2003

Textual integrity and foreground deceptions : Chopin's Prelude in A-Flat, 28/17

Paul Martin Ellison
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Ellison, Paul Martin, "Textual integrity and foreground deceptions : Chopin's Prelude in A-Flat, 28/17" (2003). *Master's Theses*. 2526.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.6ccu-333e>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/2526

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript and are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was scanned as received.

Apx pgs 9-16 & 39-42

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI[®]

TEXTUAL INTEGRITY AND FOREGROUND DECEPTIONS:

CHOPIN'S PRELUDE IN A-FLAT, 28/17

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Music

San José State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

By

Paul Martin Ellison

August 2003

UMI Number: 1418755

Copyright 2003 by
Ellison, Paul Martin

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 1418755

Copyright 2004 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2003

Paul Martin Ellison

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT
OF MUSIC

William Meredith

Dr. William Meredith

William B. George

Dr. William George

John Rothgeb

Dr. John Rothgeb, Binghamton University

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

Joseph J. Paul

ABSTRACT

TEXTUAL INTEGRITY AND FOREGROUND DECEPTIONS:

CHOPIN'S PRELUDE IN A-FLAT, 28/17

by Paul Martin Ellison

This thesis examines two aspects of Chopin's Opus 28, No. 17. Part One outlines the connection between Chopin and Schenker and traces the background to the traditional prelude genre, contrasting it with Chopin's own concept. Chopin's *Reinschrift*, Fontana's two copies, and all first editions are compared, resulting in a new critical text that takes account of all these sources—something yet to be achieved by any current edition.

Part Two comprises an analysis based on this edition, considering formal aspects of the work in accordance with Schenkerian theoretical premises. Tonal relationships between the sections of this five-part rondo reveal supposedly distant foreground modulations at middleground levels to be composings-out of a structural neighbor note and dividing dominant, both cunningly disguised through enharmonic foreground deceptions. Motivic aspects are considered and issues of orthography and thematic transformation discussed. Foreground harmonic syntax is outlined, illustrating how the deceptions are achieved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I should like to thank Church of the Advent of Christ the King, San Francisco, for granting me paid sabbatical leave for four months in the winter of 1999, which enabled me to work on the musicological portion of this thesis. Additionally, a word of thanks must go to my colleagues at St. Matthew's Episcopal Day School, San Mateo, and Congregation Beth Am, Los Altos Hills, for their understanding as I seemed "otherwise engaged" during the completion of this work. Richard Adamson and Ellison Yufenyuy were generous in their assistance with translating some of the original sources in French and German.

Special thanks are due to Dr. Jeffrey Kallberg for sharing much information on the dating and means of dispersal of Chopin manuscripts and for being a tireless mine of information whenever I needed support. My indebtedness to Dr. Kallberg's personal research should also be acknowledged. I should like to recognize the late Dr. Steven Gilbert of California State University, Fresno, who, before his untimely death had shared his thoughts with me concerning the Schenkerian view of this prelude. Following Dr. Gilbert's death, I also received invaluable assistance from Dr. John Rothgeb of Binghamton University, who reviewed and corrected the graphs and read the finished work. I should like to acknowledge the teaching of Professor Christopher Wintle, of King's College, London University, who first explained to me the teachings and philosophy of Heinrich Schenker many years ago during my postgraduate studies at Goldsmiths' College, London.

At San José State University, my supervisors, Dr. William Meredith and Dr. William George, have both been tireless sources of great inspiration. Dr. Meredith's suggestions and assistance were invaluable as I completed the musicological requirements of assembling and reviewing the many primary sources necessary for establishing a critical text. Thanks to Dr. George's teaching, my interest in Schenkerian analysis was rekindled after a gap of some sixteen years. I am also grateful to him for sharing his knowledge and insight as I completed work on the analytical portion of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	v
Chapter One Chopin and Schenker: Counterpoint and Canon	1
Chapter Two A Context for the Preludes	5
A: Background to Opus 28	5
B: Contemporaneous Reception of Prelude in A-flat	10
C Chopin's Praxes of Hermeneutics and Improvisation	13
Chapter Three Textual Criticism and the Sources	19
A: The Significance of Primary Sources in Schenkerian Theory	19
B: The "Chopin Problem"	21
C: A Historiography of Opus 28	23
Chapter Four An Examination of Primary Source Material	38
A: Issues of Taxonomy in Chopin's Manuscripts	38
B: Primary Sources Consulted for this Study	39
C: Chopin's Compositional Methodology	42
D: Fontana's First Copy, ca. 1837	44
E: The Autograph Manuscript (<i>Reinschrift</i>), 1839	47
F: Fontana's Second Copy, 1839	50
G: A Fragment of the Prelude in Chopin's Hand	51
Chapter Five A Detailed Examination of the Variant Readings	54

