

PERFORMANCE COMMENTARY

Notes on the musical text

The variants marked as *ossia* were given this label by Chopin or were added in his hand to pupils' copies; variants without this designation are the result of discrepancies in the texts of authentic versions or an inability to establish an unambiguous reading of the text.

Minor authentic alternatives (single notes, ornaments, slurs, accents, pedal indications, etc.) that can be regarded as variants are enclosed in round brackets (), whilst editorial additions are written in square brackets [].

Pianists who are not interested in editorial questions, and want to base their performance on a single text, unhampered by variants, are recommended to use the music printed in the principal staves, including all the markings in brackets.

Chopin's original fingering is indicated in large bold-type numerals, 1 2 3 4 5, in contrast to the editors' fingering which is written in small italic numerals, *1 2 3 4 5*. Wherever authentic fingering is enclosed in parentheses this means that it was not present in the primary sources, but added by Chopin to his pupils' copies. The dashed signs indicating the distribution of parts between the hands come from the editors.

A general discussion on the interpretation of Chopin's works is to be contained in a separate volume: *The Introduction to the National Edition*, in the section entitled *Problems of Performance*.

Abbreviations: R.H. – right hand, L.H. – left hand.

1. Scherzo in B minor, Op. 20

p. 11 *Bars 31-32 and analog.* L.H. In this type of context, in which upon four occasions (in bars 29-33) upbeat double-notes lead to accented downbeat double-notes, the slur between notes *e*¹ is probably of a motif nature and not a tie; for this reason, it is better to repeat note *e*¹.


p. 12 *Bar 44, 56 and analog.* In these places *ritenuto* has the nature of a local rubato within particular bars, and not of a general slowing down of the tempo.

Bars 56-57 and analog. The following fingering will facilitate a calm execution of the legato octaves in the bass:



Bars 65-68 In the opinion of the editors it is possible to omit the entry into the first volta in bar 65 and the repeat (bars 9-68) owing to the five repetitions, noted in the course of the *Scherzo*, of the part which ends here.

p. 20 *Bar 305 and following* The marking *ben legato* probably refers to the "harmonic legato" (fingers sustain components of harmony) and, hand span permitting, should be realised in the following manner (which we give together with suitably adjusted pedalling):




Bars 322-325 and analog. R.H. In accordance with Chopin's directives in pupils' copies of other compositions (e. g. *Scherzo in E*, Op. 54, bar 89 and 400) ornaments of this type should be started simultaneously with the bass; for example:



p. 21 *Bar 329* R.H. (*f*^{##1} simultaneously with *d*[#] in the L.H.).


p. 22 *Bars 383-384* The following device makes it possible to sustain the sound of the bass *C*[#], possibly foreseen by Chopin (unless there is an error in the original record of the pedalling), without mingling harmony:



2. Scherzo in B flat minor, Op. 31

p. 31 *Bar 73 and analog.* R.H. The grace-note *g*¹ should be sounded together with *eb*, the first note in the L.H.

p. 33 *Bars 126-128* R.H. There are several proposals of facilitating this uncomfortable arpeggio, particularly for smaller hands:



p. 35 *Bar 179, 630* Beginning of trill: .

- p. 38 *Bar 281 and analog.* L.H. It is best to execute the arpeggio in an anticipatory manner, so that the last note of the arpeggiated chord (e#') would be heard simultaneously with c#² in the R.H. In order to avoid complications with the pedal or breaking the legato in the melody it is possible to perform this place as follows:



Analogously in bar 306 and 408.

Bar 293 and analog. In practice, the mute taking into the L.H. of the sustained note f#, marked by Chopin (cf. *Source Commentary*), must be completed already in the previous bar. If the hand span makes it impossible to retain the D-A-f# chord, then it can be achieved with the help of a pedal depressed on the last note in bar 292 and analog.


- p. 47 *Bars 553-572* In the sources, the arpeggios are marked inconsistently (see *Source Commentary*), which permits the performer certain freedom in their application. In the opinion of the editors the quick tempo and greater volume of sound of modern pianos allow the execution of R.H. chords in the whole section without arpeggios. This is a considerable facilitation, and produces a much more decisive sound effect.

- p. 48 *Bars 587-588 and analog.* Slurs continued to the end of bar 587 and analog. emphasise the necessity of holding notes *f* and *f'* to the *ff* strokes in bar 588 and analog.

- p. 53 *Bars 744-755* A longer sustaining of the pedal than marked by Chopin, from bar 744 to bar 754 incl., sounds very well on modern pianos, provided that the notes *Ab¹-Ab-ab* in bar 744 are struck suitably sonorously.

3. Scherzo in C sharp minor, Op. 39

- p. 54 *Bars 6-7 and 14-15* L.H. In the case of a smaller hand it is possible to execute the wide chords arpeggio (this was the way they were probably played by Chopin). On the other hand, they may be simplified in the following manner:



While using the original pedal and sharp articulation in both hands the difference between this type of execution and the original version is, for all practical purposes, unnoticeable.

Bar 31, 47 and analog. Those bars – a total of six places – require to be discussed both as regards the selection of one of the two variants of rhythm in particular bars and the practical realisation of those rhythmic figures. In the opinion of the editors it is necessary to accept one of the three most probably authentic combinations of the main text and variants (see *Source Commentary*):

- the main text everywhere; in this version, the rhythms and occur in the course of the *Scherzo* interchangeably;
- variants in bar 47, 129, 373 and 389, i. e. in all four places in which they are given; in this version, the rhythm appears only in bar 373 together with additional accents in bar 368, 370, 372 and 374 as well as the notes *A* and *a'* in bar 374;
- variants in bar 47, 129 and 389; this is the version containing only one of the variant rhythms.

Chopin's wavering discernible in the record of this type of rhythms is encountered in other compositions (e. g. in *Mazurka in Ab*, Op. 41 no. 3, bar 6, 8 and analog., *Etude in Gb*, Op. 10 no. 5, bar 65, *Sonata in B minor*, Op. 58, first movement, bar 139). This suggests the assumption that the composer had in mind a rhythmic record (approximate) of the gesture of raising the hand, inserted between equal rhythmic values (in this case, crotchets). The above variants of the rhythm would thus correspond to extreme possibilities of performance, in which:

- a) the inserted rest does not disturb noticeably the rhythmic course –
- b) the hiatus caused by the described gesture is distinct –


The rhythm of the other permissible renditions could be described as situated within an intermediate zone between those possibilities.

Ultimately, both the choice of the variants and the degree of their differentiation in the execution are left to the discretion of the performer, with due consideration to the above remarks.

Bars 37-38, 54, 62, 75-96 and analog. R.H. The legato slurs refer certainly to the top voice. It is not certain, however, whether they pertain also to the crotchets of the bottom voice. Owing to the motifs of this voice, which reflect those of the main theme (the *non legato* or *staccato* octaves in bars 27-32 and analog.), subsequently developed in the L.H. part marked *staccato* in bars 57-67 and further on, it is better to play the bottom voice in bars 37-38, 62, 75-96 and analog. as *staccato*, enhancing the effect of the polyphonic structure of these places. only in bar 54 (and 396) can the bottom voice, which imitates the melodic fragment of the previous bar, be performed *legato*.

