

Editorial Conception of the Scores of Fryderyk Chopin's *Concertos*

The orchestral scores of Chopin's *Concertos* are one of the most difficult editorial challenges to publishers of his works. There are two main reasons for these difficulties:

- the lack of sources that one could regard in their entirety and without reservation as transmitting Chopin's text,
- the unquestionable participation of foreign hands at various stages in the forming of the instrumentation of the *Concertos*.

Judging by the extant sources for earlier concert works by Chopin (Opp. 2, 13 and 14), we might have expected some sketches and original, working versions of the scores to exist. Yet no autograph of this type – discounting a bar-and-a-half sketch of a fragment from mvt. I of the *Concerto in F minor* – has survived. The fact that the *Concertos* were performed with orchestra indicates the existence of fair copies of the scores and orchestral parts from which Chopin played both these works in Warsaw, and subsequently on his first appearances abroad; this is confirmed by mentions in his correspondence ('the scores bound')¹. These manuscripts have also disappeared, a loss which is felt most acutely by editors, since the extant later sources based (not always directly) on these manuscripts – the orchestra part of the 'semiautograph' of the *F minor Concerto* and the printed parts of the first French edition of the *E minor Concerto* – were produced essentially without Chopin's participation; one can only presume that they contain some occasional, minor alterations by the composer. The lack of these sources is compensated for, albeit to a certain degree only, by the extant piano reductions of the accompaniments to mvts. II and III of both *Concertos*, allowing for some approximate reconstructions to be made. These are a photograph of a reduction prepared by Fontana, doubtless from the above-mentioned fair copy of the score of the *Concerto in F minor*, and two reductions (of the whole orchestra and the wind section) written out by Francomme, most probably from manuscript orchestral materials (parts) of the *Concerto in E minor*.

The orchestration of the *Concertos* in the form transmitted to us by the scores compiled from the parts of the first editions betrays certain features alien to Chopin's musical thinking. These features become manifest primarily on comparing the orchestra part with piano reductions of the *tutti* undoubtedly prepared by Chopin or with the solo part. These are the following:

- the shifting of the centre of gravity of the sound of the orchestra towards the middle register, to the detriment of the melody line;
- the lowering and doubling of the bass line, deforming Chopin's conception of the 'sound field';
- the overlapping of the group of instruments ending a phrase with the group beginning a new phrase, which is a device characteristic of fully fledged romantic instrumentation; such 'splices' are particularly suspicious when the Chopin reduction shows in a new phrase the names of the instruments or a change in dynamics and character (e.g. *Violini, dolce*); Chopin preferred the juxtaposition of groups, cf. e.g. the openings of mvt. II of the *F minor Concerto* and mvt. III of the *E minor Concerto*;
- the excessive use of tremolando in the strings;
- the tying notes of the same pitch on every occasion;
- the long-held notes of the string accompaniment (in the semiautograph of the *F minor Concerto* one finds several corrections, in the composer's hand, involving their shortening or separation with rests, mvt. I bars 104, 137, 247-248, 294, mvt. II bars 79-80);
- contradictions of harmony, dynamics and articulation compared with the authentic part of the solo piano;
- the inconsistent marking of articulation.

This enables one to draw the conclusion that some foreign hands probably helped to impart to the score the form which we know today. Investigation into the historical circumstances of the period during which these works were written indicates that the influence of his collaborators may be manifest from the very first Warsaw scores.

One deduces from Chopin's letters that the composing of the two *Concertos* and the preparation of the accompanying orchestral materials necessary for public performance took him about one year. We also know that during this time he carried on a normal social life, attended operatic productions and concerts in artistic salons, and held rehearsals of chamber works by himself and by others, prior to their performance

in the same salons. He travelled beyond Warsaw (to Strzyżewo, Antonin, Poturzyn). If we add to this the dozen or so smaller scale works that he wrote during this period, it seems reasonable to ask how he could have found time to do everything. After all, the very composition of large forms, in which he was not yet greatly experienced, and their correction must have consumed a lot of this time ('I do not want anyone's verdict on the *Rondo* [of the *Concerto in F minor*] since I am still not quite pleased with it')². How to fit in here the instrumentation for the whole orchestra, including dense *tutti*, transpositions, etc., in which he was also less than well-versed? A simple conclusion presents itself: someone must have helped him. He could have sought this assistance among colleagues from Elsner's class more skilled in instrumentation. A few such names crop up in his correspondence. 'Linowski is copying hurriedly, but he has already started the *Rondo* [of the *Concerto in E minor*]'³. Comparing the dates, however, one concludes that this probably referred to the parts. One interesting item, albeit rather vague, was recorded by F. Hoesick: '[Chopin] allowed Ignacy Dobrzyński to "transinstrument" both *Concertos*. Both scores have been lost. I am grateful for this detail to Director Adam Münchheimer'⁴. He further quotes Münchheimer: 'From the lips of the late Ignacy Feliks Dobrzyński I heard that he instrumented both the maestro's *Concertos* while the composer was still alive'⁵. However, no additional information on this matter has come to light.

References to progress on the *Concertos* are accompanied in the letters by the motif of haste. Following a sojourn at the Radziwiłłs' residence in Antonin, he wrote: 'my *Concerto* [in *F minor*] is not yet finished, and, impatiently awaiting the completion of its finale, has impelled me to leave this paradise'⁶, and three months later, now on the *Concerto in E minor* '[...] the task is urgent, I have to write in a hurry'⁷.

Taken together, all these arguments point to the likely participation of foreign hands in the very first scores, although the lack of sources makes it difficult to point to places where this interference may have occurred and to establish its scale. Whatever the case may be, the expression of doubt as to whether Chopin wrote out the entirety of the first scores of the *Concertos* in his own hand can be regarded as justified.

Certain changes were most probably also made to the instrumentation of the *Concertos* during the periods preceding their publication (amendments to and expansion of the parts of the double basses and the violas, numerous supplements to the wind instrument parts). Such is indicated by a comparison of the extant orchestral material with the Fontana and Francomme reductions. It is almost certain that Chopin's participation in these alterations was insignificant and occasional in character.

Thus, the incompleteness of the sources and the resultant impossibility of specifying the exact relationships between them create a situation in which we are sometimes certain that foreign hands have been involved in a given place, yet unsure as to the moment when this occurred, and utterly unable to indicate who may have been responsible.

* * *

The full scores of both *Concertos* were issued in print by the publishers of their piano scores and orchestral parts: the *Concerto in F minor* by Breitkopf & Härtel in Leipzig (two editions, 1865-1866 and 1879), and the *Concerto in E minor* by the firm of F. Kistner in Leipzig (two editions, c. 1866 and 1875), and subsequently by Breitkopf & Härtel (1880). The first printed scores were compiled from the parts printed by the firm in question, with some errors corrected and alterations made – not infrequently crucial – in the performance markings. Subsequent editions of each *Concerto* were essentially based on their predecessors, with some errors corrected, others repeated, and further changes effected. The final editions, by Breitkopf & Härtel, function to the present day on concert platforms around the world, regarded as the 'original' scores.

For over 150 years, this group of nineteenth-century scores has shaped the attitudes of musicians towards the accompaniments of Chopin's *Concertos*, as well as performance traditions and the tastes of audiences.

As early as the first orchestral performance in Paris of mvt. I of the *E minor Concerto* (20 May 1832; Chopin had already played the *Concerto* in February of that year, with great success, yet this was a solo rendition or with quintet accompaniment) a disproportion was noticed between the sound of the solo part and that of the accompaniment. The reviewer of the daily *Le Temps* wrote: 'The first movement of the *Concerto* made a greater impression in the private concerts. This must be ascribed [...] to a certain heaviness of the accompaniment [...]'⁸.

A few days later, F.-J. Fétis expressed a very similar view: 'This time the performance was not received so well, which should undoubtedly be attributed to the thick instrumentation [...]'.⁹

Considerable influence on the opinions of professional circles with regard to the accompaniments to Chopin's *Concertos* may have been exerted by two figures: H. Berlioz, the great symphonist of the Romantic era and author of the *Traité d'instrumentation et d'orchestration modernes*, and F. Niecks, the author of a valuable biography – one of the first – of Chopin (1888). Berlioz, contrary to his earlier enthusiastic review of a performance by Chopin with orchestra of the *Romance* from the *E minor Concerto* (cf. quotes about the *Concerto in E minor...* before the musical text), made the famous remark: 'The whole charm of Chopin's works is focussed on the piano part; the orchestra of his *Concertos* is nothing more than a cold and virtually useless accompaniment'.¹⁰ Niecks's opinion, meanwhile, read thus: '[...] Chopin's originality is gone as soon as he writes for another instrument than the pianoforte'.¹¹

Reservations with regard to the orchestration of the accompaniments were also not lacking among Polish musicians. Here is the opinion of W. Żeleński: 'In the *Concertos* we are not satisfied with the orchestral part. For whilst the solo part is supremely beautiful and colourful in its detail, the orchestra fails to provide adequate support, thus not only does it not enhance our interest, it rather diminishes and frustrates it'.¹² Few observers rated the orchestral parts highly.