Chapter Six	A Schenkerian Analysis	69
A:	The Theoretical Etiology	69
B:	Views of Other Writers on Opus 28, No. 17	70
C:	The <i>Ursatz</i> Archetype	74
D:	The First Level of Middleground	75
E:	The Second Level of Middleground	77
F:	The Third Level of Middleground	78
G:	The Foreground Level	79
H:	Motive	86
I:	Thematic Transformation	87
J:	Foreground Tonal Operations	89
Chapter Seven	Chopin and Schenker: Connections that Bind	92
Bibliography		95
Volume II:	Appendices	
Appendix One:	A List of Erasures in the <i>Reinschrift</i>	1
Appendix Two:	A Table of Variants between the Primary Sources	4
Appendix Three:	An Edited Text of Opus 28, No. 17	45
Appendix Four:	A Graphic Analysis of Prelude in A-flat	51

CHAPTER ONE

CHOPIN AND SCHENKER: COUNTERPOINT AND CANON

Writing of Fryderyk Chopin in characteristically authoritarian style, the Austrian theorist and editor Heinrich Schenker declared:

The skill of his voice-leading ranks him among the greatest masters of music, the sheer expansiveness of his unfolding progressions¹ derives from a compositional power beyond compare—yet who has there ever been who was capable of following them!²

That Chopin occupied a special place in Schenker's esteem has long been acknowledged. Indeed it should come as no surprise, since Schenker himself was in direct musical lineage with Chopin in the person of his teacher Karol Mikuli (1819–1897), with whom he studied at the Gymnasium in Lemberg.³ Mikuli was both a pupil of Chopin in Paris from 1844–1848, and his assistant, and was held in high regard by his teacher. Chopin and Schenker also shared similar philosophical views on the importance and significance of strict counterpoint in the pedagogy of composition, as can be seen by a brief review of their backgrounds and writings. Chopin entered the High School of Music in Warsaw in 1826,⁴ taking a three-year course with Józef Elsner (1769–1854), who was professor of counterpoint and composition and rector there, and with whom he had likely already taken private lessons. Chopin's classes included species counterpoint, figured bass, and

¹ The original term is *Auswicklungszüge*.

² Heinrich Schenker, *The Masterwork in Music: A Yearbook Volume I*, ed. William Drabkin, trans. Ian Bent, William Drabkin, Richard Kramer, John Rothgeb and Hedi Siegal (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 81.

³ Mikuli edited an edition of the Preludes in 1879, which was published by Kistner in Leipzig and is remarkably (although not completely) error-free.

his main concentration, composition.⁵ Józef Chominski has pointed out that the texts used in these classes included: *Die Kunst des reinen Satzes in der Musik* by Johann Philipp Kirnberger, *Gründliche Anweisung zur Composition* by Johann Georg Albrechtsberger, and *Anweisung zum Generalbaß* by Karol Antoni Simon. This placed a significant part of Chopin's formal training as a composer firmly within the Austro-German tradition.⁶ Indeed, the Albrechtsberger treatise, which was clearly in the tradition of Fux's *Gradus ad Parnassum*,⁷ comprised a detailed course in counterpoint, beginning with species counterpoint and concluding with fugue and double counterpoint. Albrechtsberger's approach was tempered, however, by the Kirnberger text, which employed the Bachian model of the four-part chorale texture as a foundation for free counterpoint. That these didactic influences remained potent throughout Chopin's career can be clearly observed in a conversation he had with the painter Eugène Delacroix about six months before his death:

I asked him what establishes logic in music. He made me feel what counterpoint and harmony are; how the fugue is like pure logic in music, and that to know the fugue deeply is to be acquainted with the element of all reason and all consistency in music. [Art] is reason itself, adorned by genius, but following a necessary course and encompassed by higher laws ... "Each of the parts has its own movement which, while still according with the others, keeps on its own song and follows it perfectly; there is your counterpoint, '*punto contrapunto*.'" He told me

⁴ Also known as the Warsaw Conservatory.