- p. 56 *Bars 129-130* Dots probably do not signify here a change of articulation (in the preceding bars octaves are also played *staccato* or *non legato* – cf. previous comment). See *Source Commentary*.

- p. 57 *Bars 159-235, 291-319 and 453-525* R.H. Slurs in the main text and the pedalling suggest a continuum, independent of texture (figurate insertions), of the choral-type chord theme, built of eight-bar phrases:



The execution of those phrases in a uniform tempo and strict rhythm would produce the illusion of an excessively rapid tempo of the chordal part of the phrases or an over slow figuration part. On the other hand, in concert praxis, one frequently hears quaver figurations performed much too quickly in relation to the preceding chords. As a result, the editors recommend:

- the acceptance of a tempo as flowing as possible for the chords beginning the phrases;
- the execution of the progressions of quavers, after the shortest possible but natural transference of hands from the lower to the higher register, in a slightly quicker tempo, so that for the performer bars 159-162 (and analog.) would seem to last as long as bars 155-158 (and analog.)

L.H. Depending on the performer's individual predispositions, some of the figurations, played with the natural fingering given in the text, appear to be less comfortable. In case of distinct difficulties, it is possible to try alternative fingering (we give three examples of such situations):
bars 159-163:



bars 315-319:



bars 453-457:




p. 58 **Bar 210 and 460 R.H.** In the editors' opinion variants in the footnotes are permitted only in those cases when the hand span makes it possible to execute them without an arpeggio.

Bar 219 L.H. The arpeggio – the only one in this part of the *Scherzo* – is probably technical and not expressive. In the opinion of the editors it can be omitted in the case of a sufficiently large hand span.

p. 59 **Bars 243-249, 251-257, 259-265 and 267-271** Here, Chopin noted two types of pedalling:
– the whole section on a single pedal,
– a change of the pedal at the beginning of the third and subsequent bars. In the editors' opinion the performer can in practice choose between:
– the acceptance of one of the Chopinesque pedalling proposals for all four sections;
– the application of assorted pedalling in various sections, best of all in connection with a differentiation of articulation or dynamics (e. g. bars 243-249 *mezza voce*, *poco legato*, with changes of the pedal, and in bars 251-257 *pianissimo*, *leggierissimo*, on a single pedal, etc.).

p. 62 **Bar 374** The accents refer to notes A and a¹ (cf. *Source Commentary*).

p. 67 **Bar 598 L.H.** Beginning of trill:  F# together with the R.H. chord.

p. 68 **Bars 629-633 R.H.** Two proposals of facilitating the passage:



Bars 637-644 The at first glance obvious understanding of *stretto*, in which octaves from bars 643-644 would be three times quicker than the preceding dotted minims, is unperformable and from the viewpoint of aesthetics dubitable. The most suitable appears to be

such an interpretation in which the gradually accelerated dotted minims fluently change in bar 643 into crotchets played in a normal tempo (**Tempo I**) or with very slight acceleration.

Bars 637-649 One of the sources has the following pedalling:




In the editors' opinion it is better to omit the bracketed change of the pedal at the beginning of bar 644 (cf. *Source Commentary*).

4. Scherzo in E, Op. 54

p. 69 **Bar 9-16 and analog.** We recreate assorted variants of slurring which occur in this phrase and its counterparts in the course of the *Scherzo* (bars 9-16, 41-48, 161-168, 193-200 and analog.) according to autograph notation (cf. *Editorial Principles*, p. 10). The remaining sources contain other authentic versions of slurring. The differences pertain predominantly to breaking the slur in places, which upon the first occasion were marked in the musical text with asterisks. In the editors' opinion this means that different slurrings do not denote a distinctly different performance of particular places, but accentuate its various aspects (the range of motifs or phrases, hand motions, articulation).

p. 70 **Bar 89 and 689** The first grace-note a# should be struck together with F# in the L.H. (cf. *Source Commentary* on bar 89 and 400).



p. 71 **Bar 117 and 717 L.H.** The continuation of the wavy line of the arpeggio to f# seems to indicate that Chopin wanted this note to be repeated. The tie from f# in the previous bar would then emphasise the necessity of the longest possible sustaining of this note in bar 116 and 716.

p. 72 **Bar 162, 194 and analog.** L.H. Here, the meaning of vertical slurs is uncertain (see *Source Commentary*). Accepting that the most probable possibility is an arpeggio, it should be performed in an anticipatory manner, namely, by striking the top note together with the R.H.

Bars 167-168 and analog. L.H. Fingering without parentheses refers to a division into hands, stemming from the original script. Fingering in brackets considers the taking of the top note (b^b or f#) into the R.H.; this can be done by striking in the R.H. all four notes of the four-bar chord at once, or in a "mute" manner slightly later on.

p. 73 **Bars 218-219, 234-235 and analog.** R.H. The editors recommend to choose a uniform version (with a repetition or the sustaining of the bottom note) for all four places. Nevertheless, all other arrangements of those versions are permitted as long as the performer regards them as logical and artistically justified. See *Source Commentary*, which gives, i. a. combinations of versions occurring in the sources.

Bars 220-221, 236-237 and analog. L.H. For a choice of a version see previous comment. In this case, it is possible to select one of the three versions of each place:

- sustaining the middle note,
- without sustaining,
- sustaining both upper notes.

p. 75 Bars 297-301 The pedal should be depressed in bar 297 or 298 (recommended by the editors) and kept until the end of bar 301.

p. 76 Bar 308 R.H. It is best to play the grace-note $d\#^1$ in an anticipatory manner, in this case – at the end of the previous bar.

p. 77 Bars 357-376 Facilitation of the L.H. part:

bars 357-360

bars 365-368

or

bars 369-376

p. 78 Bar 400, 429, 440, 469, 520, 544 and 552 R.H. The first grace-note should be struck simultaneously with the first note in the L.H., and in bar 440 and 520 also with a^1 in the bottom voice (in bar 400 Chopin marked this in a pupil's copy).

Bars 419-422 The Chopinesque pedalling (from the second crotchet in bar 419 and 421) should be supplemented by using the "harmonic legato" – sustaining components of harmony with fingers, in this case, the fundamental notes of A and G# – just as Chopin marked it in bar 461. The editors recommend the following execution of those bars, allowing an additional retention of the complete and pure harmony in the entire bar 422:

Bar 425 and 465 L.H. It is recommended to use the "harmonic legato" (the sustaining of G# as a minim) and pedalling (from the second crotchet), as in bar 461.