All this has contributed to the creation of a certain stereotype of Chopin as an artist marked by the genius of 'pianoforte thinking' but devoid of the skill of 'orchestral thinking'.

Regardless of the fact that no-one has taken the trouble to establish whether Chopin himself was responsible for all the shortcomings in the score, the authors of negative evaluations of the accompaniments have committed the notorious error of anachronism, presuming the norm to be solely their own orchestral thinking, i.e. thinking in terms of the greatest development of symphonic music of the Romantic era.

The accusation that Chopin was bereft of orchestral thinking is sufficiently weighty to warrant a number of digressions. One may generally doubt the existence of an objective notion of 'orchestral thinking'. It was once said in respect to the orchestrations of J. S. Bach that 'he did not instrument, he registered', in other words his thinking was organ-orchestra orientated. Even if this opinion is too far-reaching a generalisation, one can certainly find this phenomenon in some of his compositions. Haydn and Mozart, as well as Beethoven in his early works, applied quartet-orchestra thinking. Perhaps Chopin represented piano-orchestra thinking. If so, let us enquire in which sources this is best expressed.

This question may be answered by an event from the Paris period of Chopin's life. In 1842, he organised in his own drawing-room a recital by his brilliant 12-year-old pupil Carl Filtzsch, preparing with him the first movement of the *Concerto in E minor*. As another Chopin pupil, W. von Lenz, relates, 'When he finally allowed Filtzsch to play the whole work [...], the Master declared: "You have prepared this movement so splendidly that we can perform it: I shall be your orchestra". [...] Chopin recreated the whole well-devised, ephemeral instrumentation of this composition in his incomparable accompaniment. He played by heart. Never before have I heard anything to equal the first *tutti* [...]'.¹³ This is borne out by a description of a Chopin accompaniment recorded by his pupil C. O'Méara-Dubois: 'Chopin had always a cottage piano by the side of the grand piano on which he gave his lessons. It was marvellous to hear him accompany, no matter what compositions, from the concertos of Hummel to those of Beethoven'.¹⁴

The accounts of firsthand witnesses with Chopin's own words quoted therein seem most illustrative of his piano-orchestra thinking, giving the lie to Berlioz's opinion of 'cold and virtually useless accompaniments'. Meanwhile, to the question as to where this thinking is best documented, there exists only one reply: in the piano reductions prepared by the composer.

Chopin's alleged lack of skill in writing for the orchestra also led to a certain phenomenon probably hitherto not encountered on such a scale in the history of music. Between the late nineteenth century and the mid twentieth century numerous adaptations were produced with the aim of 'refining' the accompaniments to Chopin's *Concertos*. Among those responsible were Klindworth, Münchheimer, Balakirev, Tausig, Burmeister (whose arrangement was used by I. J. Paderewski in performing the

F minor Concerto), Cortot, Reichwein, and Fitelberg. All those undertaking such adaptations endeavoured to reduce the chasm separating the brilliant piano parts and the orchestra parts through the enhancement of the sound and the forces of the orchestra (sometimes by the use of as many as three trombones), which occasionally even necessitated the virtuosic expansion of the piano texture (!). It was always the same anachronism, the changes being made in the direction of the orchestral sonorities achieved during the times of the authors of the adaptations, who lived many years after Chopin, in the period of the great development of symphonic music. It is not surprising, then, that these efforts did not find acceptance, and this direction in the search for a solution to the problem was deemed, it would seem, to lead to nowhere.

* * *

Since the mid twentieth century, a certain interest has been shown in the problem of the accompaniments to Chopin's *Concertos*, giving rise to objective attempts to revise widely held views regarding this area of his output. The authors of works on this subject – the Kraków musicologist A. Frączkiewicz and the English musicologist G. Abraham – endeavour to set Chopin's instrumentation within its historical context. They draw attention above all to the fact that during the period preceding the writing of the *Concertos* Chopin was familiar with the *Concertos* of neither Mozart nor Beethoven, and that his models were solely concertos written in the virtuosic style *brillant* by Hummel, Moscheles, Ries and Field (Chopin himself played *Concertos* by Gyrovetz and Kalkbrenner). They concur that he could not have taken a more thoroughgoing knowledge of the art of instrumentation from his teacher, Józef Elsner.¹⁵ '[Chopin's orchestration] is much more individual than is commonly assumed; it is markedly superior to that of his Polish predecessor or that of his Western models Field and Hummel. It is limited in scope, yet so far as it goes it is always adequate, except in the thick *tuttis*, and sometimes much more than adequate – bold or delicate and poetically imaginative [...]'.¹⁶

Let us add a few more facts. Firstly, the *Concertos* were rarely performed by the full forces in Warsaw while Chopin was residing there. They were more frequently played in private drawing-rooms with quartet accompaniment. Secondly, Chopin held the majority of rehearsals of the *Concertos* with incomplete forces. He wrote the following to a friend¹⁷: 'I rehearsed my *Concerto [in E minor]* with a quartet [...] I shall write you next week how it will sound with an orchestra [...] Tomorrow I want to do it once more with the quartet'; four days later: 'Today I am rehearsing the second *Concerto [in E minor]* with the whole orchestra, with the exception of trumpets and kettle-drums'.¹⁸ There was little time left for rehearsals with the really full orchestra. Thirdly, Chopin never heard his *Concertos* from outside the orchestra, from the perspective of the concert hall, and therefore he could not have checked the sound proportions between particular instruments and sections.

Niecks's idea that Chopin's imagination was limited to the sound of a single instrument – the pianoforte – also fails to withstand scrutiny. It is contradicted by facts from Chopin's biography, by his output and comments. He was interested in other instruments from his schoolboy years. At Szafarnia (1824) he played a 'basetla' [a folk instrument similar to a cello], and this was most probably also where he wrote an earlier version of the *Mazurka in A minor* (Op. 7 No. 2), in which he imitates traditional folk bagpipes, or 'dudy'. He played the organ. He tried out a newly constructed instrument (the aeolopantalon), for which he even wrote two minor pieces (both unfortunately lost). He admired the playing of Paganini, and also of the Czech violinist Josef Slavik, with whom he wanted to compose variations on a theme by Beethoven. On Joseph Merck he wrote: 'He is the first cellist whom I adore close up'.¹⁹ He admired the technical and expressive possibilities of bügelhorns. His correspondence is also not lacking in statements of a more general nature: '*Le Comte Ory* [an opera by Rossini, 1828] is pleasant, particularly the instrumentation and choruses'.²⁰

Yet the range of his interests is most eloquently expressed by his orchestral and chamber works from this period. The way in which he deploys solo wind instruments in compositions with orchestra testifies to his excellent feel for their tonal and expressive capacities. When referring to the Trio, Op. 8²¹, in his correspondence he considers the idea of replacing the violin with viola. In another letter he describes the construction and action of mutes²², which indicates that this was a new orchestral device; Chopin's stressing of the imperative of their use in

the *Concerto in E minor* shows how important a musical role they played for him ('[...] without them the *Adagio* would fail' – he wrote to a friend²³). Finally, the bold use of effects and instruments rarely employed at that time (*col legno* and *cor de signal* in the *F minor Concerto*) show that Chopin kept abreast of innovations in instrumentation. It would also be no exaggeration to state that the recitative from the *Larghetto* of the *F minor Concerto* is one of the most beautiful orchestral pages in the history of the piano concerto, whilst of symbolic significance in this respect is the fact that the last work destined by the composer for print was the *Sonata* for piano and cello.

Thus we note a contradiction between the common stereotype of Chopin as incapable of thinking orchestrally, or in terms of the sound of instruments other than the pianoforte, and his actual leanings and achievements.

In considering Chopin's attitude towards his orchestra, E. Zimmermann, editor of Chopin's works at Henle-Verlag, addresses, albeit in quite general terms, the problem of the interference of foreign hands in Chopin's scores. He draws a 'provocative' – as he terms it – conclusion from the disappearance of the earliest written sources: 'I consider it a curious fact that 150 years after these works were composed we are not in a position to state with the utmost certainty whether even one single note in the orchestral parts of both *Concertos*, in the version in which we hear them today, actually comes from Chopin himself'.²⁴ (This is, however, contradicted by the indications for the entries of instruments written by Chopin into the piano reductions.) He leaves unanswered the questions: 'Could it be that Chopin wrote the whole piano part – therefore with the reduced orchestral places – and then, making use of this basic material, someone else (who?) instrumented the work? Or were there perhaps some sketches, plans or even a prepared instrumentation by Chopin himself [...]'²⁵ Later, when characterising the printed scores, he writes: 'In the middle of the last [nineteenth] century changes appear to have begun in the conditions under which musical works were published. Composers of classical-romantic repertoire, who previously often participated themselves in the preparation of the first editions of their works, slowly departed the scene, and the editorial work passed into other hands. Now contradictions were discovered, alleged or genuine errors. [...] At this time texts began to be polished up, retouched, adjusted and unified'.²⁶

* * *

It is not the intention of the National Edition editorial team to evaluate Chopin's skills as the composer of orchestral parts. It is sufficient for us to express our conviction of his excellent predispositions for employing the orchestra in works for piano and orchestra. The full development of these skills was hampered by factors for which he was not culpable: gaps in his musical education, a lack of models of a higher calibre and the editorial customs of the day.

