

# PERFORMANCE COMMENTARY

## PIANOFORTE

### Remarks on the musical text

Variants marked *ossia* were designated as such by Chopin himself or written by him into his pupils' scores; variants without this marking result from discrepancies between authentic sources or from the impossibility of an unambiguous reading of the text.

Minor authentic alternatives (single notes, ornaments, slurs, accents, pedal signs, etc.) which may be regarded as variants are enclosed in parentheses (). Editorial additions are placed in square brackets [].

Performers with no interest in source-related problems and who wish to rely on a single text without variants can be recommended the text given on the main staves, taking account of all the markings placed in parentheses and square brackets.

Chopin's original fingering is marked in slightly larger digits in Roman type **1 2 3 4 5**, as distinct from the editors' fingering, written in smaller digits in italics *1 2 3 4 5*. Where the digits of authentic fingering are given in parentheses, this means that they do not appear in the basic sources but were added by Chopin in his pupils' scores. Indications concerning the division between the right and left hands, marked with a broken line, come from the editors.

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 'Issues related to performance'.

Abbreviations: RH – right hand, LH – left hand.

### Trio in G minor, Op. 8

#### I. Allegro con fuoco

p. 11 Bars 4 & 8 Proposed execution of arpeggios (bar 8 analogously):



The second proposition, which sounds more decisive on modern pianos, is modelled on a solution used by Chopin in movt. III, bar 23.


Bars 10-14 & analog. RH The larger leaps at the end of some figures can be facilitated by playing the lowest notes with the left hand.



p. 13 Bars 51-52 The sign  $\text{—}$  repeated seven times unquestionably denotes here a long accent, but it is not entirely clear which notes should be stressed: only the first semiquavers in each grouping, only the second, or perhaps both. In an earlier redaction of this passage, Chopin wrote it in the following way:




In the editors' opinion, combining the two notations provides the most accurate idea of how Chopin imagined the performance of this passage.


### III. Adagio. Sostenuto

Combinations of the rhythm  and quaver triplets, appearing several times in the *Adagio* (bars 5, 39, 45, 50-52 & 55), should always be

played in a ternary division:  = . An analogous execution

also obtains where a semiquaver appears after rests (bars 44 & 49), as well as in more complicated rhythmic combinations, which are discussed in the comments to particular bars (32, 33 & 71). Since motifs containing  rhythms with a triplet accompaniment intertwine over the course of the *Adagio* with similar motifs in which these rhythms appear by themselves (see e.g. RH in bar 6 with the part of the violins in bar 14), the latter may also be played in a ternary division (bars 1, 6, 21, 22, 34, 40, 63, 67, 69 & 79-81).

Bars 6, 21, 34, 72 & 73 The arpeggios may be played either in both hands simultaneously or else successively, from the lowest note of the LH to the highest of the RH




Bar 12 RH Execution of the beginning of the bar:



Bar 32 Modern rhythmic notation of the 3<sup>rd</sup> beat:



Bars 33 & 71 RH  = 

Bar 51 RH Execution of the 3<sup>rd</sup> beat: 

### IV. Finale. Allegretto

Bars 181 & 182 RH In the editors' opinion, there are three possible combinations of the notes  $a^7$  or  $ab^7$  in these bars (see *Source Commentary*):

- $a^7$  in both bars;
- $ab^7$  in both bars;
- $ab^7$  in bar 181 and  $a^7$  in bar 182.

Bars 215-234 LH Original version of the figuration with more precise authentic performance markings:





These markings cannot be mechanically transferred to the final version, as the changes made in that version are too extensive. However, they may give us an idea of how Chopin shaped the phrasing of this type of figuration marked *marcato* (cf. *Concerto in E minor*, Op. 11, movt. I, bars 291-298).

Jan Ekier  
Paweł Kamiński

# SOURCE COMMENTARY /ABRIDGED/

## Initial remarks

The present commentary sets out in abridged form the principles behind the editing of the musical text and discusses the more important discrepancies between authentic sources; in addition, it signals the most frequent departures from the authentic text encountered in collected editions of Chopin's works prepared since his death. A precise characterisation of all the sources, their relations to one another, the justification of the choice of basic sources, 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*.

Abbreviations: vn. – violin, vc. – cello, RH – right hand, LH – left hand, pf. – piano-forte. The sign → indicates a relationship between sources, and should be read as 'and the source(s) based thereon'.

## Trio in G minor, Op. 8

### Title

In the first editions the work bears the title *Premier Trio* (the only extant manuscript is not titled). It is difficult today to state whether its designation as the 'first' *Trio* reflected Chopin's plans for writing another composition in this genre or was merely a promotional device on the part of the publisher. Since no traces of any further trios have come down to us, at the NE we employ the generic name *Trio* alone to identify this work.

### Forces

Chopin wavered over using violin or viola as the higher pitched string instrument:

- violin is written in the autograph of the first redaction (1828-1829);
- a letter to his friend (1830, see quotations *about the Trio...* before the musical text) testifies a clear change of conception;
- publishers' correspondence (1832, see next quotation) points to the optional treatment of violin and viola;
- the first editions (1833) again give only violin.

The arguments which Chopin employs in the above-mentioned letter attest his considerable sensitivity to how the instruments sound together in the texture employed in the *Trio*. One may suspect, therefore, that the later gradual departure from the idea of using viola resulted rather from the suggestions of publishers than from the composer's inner conviction. For this reason we give both authentic conceptions of the forces of the *Trio*.

### Sources

**AI** Autograph of first redaction (Muzeum Fryderyka Chopina, Warsaw), with signature and date (1829) at the end. This manuscript does not have a uniform character:


- the whole of the first *Allegro* has a 'working' character, with patchy performance markings, a short notation of repeated fragments and even the composer's comments that are not part of the notation of the music (see note to movt. I, bar 213);
- the *Scherzo* is written with a different pen and fainter ink, and its beginning is also distinguished by the most meticulous, almost calligraphic, writing, with a large number of performance markings; in the rest of this movement and throughout the next, the notation becomes less careful, although still with a great many details; over the course of movt. IV, there appear fragments distinctly less polished.



Due to the large number of errors and inaccuracies in the first editions, **AI** is very important for establishing the text of the *Trio*.