Bars 429-430 It is worth recommending the use of the pedalling given by Chopin in bar 469 – a change of the pedal a crotchet earlier, on the third beat in bar 429.

p. 79 Bar 449 and 529 R.H. The grace-note b should be sounded together with $F\#$ in the L.H. The hand span permitting, one might apply the following device, making it possible to eliminate the dissonant sonority of b , while retaining the $F\#$ root:

Bar 459 "Harmonic legato" and pedalling analogous to those recommended in bar 425 and 465.

p. 80 Bar 477 and 493 R.H. The grace-note should be struck together with the first note in the L.H.

Bar 480 and 496 R.H. $\{\} = \{\} = \{\}$ (bottom note of the arpeggio together with the first note in the L.H.).

p. 82 Bars 559-560 and 567-568 R.H. Owing to the logic of the development of the phrase in bars 553-578 it is recommended to treat variants jointly, i. e. the main text or variants in both places.

p. 84 Bar 636 R.H. The slur before the grace-note can be understood as an arpeggio ($\{\}$) or as a conventional sign (the $d\#^1-d\#^2$ octave is sounded simultaneously).

p. 90 Bars 885-886 R.H. The main text tells to strike $g\#^1$ in bar 886 as sonorously as the remaining minims in this section. The text of the variant permits two ways of interpreting:

- $g\#^1$ sustained,
- $g\#^1$ sustained in the upper voice, but repeated (appropriately more delicately) in the bottom voice.

Jan Ekier
Paweł Kamiński

SOURCE COMMENTARY /ABRIDGED/

Introductory comments

The following commentary sets out in an abridged form the principles of editing the musical text of particular works and discusses the most important discrepancies between the authentic sources; furthermore, it draws attention to departures from the authentic text which are most frequently encountered in the collected editions of Chopin's music compiled after his death. A separately published *Source Commentary* contains a detailed description of the sources, their filiation, justification of the choice of primary sources, a thorough presentation of the differences between them and a reproduction of characteristic fragments.

Remark to the second edition

In the course of preparing this edition of the *Scherzos* attention was paid to copies of first English editions of Op. 20 and 39, unavailable during work on the first edition (PWM, Kraków 1985) and enabling a more certain establishment of the text.

Abbreviations: R.H. – right hand, L.H. – left hand. The sign → symbolises a connection between sources; it should be read “and... based on it”.

1. Scherzo in B minor, Op. 20

Sources

[A] There is no extant autograph.

FE First French edition, M. Schlesinger (M. S. 1832), Paris February 1835. **FE** is based on [A] and was corrected by Chopin (probably twice), but includes numerous and, as a rule, obvious errors and imprecisions.

FED Collection of pupil's copies of **FE** with the composer's annotations, belonging to Chopin's pupil Camille Dubois (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris). It contains fingering, performance directives, variants, and corrections of printing errors.

GE1 First German edition, Breitkopf & Härtel (5599), Leipzig March 1835. **GE1** is most probably based on the proofs of **FE** which did not include the last corrections. Many errors of the basis were corrected and slight, arbitrary changes were introduced. There are no traces of Chopin's proof-reading.

GE2 Second impression of **GE1**, containing numerous unauthentic changes and supplements.

GE = **GE1** and **GE2**.

EE1 First English edition, Wessel & C^o (W & C^o 1492), London May 1836. Based probably on **FE**, **EE1** was not corrected by Chopin and contains traces of adjustments by the publisher.

EE2 Second impression of **EE1** (same firm and number), after 1856, containing a number of arbitrary changes.

EE = **EE1** and **EE2**.

Mi-Hi Letter written probably in the 1870s by Karol Mikuli, Chopin's pupil, to Ferdinand Hiller, a friend of the composer, with a request for a solution of doubts concerning the authentic text of nine passages in assorted compositions by Chopin, i. a. in bars 51-52 and analog. and bars 382-383 of this *Scherzo* (Bibliothek des Landes Konservatoriums, Graz).

Editorial Principles

We accept as our basis **FE** as the only authentic source and take into consideration Chopin's annotations in **FED**. The relatively frequent and obvious errors have been corrected. We rendered uniform many of the numerous imprecisions of slurring, accenting, articulation, etc. In all those cases where the accidental absence of certain markings could give rise to doubts, the supplements are given in brackets.

p. 11 *Bars 28-29 and analog.* L.H. Analogously to bars 260-262 (see *Commentary*) some of the later collected editions tied g^1 in these bars.

p. 12 *Bars 51-52, 53-54 and 55-56 and analog.* L.H. In **FE** (→**EE1**) the octaves B_1-B are tied in bars 283-284, 547-548 and 551-552 (in **EE1** also, probably mistakenly, in bars 167-168). In **GE1** ties occur in 29 out of the total of 30 discussed places (with the exception of bars 435-436). We regard the most probable explanation of this state of things to be Chopin's proof-reading of **FE** in which ties originally occurring in all bars were removed. This correction was effected already after the copy, which served as the basis for **GE1**, had been sent to Leipzig. The retention of these ties in three places in **FE** should be recognised as the outcome of an oversight of the engraver or Chopin. In **EE2**, probably under the influence of **GE1**, ties were added in all these bars (apart from bars 51-52), while in **GE2** they were removed (with the exception of bars 53-54 and 285-286), possibly under the impact of the final version of **FE**. In Mi-Hi F. Hiller introduced ties in all three places, and then crossed them out in bars 55-56 (and analog.). Moreover, he erred in tying the first octave in bar 52 with the succeeding octave instead of the previous one. Both this wavering and the mistake testify that the ties were added from memory. In this case, the absence of a confirmation of this version in other sources makes it possible to doubt the correctness of Hiller's recreation of Chopin's final intention. For this reason, we do not take this version into consideration.

p. 15 *Bar 135 and 292* The fifth quaver in bar 135 and the third crotchet in the L.H. in bar 292 in **FE** is the $b-d^1$ third. This is a characteristic mistake connected with correcting: the engraver added the right note (b) without removing the erroneously printed d^1 .

p. 18 *Bars 260-261* L.H. The notes g^1 are tied over the bar line. Since a corresponding tie does not occur in any of the four analogous places, we do not take this probably accidental version into consideration.

p. 20 *Bar 321, 325 and 342* L.H. The fourth quaver in **FE** (→**GE1**) is B in bar 321, $f\#$ in bar 325, and $d\#$ in bar 342. These are probably mistakes committed by the engraver – cf. analogous bar 353, 357 and 310. In bar 342 a mechanical error is evidenced by $\#$ prior to the discussed note, and superfluous before $d\#$. In **EE** and **GE2** the notes in question were shifted a third lower (with the exception of bar 342 in **GE2**).

p. 22 *Bars 374-375* L.H. We give the **FE** (→**GE1**) version. In **EE** and **GE2** the second quavers in both bars were arbitrarily changed: $a\#$ into a in bar 374 and $g\#$ into $a\#$ in bar 375. As a rule, later collected editions accepted the first change or both changes. The **FE** version most probably does not contain an error – the five-note melodic motif, which begins with an accented note in bar 374, comprises a variant of the motif composed of the same notes and used in bars 310-312 and analog. (we distinguish the components of the motif by using larger note heads):

It is recommended to consider the possibility of Chopin's oversight of \flat before $a\#$ in bar 374. It was not rare for Chopin to omit accidentals (cf. e. g. the following comment), but in this case a number of arguments considerably reduces the probability of such a mistake:

– a similar chord with a minor and not diminished seventh is encountered upon several occasions in Chopin's compositions (e. g. *Etude in C* Op. 10 no. 1, bar 4, *Sonata in B minor* Op. 58, first movement, beginning of bar 195),

– Chopin did not add \flat in **FED**, although he supplemented missing signs in bars 382-383.

