9</sup> and of BWV 1000<sup>10</sup>, the only source of that version of the violin fugue. BWV 997 also exists as a five-movement work in staff notation in several sources<sup>11</sup>.

The first comprehensive edition of Bach's music was the *Bach-Gesellschaft Ausgabe* (BGA), published between 1851 and 1926. Two of the lute works are in the main volumes of keyboard music: the Prelude BWV 999 (1890)<sup>12</sup>, and Suite BWV 1006a (1894)<sup>13</sup>. Three others, BWV 996, 997 and 998 are in the 'Completion Volume' of 1897<sup>14</sup> as 'sundry instrumental works'. The Suite and Fugue in G minor, BWV 995 and 1000, are missing from the BGA entirely. Interestingly, BWV 999 was marked '*pour le luth*' in the Peters catalogue of 1882<sup>15</sup>, following the only source, but not in the BGA itself.

The first identification of these seven works as being for lute was in the highly influential work of Dr Hans Dagobert Brugger, *Johann Sebastian Bach: Kompositionen für die Laute*, first published in 1921 and substantially revised in two further editions<sup>16</sup>. The third edition of 1925 is still in print<sup>17</sup>. It gives versions for the 'modern lute', essentially a 10-string guitar, and some useful notes on his transcriptions, and it is where the familiar numbering of Suites I-IV comes from.

When the updated catalogue of Bach's work, *Bach-Werke-Verzeichnis*<sup>18</sup>, was published in 1950 these seven works were identified as lute works and the allocation of BWV numbers was made. In 1975 a facsimile of the three contemporary lute tablatures was published in Leipzig<sup>19</sup> followed in 1976 by the *Neue Bach Ausgabe* (NBA) edition of the lute works<sup>20</sup>. The critical commentary was published in 1982<sup>21</sup> and gives the information about sources and the evidence around instrumentation that was available at the time.

In June 2022 the third edition of *Bach-Werke-Verzeichnis* (BWV<sup>3</sup>) was published<sup>22</sup> and follows the practice of Bach-Digital and the Leipzig Bach Archive in renumbering BWV 1006a as BWV 1006.2. The section on Lute Works is now renamed 'Lute and Lute Harpsichord Works' with a corresponding re-evaluation of the instrumentation of these works, of which I have only been able to see the parts on BWV 995 and 996.

It is really beyond doubt that BWV 995, 998 and 999 were intended by Bach to be played on the lute. The autographs of the first two are explicitly marked 'for the lute', as was BWV 999 by the copyist, and it may be significant that he made the same error as Bach – '*la lute*', not '*le*' – suggesting that he may have copied the title as well as the music. There are also numerous details in all these pieces suggesting the lute rather than keyboard. But with Bach nothing is simple, and the first two need some adjustment to fit the normal 13-course lute of Bach's time, if that was indeed his intended instrument.

BWV 995 is most clearly a lute work by Bach, with its unambiguous '*pour la luth*' in his hand. It is, however impossible to play it on the normal 13-course lute exactly as written<sup>23</sup>, because of the lack of the low G<sub>1</sub> which recurs throughout the score, and there are other difficulties to be tackled. Some have chosen to use a 14-course instrument, but to make the G<sub>1</sub> sound well requires a rather large body, which brings its own problems. In addition, there are just one or two surviving instruments and, as far as I know, no music in tablature for fourteen courses. Players today can choose to use a 14-course instrument to follow Bach's score exactly, omit the G<sub>1</sub> following the contemporary tablature, or transpose it, normally to A minor, which fits on 13 courses and avoids some of the difficulties of the original.

The Prelude, Fugue and Allegro, BWV 998, needs some small adjustments in the last two movements to be played on the lute but then works well. It also fits the keyboard, as would be expected from the title 'Prelude for lute or harpsichord'. An influential paper by the pioneer Eugen Müller-Dombois argued that the Fugue and Allegro were composed for lute-harpsichord<sup>24</sup>, and more recently David Ledbetter<sup>25</sup> concluded the same. Nevertheless, it can all be made to work on the lute and the title shows that Bach expected it to be played on either. We should not read too much into the fact that the title mentions just the Prelude as this was not uncommon at the time.