The existence of the lost manuscripts characterised below can be deduced from a comparison of the extant autograph and the first French edition, which was based on a manuscript source, but not on **AI**. The number, kind and features of these manuscripts are hypothetical; that said, the editors consider the proposition presented here to be the most plausible.

**[A]** Lost autograph *Stichvorlage* of the piano part. In relation to **AI** Chopin above all carefully elaborated the notation of movt. I (examples of alterations: bars 1-2, addition of bottom notes of LH octaves; bars 17-27, change to notation of bass notes from minims to quavers and addition of pedalling; bars 239-240, addition of piano part); in the other three movements the range of alterations is smaller. The focus was mainly on supplementing and clarifying performance markings. In spite of the numerous changes and improvements, **[A]** also contained errors (e.g. numerous accidentals omitted), which we subsequently find in the first French edition, based on this manuscript.

**[M<sup>v</sup>]**, **[M<sup>c</sup>]** — lost manuscript copies of the violin and cello parts, made from **AI** (Chopin 'tried out the *Allegro* with accompaniment' before completing **AI** – see quotations *about the Trio...* before the musical text) and subsequently supplemented and corrected by Chopin. As with **[A]**, the more important textual alterations concern

movt. I (e.g. vn. bars 2 & 136, removal of motif  on

1<sup>st</sup> beat; vc. bars 215-236, change of texture from  to , yet in movt. I and in the remaining move-

ments Chopin primarily elaborated and supplemented performance markings. He appears to have looked through the movements at times merely checking their correlation with the score. This *modus operandi* in preparing these parts for print accounts both for certain errors in the first editions (vn. movt. III, bar 76; vc. movt. I, bar 67) and also for the quite numerous situations in which the inconsistent performance markings of both parts hinder – in extreme cases considerably – a vivid rendering of the character of the music.

**FE** First French edition, M. Schlesinger (M.S. 1344), Paris, beginning of 1833, most probably based on **[A]**, **[M<sup>v</sup>]** & **[M<sup>c</sup>]**. The edition as a whole was proofread at least twice by Chopin, who on one hand introduced a number of significance changes (e.g. movt. I, bars 139-140, and movt. IV, bars 215-234), but on the other left numerous uncorrected errors and inaccuracies.

**FEFr** Copy of **FE** left by Auguste Franchomme (Paris, private collection\*), including numerous additions in his hand supplementing or correcting performance markings. A friend of Chopin's, Franchomme performed the *Trio* with the composer on more than one occasion, and so these revisions may be treated as accepted by Chopin.

**GE** First German edition, F. Kistner (999), Leipzig, March-April 1833. **GE** is based on a proof of **FE**, prior to Chopin's final corrections. It contains numerous additions and revisions, certainly inauthentic. There are copies differing in details on the cover (including the price).

**EE1** First English edition, Wessel & C<sup>o</sup> (W & C<sup>o</sup> N<sup>o</sup> 924), London, July 1833. **EE1** is based on **FE** and contains a number of inauthentic additions and alterations. Fingering was added to the string instrument parts (by C. Rudolphus) and violin cues to the piano part.

**EE2** Later impression of **EE1** (same firm and number, 1856-1860), in which some errors were corrected and further arbitrary changes (some probably on the basis of **GE**) and additions were made, e.g. the addition of fingering in the piano part.

**EE** = **EE1** & **EE2**.

### Editorial principles

As the basic source we adopt **FE**, since it is based directly on manuscripts of the final version and was proofread twice by Chopin. We correct and supplement numerous obvious errors, inaccuracies and missing elements on the basis of **AI**. In the further part of this commentary we discuss different versions of **AI** only when an error or significant inaccuracy of notation may be suspected in the text of **FE**. We take account of the revisions of **FEFr**.

\* The NE offers its sincere thanks to Ms Sophie Ruhlmann for indicating the current location of **FEFr** and to Mrs Elisabeth Pénicaud, wife of the late Laurent Pénicaud, great-grandson of August Franchomme, for making this important source available.

Additionally, in editing the performance markings, we adopt the following principles:

- if the markings of **FE** do not indicate a desire to alter the conception in relation to **AI**, we adopt the latter as binding;
  - if the annotations of **FEFr** correct clear errors or missing elements in the markings of **FE**, we introduce them tacitly into the text;
  - the principle of the parallelism of agogic markings in the various parts; as this is obvious, for practical reasons, we apply it without exception, adding or shifting the relevant markings;
  - the principle of the limited parallelism of dynamic markings – we modify them only in the most obvious situations.
- Particular difficulty is encountered – especially in the densely printed string parts – with differentiating between hairpins  $\rhd$  and accents (short or long). We endeavour to reproduce the composer's intentions, taking account of his habits in this area, as documented in sources of other compositions.

A separate issue in the *Trio* is that of slurring. In none of the extant sources was this elaborated with satisfactory care; there are numerous lacunae, inaccuracies and inconsistencies. What is more, in the string parts this slurring takes little account of the specificities of the notation of these instruments, bowing in particular.


In this situation, we adopt the following solution:

- in the score of the *Trio* we give the original slurring, edited according to the principles described above; in this way, the piano part is rendered in the same way as Chopin's other works;
- in the separate parts of the string instruments we replace the slurring of the sources with bowing elaborated by the editors (see *Performance Commentary*).

## I. Allegro con fuoco

- p. 11 **Bar 1** The metre  $\Phi$  adopted by us appears in **AI**. In **FE** different markings are given in different parts:  $\Phi$  in the violin;  $\mathbb{C}$  in the piano and cello. Arbitrary changes of  $\Phi$  to  $\mathbb{C}$  occurred in **FE** very frequently (see e.g. commentary to *Etude in C*, Op. 10 No. 1). **GE** has everywhere  $\mathbb{C}$ ; **EE** has  $\Phi$ .  
The tempo  $\text{♩}=152$  appears in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **EE**); it was most probably added during the final proofreading, as it is absent from **GE**. It is possible, however, that Chopin gave  $\text{♩}=132$ , which would accord with the indication written in **AI** ( $\text{♩}=66$ ) and seems better suited to the character of this movement.

**Bars 5-6** pf. **AI** has the following version, altered by Chopin prob-



**Bar 10** pf. In some of the later collected editions the penultimate note is arbitrarily changed from  $d$  to  $g$ .

- p. 13 **Bars 33 & 167** RH On the 3<sup>rd</sup> beat some of the later collected editions interchanged arbitrarily the 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> semiquavers.