It is the task of the editors, meanwhile, to present the most authentic forms possible of the scores of both *Concertos* in such a way as to provide the opportunity of hearing them – as far as is possible – just as Chopin himself wished them to be heard, and by the same stroke help to shape true judgments concerning their significance for the history of this genre of music.

* * *

So we have at our disposal on the one hand the orchestral material appended to the solo part prepared for print by Chopin – the complete material, albeit contaminated by the participation of foreign hands, not supervised by Chopin – and on the other hand sources closer to the composer's intentions or even authentic, although only indirectly concerning the orchestra part. As far back as the 1970s, when the NE editorial committee was commencing its work, this situation led me to put forward the idea of two types of score for each of the *Concertos*, which would take account of all the editorial problems connected with the accompaniments. This distinction was initially rather vague. The 'concert' score was to be as close as possible to Chopin's orchestral thinking and serve concert performance, whilst the 'historical' score, prepared from materials intended by Chopin for print, was to constitute a record of the extant source orchestral material, with all its baggage of foreign accretions. Essential conditions with both types of score were that they be rooted in sources and that the editing methods be appropriately selected.

Since the 'concert' scores are an editorial form specific to NE and preferred by our editorial team as the basis for performance (hence the name), this type will be discussed at greater length and in the first instance. We will attempt to make our initial, broad editorial assumptions more specific, employing the experience acquired in the process of editing the previously published volumes, particularly the *Concertos* in their versions for piano.

* * *

A discussion of the principles behind the editing of the 'concert' scores must begin with the signalling of yet another issue, at once both historical and practical in nature, namely the difference in sonority between the orchestras of Chopin's times and modern-day orchestras.

The particular sections of the orchestra possessed different forces and tonal proportions, and the instruments different technical capacities. E.g. in the line-up of orchestras from those times the flutes possessed a more distinctive sound, whereas in our orchestras in the passages above the strings or between *ff tutti* chords they are often inaudible (e.g. *Concerto in E minor*, mvt. I, bars 99-103 and analogous bars, mvt. III, bar 111). The trombone, whose principal task was to reinforce the bass line, rather sparse in those days, in present-day orchestras sometimes sounds too distinct. In earlier scores we encounter bars filled with rests which at first glance are incomprehensible to us today, in places where Chopin wrote notes in the reduction, i.e. notes which he expressly intended. These notes were unplayable on the natural French horns of those times (e.g. *Concerto in F minor*, mvt. I, bar 262), yet present no difficulties for modern chromatic French horns. The contrary is sometimes also the case, e.g. the highest notes played by trumpets in E used by Chopin are impossible to perform on the trumpets in B \flat employed today (e.g. *Concerto in E minor*, mvt. III, bar 107).

The primary sources for the 'concert' scores are the piano reductions written in Chopin's hand and corrected by him in the first editions. In these, of particular value are the indications as to the entries of particular instruments. Next are the piano reductions of Fontana and Francomme, which allow us to reconstruct the state of the scores prior to the final phase of changes, doubtless introduced under the influence of the publishers.

However, these sources are not wholly adequate (e.g. the lack of the first movement of the *Concertos* in Fontana and Francomme, the lack of a detailed layout of the instruments in the full *tutti*). Hence our further recourse to an examination of the internal musical traits of the accompaniments, perceived from a number of perspectives.

Let us pose three questions:

- If Chopin turned to his collaborators with the instrumentation of the accompaniments, then which parts would he have entrusted to them above all?
- Which parts have aroused the most reservations?
- Which parts require modification due to the different sonority of the orchestras of Chopin's times?

The answer to the first question is as follows: Chopin would have delegated above all the instrumentation of the full *tutti*, as these are the most time-consuming fragments (the number of instruments, the transpositions, the need for a skilled hand in the vertical layout of the instruments). Next he would have entrusted his assistants with the 'routine' harmonic backgrounds in the quintet, requiring no great invention.

The answer to the second question is surprisingly convergent with the answer to the first. The most heavily and commonly criticized parts are the *tutti*. ' [...] In the *tuttis*, [...] Chopin's orchestration is most dull and conventional [...]. It is the thick, unimaginative scoring of the opening *tuttis* of the two *Concertos* that has done more harm than anything else to Chopin's reputation as an orchestrator'.²⁷ One also reads: 'Chopin's orchestration is less felicitous, as it is frequently scarce, without the exploitation of instrumental effects and without symphonic import. Chopin usually gives a quartet ground in drawn-out notes. It is wearisome'.²⁸ These opinions were not and are not isolated, and – with hindsight – can be deemed objective.

There is no question, however, that the thematic and contrapuntal parts entrusted by Chopin to the wind instruments are employed by him with a great sensitivity to colour, register and character, and are generally precisely indicated in the reduction. Let us quote once more the opinion of G. Abraham: 'As we shall see, it is precisely in his treatment of

the wind that Chopin is at his most poetic as an orchestrator.²⁹ One must also not forget that Chopin entrusts a long thematic phrase in the ending of mvt. II of the *E minor Concerto* to the violins, which the piano accompanies with a delicate figuration.

These observations allow us to establish with great likelihood the scale of the authenticity of Chopin's hand in the orchestral parts:

— the places where the instrumentation can be ascribed to Chopin with the greatest degree of certitude: the indications of instruments in the piano reduction undoubtedly prepared by Chopin and the solo parts of the instruments (thematic and contrapuntal),

— the places of less certain authenticity: the harmonic accompaniments,

— the least certain places: dense *tutti* with the instruments not specified in the reduction.

The above stratification of the texture of the accompaniments cannot, of course, be effected with absolute accuracy, yet it does allow us to be bolder in correcting awkwardness in the *tutti* or in rarefying or shortening notes held for too long in the strings, since we can be confident that in interfering in these parts we are not disturbing the authentic conception of the composer. At the same time, it makes us wary with solo instrument parts. Here we allow ourselves – particularly in the developments of the first movements – to double those thematic passages which are often barely audible through the dense figuration of the more powerfully sounding modern-day piano (a procedure in keeping with the concert practice).

So as not to disturb in the least the above-mentioned piano-orchestra thinking of Chopin, in making alterations in doubtful places we take as our model similar undoubted places in the *Concertos* and in earlier concert works. Thus we wish to avoid the accusation of adding yet another 'foreign hand', in such a way that these corrections might be regarded rather as a 'return to the hand of Chopin'.

The effects in terms of the sound of the 'concert' scores involve above all greater clarity in the dense *tutti*, at times somewhat lighter, with the point of gravity shifted to the melody line, and a greater transparency in the chamber accompaniments. One example here is the atmosphere of the sound of *Larghetto* from the *E minor Concerto*, in keeping with Chopin's description of the mood of this movement and with Berlioz's review (cf. quotes *about the Concerto in E minor...* before the musical text). On the other hand, we note an improved audibility of the thematic motifs played simultaneously to virtuosic figuration in the piano.

The sources for the 'historical' scores are the oldest homogenous written or printed orchestra parts, i.e. the 'semi-autograph' in the case of the *F minor Concerto*, and for the *E minor Concerto*, due to the lack of a score, the orchestral parts of the first French edition.

The editorial method consists in giving the text of the source as faithfully as possible, with the correction of its evident, mechanical errors. However, this simple solution does have the drawback that the presented text, although approved for print by Chopin, corresponds only in part to his intentions.

The sound of the 'historical' scores is close to that which so far has been regarded as fully authentic and which due to the nineteenth-century editions, above all those issued by Breitkopf & Härtel, also became fixed in the twentieth-century performance tradition. Thus we find here all those deficiencies criticised for 150 years.

Summary

Both types of score derive from sources, yet the basic group of sources is different for each type.

The 'concert' scores are a most particular form of reconstruction. The fact that they are based on various types of source allows for slightly greater latitude in their interpretation. Yet thanks to the use authentic sources, or others directly linked to such, they are closer to the creative intentions of the composer.

It must be pointed out here that the changes that are manifest in the 'concert' scores in comparison with the 'historical' scores tend – contrary to all previous editions and adaptations – towards making the orchestral parts more chamber-like, more in keeping with a piano part filled with subtle nuances.

The 'historical' scores are clearer with regard to editorial interference, yet contaminated by the involvement in the sources of foreign hands.

Chopin's presumed attitude towards the two types of score:

— the 'concert' scores convey that which Chopin wished to be heard,

— the 'historical' scores show that which, for various reasons, Chopin agreed to have published.