⁵ Chopin described in a letter to his school friend, Jan Białobłocki, dated November 2, 1826 that he studied counterpoint with Elsner for six hours a week.

⁶ Józef Chomiński, *Fryderyk Chopin*, trans. Bolko Scheinitz (Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1980), 42. The full titles of the texts used are: Johann Philipp Kirnberger, (1721–1783), *Die Kunst des reinen Satzes in der Musik, aus sicheren Grundsätzen hergeleitet und mit deutlichen Beyspielen erläutert* (2 vols.: i, Berlin and Königsberg: n.p., 1771; ii, 1776–9); Johann Georg Albrechtsberger (1736–1809), *Gründliche Anweisung zur Composition ... mit einem Anhang von der Beschaffenheit und Anwendung aller ... musikalischen Instrumente* (Leipzig: n.p., 1790).

⁷ Johann Joseph Fux (1660–1741), *Gradus ad Parnassum* (Vienna: n.p., 1725), perhaps the most influential composition treatise of the eighteenth century, was used as a teaching tool by Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven amongst others.

that the custom was to learn the harmonies before coming to counterpoint, that is to say, the succession of the notes which leads to the harmonies.⁸

Chopin's views thus bear a marked similarity to those of Schenker, both musically and philosophically. Schenker frequently emphasized in many of his writings the importance of the study and understanding of strict counterpoint in a composer's art. In the first volume of his *Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien: Harmonielehre*, he stated:

No matter whether the style of a composition is strict or free, the parts remain duty-bound to move along as if their meaning as scale-steps [*Stufen*] counted at first for nothing.⁹

Not only was Chopin schooled in the musical canons of the Austro-German tradition, but he also achieved historical respectability through his acceptance into the fold of the most influential German music publisher, Breitkopf & Härtel in Leipzig. As Jim Samson has observed:

Chopin's acceptance in the canon of great composers owed much to the publication of the Breitkopf & Härtel collected edition in 1878–80 ... the Breitkopf edition represented a major landmark in Chopin reception ... The formation of a musical canon and the development of the associated category "classical music" with all its atemporal resonance, was largely a product of the nineteenth century ... But it can also be traced through music criticism, and through publishing history.¹⁰

In the second half of the nineteenth century, Breitkopf & Härtel published a series of collected editions of the works of J. S. Bach (1851), Handel (1858), Beethoven (1862), Mendelssohn (1874), Mozart (1877), Schumann (1880), and Schubert (1884), a roll call

⁸ Eugène Delacroix (1798–1863), *The Journal of Eugène Delacroix*, trans. Walter Pach (New York: Crown, 1948), 194–5, quoted in John Rink, "The Evolution of Chopin's 'Structural Style' and its Relation to Improvisation" (Ph.D. diss., Cambridge University, 1989), 1: 5. Delacroix was a distinguished painter who was a friend of both Chopin and his partner, George Sand.

⁹ Heinrich Schenker, *Harmony*, ed. Oswald Jonas, trans. Elisabeth Mann Borgese (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1954), 154–5.

¹⁰ Jim Samson, "Chopin Reception: Theory, History, Analysis," in *Chopin Studies 2*, ed. John Rink and Jim Samson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 5–6.

that, on reflection, makes remarkably similar reading to Schenker's canon of Austro-German master-composers contained in the introduction to *Der freie Satz*.¹¹

Samson continued:

The Breitkopf editions were part and parcel of a development famously described as the invention of tradition ... the inclusion of Chopin in the Breitkopf canon was tantamount to a form of adoption. Like Palestrina, also embraced by Breitkopf, he became a sort of honorary member of the German tradition.¹²

In addition to the publication of his complete works, he also became the subject of biographies by Hugo Leichtentritt, Adolf Weismann and Bernard Scharlitt.¹³ More surprisingly, Leichtentritt undertook a huge analytical study of Chopin's music, something that was certainly a rarity at that time.¹⁴ Samson has also pointed out that the works that are excluded from this study are precisely those that might reflect Chopin's image as a composer for the salon—hardly a fitting legacy for the highbrow canons of Austro-German musical culture!¹⁵ Schenker himself had strong views on this subject, “But if indeed he wrote for a salon of any sort, it was for a salon frequented exclusively by geniuses.”¹⁶ Perhaps Schenker should be allowed the final word here, for his admiration of Chopin knew no bounds: “For the profundity with which Nature has endowed him, Chopin belongs more to Germany than to Poland.”¹⁷ From his iconoclastic viewpoint, he could pay his teacher's teacher no higher compliment!