- p. 14 **Bar 38** vn. At the beginning of the bar some of the later collected editions have a chord  $ab\text{-}eb\text{-}c^2$ , with no source-based grounds.

**Bars 39-40** vn. In some of the later collected editions the last quaver in bar 39 and the first in bar 40 are arbitrarily changed from  $a^1$  to  $a$ .

**Bars 39-41** RH On the 5<sup>th</sup> quaver of bar 39 **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) has  $eb^1$ . As this is most probably a mistake – cf. bars 40-41 – we give the  $g^1$  written in **AI**. In **GE** an erroneous version appears also in bars 40 (with  $eb^2$ ) and 41, in which the corresponding note is absent entirely.

- p. 15 **Bar 53** vn. The combination of the markings **f** and *espress.* that appears in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) raises doubts, since Chopin used *espress.* either by itself or else combined with **p**. For this reason, we give **f** in parentheses.

- p. 17 **Bar 67** vc. The rhythm of the 1<sup>st</sup> half of the bar was written correctly in none of the sources. In **AI**, as a result of manifold corrections, Chopin was forced to write the final version of the string parts in this bar and the next (beginning with the 2<sup>nd</sup> note of bar 67) on an extra stave:



In this notation – in spite of the discrepancy in the values of the 1<sup>st</sup> note – the rhythmic synchronisation of the two parts is beyond doubt (see also corresponding place in the reprise, bar 211). Chopin's error most probably confused the scribe of **[M<sup>c</sup>]**, such that **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) has in the 1<sup>st</sup> half of the bar the following



**Bar 73** vn. **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) does not have the tie sustaining the minim  $bb^1$ . In **AI**, however, this note is held, and so, taking account of the analogous motifs in bars 71-74 (in all 3 instruments), we regard the lack of the tie as a mistake.

Vc. In some of the later collected edition the 2<sup>nd</sup> quaver in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the bar was arbitrarily changed from  $g$  to  $d$ .

- p. 18 **Bar 78** (2<sup>v</sup>) LH Some of the later collected editions omitted the lower note of the octave,  $E_1$ .

**Bar 81** LH As the penultimate note **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) erroneously has  $d$ . We give the  $Bb$  that appears in **AI**.

**Bars 83-84** RH The trill is notated in the sources by means of 2 signs  $\text{tr}$ , one above each of the notes  $c^2$ . This is one of the several ways of writing a continuous trill which Chopin employed in alternation (see commentary to *Waltz in Db*, Op. 64 No. 1, bars 59-62). Another is the notation which we adopt here as more commonly used today.


- p. 20 **Bars 102-103** vn. & vc. We give the performance markings on the basis of **FEFr**. In **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) *dolce* appears only in the cello part in bar 102; also there, we find  $\rhd$  instead of  $\rhd$ . **AI** has no markings here.

- p. 21 **Bars 107-131** LH **AI** has none of the motifs  $\text{♩} \text{♩} \text{♩}$ , only tied semibreves. Chopin added these motifs probably when proofreading **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**).  
LH Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed the moments of striking the bass octaves by adding ties in some places and removing them in others.

**Bar 110** RH Some of the later collected editions introduced the  $b$  lowering  $d^1$  to  $db^1$  already before the 3<sup>rd</sup> semiquaver.

**Bar 116** RH Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily raised the last semiquaver to  $g^1$ .

- p. 24 **Bars 139-140** pf. **AI** ( $\rightarrow$ **[A]**) repeats here the original version of bars 5-6 (see note to those bars). We give the version introduced by Chopin when proofreading **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**). One may wonder if this revision constitutes only a part of the changes intended by Chopin in this place (see below).  
Vc. Given the way in which Chopin altered the configuration of the voices in the reprise (bars 142-150) in relation to the exposition (bar 8-16), it seems likely that he wished to introduce a similar type of variety here, too. The above-described changes to the piano part strengthen the bass line at the expense of the alto voice set against it (see piano part in bars 5-6):



It is possible, therefore, that Chopin intended this motif to be given to the cello, but that this did not come about due to some oversight. However, we do not give this version in the text as the hypothesis is not confirmed by sources.

**Bar 144** RH As the penultimate note **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) has *g*, probably by mistake; cf. analogous bar 10. We give the *d* that appears in **AI**.

p. 26 **Bars 163, 165 & 167** vc. The dynamic markings in bars 163 & 167 come from **FEFr**; the other sources have no signs. The *f* in bar 163 raises certain doubts, since the maintaining of such a dynamic up to bar 167 is at odds with the markings of the violin part (*p* in bar 165). For this reason, we give this *f* in parentheses, with the suggestion of *p* in bar 165 so as to preserve concordance with the violin part.

**Bar 172** RH Before the 9<sup>th</sup> semiquaver the sources have no accidental, and so this and the 12<sup>th</sup> note should be read as *f*<sup>#1</sup>. However, the lack of *b* here is certainly due to oversight on Chopin's part; such is indicated by both harmonic considerations (the modulation begun in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of bar 170 leads to the key of D minor, as is attested by the note *f*<sup>1</sup> in bar 170 and the chords in bars 174 & 176) and melodic factors (the progression *g*<sup>#1</sup>-*a*<sup>1</sup>, *f*<sup>#1</sup>-*g*<sup>1</sup>, *e*<sup>1</sup>-*f*<sup>1</sup>, formed by the outermost semiquavers of the groupings, counting from the last note of bar 171). This type of omission of an accidental restoring a note to that of the prevailing key is the most common of the errors made by Chopin.

p. 27 **Bar 173** vc. The main text comes from **AI**, the variant from **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**). The possibility of error in **FE** is indicated by the fact that from the middle of bar 151 to bar 177 the cello helps the piano to execute the bass line, and the place under discussion would be the only departure from that principle.

**Bar 177** RH As the penultimate semiquaver the sources have the third *bb*<sup>1</sup>-*d*<sup>2</sup>. Visible in **AI** are corrections concerning the last 2 notes: it is likely that they were originally *d*<sup>2</sup>-*f*<sup>2</sup> and *bb*<sup>2</sup>. However, neither the original nor the corrected version takes account of the relationship with the cello part, which on the last quaver has *B*. In 3 other places in bars 177-179 Chopin removed in **AI** those members of the thirds he originally wrote which gave false-sounding semitones with the violin part: *f*<sup>2</sup> on the 7<sup>th</sup> semiquaver of bar 177, *g*<sup>2</sup> on the 7<sup>th</sup> semiquaver of bar 178 and *f*<sup>2</sup> on the 7<sup>th</sup> semiquaver of bar 179. A similar clash with the cello part clearly escaped his attention; therefore, after the fashion of the corrections described here, we remove in this place the bottom note of the third, *bb*<sup>1</sup>.