Jan Ekier

¹ Letter to Tytus Woyciechowski in Poturzyn, Warsaw, 5 Oct 1830; all quotations from letters by Chopin in *Korespondencja Fryderyka Chopina* [The Correspondence of Fryderyk Chopin] ed. B. E. Sydow (Warsaw, 1955).

² Letter to Tytus Woyciechowski in Poturzyn, Warsaw, 20 Oct. 1829.

³ Letter to Tytus Woyciechowski in Poturzyn, Warsaw, 31 Aug. 1830.

⁴ F. Hoesick, *Chopin. Życie i twórczość* [Chopin. His Life and Work] (Warsaw, 1967), i, 360.

⁵ *ibidem*, 360n.

⁶ Letter to Tytus Woyciechowski in Poturzyn, Warsaw, 14 Jan. 1830.

⁷ Letter to Tytus Woyciechowski in Poturzyn, Warsaw, 17 Apr. 1830.

⁸ *Le Temps*, 22 May 1832.

⁹ *Revue Musicale*, 26 May 1832.

¹⁰ H. Berlioz, *Mémoires* (Paris, 1969), ii, 275.

¹¹ F. Niecks, *Chopin as a Man and Musician* (London, 1888), i, 206.

¹² F. Hoesick, op. cit., 361.

¹³ W. von Lenz, 'Uebersichtliche Beurtheilung der Pianoforte-Kompositionen von Chopin [...]', *Neue Berliner Musikzeitung*, 4 Sept. 1872.

¹⁴ F. Niecks, op. cit., ii, 188.

¹⁵ A. Frączkiewicz, 'Instrumentacja koncertów Chopina' [Instrumentation of Chopin's

Concertos], in *Muzyka*, 3-4 (Warsaw, 1952).

¹⁶ G. Abraham, 'Chopin and the Orchestra', in *The Book of the First International Musicological Congress Devoted to the Work of Frederick Chopin* (Warsaw, 1963), 87.

¹⁷ Letter to Tytus Woyciechowski in Poturzyn, Warsaw, 18 Sept. 1830.

¹⁸ Letter to Tytus Woyciechowski in Poturzyn, Warsaw, 22 Sept. 1830.

¹⁹ Letter to his family in Warsaw, Vienna, 28 May 1831.

²⁰ Letter to Tytus Woyciechowski in Poturzyn, Warsaw, 10 Apr. 1830.

²¹ Letter to Tytus Woyciechowski in Poturzyn, Warsaw, 31 Aug. 1830.

²² Letter to Tytus Woyciechowski in Poturzyn, Warsaw, 15 May 1830; cf. quotes *about the Concerto in E minor...* before the musical text.

²³ Letter to Tytus Woyciechowski in Poturzyn, Warsaw, 22 Sept. 1830.

²⁴ E. Zimmermann, 'Chopin und sein Orchester', in *Chopin Studies*, 3 (Warsaw, 1990), 175.

²⁵ *ibidem*, 177.

²⁶ *ibidem*, 182.

²⁷ G. Abraham, op. cit., 86.

²⁸ A. Münchheimer, in F. Hoesick, op. cit., 360n.

²⁹ G. Abraham, op. cit., 85.

SOURCE COMMENTARY (ABRIDGED)

Initial remarks

The present commentary concerns the orchestra part alone (the solo part is discussed in the commentaries to the versions for one piano and with a second piano). It sets out the principles behind the editing of the musical text and discusses the major discrepancies between sources; in addition, it signals the most crucial alterations made to the printed scores of the *Concerto* (none was published during Chopin's lifetime).

A precise characterisation of all the sources, their relations to one another, a detailed presentation of the differences appearing between them, and also reproductions of characteristic fragments of the different sources are all contained in a separately published *Source Commentary*.

More far-reaching editorial alterations (above all the reconstruction of certain fragments and the rationalization of performance markings) were applied in the concert version of the score and are discussed in the commentary to this version.

The sign → indicates a relationship between sources and should be read as 'and the source(s) based thereon'.

Concerto in E minor, Op. 11

Sources

[S] The manuscript (autograph?) of the score is not extant. The existence of this manuscript, dating from the period of the work's composition, in 1830, is beyond doubt. Probably when the *Concerto* was being prepared for print (1832-33), alterations to the instrumentation were made to [S], mostly aimed at supplementing the wind instrument parts and enhancing the sound of the strings through the more frequent use of violas and double basses. Some of these changes probably came from Chopin or were accepted by him.

[A] Lost autograph of the solo part of the *Concerto*, from which Chopin played the work in Warsaw (11 Oct. 1830), and probably also later abroad (the performance of concert works from music was normal usage at that time, as Chopin himself confirmed in describing his Vienna performance of the *Variations*, Op. 2, in a letter to T. Woyciechowski of 12 Sept. 1829: 'pale, with a rouged companion for turning the pages (who boasted of having turned the pages for Moscheles, Hummel, Herz [...]), I sat down at [...] the instrument').

[P] Handwritten orchestral parts prepared on the basis of [S] (without the later changes). They served Chopin for public performances of the work. In 1832, in line with instructions from A. Farenco, who was initially to have published the first edition of the *Concerto*, a large part of the wind instrument soli were added in the string parts in the form of cues.

[PF] Handwritten orchestral parts probably prepared on the basis of [P] with account taken of the later changes made to [S]. They formed the basis for the parts of the first French edition.

A^{Tut} Autograph of the opening *Tutti* (mvt. I, bars 1-138) in the version for one piano (private collection, photocopy in the Chopin Society, Warsaw), prepared to supplement the manuscript forming the basis for the first French edition. Chopin was forced to replace the corresponding fragment of the basis with this newly written manuscript probably to take account of the cut suggested by F. Kalkbrenner after Chopin had presented the *Concerto* to him in the autumn of 1831.

ReFr^{orch} – manuscript of Auguste Franchomme containing a piano reduction of the orchestra part of mvts. II & III of the *Concerto* (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris). It was most probably prepared on the basis of the string parts (with the cues of the wind instruments) of [P]. It bears traces of (later?) addenda made on the basis of the wind parts of [P] or [S]. In fragments of mvt. III played by the orchestra alone and marked as *Tutti*, Franchomme copied – prob-

ably from the first French edition – the piano reduction prepared by Chopin and contained in the piano part.

ReFr^w – manuscript of Auguste Franchomme containing a piano reduction of the wind instrument parts of mvts. II & III of the *Concerto* (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris), probably based on the wind instrument parts of [P] or [S]. It contains several indications regarding instrumentation.

ReFr = ReFr^{orch} & ReFr^w. The picture of the score that emerges from the two Franchomme manuscripts allows us, to a great extent, to reconstruct the original shape of the instrumentation of mvts. II & III of the *Concerto* and the changes which it later underwent.

FE First French edition of the version for one piano, M. Schlesinger (M.S.1409), Paris, June 1833, the opening section based on A^{Tut}, the remainder most probably on [A] or [S]. FE was corrected by Chopin at least twice. There are copies of FE with different prices and other details of the cover, originating from impressions published by Brandus, the successor of Schlesinger. The following was appended to this edition:

PFE Orchestral parts (same firm and number), based on [PF]. They bear traces of at least two proof-readings; Chopin's direct involvement in these corrections is unlikely. The parts contain a great many inaccuracies in the notation of performance markings (slurs, *staccato* markings, dynamic signs, agogic indications) and the calculation of rests lasting many bars between separate entries (some render the performance of the work impossible without prior revision of the part), and also a large number of errors in rhythm and pitch (including accidentals). Most of the parts are printed so tightly that it is often impossible to state whether hairpin-shaped dynamic signs are supposed to be accents or *diminuendi*.

The NE editorial team is not aware of the existence of differentiated impressions of PFE.

GE First German edition of the version for one piano, F. Kistner (1020.1021.1022), Leipzig, Sept. 1833, most probably based on a proof of FE not including the final corrections. GE was thoroughly revised, most likely without Chopin's participation (cf. *Source Commentaries* to piano versions of the *Concerto*). There are copies of GE with a different price on the cover.

PGE Orchestral parts appended to GE (same firm and number), based most probably on a proof of PFE not including the final corrections. They bear traces of detailed editing by the publisher, mostly carried out during the process of printing (corrected were some errors in pitch and the clear majority of errors in rhythm, including in the calculation of rests; dynamic and agogic markings are set in order). Some of the changes (e.g. mvt. I, bar 464) have hitherto been generally regarded as authentic, and consequently appear in all printed scores of the *Concerto*. Chopin's involvement in the editing of PGE is excluded.

The NE editorial team is not aware of the existence of differentiated impressions of PGE.

EE First English edition of the version for one piano, Wessel & C^o (W & C^o N^o 1086), London, Apr. 1834, based most probably on FE. The editors of the National Edition failed to locate a copy of the orchestral parts of EE; thus it is most likely that – as in the case of the *Concerto in F minor*, Op. 21 – the orchestral material was not printed in EE.