Bars 382-383 L.H. In **FE** (→**GE1**) there are no naturals lowering **a#** to **a**. In **EE** the evidently mistaken **a#** in bar 382 was changed arbitrarily to **g#**, leaving **a#** in bar 383. In **FED** Chopin added naturals in both bars. The authenticity of this last version was confirmed by F. Hiller in Mi-Hi; the same version occurs also in **GE2**.

2. Scherzo in B flat minor, Op. 31

Sources

- A** Autograph fair copy (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris), upon whose base Fontana made a copy. Subsequently, after Chopin amended it, **A** served as the basis for the first French edition.
- CF** Copy made by Fontana, serving as the basis for the first German edition (National Library, Warsaw). Chopin introduced a number of amendments, with special concern for performance markings.
- FE1** First French edition, M. Schlesinger (M. S. 2494), Paris December 1837. **FE1** is based on **A** and was twice corrected by Chopin.
- FE2** Second impression of **FE1**, Brandus et C^{ie} (publishing no. as above), Paris 1852-1854. The musical text remains unchanged.
- FE** = **FE1** and **FE2**.
- FED** As in *Scherzo in B minor*, Op. 20.
- FES** Collection of pupil's copies of **FE** with the composer's annotations, belonging to Chopin's pupil Jane Stirling (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris). It contains fingering, performance directives, variants, and corrections of printing errors.
- FESch** – copy of **FE2** from a collection probably belonging to Chopin's pupil Joseph Schiffmacher (as suggested by J. J. Eigeldinger, *Chopin vu par ses élèves*, Neuchâtel 1988). This collection contains Chopin's compositions, certainly or with large probability with annotations in the composer's hand. This fact entitles us to presume that the variant and fingering introduced into the copy of the *Scherzo* can be authentic despite the fact that they do not originate directly from Chopin (**FE2** appeared after his death).
- GE1** First German edition, Breitkopf & Härtel (5852), Leipzig February 1838. **GE1** is based on **CF** and was not corrected by Chopin. There are copies of **GE1** with different prices on the covers.
- GE2** Second German edition (same firm, 9671), about 1858, with corrections of the majority of mistakes in **GE1** and numerous arbitrary supplements and changes.
- GE3** Later impression of **GE2** (same firm and number), with slight adjustments of the text. There are copies of **GE3** with different prices on the covers.
- GE** = **GE1**, **GE2** and **GE3**.
- EE** First English edition, Wessel & C^o (W & C^o 2168), London November 1837, based probably on the proofs of **FE**, which did not contain the final corrections. **EE** introduced a number of arbitrary changes and was not corrected by Chopin.

Editorial Principles

We accept as our basis **CF**, compared with **A**, and take into consideration Chopin's corrections of **FE** and annotations in **FED** and **FESch**.

- p. 31 *Bars 65-116, 197-248 & 648-707* **A** does not have pedal markings (in the manuscripts bars 648-695 are marked in an abbreviated manner as a repetition of bars 197-244). Subsequently, Chopin added them in **CF** (→**GE1**) in bars 65-104 & 197-248, and in **FE** (→**EE**) in bars 65-116 & 697-707. In **CF** he did so in a more studied manner (cf. commentary to bars 65-117 about supplements of dynamic markings), as a rule carefully marking the performance on one pedal of pairs of bars based on single harmony; this is testified by several deletions of unnecessary * signs, written "impetuously". Nonetheless, Chopin did not avoid two inaccuracies: he added an unnecessary change of the pedal in bars 225-226 (analogous bars 93-94 have one pedal), and omitted an indispensable change in bars 235-236. In **FE** the pedalling is more mechanical – only bars 65-66, 81-82, 97-98, 110-111, 113-114 & 697-698 do not have a change of pedal within a single harmony. We accept the pedalling in **CF**, corrected in the discussed places and supplemented according to **FE** and analogous bars.

Bars 65-117, 197-249 and 648-695 We give dynamic markings from **CF** (→**GE1**), in which they were added by Chopin. In **A** (→**FE**→**EE**) there was originally only — in bars 197-198; later, already after the completion of **CF**, Chopin added **ff** in bar 114. In **FE** (→**EE**) he additionally gave **ff** in bar 246 and *cresc.* in bars 110-113, 241-245 and 693-708. These fragmentary supplements remain basically in accordance with the thought-out general dynamic conception recorded in **CF**.

Bars 73-74 and analog. R.H. In **A** the tie in bars 73-74 is placed imprecisely. In **CF** (→**GE1**, **GE3**) and **FE** (→**EE**) it was deciphered as linking eb^2 (in **GE2** db^2 was linked). In analogous bars 205-206 (and 656-657, which are marked in an abbreviated manner as a repetition of bars 205-206) the tie in **A** distinctly links notes db^2 . Since there are no other differences between these places, it should be accepted that Chopin's intention was a single text – recorded clearly in bars 205-206 – in all three places. The arbitrary version given in a large part of the later collected editions, in which both notes, db^2 and eb^2 , are sustained, does not occur in any of the sources.

- p. 33 *Bars 114-117 and 246-249* The dynamic markings in the footnote come from **FE** (→**EE**). See commentary to bars 65-117.

Bars 125 and 257 L.H. Db_1 , given in the variant, comes from **A** (→**CF**→**GE**). In bar 125 in **FE** (→**EE**) Chopin changed it to Db , which in the main text we accept in both discussed bars, since their differentiation, intended by Chopin, appears to be much less probable than an oversight of the correction in bar 257.

- p. 35 *Bars 179-180* We supplement the ties linking the two Eb and the two Eb_1 according to bars 630-631. Both scripts denote identical performance. Cf. *Source Commentary* to *Waltz in Db*, Op. 64 no. 1, bars 69-72.

Bar 180 and 631 In **FED** Chopin marked the performance of the endings of the trills only in the L.H.

Bar 189 and 640 In **A** (→**CF**→**GE1**, →**FE**→**EE**) there is no **ff** (in the manuscripts bar 640 is marked in an abbreviated way, as a repetition of bar 189). Cf. bar 57.

Bar 198 and 649 L.H. The second and sixth quaver in **A** (→**FE**→**EE**) is ab . This is the original version of the bar, left behind due to inattention and corrected by Chopin in **CF** (→**GE**).