**Bar 179** RH As the 7<sup>th</sup> semiquaver **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) has the third *d*<sup>2</sup>-*f*<sup>2</sup>. This version was also written into **AI**, but there Chopin subsequently deleted the *f*<sup>2</sup>, avoiding the awkward clash with the violin's *f*<sup>#1</sup>. It was certainly wrong not to take account of this change in the editions. See above, note to bar 177.

**Bar 181** vn. At the beginning of the bar **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**), most probably erroneously, has *f*<sup>1</sup> instead of the *d*<sup>1</sup> notated by Chopin in **AI**. The likelihood of error here is increased by the fact that the 2<sup>nd</sup> note of the bar was printed in **FE** a third too high (*c*<sup>2</sup> instead of *a*<sup>1</sup>), which was corrected, being clearly out of keeping with the harmony. Cf. note to movt. IV, bar 51.

Vn. On the 6<sup>th</sup> semiquaver we give *d*<sup>2</sup>, which appears in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**). **AI** has here *f*<sup>2</sup>, probably part of the original version of the melody, gradually altered by Chopin. The corrections visible in the manuscript allow us to reconstruct this process:

original version of **AI** 

corrected version of **AI** 

final version of **[A]** 

Cf. corresponding figure in bar 182.

p. 28 **Bar 191** RH On the 2<sup>nd</sup> quaver of the bar some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed both *e*<sup>1</sup> into *f*<sup>1</sup>.

**Bar 192** vn. & vc. The instructions *riten.* & *ritard.* come from **FEFr**. Cf. analogous bar 60.

p. 29 **Bar 200** RH In **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) the two-note chord on the 3<sup>rd</sup> beat is *a*<sup>2</sup>-*d*<sup>3</sup>. The error may also have appeared in **[A]**, since in **AI** the undoubtedly intended note *g*<sup>2</sup> merges with the ledger line, placed too low.

**Bar 204** LH As the 2<sup>nd</sup> crotchet we give the seventh *f*-*eb*<sup>1</sup> appearing in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**). Some later collected editions have an extra *c*<sup>1</sup> here. The notation of **AI** is unclear in this regard.

Vc. As the 3<sup>rd</sup> crotchet **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) erroneously has *c*.

LH In **GE** & **EE2** the bottom note of the last chord is erroneously *f*.

p. 30 **Bar 208** LH We give the chord at the beginning of the bar as written in **AI**. In **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) the top note is – most probably erroneously – *db*<sup>1</sup>.

**Bar 209** vn. & vc. Some of the later collected editions shortened arbitrarily the authentic minims to crotchets. They also substituted the chord *g*-*e*<sup>1</sup>-*bb*<sup>1</sup> for the original *bb*<sup>1</sup> in the violin part.

**Bar 210** vc. In **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **EE1**) this rest bar was mistakenly omitted. In **GE**, **EE2** & **FEFr** the error was corrected.

**Bar 212** vc. In the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the bar **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) has  $\text{—}$ . The violin part, however, has  $\text{—}$ . The effect used by Chopin here of contrasting the pair of string instruments with the piano entering in the following bar (cf. next comment) speaks in favour of the dynamic parallelism of the two parts, and so we consider it more likely that the direction of the sign in the cello part was mistakenly altered (errors of this kind are encountered several times in the first editions of Chopin's works, cf. e.g. commentary to *Variations in Bb*, Op. 12, bar 94). Placed above the entry of the cello in bar 211 in **AI** – and also applying to the violin – is the instruction *cresc.* with its scope marked as extending to the end of bar 212. Cf. analogous bar 68.

**Bar 213** pf. The instruction *risoluto* does not appear until the following bar. We move it to this earlier place in line with Chopin's remark written in **AI** in bars 211-212: 'nothing for the piano until here *f* [in bar 213]'.

p. 32 **Bars 225-226 & 237** vc. The additions described in the *Performance Commentary*, enabling a more natural and better sounding fingering to be used, were introduced already in **GE**.

**Bar 226** vc. We give the version of **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **EE**), probably proof-read by Chopin. **GE** has here a clearly erroneous text, most probably a combination of mistakes and the reviser's ill-judged at-

tempts at correcting them:  Later collected

editions give further, arbitrary, versions.

p. 33 **Bar 238** vc. **AI** & **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) give for this bar the instruction *pizz.* (and *arco* in bar 239). We omit them, since *pizz.* was deleted in **FEFr**. In this context the *pizzicato* of the cello is almost entirely submerged in the sound of the piano, and so the need to make this change certainly arose while performing the *Trio*.

**Bars 239-240** vc. As the 2<sup>nd</sup> minim of bar 239 **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **EE**) erroneously has the third *G*-*Bb*, and at the beginning of bar 240, the fifth *G*-*d*. In **GE** not only was the error repeated, but these two-note chords were furnished with fingering. The error in bar 240 was corrected in **FEFr**.

**Bar 243** LH In **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) the last semiquaver is erroneously *g* (cf. RH part and analogous figure in bar 245).

**Bars 245-246** vc. Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed the 2 last crotchets to the chords *d-c<sup>1</sup>* & *G-d-bb*.

## II. Scherzo. Vivace

In **AI** bars 60-79 are marked in short as a repeat (*dal segno*) of bars 5-24; similarly, bars 120-135 are marked as a repeat of bars 80-95. A short notation of this sort was also most probably used in **[A]**.

p. 34 **Beginning** We give **Vivace**  $\text{♩}=69$ , introduced by Chopin when proofreading **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **EE1**) in place of the earlier **Con moto ma non troppo**, retained in **GE** and transferred to **EE2**. **AI** does not have a verbal indication, only a metronome marking,  $\text{♩}=63$ . Vn. & vc. The signs **f** in both parts come from **FEFr**, in which Franchomme used them to replace the **p** in vn. and accent in vc. that appeared in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**).