S66 First, lithographed, edition of the score of the *Concerto*, F. Kistner (3050), Leipzig, c. 1866, based on PGE. A thorough revision was carried out here, especially of performance markings, with the account taken of the text and markings of GE (both Chopin's piano reduction and the solo part); some of the changes are of an arbitrary nature. Although most of the errors were corrected a certain number of mistakes can still be found.

S75 Second edition of the score, F. Kistner (4528), Leipzig, 1875, based on S66. Several errors were corrected here, and few arbitrary changes also made.

S80 Edition of the score of the *Concerto* prepared by J. Brahms as part of an edition of the complete works of F. Chopin (*Erste*

kritisch durchgesehene Gesamtausgabe), Breitkopf & Härtel (C XII 2), Leipzig, 1880. This edition is based on **S75**, possibly in comparison with **PGE**. Interpretational markings are revised, and several alterations of a different sort are made, including some arbitrary changes.

SS = **S66**, **S75** & **S80**.

SSi Edition of the score of the *Concerto* prepared by K. Sikorski as part of an edition of the complete works of F. Chopin, Instytut Fryderyka Chopina and PWM Edition (PWM-3822), Warsaw-Kraków, 1960. An edition based on **S80**, with numerous revisions and changes in instrumentation, harmonics, dynamics and articulation. Since these were described in detail in the commentary to this volume, they are not noted here.

The editorial principles for the orchestra part

As the basic text we adopt **PFE**, being the only source produced – at least in part – under Chopin's supervision. We correct only clear errors in pitch or rhythm.

We unify the notation of tremolo in the strings, in **PFE** sometimes written out note after note, without the use of abbreviated notation.

We add no performance markings, with the exception of the most obvious oversights, confirmed through comparison both with the parts of other instruments and with analogical places. We correct unquestionable inaccuracies in the notation of signs, chiefly of dynamics (the placing of signs, erroneous exchanging of **f** and **ff**). More specifically, we unify – wherever possible – markings appearing in the parts of pairs of wind instruments, written in Chopin's score on a single staff.

As a rule, short *diminuendo* hairpins are given as long accents, so characteristic of Chopin in his piano music.

We do not note errors appearing in the cues.

The piano part comes from the volume 13 **A XIIIa** (version for one piano). Omitted are fingering and elements of notation deriving from editors which have no effect on the tonal relations between the solo and orchestra parts (brackets and minor variants).

Noted in the remainder of the commentary are only the more important changes made to **PGE** and only the most crucial changes from **SS**.

I. Allegro maestoso

p. 14 *bar 1* Timp. Missing in **PFE** is the semiquaver tremolo sign. This obvious error was already corrected in **PGE**. Cf. bar 486.

bar 5 Timp. As the third crotchet **PFE** erroneously have *B*. Cf. bar 490. In **PGE** the error was corrected.

bars 6-7 Fl. I, Vni I. **SS** arbitrarily tied the notes b^1 .

p. 15 *bar 17* Fl. II. Missing before the last note in **PFE** is \sharp . Cf. Fl. I. In **PGE** the error was corrected.

p. 16 *bar 24* Timp. **PFE** erroneously have *B*. Cf. bar 509. In **PGE** the error was corrected.

p. 17 *bar 36* Cl. I in do. Missing in **PFE** is \flat . Cf. **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) and the part of the violins II. In **PGE** this sign was added.

bar 37 Cor. in do. **PFE** erroneously have c^1-d^1 , which is changed in **PGE** (\rightarrow **SS**) to the unison c^1-c^1 . Comparison with **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) shows that both these versions are most likely to be wrong. We give e^1-e^1 , as in the following bar.

bar 42 Cor. I in mi. At the beginning of the bar **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) have f^2 . Without doubt the typesetter or copyist confused this bar with its predecessor, since the harmonic structure of the motifs here precludes the use of this type of suspension. We change this note to c^2 , by analogy with the beginning of the following bar. In **S80** this note was changed to eb^2 .

p. 18 *bar 49* Cl. I in do. **PFE** erroneously have d^2 , and in addition the quaver flag is omitted from this note. In **PGE** (\rightarrow **SS**) the rhythmic error was corrected and d^2 changed to $d\sharp^2$. We give b^1 as the most naturally linked to the preceding $c\sharp^2$.

bar 50 Timp. Erroneously written in **PFE** is 14 instead of 41 bars of rest. In **PGE** the error was corrected.

p. 19 *bar 75* Vni I. As the last quaver **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) erroneously have $f\sharp^1$. We give the $d\sharp^1$ appearing in **A**^{Tut} (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **GE,EE**). Cf. also bars 236 and 587 in **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**). This change was also made in **S80**.

p. 20 *bars 89-91* Cl. II. We give the corrected version of **PFE**. Initially the part of the clarinet I was repeated here – doubtless by mistake; this was transferred to **PGE** (\rightarrow **SS**).

bar 91 Tr. I. **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) have here a dotless crotchet. Cf. the parts of the trumpet II and French horns in C. In **SS** a dotless crotchet appears in the parts of both trumpets.

bar 94 Ob. II. We give the crotchet e^1 occurring in **PFE**. **PGE** (\rightarrow **SS**) have $f\sharp^1$.

p. 21 *bar 98* Fl. II. **PFE** is lacking the \flat lowering $g\sharp^2$ to g^2 . Cf. **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) and the parts of the clarinet I and the violas. In **PGE** this sign was added.

bar 99 Vle. In **PFE** the octave $g-g^1$ erroneously has the value of a dotted minim. In **PGE** the error was corrected. Fg. II. As the last quaver **PFE** erroneously have d . Cf. **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**), the parts of the trombones, cellos and double basses.

bar 103 Vle. **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) erroneously have *p* instead of *ffp*.

p. 22 *bar 114* Vni I. At the beginning of the bar **SS** erroneously have e^2-c^3 .

p. 23 *bar 119* Vni II. In **PFE** the note $a\sharp^1$ erroneously has the value of a crotchet instead of a minim. In **PGE** the error was corrected.

bars 119 & 679 Cor. in do. **PFE** have here the third c^2-e^2 . Comparison with **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**), and also with bar 107, points to the considerable likelihood of an error involving the repetition of the version of bar 117. The recurrence of the error in bar 679 was doubtless connected with the short notation (not written out in notes) of this fragment of the ending during the initial stage in the work's notation. In **PGE**, only c^2 was corrected to e^2 in the part of the horn II in bar 119. **SS** have the correct version.

bar 120 Fl. II. As the third crotchet **PFE** erroneously have c^3 instead of a^2 . Cf. analogous bar 680. In **PGE** the error was corrected.

p. 24 *bar 139* Timp. **PFE** erroneously have 26 instead of 61 bars of rest. Trbn. In **PFE** a total of 93 instead of 83 bars of rest were counted up to the change of key. Fg. In **PFE** 70 instead of 61 bars of rest were counted. In **PGE** all the errors in this bar were corrected.

p. 25 *bar 169* Vni II. At the beginning of the bar **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) have d^1 . As this is doubtless an error, we give the c^1 appearing in the analogous bar 524. In **S80** this note was arbitrarily changed to e^1 .

p. 27 *bars 190, 196 & 197* Vni II. Before the last note of bar 190 **PFE** is lacking the \sharp raising c^1 to $c\sharp^1$. This sign is also missing in bars 196-197. In **PGE** the signs were added.

p. 28 *bars 206-207* Cor. in do. The dynamic markings derive from the part of the horn I. We omit the clearly erroneous *pp* at the beginning of bar 207. In bar 206 the horn II has *ff* for *f*.