¹¹ Schenker, *Free Composition*, xxii.

¹² Samson, *Chopin Studies* 2, 6.

¹³ Hugo Leichtentritt, *Frédéric Chopin* (Berlin: Harmonie, 1905); Adolf Weissmann, *Chopin* (Berlin: n.p., 1912); Bernard Scharlitt, *Chopin* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1919).

¹⁴ Hugo Leichtentritt, *Analyse der Chopin'schen Klavierwerke*, 2 vols. (Berlin: Max Hesses Verlag, 1921 and 1922). Leichtentritt's analysis of Opus 28, No. 17 is considered on 70-71.

¹⁵ Samson, *Chopin Studies* 2, 6.

¹⁶ Schenker, *Masterwork in Music*, 1: 81.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 1: 81.

CHAPTER TWO

A CONTEXT FOR THE PRELUDES

A: Background to Opus 28

The Preludes were composed at a time when Chopin was deeply immersed in the music of J. S. Bach (1685-1750). Bach, in fact, remained a lasting influence throughout his life. Many of his pupils have documented that *Das wohltemperiertes Clavier* formed the basis of much of his piano pedagogy and his personal preparation for recitals and concerts. He went so far as to acknowledge this influence himself:

New themes assail me like a swarm of bees. They will become my Preludes. I do not know yet whether I'll be able to write forty-eight like Bach. I probably won't be able to reach that number, it will be too much for my Polish patience. But even if they are short and small it does not mean that they have not cost me much effort to write.¹⁸

Apparently, *Das wohltemperiertes Clavier* was the only score Chopin took with him during his stay in Palma where the preludes were completed, a circumstance that can certainly not have been considered a mere coincidence. Moreover, at that time he was actually engaged in preparing a French edition of "The 48," as is clear in his letter to his copyist and boyhood friend, the pianist and composer Julian Fontana (1810-1865).¹⁹ The letter dates from August 1839, while he was awaiting the arrival of a piano from Paris:

Having nothing to do, I am correcting the Paris edition of Bach; not only the engraver's mistakes, but also the mistakes hallowed by those who are supposed to understand Bach.²⁰

¹⁸ Quoted in Ruth Jordan, *Nocturne: A Life of Chopin* (London: Constable, 1978).

¹⁹ A fellow student of Chopin at the Warsaw Lyceum and the Conservatory, Fontana was Chopin's copyist from 1832 to 1841. At the request of Chopin's family following the composer's death in 1849, he prepared an edition of the unpublished music.

²⁰ Henryk Opieński, ed., *Chopin's Letters*, trans. E. L. Voynich (New York: Dover, 1988), 205.

As Jean-Jacques Eigeldinger has noted,²¹ Chopin's reverence for Bach also comes down to us through the pen of his longtime partner, author George Sand, who wrote in *Consuelo*: "he [Bach] is a genius who embraces, sums up and gives life to all the knowledge [*science*] of the past and present."²²

It seems clear that other composers also influenced the composition of Opus 28. In 1829 August Alexander Klengel performed his collection of *48 Canons et Fugues dans tous les tons majeurs et mineurs* for Chopin, while he was visiting Prague, and presented the young composer with a copy of the work.²³ Clearly inspired by Bach, this collection may well have served later as another influence for Chopin to compose a set of pieces in all the keys himself. Writing of this concert to his boyhood friend, Tytus Woyciechowski (1808-1879), Chopin remarked:

Of all the artists whose acquaintance I have made, Klengel pleased me most. He played me his fugues (one may say they are a continuation of those of Bach. There are forty-eight of them, and the same number of canons). What a difference between him and Czerny!²⁴

It is also likely that Chopin was familiar with several other extended collections that were circulating at that time, including those of Muzio Clementi,²⁵ Johann Nepomuk

²¹ Jean-Jacques Eigeldinger, "Placing Chopin: Reflections on a Compositional Aesthetic," in *Chopin Studies* 2, 119.

²² George Sand, *Consuelo*, ed. Léon Cellier and Léon Guichard, 2 vols. (Paris: Garnier, 1959), 2: 242. Sand, also known as Aurore Dudevant (1804–1876), novelist and author, was Chopin's lover.

²³ August Stephan Alexander Klengel (1783–1852), German pianist, organist and composer, whose company Chopin was known to enjoy.