**Bars 1-3** pf. The sources do not have articulation markings for the LH. In the analogous bars 25-27, however, signs are given, and so we also add them at the beginning of this movement.

**Bars 16 & 71** RH On the last quaver **AI** has an additional note *b*. Chopin removed it when proofreading **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**).

**Bars 17 & 21 and 72 & 76** vn. & vc. At the beginning of the bars **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) does not have the signs **tr**. Taking into account the dialogue character of bars 17-22 & analog., we consider it more likely that the signs were omitted by mistake (e.g. in **[M<sup>v</sup>]** & **[M<sup>c</sup>]**; bars 60-79 were most probably not written out in these sources – see note at the beginning of the commentary for this movement – which considerably increases the chances of such an oversight). We give the **tr** written by Chopin in **AI**.

p. 35 **Bars 21-22 & 76-77** RH In **AI** the notes *a<sup>1</sup>* are tied over between bars. In the version of **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) given by us, the repetition of the note refers to the preceding two-bar unit, and so it seems much more likely that the tie was purposely omitted in **[A]** by Chopin than that it was overlooked by the engraver.

**Bars 24 (2 volta) & 26** vn. The **f** in bar 24 and *dim.* in bar 26 come from **FEFr**.

**Bars 28-30** pf. In **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **EE1**) all 3 pairs of chords are marked with wedges (in bars 28-29 in the RH, in bar 30 in the LH), and these are the only articulation markings in this place. The signs for the LH in bar 30 were certainly supposed to appear in bar 29, and that is where we move them, furnishing bar 30 with the slurs written by Chopin in **AI** (cf. articulation of string parts, raising no doubts with regard to sources or sound). A less clear-cut situation occurs in bar 28, not precisely marked by Chopin in any of the sources: **AI** has only the ending of the slurs in the piano part (the string parts do not have markings), whilst **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **EE1**) has only the wedges given by us in parentheses (and the slur of the violin). **GE** & **EE2** reproduce the markings of **FE**, adding in bars 28-29 wedges in the LH too.

**Bar 38** vn. We give the accent on the last note, which appears only in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**), in parentheses, since the place in which it appears raises doubts of a musical nature:

— the end of the melodic motif on the weakest beat (cf. analogous motif in the cello part a bar earlier);  
— the tonic resolving the preceding dominant seventh.

p. 36 **Bar 44** RH In **AI** the note *a<sup>#1</sup>* on the 2<sup>nd</sup> beat is extended to the value of a minim, as in the following bar. Visible in **FE** in this place are traces of corrections made during print, and so Chopin probably asked for the additional minim to be removed.

p. 37 **Bar 79 (2<sup>a</sup> volta)** RH At the beginning of the bar **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) has only *g<sup>1</sup>*. This is certainly an error: in **AI** this bar is identical to bar 24 (see note at the beginning of the commentary to this movement).

p. 38 **Bar 82** RH In the 1<sup>st</sup> chord **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) does not have the *b*. This is most probably a mistake:  
— this note appears in **AI**;  
— Chopin did not intend any differences between bars 120-135 and bars 80-95 – see note at the beginning of the commentary to this movement – and in bar 122, corresponding to bar 82, *b* appears also in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**).

**Bars 85-86 & 125-126** LH The tie sustaining *g* appears only in **AI** (see note at the beginning of the commentary to this movement). It is difficult to state if it was mistakenly omitted in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) or if Chopin ultimately decided to repeat this note.

**Bars 93 & 133** vn. Missing in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) is the  $\text{tr}$  on the 5<sup>th</sup> quaver, which is certainly an error; the sign appears in **AI**. Cf. cello part, proceeding in unison.

**Bars 95-111** vn. We supplement the dynamic hairpins and *staccato* wedges in accordance with to the unison cello part.

**Bar 99** vn./va. On the 2<sup>nd</sup> beat **AI** has the chord *g-c<sup>#1</sup>-bb<sup>1</sup>*, impossible to play on the violin, and so in the violin part we give the version of **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) with *e<sup>1</sup>* as the inner note, most probably introduced by Chopin. In the viola part, meanwhile, we retain the original form of the chord, more logical in terms of the motion of the voice.

**Bars 99-100** vc. The slur appears in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**), the wedges in **AI**.

Vn. Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed all 3 chords to *bb-g<sup>1</sup>-c<sup>#2</sup>*, *bb-g<sup>1</sup>-d<sup>2</sup>*, *g<sup>1</sup>-bb<sup>1</sup>-e<sup>2</sup>*.

p. 39 **Bar 112** vn. **pp** comes from **FEFr**.

**Bars 112 & 114** RH On the 5<sup>th</sup> quaver of bar 112 **AI** has an additional *d<sup>#1</sup>*; similarly in bar 114 it has *d<sup>#2</sup>*. Chopin removed both notes when proofreading **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE1**).

**Bar 116** RH We give the chord as notated in **AI**. In **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) it contains a 6<sup>th</sup> note, *f<sup>3</sup>*, which is probably an error:

— a built alike five-note chord appears in works by Chopin several times as an independent structure (*Grand Duo Concertant*, Dbop. 16, bars 116-118, *Etude in A minor*, Op. 25 No. 11, bar 88, *Polonaise in Ab*, Op. 53, bar 32, *Polonaise in A*, Op. 40 No. 1, bars 9-11, 13-14 & analog.); a six-note chord can be found only within a chord progression in the *Polonaise in A*, Op. 40 No. 1, bar 12.

— in the above-mentioned *Polonaise in A* in **FE** an error was made involving the addition of an unnecessary 6<sup>th</sup> note, a second below the top note of the chord (see commentary to bar 93 of the second version of this *Polonaise*).

## III. Adagio. Sostenuto


p. 40 **Bar 1** We give the metronome tempo given by Chopin during the final proofreading of **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **EE**). **GE** does not have this marking, while **AI** has  $\text{♩}=56$ , subsequently altered to 54.

**Bars 1-3 & analog.** pf., vc. vn. The characteristic motif with which each of the 3 instruments begins this movement was notated by Chopin in several different rhythmic versions. As a result of arbitrary changes in some later collected editions, this differentiation was more or less eliminated.

**Bar 2** RH **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **EE1**) has *c<sup>1</sup>* (with  $\text{♩}$ ) in the chord. This glaring error was corrected in **GE** & **EE2**; the correct *cb<sup>1</sup>* can also be found in **AI**.