- bar 207 Vni I. In the first chord **PFE** erroneously have $c\sharp^2$. We unify the sound of this chord with the c^2 in **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) and in the parts of the oboe II and clarinet I, and with the c^1 of the violas. **PGE** have the correct version.
- p. 29 bar 221 Vni II. In **PFE** the note *a* erroneously has the value of a dotted minim. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- bar 222 Timp. In **PFE** 112 instead of 111 bars of rest were erroneously counted up to the entry of the *Tutti*.
Trbn. In **PFE** a total of 107 instead of 111 bars of rest were counted up to the entry of the *Tutti*.
Fg. I. **PFE** erroneously give 14+3 instead of 41+3 bars of rest. In **PGE** all the errors in this bar were corrected.
In **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) the change of key appears in the part of the violins I in bar 230, and in the first oboe part not until bar 333.
- p. 31 bars 270-272 Cor. I in mi. In **PFE** the d^2 held over from the preceding bars is thrice repeated. We correct these to c^2 , in line with the harmonic sense contained in **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) and the logic of the voice leading (cf. the part of the clarinet I). The error was already corrected in **PGE**.
- bar 273 Cl. I. In **PFE** 28 instead of 24 bars of rest were erroneously counted. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- p. 33 bar 305 Vle. In **PFE** the \sharp is a crotchet and falls on the third beat. The variance in rhythm with the remaining string parts is certainly an error here. Cf. the analogous bar 289. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- p. 34 bar 315 Cl. I & Fg. I. In **PFE** 21 instead of 17 bars of rest were erroneously counted. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- bar 322 Vle. As the third crotchet **PFE** have f^1 . The error is testified by the \sharp^1 appearing as the eleventh semiquaver in **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**). In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- p. 35 bar 331 Vle. **SS** have a semiquaver tremolo instead of a quaver tremolo (due to an error or arbitrary alteration in **S66**).
- bar 335 Vle. At the beginning of the bar **PFE** is lacking the \flat lowering $d\sharp^2$ to d^2 . In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- bar 338 Fg. As the third crotchet **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) erroneously have g^1 . We change this to f^1 , in line with the sound of the chord confirmed in **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) and with the logic of the voice leading (cf. the parts of the oboe I and the violins II). **SS** have the correct version.
- bar 339 Ob. II. Before the first crotchet **PFE** is lacking the \flat . Cf. **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) and the parts of the clarinet II and the violas. In **PGE** the sign was added.
- bar 340 Cb. As the first crotchet **PFE** erroneously have \sharp . The bass ground here is undoubtedly $d\sharp$, as confirmed by **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) and by the parts of the cellos and the bassoon I. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- p. 36 bar 342 Vle, Vc. Before the second crotchet **PFE** is lacking the \flat . In **PGE** the signs were added.
- bar 343 Cl. II. Missing in **PFE** is the \flat . Cf. **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) and the parts of the flute I, horn I in C, trumpets and violins I. In **PGE** the sign was added.
- bar 345 Ob. I. Missing in **PFE** is the \flat . Cf. **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) and the part of the French horns in C. In **PGE** the sign was added.
- bar 349 Ob. I. On the second beat **PGE** erroneously have a minim e^2 . This error most probably occurred also in **PFE**, though here it was corrected in the final stage of revision. **SS** have the correct version.
- Trbn. In **S75** (\rightarrow **S80**) the notes *A* are erroneously placed on the second and third beats.
- bars 349-350 Fl. I, Cl. I in do, Cor. II in do. Missing in **PFE** are the ties sustaining the notes *c* (in various octaves). The omissions are revealed by the ties in **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) and in the parts of the remaining wind instruments and the double basses. In **PGE** the tie is missing only in the flute part.
- bars 350-351 Vni II. In **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) the last crotchet of bar 350 is furnished with a *staccato* dot, regardless of the tremolando. **PFE** have this erroneous notation also on the first crotchet of bar 351.
- p. 37 bars 351-352 Ob. I, Cl. II in do, Cor. I in mi, Cor. I in do. Missing in **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE** except for Cor in do) are the ties sustaining $d\sharp^2$, \sharp^1 , d^2 and c^2 respectively. The omissions are revealed by the ties in **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) and in the parts of the remaining wind instruments and the double basses.
- bar 352 Fl. II. At the beginning of the bar **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) have, most probably erroneously, $d\sharp^2$ for \sharp^2 . **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) proves that Chopin intended a clear syncopation. Cf. previous note.
- p. 38 bar 362 Cor. II in mi. On the third beat **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) have erroneously c^2 .
- bar 365 Tr. I in do. In **PFE** the note e^2 has the value of a dotted minim. Leaving it to resonate on the third beat, where another harmony presides, is certainly an error. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- bar 366 Ob. II. Missing before the first crotchet in **PFE** is the \sharp . Cf. **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) and the parts of the flute II and violins II. In **PGE** the sign was added.
- p. 39 bar 370 Fg. II. In **PFE** 16 instead of 15 bars of rest were erroneously counted up to the entry of the solo piano. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- bar 376 Fl. II. In **PFE** 68 instead of 66 bars of rest were erroneously counted. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- p. 42 bar 419 Vni I. In **PFE** the $b\sharp^1$ ending the bar has the value of a crotchet. The omission of the quaver flag is testified by the rests preceding this note, lasting a total of five quavers. Cf. also the part of the violins II and bar 443. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- p. 44 bar 440 Vni II. As the first crotchet **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) have *a*, most probably erroneously. The error was corrected in **S75** (\rightarrow **S80**).
- bar 443 Fl. II. Missing before the last note in **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) is \sharp . Cf. **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) and the parts of the flute I and violins II.
- bar 447 Vc. Missing in **PFE** is \sharp . Cf. **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) and the parts of the violas and double basses. In **PGE** the sign was added.
- p. 45 bar 450 Fg. I. Missing before the last quaver in **PFE** is \sharp . Cf. **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**) and the parts of the violas, cellos and double basses.
- bars 453-454 Vle. Instead of two identical bars with the tied note *b*, **PFE** have three such bars. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- p. 46 bar 464 Cor. I in mi. We give the version of **PFE**. In **PGE** the first crotchet was arbitrarily changed to b^1 (doubtless intended as b b^1), and the second was replaced by a rest. **SS** give a revised version of **PGE** (bb^1).
- p. 47 bars 478-479 Vni I. Missing in **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) is the tie sustaining $d\sharp^2$. The omission is testified by the ties in all the other parts.
- bar 479 Cb. In **PFE** the note *B* has the value of a crotchet, most doubtless erroneously (such is indicated by the remaining parts). In **PGE** the value was altered to a quaver. Cf. note to bar 221.

p. 49 bars 493 & 495 Vc. In **PFE** (→**PGE**) the dynamic signs are placed two bars earlier, in bars 491 and 493 respectively. Comparison with the other parts shows this to be an error. In **PGE** *f* was added in bar 494.

bar 498 Tr. II. The whole of this bar is missing in **PFE**. We add it in accordance with the analogous bar 13. In **PGE** the error was corrected.

p. 50 bar 509 Timp., Trbn. & Cor. I in do. In **PFE** 163 instead of 162 bars of rest were counted up to the closing *Tutti*. In **PGE** the errors were corrected.

p. 52 bar 543 Vni II. In **SS** the last note of the bar was given the value of a crotchet (analogously to bar 188).

p. 54 bar 569 Vni II. **PFE** (→**PGE**) have here *f*¹, tied to the *f*¹ in the preceding bar. We unify the sound of the chord in the strings with the *g* notes appearing three times in **FE** (→**GE,EE**). The error was corrected in **S75** (→**S80**).

p. 55 bar 573 Tr., Cor. II in do & Ob. In **PFE** 99 instead of 98 bars of rest were erroneously counted up to the closing *Tutti*. In **PGE** the errors were corrected.

p. 56 bar 621 Cb. In **PFE** this bar comprises a crotchet, a quaver rest and two crotchet rests. Comparison with the analogous parts of the horns, violas and cellos indicates the redundancy of the quaver rest. In **PGE** a flag was added to the note.

p. 57 bar 636 Cl. I. In **PFE** 34 instead of 35 bars of rest were counted up to the closing *Tutti*. In **PGE** the error was corrected.

p. 58 bar 643 Vle. Missing at the beginning of the bar in **PFE** is *γ*.

p. 59 bar 658 Pfte, Vc. At the beginning of the bar in the cello part we give the *eb*¹ appearing in **PFE**. At the same time, however, **FE** has a chord with *e-e*¹ in the piano part (the variant given in the footnote comes from one of the teaching copies annotated by Chopin). In **PGE** (→**SS**) the *b* was removed from the part of the cellos, thus matching it to the printed piano part. See *Performance Commentary*.

bar 661 Vni II. In **SS** the triad *b-g*¹-*e*² was arbitrarily changed to the four-note chord *b-e*¹-*b*¹-*e*².

p. 60 bars 671 & 673 Cor. On the third beat of bar 671 in **S75** instead of a rest the preceding third is repeated. In **S80** this arbitrary change was also made in bar 673.

bar 674 Tr. I in do. At the beginning of the bar **PFE** erroneously have *f*². We correct this in accordance with the analogous bars 102 and 114. The error was already corrected in **PGE**.
Cor. II in do. As the third crotchet **PFE** (→**PGE**) erroneously have *c*². We correct it according to the analogous bars 102 and 114.

bar 677 Fl. I. **PFE** erroneously have *e*³. Cf. identical bar 117. The error was already corrected in **PGE**.

II. Romance. Larghetto

p. 62 bar 4 Vni I. Missing in **PFE** (→**PGE**) is the tie sustaining *a*¹. Cf. **FE** (→**GE,EE**), **ReFr**^{orch} and the analogous bar 9. In **SS** the tie was added.

bar 12 Cor. On the fourth crotchet **SS** introduced a dotted rhythm (♩.) instead of two quavers.

p. 63 bar 33 Fg. I. In the first half of the bar **PFE** erroneously have the rhythm ♩♩. We adopt the version of **ReFr**^{orch} and **ReFr**^w. Such a version was already introduced in **PGE**.

p. 67 bars 64-65 Vc. In **PFE** the slurs are unclear: in bar 65, occurring at the start of a new line of text, a new slur begins, even though the slur in bar 64 is extended beyond the last note. In **PGE** the slur in bar 64 is curtailed. We adopt an analogous notation to that appearing at the beginning of bar 67 and in the second half of bar 68.

p. 68 bar 77 Vle. We give *c*^{#1}, after **PFE**. In **PGE** (→**SS**) it was changed to *c*^{#1}, matching this note to the version of the piano part adopted in **GE**.

p. 70 bars 100-101 Cor. II in mi. **PFE** (→**PGE**) have ◀. The *smorz.* in **FE** (→**GE,EE**) and ▶ in **ReFr**^w testify that we are dealing here with a typesetting error, not uncommon in Chopin's work.

bar 102 Cor. II. In **PFE** 3 instead of 2 bars of rest are erroneously counted. In **PGE** the error was corrected.

p. 73 bar 123 Cb. In **PFE** (→**PGE**) the note *E* is given the erroneous value of a minim. In **SS** the error was corrected.

bar 124 Vc. & Cb. **PFE** (→**PGE**) have *pp* in the cello part alone.