Only BWV 999 fits on the lute completely unchanged, as well as on the keyboard.

The contemporary lute tablatures of BWV 995, BWV 997 and BWV 1000 make the case for these works as being for the lute, but are all problematic in some way. That of BWV 995, as well as omitting the G<sub>1</sub>, has other detailed differences from the autograph, including in ornamentation. Most players today take the autograph as their starting point.

BWV 997 omits two movements from the staff version, one of which, the Double, is clearly a later addition and unplayable on the lute as it stands. But it must be said that the staff version is also problematic since parts of the Fugue are unplayable on the keyboard with only two hands, as is the last chord of the Prelude. The tablature requires retuning the sixth course to A flat, a solution that could also usefully be applied to BWV 998. Of the recorded versions, five are of the three-movement tablature version, two include all except the Double and sixteen are of all five

movements. The tablature is the clearest indication that it might have been intended for the lute, and all movements except the Double work well without significant adjustment.

The G minor Fugue, BWV1000, is obviously for the lute but deviates enough from the violin version for some to doubt that Bach was involved with it at all. The most obvious difference is an additional entry in the bass in bar four of the lute version, replacing the treble entry in bar three and adding two bars. This would have been impossible on the violin, but when Bach arranged it for the organ, BWV 539/2, it is significant that he chose to follow the violin version of the exposition rather than the lute version. These different versions of the fugue have led to some confusion as several players have made their own intabulations of the violin version, sometimes presenting it as BWV 1000. I have checked all recorded versions and identified seven instances of the violin version being labelled as BWV 1000. These are marked in the discography with #. I quite understand that some find this version musically superior and closer to Bach, but it would help to identify it clearly. There are three cases of the opposite, with the lute version inserted into the violin sonata: one of these is labelled explicitly as BWV 1000 while the other two simply mention the lute version in the notes. These two are marked in the discography with +. This is understandable, as the lute version could be considered to be approved by Bach and so an appropriate substitution. You can take your pick. Three of the ten complete recordings include the violin version as BWV 1000 rather than the lute intabulation. These substitutions are noted in the discography.

BWV 996 was almost certainly conceived for the keyboard<sup>26</sup> because of its unfriendly key, dense texture and annotation '*aufs Lauten Werck*' and in BWV<sup>3</sup> it is now clearly marked for lute harpsichord. Relatively few players have recorded it, the choice being to transpose it into a viable key or retune the lute to make E minor more accessible. Indeed, the ten complete recordings contain the only full versions on baroque lute. The three other recordings of the whole suite use renaissance tuning on 10-course lute or archlute.

Finally, despite having no indication of instrument, BWV 1006a works well on the lute, but is impossible in the original key, at least without some re-tuning. Most players transpose it to F major, and occasionally D major. It may have been intended for the *lautenwerk*, although there is no indication of instrument on the manuscript and it does not work well on the keyboard at all. When Bach adapted it for organ (BWV 29 and 120a) he reworked the prelude to avoid the bariolage that is so characteristic of string writing. Bruger sensibly assigned it to the lute on the basis of its range, and sparse texture. He was not put off by the key, and rightly notes that Bach was never constrained by technical difficulty.

The discography is a testament to the fact that all seven are playable on the lute with some adjustment, but of all of them the E minor suite, BWV 996, is the least likely to have been conceived for the lute, along with the Double of BWV 997. That does not mean, of course, that lute versions are 'wrong', just not what Bach originally had in mind.

The lack of accurate and authoritative contemporary intabulations of Bach's lute works means that players who wish to go beyond the three original tablatures need to use modern editions or make their own. The amount of editing necessary to provide playable versions has ensured a fair amount of controversy about instrument (13 or 14 courses), key and choice of source. This means that there is no single 'Urtext' edition, and a great deal of argument about which published version is closest to Bach's obscure intentions.