Bar 206 and 657 R.H. **CF** (→**GE1**) does not have a mordent.

- p. 36 *Bars 211-212 and 662-663* R.H. The tie sustaining c^2 was added in the proofs of **FE** (→**EE**). Cf. bars 79-80.

- p. 37 *Bar 240 and 691* R.H. On the third beat **A** (→**CF**→**GE1**, →**FE**→**EE**) has $bb^1-gb^2-bb^2$ (in the manuscripts bar 691 is marked in an abbreviated manner as a repetition of bar 240). In analogous bar 108 Chopin corrected a corresponding chord in **A**, ultimately writing $bb^1-f^2-bb^2$. It is not very likely that retaining this type of an almost unnoticeable difference was his intention, and since when correcting Chopin frequently missed one of several similar passages, as the main text we accept the version with f^2 (this change was introduced already in **GE2**).

- p. 38 *Bars 281-284 and analog.* R.H. In **FE** (→**EE**) these bars are written mistakenly with notes of normal size. We encounter similar misreadings by the engraver of Chopin's manuscript in, e. g. *Ma-zurka in C* Op. 24 no. 2, bars 70-88 and *Prelude in C# minor* Op. 45, bar 79.

Bar 293 and 395 The figure **1**, which in this context signifies taking $\#$ into the L.H., occurs only in **A**.

- p. 39 *Bar 310* L.H. Below the second and third crotchet **A** (→**CF**→**GE**) has a slur. The absence of slurs in the following bars and a slur deleted in **A** over bars 412-415 prove that ultimately Chopin resigned from slurs in this part, and was content with the *legato* marking.

Source Commentary

p. 41 *Bars 375-376, and 392-393* R.H. **A** (→**CF**→**GE1**, →**FE**) mistakenly does not have ties sustaining *g#*, *e*¹ and *f#*, *f#*¹. Corresponding ties occur in all analogous places (bars 273-274 and analog. and bars 266-267 and analog.).

Bar 394 R.H. In the inner voice **FE** has a mistaken rhythm | *f* *f* |, which in **EE** was arbitrarily changed into | *f* *f* |.

p. 43 *Bars 444-445* The sources have a change of the pedal under the bar line, which certainly did not correspond to Chopin's intention – the next bars in this part of **A** do not have pedalling (later supplemented by Chopin in **CF** and **FE**), which indicates the composer's temporary inattention. Cf. bars 334-335, 342-343 and 436-437 as well as commentary to bars 65-116 and analog.

p. 46 *Bar 544* We combine the complementary performance markings, added by Chopin in **CF** (→**GE**) – an accent and *sempre con fuoco*, and in **FE** (→**EE**) – *sempre ff*.

Bar 550 L.H. The variant in the footnote comes from **FESch**.

p. 47 *Bars 555-572* In **A** arpeggios occur before the majority of the chords in this section. In case of their absence, we supplement them, rendering the notation of particular places dependent on the extent to which their mistaken omission by Chopin seems to be probable (in **CF**, **GE1**, **FE** and **EE** several more of them were omitted without Chopin's participation, and in **GE2** they were arbitrarily supplemented before all the chords):

– in bar 557 we give the arpeggios, which were with all certainty overlooked, without parentheses;

– in bar 562 and 564, in which the version lacking arpeggios, although not very likely, is acceptable, we give them in brackets in the main text;

– in bar 570 and 572, where the absence of arpeggios in the R.H. could be regarded as justified by the diminuendo, we suggest the possibility of arpeggios in the form of a variant;

– in bar 568, 570 and 572 we regard arpeggios in the L.H. as unnecessary owing to the reduced span of the chords and the diminuendo obligatory from bar 567.

See *Performance Commentary*.

p. 53 *Bar 780* The *staccato* markings for the final minims – wedges in **A**, dots in **CF** (→**GE1**) – were overlooked in **FE** (→**EE**) and **GE2**.

R.H. In some of the later collected editions the grace-note was mistakenly not encompassed by the *all'ottava* sign.

3. Scherzo in C sharp minor, Op. 39

Sources

Lost editorial manuscripts, including one or two autographs – see below *Filiation and Chronology of Sources*.

CG Copy, probably by Gutmann (National Library, Warsaw), with few annotations by Chopin, intended as the basis for the first German edition. The copy contains numerous errors and imprecisions.

GE First German edition, Breitkopf & Härtel (6332), Leipzig November 1840. **GE** is based on **CG** and contains traces of adjustments by the publisher; it was not corrected by Chopin. There are copies of **GE** with different prices on the covers.

FE1 First French edition, E. Troupenas (T. 926), Paris December 1840, most probably based on a lost autograph, and corrected by Chopin. It contains rather numerous errors and imprecisions.

[**FE2**] Second impression of **FE1** (same firm and number), in which some of the errors were corrected and several arbitrary changes were introduced. There are no traces of Chopin's participation in its production. The editors of the *National Edition* were unable to find a copy of this edition, and thus information about it is given upon the basis of **FE3** (see below).

FE3 Third impression of **FE1**, Brandus et C^{ie} (T. 926, B et C^{ie} 6483), Paris 1854-1858. The musical text probably remained unchanged in relation to [**FE2**].

FE = **FE1** and **FE3**.

FES As in *Scherzo in Bb minor*, Op. 31.

FEJ Collection of pupil's copies of **FE** with the composer's annotations, belonging to Chopin's sister Ludwika Jędrzejewicz (F. Chopin Society, Warsaw). It contains fingering, performance directives, variants, and corrections of printing errors.

EE First English edition, Wessel & C^o (W & C^o 3556), London October 1840, containing traces of the publisher's adjustments; it was not corrected by Chopin.

Filiation and Chronology of Sources

In this *Scherzo* it is extremely difficult to recreate the filiation and chronology of the sources. A detailed comparison of deviations in the existing sources makes it possible to formulate the following ascertainties:

– **FE**, **EE** and **CG** were based on manuscripts: an autograph was certainly the basis of **CG** and most probably of **FE**, although we are entitled to presume that these were different autographs; the basis of **EE** was the same autograph which served as the basis of **CG**, or its different, lost copy;

– extant sources bear only scarce traces of introduced changes; the majority of differences must have resulted due to corrections made in lost manuscripts, and it is impossible to establish their chronology in a manner which would not give rise to doubts. The logic of the publishing process calls for the recognition of the author's proof-reading of **FE1** to be the last link in Chopin's shaping of the text of the *Scherzo*; on the other hand, stylistic criteria indicate **EE** as the source which contains the earliest image of the composition.

Editorial Principles

We accept as our basis **CG**, compared with **EE** and **FE1**, with particular consideration for Chopin's corrections in the latter. The probably original versions of the text, occurring in **EE**, are considered only in those cases when the presumable reason for their change could have been more connected with execution than of a musical nature.

p. 54 *Bars 6-20* We give dynamic markings according to **EE**. In other sources they are incomplete:

– **CG** (→**GE**) does not have *f* in bar 6, 14 and 18,

– **FE** does not have *mf* in bars 6-8 and 18-20, *p* in bar 17, and *f* in bar 18.