LH In **GE** the notes placed on the lower staff were preceded by an arpeggio wavy line, which is certainly an arbitrary addition,

resulting from a misunderstanding of Chopin's notation. In **EE2** all 6 notes of the chord were arpeggiated.

Pf. We give the sign  in bar 2 in accordance with **AI**. In **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) it was placed – most probably by mistake – at the beginning of bar 3.

Vc. In **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE1**) the marking *p* is placed at the beginning of the bar. We give the notation of **AI**, adding *f* in brackets for clarity (cf. dynamic markings of pf. & vn.).


**Bar 4** vc. We give the *bb* that appears in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**); in **AI** the corresponding note is *ab*. In this case, it seems more likely that Chopin deliberately altered this note:

— in relation to the version of **AI**, also changed in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) were dynamic markings concerning the note *a* preceding this place (**AI** has  $\langle \rangle$  instead of  $\langle \rangle$ ;

— the version with *bb* gives a better melodic connection with the piano's semiquaver figure in the further part of bar 4 which brings in the theme.


LH On the 2<sup>nd</sup> beat some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed the fifth *bb-f*<sup>1</sup> into the third *bb-d*<sup>1</sup>.

**Bar 11** RH At the beginning of the bar **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) has *f*<sup>1</sup> in the lower voice, which means that the *a*<sup>1</sup> from the preceding bar does not obtain a natural resolution. We give the *ab*<sup>1</sup> that appears in **AI**.

**Bar 12** LH On the 3<sup>rd</sup> beat **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) has the rhythm . This is certainly a mistake; cf. rhythm of the cello part and lower voice of the RH. The error probably originated in **AI**, where a dot appears by *Ab*, even though the subsequent *Bb* is a quaver.

p. 41 **Bar 18** RH As the last note **AI** has *ab*<sup>1</sup>. One might wonder whether the *c*<sup>2</sup> that appears in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) is not just one of the many errors in this source involving the shifting of a note by a third. However, Chopin's deliberate introduction of *c*<sup>2</sup> (already in **[A]**) is suggested by the polyphonic quality of this version: in this bar the top notes of each of the triplets forms the progression *ab*<sup>1</sup>-*bb*<sup>1</sup>-*c*<sup>2</sup>, juxtaposed with the bass line – cf. violin part in the analogous bar 38.

**Bar 23** vc. The main text comes from **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**), the variant from **AI**. Both versions belong to the repertoire of typical phrases of recitative melody, and so it is difficult to conclude whether Chopin changed the conception of this place in writing **[A]** or whether we are dealing with another error of **FE**. In favour of a deliberate change to the melody is the fact that Chopin made a similar change in the analogous phrase of the violin part in bar 27: visible in **AI** at the end of the bar are traces of the removal of the note *g*<sup>1</sup>, replaced by *bb*<sup>1</sup>.

**Bar 26** vc. **FE** has an erroneous text: . In

**GE** & **EE** the rhythmic values were supplemented, with the 2<sup>nd</sup> rest changed to a crotchet one. We give the secure version of **AI**. Some of the later collected editions introduced various arbitrary changes or supplements to this bar.

RH As the 2<sup>nd</sup> note **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE1**) erroneously has *eb*<sup>1</sup>. We give the *g*<sup>1</sup> written in **AI** (the relevant change was also made in **EE2**). Some of the later collected editions changed the mistaken note to *e*<sup>1</sup>.


p. 42 **Bar 43** vc. The last 3 accents (given in brackets) appear only in **AI**.

p. 43 **Bar 54** LH As the 2<sup>nd</sup> note **AI** ( $\rightarrow$ **[A]**) has *eb*<sup>1</sup>, changed by Chopin during the proofreading of **FE** to *d*<sup>1</sup> (in **GE**  $\flat$  was even added before this *d*<sup>1</sup>). In this harmonic context, it is obvious, however, that the correction was not precise, and the intended note is *db*<sup>1</sup>. In **EE** the correction of **FE** was neglected, with *eb*<sup>1</sup> retained.

**Bar 62** RH As the 1<sup>st</sup> note **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) has *bb*<sup>2</sup>. Comparison with the analogous figures at the beginning of bar 60 & 61 suggests an error (most probably by the engraver), and so we give the *d*<sup>3</sup> written by Chopin in **AI**.




p. 44 **Bar 66** vc. **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) does not have a dynamic sign here. In **AI** both the violin and the cello have *p*. We give the *pp* that appears in **FE** in the violin part, since the context undoubtedly requires here the unifying of the markings.

**Bars 67-68** RH At the beginning of both bars **AI** has the following


version: . The traces in **FE** of cor-


rections made in print prove that Chopin introduced his first changes (in bar 68) already in **[A]**, and then, when proofreading **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**), gave both bars their final form, given by us.

**Bar 76** vn. The notation of the rhythm in this bar raises doubts. Visible in **AI** are corrections: the original, erroneous entry


 was changed by Chopin to , and then to .

The second of these versions, although formally correct, is certainly an error, due to the awkward combination with the cello part; this doubtless explains why it was subsequently altered by Chopin. However, this change was not given in **[M<sup>v</sup>]** ( $\rightarrow$ **FE** $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**), most probably because Chopin introduced it in **AI** only after having prepared **[M<sup>v</sup>]** and forgot about it when preparing the latter manuscript for print.

Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily introduced the rhythm  here.

**Bar 77** vc. Here too (cf. note to bar 76) the notation of **AI** originally contained a rhythmic error: . The smoother

rhythm of **FE** – our main text – could have been deliberately introduced by Chopin in connection with the approaching conclusion of this movement. However, the semiquavers that appear in this version, being an element of the original, erroneous, notation, may indicate a misreading of the rhythm. For this reason, as the variant we give the text of **AI** after its correction by Chopin.

Some of the later collected editions introduced here the arbitrary rhythm .

## IV. Finale. Allegretto

p. 45 **Bar 1** We give the metronome tempo added by Chopin during the final amendment of **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **EE**). **GE** does not have this marking, while **AI** has  $\text{♩} = 96$ .

**Bar 21** LH As the bottom note of the chord we give the *c*<sup>#1</sup> introduced by Chopin when proofreading **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) in place of the *e*<sup>1</sup> written in **AI** ( $\rightarrow$ **[A]**).

p. 46 **Bars 26-27** LH We give the tie sustaining *A* in accordance with **AI**. **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) has here a phrase mark for the lower voice running from *D*. This is almost certainly a misreading of the tie written also in **[A]**.