III. Rondo. Vivace

p. 75 bars 58 & 60-64 Vle. In **SS** the part of the violas was supplemented in keeping with the analogous bars 286 & 288-292.

p. 76 bar 66 Vni I. Added on the fourth quaver in **SS** – in keeping with the analogous bar 294 – was the note *b*¹.

bar 69 Vni II. As the first quaver **PFE** erroneously have *c*^{#1}. **ReFr**^{orch}, **ReFr**^w, **FE** (→**GE,EE**) and the parts of the clarinet II and bassoon I all have *d*^{#1} here. Cf. also the analogous bar 297. In **PGE** the error was corrected.

bars 72-73 & 300-301 Vni I, Vni II & Vle. We give the version from **PFE** (→**PGE**). Introduced in **S75** is a version partly doubling the parts of the first flute, clarinet and bassoon:

p. 77 bars 80-81 Vc. & Cb. In **PFE** (→**PGE**) the tie sustaining the *B* appears in the cello part alone.

bar 86 Vni I. In **PFE** the flag is missing from the first quaver. In **PGE** the error was corrected.

Vle. In **PFE** (→**PGE**) the accent is erroneously placed on the last quaver instead of the crotchet. In **SS** the accents are omitted here in all the string parts.

bars 86 & 314 Tr. II. **PFE** (→**PGE**) have here the accents reversed, doubtless erroneously.

bars 86-88 Vni I. We give the version of **PFE** (→**PGE**). **S75** introduced the following version:

bars 87-88 Timp. **PFE** have a staccato sign instead of tremolo in bar 87, and the diminuendo is erroneously rendered as an accent in bar 88. In **PGE** only the tremolo in bar 87 was restored, the dynamic sign remaining unchanged. We correct both errors in line with the analogical bars 315-316.

bar 95 Vle. On the third quaver of the bar **PFE** (→**PGE**) erroneously have *e*. In **SS** it is changed to *b*. We give the *ff* of **ReFr^{orch}**.

p. 78 bars 98-99 Cor. I in mi. Missing in **PFE** is the tie sustaining the *g*². The omission is testified by the tie appearing in **ReFr^w** and also in the analogous bars 326-327. In **PGE** the tie was added.

bar 99 Timp. In **PFE** the flag is omitted from the fourth quaver. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
Tr. II. In **SS** the last quaver of the bar was shifted downwards an octave, doubtless by analogy with bar 327.

p. 79 bars 109-110 Vc. In **PFE** (→**PGE**) the slur only begins with the semiquaver *ff*. Cf. analogous bars 113-114.

bar 111 Timp. Between the second quaver and the quaver rest **PFE** have a semiquaver rest. This we delete, amending the rhythm in line with most of the basses (trombone, cello and double bass parts). In **PGE** the second note was shortened to the value of a semiquaver, as in the bassoon, horn, trumpet, violin and viola parts.

Vni II. **PFE** (→**PGE**) have *ff* on the first quaver of the bar, most probably one quaver too soon. Cf. the parts of the bassoons, violins I and violas.

Vni I. In **SS** the last note (*b*²) was shifted to a semiquaver earlier, with its rhythmic value changed to a quaver.

p. 80 bar 112 Vni I. On the first quaver we give the fourth *b*²*e*³, appearing in **PFE**. In **PGE** the note *e*³ is written out in small type as the ending to the cue of the flute part from the preceding bar. This version (*b*² only) was adopted in **SS**.

bars 114-115 Fl. II, Vni. **PFE** (→**PGE**) have in these parts accents on the first quaver of bar 115. Analysis of the accentuation of the other parts, which raises no doubts, testifies that the accents here are most probably placed erroneously one quaver too soon (Fl. II & Vni II) or too late (Vni I).
Fl., Fg. I, Cor. **PFE** is lacking the ties. In **PGE** the tie was added only in the part of the bassoon I.

bars 115-117 Vle. In **S66** (→**S75**) *d*^{#1} was added to the syncopated crotchet *a*¹. In **S80** this arbitrary change is also made in bars 116-117.

bars 116-117 Cl. I in la. In **PFE** (→**PGE**) the part of the clarinet II is repeated in these bars. This is most probably an error (see note to mvt. I, bars 89-91), as the following suggests:

- the sound at this point does not justify a switch to playing a 2;
 - there are awkward leaps of a fourth on the passage between bars 115-116 and 117-118;
 - on the fourth quaver of both these bars, nowhere in the whole orchestra part is there an instrument realizing the semiquaver repetition of the note *a*¹, written by Chopin in **FE** (→**GE,EE**).
- In **SS** the version of the first editions is reproduced, the sole alteration being the first quaver of bar 116 from *g*¹ to *b*¹.

bars 116-119 Tr. in mi. We give bar-long rests after **PFE** (→**PGE**). In **SS** the parts of the trumpets were supplemented as follows:



bars 118-119 Vc. In **PFE** (→**PGE**) the accent appears one quaver too late (at the beginning of bar 119). Cf. **FE** (→**GE,EE**) and the double bass part.

bar 119 Vni II. In **PFE** (→**PGE**) *ff* appears at the beginning of the bar, most probably one quaver too soon. Cf. the parts of the violins I, violas and cellos.

p. 81 bar 127 Fl. II. Missing from the first quaver in **PFE** is the *ff* raising *b*¹ to *b*^{#1}. In **PGE** the error was corrected.


p. 82 bar 139 Vc. As the first note we give *g*[#], in line with **PFE** & **ReFr^{orch}**. This note is changed arbitrarily to *g* in both the cello part of **PGE** (→**SS**) and **GE**.

p. 84 bars 161 & 166 Cb. In **PFE** *p* erroneously appears in bar 161 (5 bars of rest). We shift it to bar 166. An identical amendment was made in **PGE**.

p. 85 bar 184 Vni I. Missing before the second quaver in **PFE** is the *b* lowering *d*^{#2} to *d*². In **PGE** the sign was added.

bar 185 Vni II. Missing before the last quaver in **PFE** (→**PGE**) is the *b* lowering *b* to *bb*. **SS** have the correct version.

bars 199-200 & 443-444 The agogic markings in **PFE** suggest a return to tempo in bars 199 and 443, where we find *a tempo* in both violin parts and – only in bar 199 – in the part of the double basses (in bars 443-444 this indication is entirely absent from the remaining **PFE**). Although it does not appear in the parts of the violas and cellos until bar 200, this is the bar in which these instruments begin to play. By contrast, **FE** (→**GE,EE**) gives *a tempo* in bars 200 and 444. The doubts are not dispelled by **ReFr^{orch}**, where *a tempo* is written in bars 200 and 443. In **PGE** and **SS** the indications are unified, with *a tempo* given in bars 200 and 444.

p. 86 bar 206 Vc. We give the rhythm of **PFE**, in keeping with the rhythm of the analogous bar 450 and **ReFr^{orch}**. **PGE** have a quaver rest and quaver on the second beat. This version most probably results from the correction of the erroneous rhythm , which initially also appeared in **PFE**, where it was corrected during the final stage of proofreading.

bars 207-208 Vni II. In **PFE** (→**PGE**) the tie sustaining the *a*¹ is erroneously placed between the crotchets in bar 207. Cf. the horn part in these bars and viola part in bars 451-452.

bar 208 Vle. In **PFE** the quaver flag is omitted. In **PGE** the error was corrected.

bar 210 Ob. I & Vni II. Missing in **PFE** before the second quaver is the *b* lowering *g*^{#2} to *g*². In **PGE** the sign was added.

bars 210-211 Fl. & Cl. For each of the pairs of flutes and clarinets we give separate dynamic signs taken from **PFE** (above and below the staves respectively), since in this case they cannot be regarded as mutually complementary.

bar 213 Vni I. Below the fourth quaver **PFE** (→**PGE**) have a *staccato* dot. Comparison with bar 217, the second violin part and **ReFr^{orch}** in both bars proves that this sign was placed here by mistake.



p. 87 bars 221-222 Vni II. Missing in **PFE** (→**PGE**) is the tie sustaining the *d*^{#1}. Comparison with bars 225-226 and with the viola part in both places testifies the omission of the tie.

p. 88 bar 228 Vni II. The quaver flag is omitted in **PFE**; this was corrected in **PGE**.

bars 229-230 Fl. II. As the first quaver **PGE** have in these bars *d*^{#2} and *c*^{#2} respectively. This is probably an arbitrary alteration, made during printing.