²⁴ Quoted in Frederick Niecks, *Frederick Chopin as a Man and Musician*, 2 vols. (London: Novello, Ewer & Co., 1890, repr. 1973), 1: 108.

²⁵ Muzio Clementi, *Préludes, Exercises, National Airs and Variations, with Other Pleasing and Instructive Pieces* (n.p., 1811, rev. ca. 1821). Mikuli stated that Chopin made his pupils study this volume (which he valued highly), beginning with the chromatic keys and ending with C major.

Hummel,²⁶ Johann Baptist Cramer,²⁷ Maria Szymanowska,²⁸ Frédéric Kalkbrenner,²⁹ and Ignaz Moscheles.³⁰ The majority of these *oeuvres* were mere tools of piano pedagogy—functioning, for the most part, as keyboard exercises designed to improve the technique. Few attained the status of the programmatic or so-called *Characterstück* study seen in the work of Franz Liszt and Valentin Alkan. Only one—Hummel’s—follows a cyclic pattern of fifth-relationships, whereby a major key is followed by its relative minor, a pattern that is then repeated ascending through the sharp keys and descending through the flat ones. This was the scheme ultimately adopted by Chopin in Opus 28.

Chopin was, therefore, thoroughly familiar with the models of the prelude as (1) a piece played or improvised before a more important work and (2) as a foretaste of something to come later. He would himself often improvise a prelude in this manner before a concert that included one or more of his composed preludes later in the program. Jeffrey Kallberg quotes a review by Léon Escudier from 1841, describing just such a concert:

One may say that Chopin is the creator of a school of piano and a school of composition. In truth, nothing equals the lightness, the sweetness with which the composer preludes on the piano; moreover nothing may be compared to his works, full of originality, distinction and grace.³¹

²⁶ Johann Nepomuk Hummel, *Vorspiele vor Anfänge eines Stükes [sic] aus allen dur und mol Tonarten*, Opus 67 (Vienna: n.p., ca. 1814-15).

²⁷ Johann Baptist Cramer, *Twenty-six Preludes or Short Introductions in the Principal Major and Minor Keys* (London: n.p., 1818).

²⁸ Maria Szymanowska, *Vingt exercices et préludes* (Leipzig: n.p., 1819). Szymanowska, who lived from 1789 to 1831, was a virtuoso pianist who performed throughout Europe. While in Russia she met John Field (1782-1837) and was responsible for introducing his music into Poland. She is seen as forming the link between Field and Chopin.

²⁹ Frédéric Kalkbrenner, *Vingt-quatre préludes dans tous les tons majeurs & mineurs*, Opus 88 (Paris: n.p., 1827).

³⁰ Ignaz Moscheles, *Fünfzig Präludien*, Opus 73 (n.p., 1827).

³¹ Léon Escudier, in *La France musicale*, May 2 1841, 155, quoted in Jeffrey Kallberg in *Chopin at the Boundaries: Sex, History and Musical Genre* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996), 150.

In this traditional of preluding, extending back to the time of Bach, including C.P.E. Bach, Mozart, and Beethoven as well as Chopin himself, Schenker saw the origins for the archetype he would eventually come to describe as the *Ursatz*. He defined what he imagined “modulating or preluding” to comprise:

... modulating and preludizing are the free exercise of composing ... [they] should show all the characteristics of a free composition, viz., a freely invented motif, free and variegated rhythm, as well as the harmonic tools offered by the diatonic system, the principle of combination, chromatic change and alteration, and finally, free step progression, with its inherent peculiar psychology.³²

Rather than being merely a background harmonic progression that forms the skeleton on which a work is composed or improvised, the *Ursatz* constitutes a fundamental harmonic plan or archetype according to contrapuntal principles, which is composed out (*Auskomponierung*) via a series of middleground levels to the foreground of a musical composition. To quote again from *Der freie Satz*:

The ability in which all creativity begins—the ability to compose extempore, to improvise fantasias and preludes—lies only in a feeling for the background, middleground, and foreground.³³

Opus 28 shares with *Das wohltemperiertes Clavier* the traversing of all the major and minor keys. However, Chopin preferred Hummel’s key scheme, using the key sequence C major—A minor—G major—E minor through to the central nexus of F-sharp major—E-flat minor (where the sharp and flat aspects of the circle of fifths meet in enharmonic juxtaposition), and concluding with F major—D minor. One advantage of this format is that they can be played as a complete cycle, each prelude tonally preparing the one that ensues. A closer examination reveals them to be grouped with a great deal of

³² Schenker, *Harmony*, 336.