Bar 31, 47 and analog. Each of the three sources, which could have been based on an autograph, have a different arrangement of rhythms:

	bar 31	bar 47	bar 113	bar 129	bar 373	bar 389
EE	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>
CG	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>
FE	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>	<i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i> <i>f</i>

(in bar 113 in **FE** there is no quaver tail, probably next to the first octave).

The uniform version of **EE** is probably the original (cf. commentary to bar 374).

The different rhythm in bar 373 in the **CG** version could be connected with the enhanced accenting of this appearance of the theme, and the filling of the opening octaves of bar 374 with *A* and *a*¹; it could be also recognised as mistaken. We take this version into consideration as a variant.



In the **FE** version, which is possibly the last one (our main text), both forms of the rhythm are consistently arranged in pairs.

See also *Performance Commentary*.

Bars 34-35 and analog. R.H. In **GE** *g#* is tied arbitrarily. Chopin's intention to repeat *g#* is confirmed by an accent placed above that note in bar 35 and analog.

p. 55 *Bar 64 and 406* R.H. In **CG** this bar is incomplete – only the first chord was written. In **GE** it was wrongly supplemented with two crotchet rests. We give the **FE** and **EE** version.

Stylistic premises indicate rather $d\#^1$:

– in the rhythmic figure  (or , frequently appearing in scherzos and ballades, the inner notes of the second and third chords are, as a rule, of an identical pitch,
– Chopin usually preceded the chord without the fifth, which appears in bar 351, by a chord containing precisely this missing component (in this case $d\#^1$), and not another note, which could not be retained as a common note (in this case e^1).
Numerous instances of the above described regularities can be found easily, but certain exceptions (*Ballade in F*, Op. 38, bar 39 and analog. for the first regularity, *Ballade in Ab*, Op. 47, bars 76-77 and *Scherzo in C# minor*, bars 358-359 for the second) make it impossible to question decisively the version with e^1 .

Bar 374 **EE** does not have the notes A and a^1 on the first beat (this is probably the original version of the bar). Those notes occur in **CG** (\rightarrow **GE**) and **FE**, but they are not distinguished from the octaves $C\#-c\#$ and $c\#^1-c\#^2$. Nonetheless, the notation in **CG** does not give rise to doubt that the accents refer precisely to A and a^1 . In order to avoid misunderstandings, we distinguish them graphically (Chopin used this type of script in other compositions, e. g. in the endings of *Prelude in Db*, Op. 28 no. 15 and in *Bb*, Op. 28 no. 21).

- p. 63 Bar 433 L.H. Before the third octave **CG** (\rightarrow **GE**) and **FE** do not have accidentals; it should be, therefore, read as $D\#-d\#$. In contrast to bar 95, a mistaken omission of the naturals is here almost certain:
– bars 433-434 form the pattern of a sequence; a real sequence, with the strict retention of the interval structure, is more natural in view of the modulation effected in its course;
– the version with the $D-d$ octave is connected better with the chords of the second part of the sequence, containing notes d (bars 435-436).
This is the reason why we accept the **EE** version as the only one.

Bar 439 R.H. In **FE** there is no $\#$ raising c^2 to $c\#^2$ before the last chord.

- p. 64 Bar 447 R.H. **EE** does not have the $a-b$ second in the chord. This is probably the original version, supplemented by Chopin for the sake of emphasising the harmonic function of this chord, introducing the new part.

Bar 460 R.H. The main text comes from **CG** (\rightarrow **GE**) and **FE**, and the variant – from **EE**. See commentary to bar 210.
R.H. In the second and third chord **FE** has additionally notes $c\#^1$. This appears to be the original version, left by Chopin in the basis for **FE** by inattention. The **EE** and **CG** (\rightarrow **GE**) version, accepted by us, is an example of sound economy characteristic for Chopin, which makes it possible to avoid excessively dense chords in the middle register.

Bar 475 R.H. **EE** does not have the note $f\#$.

- p. 65 Bar 506 and 508 R.H. Chopin overlooked the naturals lowering $g\#^3$ and $g\#^2$ to g^3 and g^2 . They were added only in **GE**.

- p. 66 Bar 531 R.H. The first quaver in **CG** (\rightarrow **GE**) is mistakenly e^1 .

Bar 533 L.H. At the beginning of the bar **FE** has the octave a^1-a^2 , which is probably a mistake committed by the engraver. The $c\#^2-a^2$ sixth in the **EE** and **CG** (\rightarrow **GE**) version, accepted by us, is both a harmonic completion of the passage and a melodic link between the $c\#^2$ notes in bar 529 and 534.

Bar 538 L.H. **GE** overlooked $c\#^1$.

Bar 555 L.H. Chopin forgot about $\#$ raising a to $a\#$. It was added only in **GE**.

- p. 67 Bar 591 R.H. The second quaver in **CG** (\rightarrow **GE**) is mistakenly $c\#^3-e^3$.
L.H. The note $c\#^1$ in the second chord in **CG** is barely visible, and therefore was overlooked in **GE**.

Bar 599 R.H. **CG** (\rightarrow **GE**) has mistakenly $d\#^1$ instead of e^1 .

Bars 637-649 **CG** (\rightarrow **GE**) does not have pedal markings at the end of the *Scherzo* (from bar 630). The pedalling given in the text comes from **FE**, and the one in the *Performance Commentary* – from **EE**. Each of those sources contains doubtful markings:

– **FE** has \ast after the chord in bar 645; as a rule, end chords of this type should be performed with a pedal (cf. pedalling in **EE** and at the end of *Scherzo in Bb minor*, Op. 31 and in *E*, Op. 54); we omit this sign since it is most probably mistaken;
– in **EE** the change of pedal at the beginning of bar 644 appears to be unnecessary and, considering the quick tempo, unperformable; presumably, Chopin intended the pedalling in this fragment to be analogous to the one recorded in **FE**.

4. Scherzo in E, Op. 54

Sources

- [A1], [A2] – lost two out of three autographs serving as bases for the first editions.
A3 Autograph fair copy, chronologically the last (Jagiellonian Library, Cracow), intended as the basis for the first German edition. It contains both improvements and errors which do not appear in any of the earlier autographs.
FE1 First French edition, M. Schlesinger (M. S. 3959), Paris December 1843. **FE1** is based on [A1] and most probably was corrected by Chopin.
FE2 Second impression of **FE1** (same firm and number), with corrections of several slight mistakes possibly indicated by Chopin.
FE = **FE1** and **FE2**.
FED As in *Scherzo in B minor*, Op. 20.
EE First English edition, Wessel & C^o (W & C^o 5307), London March 1844. Based probably on [A2], **EE** was not corrected by Chopin and contains numerous errors.
GE1 First German edition, Breitkopf & Härtel (7003), Leipzig November 1843. **GE1** recreates (with mistakes) the text of **A3**, introducing a number of slight adjustments. There are no traces of Chopin's proof-reading.
GE2 Later impression of **GE1** (same firm and number), after 1872, correcting some of the errors and introducing a number of supplements and adjustments.
GE = **GE1** and **GE2**.