**Bars 43-44, 47 & 50** pf. & vn. We give the dynamic markings revised in **FEFr**, in which *p* was added in bars 43-44 and *cresc.* in bar 50 and *f* was deleted in the piano part at the beginning of bar 47.

- Bars 44 & 46 RH** In **AI** the two notes  $c^3$  in bar 44 are tied together, as are the notes  $f^3$  in bar 46. The version of **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE**, **EE**) given by us, being clearly more natural to play, is most probably the result of a change of conception by Chopin.
- p. 47 **Bar 47 RH** Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed the 4<sup>th</sup> semiquaver from  $g^2$  to  $bb^2$ .
- Bar 51 RH** As the 2<sup>nd</sup> note **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE**,**EE**) has  $f^2$ . This is most probably an uncorrected engraver's error (in **FE** the next 2 semiquavers were also initially printed a third lower, though this glaring absurdity was corrected). We give the undoubtedly correct version of **AI**; cf. bar 49.
- Bar 56 vc.** As the 1<sup>st</sup> note **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE**,**EE**) erroneously has  $A$ . We give the  $Bb$ , concordant with the piano part, written in **AI**.  
**LH** In the last chord **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE**,**EE**) has an additional  $d$ . One may doubt if this note was not placed there by mistake; therefore, we give the unquestionably authentic text of **AI**.
- p. 48 **Bars 70 & 72 vc.** Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily transferred the grace-notes from bar 70 to bar 72.
- Bar 74 vc.** Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily substituted a dotted crotchet with a quaver for the authentic rhythm of this bar.
- Bars 78 & 80 vn.** In **AI** the double grace note appears in bar 78, and not bar 80. Chopin moved the embellishment when proofreading **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE**,**EE**).
- p. 49 **Bars 85-91** We give the dynamic markings on the basis of the changes made in **FEFr**, in which  $f$  was added in the string parts in bar 85 and  $p$  in the piano part in bars 86 & 88 and  $p$  was removed in the cello part at the beginning of bars 86 & 91. In **AI** the only signs of a dynamic character in this section are accents above the  $A$  in the **LH** in bars 86 & 88 and  $p$  in the cello part on the 2<sup>nd</sup> beat of bars 85 & 87 and at the beginning of bar 91.
- Bar 93 vn. & vc.** The  $f$  before the  $p$  in the cello part and  $p$  in the violin part were added in **FEFr**.
- p. 50 **Bars 123-124, 126 & 130 RH & vn.** We give the *staccato* signs on the second quavers of the bars in accordance with **AI**; their absence from **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE**,**EE**; in **GE** the sign was added in bar 126) is most probably accidental. In bars 123-124, in which, on account of the *poco ritenuto*, a change would be feasible, we give the markings in parentheses.
- p. 51 **Bar 125 RH** As the 6<sup>th</sup> semiquaver **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE**,**EE**1) has  $a^1$ , most probably erroneously. We give the  $c^2$  that appears in **AI** (& **EE**2).
- Bars 140-143 LH** We give the ties sustaining the third  $a$ - $c^1$  in bars 140-141 & 141-142 according to **AI**. In spite of the minor discrepancies in the **RH**, the differentiation of these bars in relation to the analogous bars 24-26 does not seem appropriate, and so the lack of the ties in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE**,**EE**) is most probably due to oversight. For similar reasons, we give the ties in bars 142-143 that are absent from the sources.
- p. 52 **Bar 148 RH** As the 7<sup>th</sup> semiquaver **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE**,**EE**) has  $a^1$ . We give the  $\sharp f^1$  written in **AI** (cf. analogous bar 32).
- Bar 150 RH** As the 5<sup>th</sup> semiquaver **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE**,**EE**1) has  $a$ . We give the  $bb$  written in **AI** (a corresponding change was also made in **EE**2). Cf. analogous bar 34.
- Bars 152 & 155 vc.** In accordance with **FEFr** we remove the signs  $p$  on the 2<sup>nd</sup> beat of these bars that appear in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE**,**EE**).
- Bar 153 RH** As the 4<sup>th</sup> semiquaver **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **EE**) erroneously has  $f^1$ - $a^1$ . We give  $d^1$ - $a^1$ , in accordance with **AI** (cf. analogous bar 37). In **GE** the error was corrected.
- Bars 158-159 LH AI** has octaves neither in bar 158 nor at the beginning of bar 159. When proofreading **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE**,**EE**) Chopin added octaves on the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> quavers of bar 158. In this situation, it seems wrong that a single note was left in bar 159 (cf. analogous bars 155 & 160-165).
- Bars 162, 166 & 174 vn.** The signs  $\text{tr}$  appear only in **AI**.
- Bars 163-164 vn.** Missing in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE**,**EE**) is the tie sustaining  $f^1$ . We give the version of **AI** (cf. analogous bars 159-160). The tie was added in **FEFr**.
- p. 53 **Bar 167 vn. & vc.** We give the  $p$  added in **FEFr**. In the cello part it replaced the  $p$  on the 4<sup>th</sup> quaver of the previous bar.
- Bar 172 RH** In **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE**,**EE**) the last note is  $f^1$ . We give the  $ab^1$  written in **AI**. In some of the later collected editions  $f^1$  was left here, and the preceding note was arbitrarily altered from  $bb^1$  to  $ab^1$ .
- Bar 173 RH** In **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE**,**EE**1) the last note is  $g^1$ . We give the  $bb^1$  written in **AI** (& **EE**2). Cf. analogous bar 171.
- Bar 180 RH** The main text (3<sup>rd</sup> semiquaver  $e^1$ ) comes from **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE**, **EE**), the variant ( $f^1$ ) from **AI**. We give both versions, since although  $e^1$  may be regarded as the effect of a correction made by Chopin in [**A**], it may also be interpreted as an engraver's error, involving, for example, the insertion here of the note from the following bar, which looks similar in this fragment. Musically speaking, the two versions seem of equal weight.
- Bars 180-183** The instruction *dim.* in pf. & vc. in bars 180-181 was added to **FEFr**, as was  $f$  in the string parts in bar 183.
- Bars 181 & 182 RH** Missing in the sources are the accidentals before the last note of bar 181 and the 4<sup>th</sup> note of bar 182. Considering that over the course of over a dozen bars (170-185) all the keys, even those used only in passing, contain  $ab$ , for harmonic reasons it should be seen as likely that Chopin mistakenly omitted the  $b$ . On the other hand, in a melodic context of this kind, it is perfectly natural to use a raised lower second, and so  $a^1$ . Of the 4 theoretically possible combinations of the notes  $a^1$  and  $ab^1$  only one –  $a^1$  in bar 181 and  $ab^1$  in bar 182 – seems less natural musically and at the same time less likely in respect to the sources (hearing  $a^1$  in bar 181, it is rather unlikely that Chopin would have considered  $ab^1$  4 semiquavers later as obvious). We regard the other three, described in the *Performance Commentary*, as equal.
- p. 54 **Bar 187 RH** Arbitrarily added in **GE** & **EE**2 before the top note on the 7<sup>th</sup> semiquaver is a  $\sharp$  raising  $f^2$  to  $\sharp f^2$ .
- Bar 188 vn.** The  $p$  comes from **FEFr**.
- Bars 188-189 vn.** Some of the later collected editions omitted the  $c\sharp^1$  &  $d^1$  of the lower voice.
- Bar 193 RH** In some of the later collected editions, the 2<sup>nd</sup> semiquaver was arbitrarily altered from  $f^1$  to  $db^1$ .  
**RH** Before the 3<sup>rd</sup> semiquaver the sources have no accidental, and the  $b$  lowering  $a^1$  to  $ab^1$  appears before the 6<sup>th</sup> note. However, the harmonic context here speaks clearly in favour of  $ab^1$ , since this bar is only a melodic variant of bar 191, with the chord progression unaltered. Chopin made a similar type of error, involving an accidental placed too late, several times; see for example the commentary to the *Mazurka in A minor*, Dbop. 42B, bars 56 & 61, and the *Concerto in F minor*, Op. 21, movt. I, bar 100.