The first publication of tablature for any of these works was, I believe, a transcription of the original tablature for BWV 995 in Franz Julius Giesbert's *Schule für die Barocklaute*, Mainz,

1940. It is probably no coincidence that three of the first four recordings of Bach on the lute contained this suite.

Complete versions by Giesbert and Josef Klima circulated in the 1970s but are, as far as I know, unpublished. The first published performing edition of the complete lute works for baroque lute were by Stefan Lundgren (Lundgren Edition) and Michihiko Okazawa, both in 1984 and both requiring 14 courses. They were followed by Yasunori Imamura in 1992 (Tree Editions), who published a re-worked version in 2019 after his second complete recording. Both also use 14 courses for BWV 995 and BWV 998. Hopkinson Smith published the first version for 13 courses in six volumes that appeared from 2001 to 2009 and are still in print (Ut Orpheus). Two more complete editions are the series by Wilfed Foxe, requiring 13 courses, that was published in Lute News from 2008 to 2011, later collected in a single edition (Lute Society), and one by Clive Titmuss (with 13- and 14-course versions of BWV 995) from 2009 on his website<sup>27</sup>. Uncompleted editions include David Rhodes's two volumes of BWV 996 and 998 (Prelude Publications, 1976).

Most professional players will, of course, make their own edition from the sources, which are now easily available.

Part of the dilemma in choosing an edition is choice of instrument. As noted above, this has a different significance in the pieces intended by Bach for the lute from that of the others: there is a venerable tradition of transcribing Bach's works for all kinds of instrument, and this is valid, if sometimes tasteless. For the works that Bach intended for lute there is more of an obligation on lutenists to try to meet the composer's intentions, and this extends to choice of instrument. Only versions that use instruments that Bach could have had in mind can count as definitive performances in this sense. All others are transcriptions, just like guitar versions. We do not need to solve the puzzle of what instrument Bach expected in order to rule out instruments that he could not have had in mind, such as the Italian theorbo and archlute, or, *pace* André Burguete, the *angélique*<sup>28</sup>. To me, this means that versions of BWV 995, 998 and 999 on the baroque lute, whether 13 or 14 courses, have a special authority as there can be really no doubt as to the instrument intended. The same applies in all likelihood to BWV 997, except the Double, and to 1006a. It seems to me that the balance of probability is that they are indeed lute pieces. It is also good to hear the contemporary tablatures of BWV 995, 997 and 1000 on the 13-course lute, whether Bach approved them or not.

Whatever Bach's intentions were, this is some of the very best music playable on the lute and includes the only autograph music by a universally-acknowledged great composer explicitly intended for the instrument.

The discography goes well beyond the seven lute works. Around 40% of Bach pieces recorded on the lute are from other sources. The great majority are transcriptions of the solo violin and cello works in the manner of Bach's own versions of the fifth Cello Suite and third Violin Partita. Players are more free to arrange their own versions unconstrained by autographs with the composer's authority, including licence to transpose where appropriate, and many of these are very successful indeed.

The remaining Bach recordings on the lute include two versions each of the solo Flute Sonata BWV 1013 and the *adagiosissimo* (sic) from the Capriccio 'on the departure of a beloved brother', BWV 992, and single recordings of:

- the organ Toccata & Fugue in D minor (BWV 565)
- a Chorale Prelude (BWV 639)
- a Chorale Tune (BWV 690b)

- an Invention (BWV 772)
- two movements from the first English Suite (BWV 806)
- the first four French Suites (BWV 812-5)
- the second Partita (BWV 826)
- a 'little prelude' (BWV 924)
- the Air from the third Orchestral Suite (BWV 1068).

It is a testament to the creativity of players and the appeal of Bach's music that so many should have overcome the challenges of making versions for the lute of these complex and difficult pieces.

### **Analysis and Insights**

The catalogue currently contains 1480 individual pieces on 133 albums by 85 different players.

Around 60% of these, 870, are from the seven lute works. There are 146 pieces (9%) from the solo violin works (excluding BWV 1006) and 413 (28%) from the solo cello works (excluding BWV 1011). The remaining 51 (3%) are the miscellaneous, mainly keyboard, works.