Editorial Principles

We accept as our basis **A3**, compared with **FE** and **EE**, and take into consideration Chopin's annotations in **FED**.

This *Scherzo* discloses extremely numerous differences in details of notation between particular sources and between recurring or similar fragments (the occurrence and ranges of slurs and dynamic signs, accents, dots, verbal indications, and graphic arrangement). The majority of these differences is decidedly accidental. We repeat the script of **A3** if, when compared to **FE** and **EE**, it does not reveal distinct gaps, imprecision or errors. A number of dynamic and articulation markings, present only in **FE** (possibly added in the proofs of that edition), are given in parentheses.

- p. 69 The dedication to Jeanne de Caraman comes from **A3** (\rightarrow **GE**). **FE** is dedicated to her sister, Clotilde. There is no dedication in **EE**.

Bar 17 L.H. **EE** has the $B-e$ fourth. Corrections in **A3** prove that this is the original version, rejected by Chopin.

Bar 20 and analog. R.H. In **A3** (\rightarrow **GE**) & **EE** Chopin noted a chord with $f\#^2$ in bar 20, 292 and 620, and with g^2 in bar 916. We accept the script with g^2 contained in **FE**. (Cf. commentary to bar 292).

- p. 70 Bar 89 and 400 The sign denoting the moment of striking the first grace-note was introduced by Chopin in **FED**.

- p. 71 Bars 112-113 and analog. R.H. **FE** does not have a tie and a crotchet prolonging the sound of the $f\#$ minim in bar 112.

- p. 72 Bars 147-148 L.H. The B notes in **FE** are tied.

Bar 161 L.H. **A3** (\rightarrow **GE**) has mistakenly C_1 instead of Eb_1 .

Bar 162, 194 and analog. In the sources these bars are recorded in various ways:

	bar 162	bar 194	bar 762	bar 794
FE				
EE				
A3 (\rightarrowGE)				

The inconsistent script can be explained by Chopin's doubts as to which of the hands should play the ninth of the chord and on which of the staves should it be placed. Probably not until writing **A3** did he decide to allot the ninth to the L.H. In this situation, the composer most likely intended the vertical arcs to denote a division of the chord into the hands (cf. commentary to bar 913). Arcs in the L.H. could also denote an arpeggio, which is the most frequent meaning of arcs of this type. On the other hand, such a supposition does not seem likely in reference to the R.H. arcs, which appear only in **A3** (\rightarrow **GE**) in bar 194 and 762; the absence of corresponding arcs in the two remaining places speaks against understanding them as an arpeggio (in this particular detail, performance differentiation does not appear to be purposeful). We omit the arcs in order to avoid confusion.

Bar 198-199 R.H. In **FE**, f^1 in bar 198 is slurred to $e\#^1$ in the following bar.

p. 73 Bars 218-219, 234-235 and analog. R.H. It is particularly difficult to resolve whether Chopin wished to sustain the bottom note of the chord or not. Sources differ in each of the following four places:

	FE	EE	A3
bars 218-219			
bars 234-235			
bars 818-819			
bars 834-835			

(In **GE** several of the slurs occurring in **A3** were also omitted).

In the above examples we recreate the notation of the sources together with its imprecisions, which are the reason why it is not always clear which of the notes the ties refer to or what they exactly mean (cf. commentary to bars 7-9 in *Mazurka in C minor*, Op. 56 no. 3).

Despite the fact that in each of the sources analogous phrases in these bars have different versions, a differentiation which hampers performance does not appear to be musically justified. The accidental nature of the differences is also indicated by the fact that the sequence of the versions varies within each of the sources. Such a large number of differences is probably caused by Chopin's wavering or a change of conception as regards the solution of this detail, as well as accidental omissions of the ties and their quite probable arbitrary supplementation by the engraver of **FE**.

For the main text, we accept in all four places the version which does not sustain the bottom note, first and second time recorded in the basic source (**A3**) without any deletions. We give the version with a tie in the variants. (Cf. commentary to bars 220-221, 236-237 and analog.)

Bar 219 and 819 The marking *leggiere* is found in **FE** and **EE**.

Bars 220-221, 236-237 and analog. L.H. Differences occurring in each of these four places make it impossible to ascertain whether the top and middle note of the chord should be repeated or not:

	FE	EE	A3
bars 220-221			
bars 236-237			
bars 820-821			
bars 836-837			

Taking into consideration the not always clear notation in the sources, the different possibilities of oversights and errors as well as Chopin's probable doubts as regards the ultimate shape of these places (cf. commentary to bars 218-219, 234-235 and analog.), we give for each of them three versions – without ties, tying the middle note, and tying both upper notes. We grant priority to versions with a repetition of the top note owing to the characteristic motif, subsequently repeated after two bars (it is accented in bar 837 in **A3**).

p. 74 Bar 247 R.H. The third quaver in **A3** (\rightarrow **GE**) is mistakenly bb^3 .

p. 75 Bar 266 R.H. The main text comes from **A3** (\rightarrow **GE**), and the variant – from **FE** and **EE**. In the **A3** version Chopin presumably changed the last note in relation to similar places in bar 250 and 258 owing to the different shaping of the top voice and the further development of the phrase, in which the top notes in bar 268, 270 and 272 form, together with the last quavers, an octave interval. Nevertheless, we cannot totally exclude a mistake committed by the composer.

Bar 292 R.H. The bottom note in the two-note chord in **FE** is $g\#\#^2$. This error can indicate Chopin's correction in the print of the original $f\#\#^2$ to g^2 (while correcting, this type of a mistaken shifting of a note, together with an accidental, unnecessary at a new pitch, is also encountered in the first French editions of other works, e.g. *Sonata in Bb minor*, Op. 35, third movement, bar 20 and *Etude in Ab*, Op. 25 no. 1, bar 22).

Bars 297-298 The tr sign in bar 297, given in parentheses, comes from **A3** (\rightarrow **GE**). A comparison with analogous places indicates Chopin's probable mistake. This is why we give the sign occurring in bar 298 in **EE** without parentheses. **FE** does not have pedalling in these bars.

p. 76 Bar 328 L.H. **A3** has b in the chord instead of $g\#$. This mistake was corrected in **GE**. Cf. bar 56 and 656.

p. 77 Bars 365-368 **EE** contains the following version:

In **A3**, corrections in the R.H. in bars 365-366 make it possible to ascertain that this is the original version, rejected by Chopin.