- p. 55 *Bar 209* RH On the last semiquaver **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE1**) has only  $d^2$ . This is most probably due to oversight, and so we give the version of **AI**, which accords with the neighbouring figures.
- Bars 211-214* LH in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE1**) the octaves  $G_1$ - $G$  are not tied, which is certainly an error.
- Bars 215-234* pf. When proofreading **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) Chopin made significant changes to the original version of this fragment preserved in **AI** ( $\rightarrow$ [**A**]), concerning both the contour of the LH figuration in bars 219 & 222-226 and also the arrangement and rhythm of the RH chords in bars 215-220, 222-227 & 231-234. We give this altered version, undoubtedly the final one in respect to pitch and rhythm. At the same time, we leave unaltered its incomplete slurring, since comparison with the version of **AI**, more precisely marked in this respect, gives no grounds for unambiguously stipulating the way in which the text should be amended. Consequently, we leave this task to the pianist, quoting the slurring of the original version as a guide (see *Performance Commentary*).
- Bar 217* LH Before the 4<sup>th</sup> semiquaver **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) erroneously has  $\flat$ .
- Bars 218, 226 & 234* vn. & vc. Some of the later collected editions added double grace-notes, after the fashion of bars 60-80, although in the latter the melody of the theme is played by a single instrument.
- p. 56 *Bar 236* LH At the beginning of the bar in the lower voice (and extended to the value of a minim) **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) erroneously has  $f$  instead of  $d$ , which Chopin wrote into **AI** and which we give.
- Bars 244 & 250* vc. In the main text we give the articulation of **AI**, corresponding to the articulation of the violin in these places. The version given in the footnote comes from **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**).
- p. 57 *Bar 245* RH As the 2<sup>nd</sup> semiquaver **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE1**) has  $bb^1$ . The error is attested both by the contour of the figuration (cf. bars 239-243, and especially 246-247) and also by the  $\flat$ , unnecessary before the  $bb^1$ . We give  $db^2$ , written in **AI**. In **EE2** the first two semiquavers were changed to  $bb^1$ - $db^2$ .
- p. 58 *Bar 266* RH As the 6<sup>th</sup> semiquaver **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) erroneously has  $c^3$ .
- Bar 267* LH The lower note of the octave,  $Eb_1$ , appears only in **AI** (notated as  $\delta$ ). We regard its absence from **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) as an oversight.
- Bars 267-268* LH The tie sustaining  $Eb$  appears only in **AI**. Its lack in **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) is probably an error, yet the striking of the bass note here cannot be precluded entirely.
- Bar 277* RH As the 2<sup>nd</sup> semiquaver **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE1**) erroneously has  $d^4$ .
- Bar 278* vn. *appassionato* appears only in **AI**.
- Bar 279* LH In some of the later collected editions, the 5<sup>th</sup> semiquaver was arbitrarily altered from the  $C$  that appears in all the sources to  $Eb$ .
- Bar 281* vn. **AI** has an additional  $g^2$  in the chord; we give the version of **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**), in which the connection with the preceding bar is melodically smoother ( $\sharp^1$ - $bb^1$  instead of the ninth  $\sharp^1$ - $g^2$ ). Vc. In some later collected editions, the sixth  $d$ - $bb$  was arbitrarily added to the authentic  $G$  at the beginning of the bar.
- p. 59 *Bar 284* LH On the 4<sup>th</sup> quaver we give the third  $a$ - $c^1$ , in accordance with **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) & **AI**, in which the 3<sup>rd</sup> note  $d^1$  originally written was ultimately deleted (Chopin probably wished to avoid the clash with the violin's  $e^1$ ). Some of the later collected editions give here the triad  $a$ - $c^1$ - $d^1$ , as in the other similar places.
- Bar 286* LH On the 2<sup>nd</sup> quaver **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) has the third  $a$ - $c^1$ . We regard this as an error and so give the triad  $a$ - $c^1$ - $d^1$  written in **AI**.
- Bars 290-295* vc. We give the slurs and ties written by Chopin in **AI** (adding the tie sustaining  $G$  in bar 292, doubtless omitted by mistake). In **FE** ( $\rightarrow$ **GE,EE**) each successive two-note chord is linked to the next with a slur and tie, which is most probably due to a misunderstanding of the notation of **AI** on the part of the copyist or engraver.

Jan Ekier  
Paweł Kamiński