At this time, there are ten complete recordings of the standard lute works, including two from Yasunori Imamura:

- Narciso Yepes (1973)
- Hopkinson Smith (1981)
- Lutz Kirchhof (1987)
- Konrad Junghänel (1989)
- Yasunori Imamura (1990)
- Jakob Lindberg (1992)
- Paul Beier (1996 & 1999)
- Mario D'Agosto (2012)
- Yasunori Imamura (2016)
- Evangelina Mascardi (2022)

Eduardo Egüez comes close, omitting only the 'problem child', BWV 996. All are on 13-course baroque lute except that Lutz Kirchhof uses an Italian theorbo for BWV 996 and 1006a, Yepes uses a 14-course lute throughout, and Imamura and Mascardi use one for selected works.

The complete Cello Suites have been recorded four times: by Nigel North on lute and by Hopkinson Smith on German theorbo (BWV 1007-9) and lute (BWV1010-12), and by Pascal Monteilhet and Stefan Lundgren (DVD), both on Italian theorbo. There are just two complete versions of the Violin Sonatas and Partitas, from Nigel North and Hopkinson Smith, both on lute.

In total, Hopkinson Smith has recorded the most individual pieces, 106, followed by Nigel North at 91, Toyohiko Satoh at 68 and Paul Beier at 61. The most recorded lute work is BWV 995, with 46 complete versions, followed by BWV 1000 with 43 (including the violin version), BWV 999 at 31, BWV 1006a at 28, BWV 998 at 24, BWV 997 at 16 (with the double) and BWV 996 at 13.

BWV 1007 is the most recorded of the cello works with 24 complete versions and BWV 1001 is the most recorded of the violin works, with 12. There are of course many recordings of individual movements. The top two are the Prelude and Gavotte I from BWV 995, at 48 versions.

The prelude from BWV 1007 is the most recorded cello work, at 27 and the Chaconne from BWV 1004 is the most recorded violin work, with 16 versions.

Fashions change, and it is instructive to look back over the 100 years of recording since the first collected publication of the scores in 1921. There was a string of recordings of Bach pieces on the guitar during the 1920s, 30s and 40s by such as Andrés Segovia, Miguel Llobet, and Maria Luisa Anido. These were typically isolated movements from the cello, violin and lute works. The first complete Bach suite to be recorded on guitar was the 3<sup>rd</sup> Cello Suite, BWV 1009, by John Williams in 1959, followed by Segovia with the same suite in 1961. Lutenists were slower to explore this repertoire. 1949 saw the first lute recording of Bach's solo music, Walter Gerwig's BWV 995, now happily re-released on CD. There were three more releases before 1960: BWV 999 from Suzanne Bloch, BWV 995, 996 and the first two movements of BWV 998 from Michel Podolski and a third BWV 995 from Monique Rollin. These have not worn so well as Gerwig's but are nevertheless historically important.

The 1960s produced a further eight recordings, all from Germany, including Gerwig's extended recital which included another version of BWV 995, also still available today.

The 1970s brought the first recordings on baroque lute. In 1971 Roland Zimmer recorded BWV 999 on a historic 12-course lute by Tielke, now in Leipzig, but as he transposed it into G minor I think it likely to have been in renaissance tuning. The first recordings that are certainly on baroque lutes in baroque tuning were from Eugen Dombois, recorded in 1972, and Toyohiko Satoh a year or so later, both on 14-course lutes. But the milestone of 1973 was Narciso Yepes's complete recording of all seven lute works, again on a 14-course instrument. It is not without controversy, partly because of the unusual variants of baroque tuning he used, and partly the sound. The use of nails on the right hand and nylon strings gives a rather harsh tone. He recorded the same repertoire on ten-string guitar shortly afterwards, as if to make a point. But it was the first time that some of these works could be heard in reasonably correct versions on a real lute, even if the compromises he made are not the ones that modern players would make.