Source Commentary

p. 78 *Bar 422* R.H. Only in **EE** is the rhythm of this bar written faultlessly. In **A3** (→**GE**) there is no point prolonging $g\#^1$, and **FE** does not have a quaver tail next to $f\#\#^1$. Some of the later collected editions followed **FE**, and mistakenly accepted the value of a crotchet for this $f\#\#^1$.

p. 80 *Bars 483-484* R.H. The tie sustaining $f\#^1$ is found only in **A3** (→**GE**). The absence of a tie in **FE** and **EE**, and in analogous bars 475-476 and 491-492, suggests the suspicion of Chopin's mistake.

Bar 498 R.H. There is no arpeggio in **A3** (→**GE**).

Bars 506-509 The slurring in the main text comes from **A3** (→**GE**), and the one given in the footnotes – from **FE** and **EE**.

p. 81 *Bar 538* R.H. **A3** and **EE** do not have \flat lowering $g\#^1$ to g^1 .

p. 82 *Bars 559-560 and 567-568* R.H. In **A3** (→**GE**) e^1 in bar 560 is sounded, and $f\#^1$ in bar 568 is sustained. This version gives rise to doubts pertaining to style and sources. The e^1 minim in bar 560, together with the succeeding $d\#^1$ crotchet, creates a characteristic rhythmic motif introducing a new, eight-bar section of the sequence. This motif is then heard in bar 572. In this situation, the absence of a corresponding motif in bar 568 produces a certain gap, especially if we take into consideration the obligatory *crescendo*. A mistaken introduction of a tie sustaining $f\#^1$ in bars 567-568 could be explained by distraction connected with correcting **A3** – in the R.H. part Chopin supplemented the originally overlooked bar 567. The inconsistency of the **A3** version could be also eliminated by supplementing the tie sustaining e^1 in bars 559-560, assuming that Chopin overlooked it. This more static version occurs in **FE**, but its authenticity is not quite certain since in this edition ties were arbitrarily supplemented in similar situations. The **EE** version, in which both these and adjoining bars do not have any ties, is certainly mistaken and cannot be taken into consideration.

Bar 574-575 R.H. **FE** mistakenly ties b^1 instead of the e^1 - e^2 octave, and **EE** does not have any tie.

Bars 576-578 R.H. **FE** and **EE** contain the following version:



We give the **A3** (→**GE**) version. The change in the record of the chord in bar 576 proves that Chopin intentionally resigned from $d\#^2$ in the chord in bars 577-578.

p. 83 *Bar 621 and 622* R.H. In **FE1** the first chord in bar 621 does not have $f\#\#^2$, and in the first chord in bar 622 there is $g\#\#^2$ instead of $f\#\#^2$. Both errors were corrected in **FE2**.

p. 84 *Bar 637* L.H. At the beginning of the bar **EE** has B in the top voice. This is the original version, as evidenced by the correction of B to $d\#$, visible in **A3**. **FE** and **GE** also contain $d\#$.

p. 85 *Bar 690-691* L.H. The main text comes from **A3** (→**GE**). True, in bars 689-697 in **A3** Chopin did not write a tie in the L.H., probably due to forgetfulness, but the arpeggio in bar 691 means that in this bar he wanted to repeat $f\#$. In **FE** there is no arpeggio, and $f\#$ is sustained; in view of an analogy with bars 90-91 we take this into consideration as a variant. Here (similarly as in bars 692-693) **EE** has both an arpeggio and a tie, which is certainly an error.

p. 86 *Bars 732-733* **EE** contains the original version, as in bars 132-133.

Bar 737 R.H. The crotchet chord in **A3** (→**GE**) does not have the note $c\#\#^2$.

Bars 746-747 L.H. The sources do not tie B . This is probably an oversight committed by Chopin – cf. bars 146-147.

Bars 757-759 R.H. In the inner voice **EE** sustains $f\#\#$ for three bars. Corrections in **A3** prove that this is the original version, rejected by Chopin.

p. 87 *Bar 772* L.H. **A3** (→**GE1**) does not have d^2 . This note was added in **GE2**, but without a natural.

Bar 775 L.H. The bottom note in **A3** (→**GE1**) is probably mistakenly db^1 . We give bb occurring in **FE** and **EE**, as well as in all sources in analogous bar 175. Cf. commentary to bar 328.

Bar 788 Here, **EE** has $db-db^1-db^2$ instead of $c-c^1-c^2$, probably due to an error on the part of Chopin or the engraver.

Bar 800 L.H. In **FE** the note D is tied to D in the preceding bar; at the same time, there is no slur encompassing octaves in bars 800-801. This is probably the original version, from which Chopin resigned in **A3** (→**GE**). **EE** does not contain the tie nor the slur, and thus it is difficult to say which of the versions occurred in **A2**.

Bar 804 L.H. In **A3** (→**GE1**) Chopin wrote the bottom note as c^2 . We accept the more correct script in **FE** and **EE**.


p. 89 *Bar 849* **A3** does not change the key signature.

p. 90 *Bars 885-886* R.H. The main text comes from **A3** (→**GE**), and the variant – from **FE** and **EE**. See also *Performance Commentary*.

Bar 889 R.H. The arpeggio given in parentheses is found in **FE** and **EE**. In **FE** an arpeggio is given, probably mistakenly, also for the L.H.

p. 91 *Bar 909* R.H. The notes $c\#\#^3$ and b^2 in **FE** and **EE** are written as a short appoggiatura and a crotchet. The notation in **A3** (→**GE**) could have been introduced by Chopin in order to emphasise the connection with quavers in the L.H. in bar 893 and analog., as well as with the augmented version of this motif in bar 913. L.H. Here, **FE** has only e^1 . Presumably, this is an earlier version, since in **A3** the note e makes the impression of having been added later.

Bar 913 In **FE**, b at the beginning of the bar is not sustained, and the remaining notes of the chord are played in the R.H. (as in bar 909):



EE contains a certainly mistaken and incomplete version, so that it is impossible to ascertain what version Chopin had in mind while writing **A2**.

In the **A3** (→**GE**) version given by us Chopin changed (among others) the division of the chord into the hands, marking the taking of $g\#^1$ into the L.H. by an additional vertical arc.

Bars 913-914 and 917-924 *Staccato* dots are found only in **FE**. It is probable that Chopin added them while proof-reading this edition.

Bars 924-925 L.H. The main text comes from **A3** (→**GE**) & **EE**, and the variant – from **FE**. It is difficult to determine whether the **FE** version is earlier (it could have originated from **A1**) or later, introduced in the proofs of this edition together with the *staccato* dots above the entire phrase, which ends here (cf. preceding comment).

p. 92 *Bar 949* L.H. The main text comes from **A3** (→**GE**) and **EE**, and the variant – from **FE**. The beginning of the new four bars both with a repetition of the last bar (the main text) and the introduction of a new rhythm (the variant), appears to be equally deft.

Bar 951 L.H. **A3** does not have the note e at the beginning of the bar.

Jan Ekier, Paweł Kamiński