Fl. In **PFE** (→**PGE**) the tie sustaining *e*^{#2} is missing from the first flute part (most probably the copyist preparing [**PF**] on the basis of [**S**] mistakenly wrote this tie in the second flute part, where there appears at this point an additional tie of unclear significance). The tie sustaining the *e*^{#2} does appear in **ReFr^w**.

bar 230 Cl. I in la. On the second quaver **PFE** (→**PGE**) erroneously have *a*^{#1} (sounding *f*^{#1}). **FE**, **ReFr^{orch}** & **ReFr^w** have *ff*¹. **SS** have the correct version.

- Fig. 1. On the second beat **PFE** most probably originally had d^1 , which in **PGE** was changed to $d\#^1$. The correct version with b , in line with **ReFr^w**, was introduced in **PFE** during final proofreading. Vle. In **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) $f\#$ was erroneously printed on the second quaver (under the cue of the bassoon part). Cb. In **PFE** b in the second half of the bar erroneously has the value of a quaver (the bar numbers only three quavers). In **PGE** the rhythm was corrected and a tie was added to b in bar 231.
- bar 231 Cb. As the last quaver **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) erroneously have a . **ReFr^{orch}** testifies that b is correct. **SS** have the correct version.
- p. 89 bars 254-255 & 258-259 Vle. Missing in **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) is the tie sustaining the $f\#^1$. Cf. **ReFr^{orch}** and the remaining string parts.
- p. 90 bar 256 Cb. The quaver tail is missing in **PFE**. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- bar 258 Vni II. In **PFE** before the second quaver the \flat lowering $c\#^1$ to c^1 is omitted. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- bar 263 Cl. I in la. On the third quaver of the bar **PFE** erroneously have b . In **PGE** it was corrected to c^1 .
- p. 91 bar 278 Vni II. In **PFE** this bar numbers three crotchets, since $a\#$ is written as a normal size crotchet. It is possible that the minim value of the $b\flat$ which opens the bar is erroneous (in **PGE** it was changed to a crotchet). It would seem more likely, however, that Chopin wrote here an enharmonic change in a manner which he used years later in the *Sonata in B minor*, Op. 58, mvt. III, bar 96.
- p. 92 bar 294 Vle. As the second quaver **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) erroneously have b . In **S75** it was changed arbitrarily to $b\#$. The correct a appears in **ReFr^{orch}**, cf. also analogous bar 66.
- bar 296 Fg. I. In **SS** the second crotchet (b) was replaced by two quavers $b-e$.
- bar 299 Cor. II in mi. Added at the beginning of the bar in **SS** is the quaver g^1 .
- bars 305 & 307 Vc. Instead of the $c\#$ crotchet, **S80** has the fifth $c\# - g\#$, repeated four times in semiquavers, analogically to bars 77 and 79.
- p. 93 bar 309 Cl. I. **PFE** have the following, most probably erroneous, rhythm: . Cf. analogous bars 61-63. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- bar 312 Trbn. In **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) the accent is placed one quaver too soon. Cf. bars 313 & 84-85.
- bars 313-315 Fl. We give the dynamic signs appearing in **PFE** for each flute separately (above and below the staff respectively), as they cannot be regarded here as mutually complementary.
- bars 314-315 Vc. In **PFE** these bars have the following, erroneous shape: . Cf. bars 86-87. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- p. 94 bar 327 Vni II. In **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) the flag is missing from the $g\#^1$ on the third quaver of the bar.
- bar 330 Tr. II in mi. In **PFE** the first two notes have the value of semiquavers instead of quavers. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- bar 331 Vni II. Missing from the first quaver of the bar in **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) is the note $c\#^2$. Cf. bar 329, as well as 101 & 103. **SS** have the correct version.
- p. 95 bars 332-333 Vle, Vc. In **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) p is placed in the bassoon's cue at the beginning of bar 332. We shift it to the entry of the strings in bar 333.
- bars 333 & 335 Vc. i Cb. The flag is missing from the fourth quaver of the bar in **PFE**: in bar 333 in the cello part, in bar 335 in the double bass part. In **PGE** the errors were corrected.
- bar 335 Fl. I. On the fourth quaver of the bar **ReFr^w** & **PFE** erroneously have a^3 . Cf. **FE** (\rightarrow **GE,EE**). **PGE** corrected the error.
- bars 335-336 Tr. I in mi. **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) erroneously have 5 times c^2 here. The error was corrected in **S80**.
- bar 336 Ob. II. In **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) the accent is placed one quaver too soon. Cf. the second flute part and analogous bar 112. Trbn. As the third quaver **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) erroneously have e . **SS** have the correct version.
- p. 96 bars 360-361 & 364-365 Fg. In **SS** ties were added and accents removed in bars 361 and 365.
- p. 97 bar 374 Vle. Missing before the second quaver in **PFE** is the \flat lowering $g\#^2$ to g^2 . In **PGE** the sign was added.
- p. 100 bar 412 Vle. **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) erroneously have f instead of $f\#$. Vc. In **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) p is missing after $f\#$.
- bar 413 Cl. I. In **PFE** 45 bars of rest are counted instead of 41. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- p. 101 bar 432 Vc. In **PFE** the quaver flag is missing from G at the beginning of the bar. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- p. 102 bars 454-455, 460 & 464 Fl., Cl., Cor. & Tr. In line with **PFE** we give differentiated dynamic markings for instruments notated in pairs on a single staff, since each version can be regarded as correct.
- bar 456 Tr. II. At the beginning of the bar **PFE** erroneously have a semiquaver instead of a quaver. **PGE** corrected the error.
- p. 103 bars 462-463 Cl. I in la. Missing in **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) is the tie sustaining the d^2 . Cf. bars 470-471, **ReFr^{orch}** & **ReFr^w**.
- p. 104 bar 478 Ob. II. **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) erroneously have g^1 instead of f^1 . **SS** have the correct version.
- bar 479 Cor. II. In **PFE** the second crotchet erroneously has the value of a quaver (the bar contains a total of three quavers only). In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- p. 105 bar 492 Vc. & Cb. In **PFE** the quaver flag is missing from the first note of the bar. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- bars 496-497 Timp. **SS** have here rests instead of the tremolo appearing in **PFE** (\rightarrow **PGE**) above the note e . This may result from an erroneous interpretation of **PGE**, in which, from bar 496, simultaneously to the entry of the tremolo, a two-bar cue of the piano part begins (in **PFE** also cued are bars 494-495). As the cue ought to precede the entry of the instrument, the corrector of **S66** may have regarded the minims e appearing under the cue as placed there erroneously instead of rests.
- p. 106 bar 504 Cb. In **PFE** the quaver flag is missing from the e at the beginning of the bar. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- p. 107 bar 519 Timp. In **PFE** the first note has the erroneous value of a quaver. In **PGE** the error was corrected.
- bars 519-520 Fg. II. In **SS** the last two notes are erroneously written an octave higher (in unison with the bassoon I).

PERFORMANCE COMMENTARY

Initial remarks

The present 'historical' score is intended by the editors for study purposes, and should not be used in normal concert practice; for the purposes of public performance a 'concert' score has been prepared – see *Editorial Conception of the Scores of Fryderyk Chopin's Concertos*. Therefore the present commentary concerns rather exceptional situations, in which the 'historical' score might be used – for whatever reason – as the basis for performance.

Notes on the musical text

Long accents signify an accent of a primarily expressive character, in which the accentuated part generally lasts slightly longer than in an ordinary accent (with shorter rhythmic values, sometimes covering two or three notes), and the drop in the intensity of the tone is smoother. General problems relating to the interpretation of Chopin's works will be discussed in a separate volume entitled *Introduction to the National Edition*, in the section headed 'Problems of Performance'.

Concerto in E minor, Op. 11

I. Allegro maestoso

p. 59 *bar 654* Pfte, Vc. Since some editions of the solo part of the *Concerto* give the octave *F-f* at the beginning of the bar, it should

be established which version the soloist intends to perform, with the appropriate alteration being made, if necessary, in the part of the cellos. We stress that the authentic version is that with *fb*, and consequently it is this version which should, if possible, be performed.

bar 658 Pfte, Vc. The existence of two authentic versions of the first chord of the solo part (see *Source Commentary*) requires that both possibilities (*e¹* or *eb¹*) be taken into account in the part of the cellos as well. The performance of one version or the other should on every occasion be agreed with the soloist.

III. Rondo. Vivace

p. 82 *bar 139* Pfte, Vc. Since the clear majority of editions of the solo part of the *Concerto* give *g* in the left hand at the beginning of the bar, it should be established which version the soloist intends to perform, with the appropriate alteration being made, if necessary, in the part of the cellos. We stress that the authentic version is that with *g#*, and consequently it is this version which should, if possible, be performed.

Jan Ekier
Paweł Kamiński