The publication in 1975 of the facsimile of the Lute tablatures and in 1976 of the *Neue Bach Ausgabe* edition of the lute works was a boon to baroque lute players, who had previously had to find a photocopy of the Giesbert or Klima intabulations or go back to the sources. The effect on recording was dramatic. Before 1978 nearly all recordings (including Gerwig's) were on 10-course lutes in renaissance tuning, the exceptions being those noted above. Even Guy Robert's 1972 version of the three tablature movements of BWV 997 on an 11-course lute was in renaissance tuning. After 1976, most were on baroque lutes, generally 13-course. I believe the first two on 13-course lutes, both from 1978, were Konrad Junghänel's recording in of BWV 997, minus the Double, and the Prelude and Fugue from BWV 1001, and Rodrigo de Zayas's BWV 995, 998 and 1000.

From Yepes to the next complete recording, by Hopkinson Smith, took eight years. This was the first to use historically-aware standards of instrument, playing technique, edition (Smith's own) and musicianship. The 1980s saw two more complete recordings. One from Konrad Junghänel, and one from Lutz Kirchhof, provocatively entitled 'The Works for Lute In Original Keys and Tunings' but which used an Italian theorbo for the E minor and E Major works. This was the first use on record of this instrument for Bach's solo music.

By the end of 1989 the discography numbered 44 recordings. The 1990s saw 25 new releases and further expansion of the repertoire with Nigel North's complete edition of the violin and cello works. There were also three more complete recordings of the lute works from Yasunori Imamura, Jakob Lindberg and Paul Beier. 1999 saw the first part of Pascal Monteilhet's

complete Cello Suites on Italian theorbo, and, coincidentally, Juan Carlos Rivera's version of the same three suites, also on theorbo. That year also saw the first use of the archlute, by Luca Pianca. As transcriptions, such versions are valid, and generally give a better reading than, for example, guitar versions, but they do not take us closer to Bach's world and the sound he imagined, or indeed heard.

The decade from 2000 saw the completion of Eduardo Egüez's edition of all the lute works, omitting the doubtful BWV 996. There were no other complete editions but five more recordings using archlute, some single strung, giving a sound somewhere between a theorbo and a guitar. There were also three on the Italian theorbo, including the completion of Pascal Monteilhet's Cello Suites. The seventeen lute releases included Paul O'Dette's CD, tantalisingly entitled 'JS Bach: Lute Works volume 1'. We still await volume 2. Also noteworthy was Edin Karamazov's transcription of the organ Toccata and Fugue in D minor, BWV 565.

The 2010s gave us no fewer than 30 new Bach releases, including a complete version from Mario D'Agosto, a second one from Yasunori Imamura, and Stefan Lundgren's DVD of the Cello Suites on Italian theorbo. Other notable releases included Hopkinson Smith's recording of the first three Cello Suites on German theorbo, a bass baroque lute invented by SL Weiss. As Weiss and Bach met and collaborated it seems to me that it is possible that some of Bach's music was played on such an instrument, although there is no evidence that it ever happened. The same decade saw Paul Beier's serious excursion into keyboard music with the first four French Suites. In the two-and-a-half years since 2019 there have been nine releases, including the most recent complete edition from Evangelina Mascardi, the first female lutenist to record the complete works and only the sixth to record any Bach at all.

Each decade since the 1950s has produced progressively more solo Bach albums, and the 2020s look to be following at a good rate. We sometimes look back to a 'golden age' of recording, but the decade with most releases of Bach on the lute was the last decade, the 2010s, with 30 against the 17 of the 1980s. In terms of performance quality, modern recordings generally compare well with all but the very best from earlier years, and most benefit from much clearer recorded sound.

So what can we expect to see in the future? The driving forces will be the need for a new generation to make Bach's works their own, new historical research and analysis and the desire for innovation. This will be in an environment where recording and publishing is cheaper and more accessible and where streaming makes even obscure repertoire available. I predict that the 2020s will be just as fertile in terms of new recordings as previous decades, if not more so, and that experimentation will continue. There is certainly scope to explore the keyboard works further, following the example of Paul Beier, Alexander Suetin and Edin Karamazov, and it is likely that different instruments will be used, following the spate of recordings on archlutes etc. Not everyone will welcome such innovation: there is always tension between giving education and providing entertainment. But I hope that future lutenists will keep striving to understand how this music sounded and why it works so well through recreating the instruments and performance practices of the past. Isn't that why we play the lute, anyway?

---

<sup>1</sup> The literature is too extensive to list, but recent publications with useful bibliographies include Ingo Negwer, 'Bach and the lute: a source-critical study of the music for solo lute by Johann Sebastian Bach', tr. Maginley *The Lute*, Albury, 2017, and David Ledbetter, *Unaccompanied Bach: Performing the Solo Works*, New Haven and London, 2009.

<sup>2</sup> It is now officially known as BWV 1006.2 but I have used the more familiar designation throughout.

<sup>3</sup> B-Br Ms.II 4085 Mus.

<sup>4</sup> Private collection, China

- 
- <sup>5</sup> J-Tma Littera rara vol. 2-14
- <sup>6</sup> D-B Mus.ms. Bach P 804, Faszikel 19
- <sup>7</sup> D-B Mus.ms. Bach P 801, Faszikel 22
- <sup>8</sup> D-LEm Sammlung Becker, Ms. III.11.3
- <sup>9</sup> D LEm III 11.5
- <sup>10</sup> D-LEm III 11.4, Faszikel 1
- <sup>11</sup> E.g. D-B Am.B 549-550, Faszikel 2. The staff version is now known as BWV 997.1 and the tablature as BWV 997.2.
- <sup>12</sup> Ernst Naumann, *Bach-Gesellschaft Ausgabe*: Band 36. Clavierwerke. Band 4, Leipzig 1890
- <sup>13</sup> Ibid. Band 42. Clavierwerke. Band 5, Leipzig 1894
- <sup>14</sup> Alfred Dörffel, *Bach-Gesellschaft Ausgabe*: Band 45.1. Instrumentalwerke. Ergänzungsband Leipzig (1897)
- <sup>15</sup> Alfred Dörffel, *Thematisches Verzeichniss der Instrumentalwerke von Joh. Seb. Bach Auf Grund der Gesamtausgabe*, 2nd. Ed., Leipzig 1882
- <sup>16</sup> See <http://www.danielnistico.net/first-lute-suites-edition.html> for a downloadable version of the 1921 edition.
- <sup>17</sup> Hans Dagobert Bruger, *Johann Sebastian Bach: Kompositionen für die Laute*, Wolfenbüttel & Zurich, 1925
- <sup>18</sup> Schmieder, Wolfgang, ed. *Thematisch-systematisches Verzeichnis der musikalischen Werke von Johann Sebastian Bach: Bach-Werke-Verzeichnis*, Leipzig 1950
- <sup>19</sup> Hans-Joachim Schulze, *Drei Lautenkompositionen in Zeitgenössischer Tabulatur (BWV 995, 997, 1000)*, Leipzig 1975
- <sup>20</sup> Kohlhase, Thomas, *Johann Sebastian Bach: Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke*; Serie V, 10, Leipzig 1976
- <sup>21</sup> Kohlhase, Thomas, *Johann Sebastian Bach: Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke*; Serie V, 10, Kritischer Bericht, Leipzig 1982
- <sup>22</sup> Christine Blanken, Christoph Wolff and Peter Wollny, *Bach-Werke-Verzeichnis*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, Leipzig 2022
- <sup>23</sup> In what follows I have received helpful advice on playability from William Carter.
- <sup>24</sup> *The Lute*, Albury 1972 & 1973
- <sup>25</sup> Ledbetter, *op. cit.* pp. 259-260
- <sup>26</sup> See for instance David Ledbetter, *Bach's Well-Tempered Clavier*, New Haven and London, 2002, p.30
- <sup>27</sup> <http://earlymusicstudio.com/tablatures/the-big-bach-lutebook/>
- <sup>28</sup> See his discussion at <http://www.bach-lautenwerke.de/en.html>