³³ Schenker, *Free Composition*, 6.

care and attention to such features as tempi, dynamic levels, and tension and release to the extent that they can be successfully played either as a complete set or in smaller sub-groups. It was not Chopin's own practice to perform the work in its entirety, however, but rather as individual works or in small groups with other preludes, as Jeffrey Kallberg has noted.³⁴ Chopin's practice reveals clearly the deep sense of worth with which he treated even the smallest of these works. The genre of the prelude here is transformed from a piece played before a more important work, or even a series of didactic works to a composition of intrinsic and independent value. Opus 28 is a collection of miniature tone poems, in which every mood is represented, and the whole gamut of emotions run. Jim Samson has cogently observed: "They demand to be regarded as works of substance and weight, not composed-out improvisations."³⁵ As such they are certainly unique in the repertoire, and were extremely influential on composers such as Claude Debussy and Aleksandr Skryabin. Samson noted: "After these pieces the term 'prelude' gained widespread currency for short character pieces."³⁶ It is beyond the scope of this thesis to enter into a detailed examination of the arguments for and against Opus 28 being a unified cycle, apart from entertaining the briefest comments and conclusions. Samson seems to present us with an oxymoron when he stated:

It is not entirely clear why he [Chopin] described Opus 28 as "preludes." Preluding was an integral part of the improviser's craft and several composers, notably Hummel and Kalkbrenner, had already offered composed-out pieces in all

³⁴ In "Small 'Forms': in Defense of the Prelude," *The Cambridge Companion to Chopin*, ed. Jim Samson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 138. Recitals given by Chopin on April 26, 1841, February 21, 1842 and February 16, 1848 (his last public recital) all featured in their programs "a selection of preludes."

³⁵ Jim Samson, *Chopin* (New York: Schirmer, 1996), 157.

³⁶ Jim Samson, *The Music of Chopin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 79.

the keys which were intended to serve as literal preludes (Hummel's are no more than a few bars long). Chopin's Preludes are of a different order altogether, presenting a *unified cycle of independent pieces* [my italics], which achieve something close to perfection of form within the framework of the miniature, expertly gauging the relationship of the musical substance to a restricted time-scale.³⁷

However, it is clear that Chopin never performed them as a "unified cycle," even though that is most often the custom today, and it is probable that his exact intentions as a composer here will never be known.

B: Contemporaneous Reception of Prelude in A-flat

Chopin's Prelude in A-flat gained encomium in almost all quarters from a wide spectrum of his contemporaries. Meyerbeer noted in his diary: "Monday at Leo's: Chopin played some new Mazurkas magnificently, and then once again that sublime (*himmlisch*) piece with the A-flats, which I so love."³⁸ Mendelssohn also admired it: "I love it, I cannot tell you how much or why; except, perhaps, that it is something which I could have never written at all."³⁹ Even Richard Wagner acknowledged their greatness, although that would have been one of the only things about him that would have impressed Schenker!

I look for homogeneity of materials and equipoise of means and ends. Mozart's music and Mozart's orchestra are a perfect match; an equally perfect balance exists between Palestrina's choir and Palestrina's counterpoint; and I find a similar correspondence between Chopin's piano and certain of his études and preludes.⁴⁰

³⁷ Ibid., 79.

³⁸ Giacomo Meyerbeer, *Briefwechsel und Tagebücher*, ed. Heinz Becker, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1960–75) 3: 207, quoted in Eigeldinger, *Chopin: Pianist and Teacher*, 157. It is interesting to note the mention of the repeated A^b's in mm. 65–88 of the Prelude, clearly one of the work's most distinctive features.

³⁹ Niecks, *Chopin as Man and Musician*, 2: 332, quoted in Jean-Jacques Eigeldinger, *Chopin: Pianist and Teacher as Seen by his Pupils* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 157.

⁴⁰ Edgar Stillman Kelley, *Chopin the Composer: His Structural Art and its Influence on Contemporaneous Music* (New York: Schirmer, 1913), 46. Palestrina and Chopin alone were the only two non-German

The fact that a copy of it was owned by both Clara Schumann⁴¹ and Johannes Brahms⁴² also speaks volumes as to the esteem in which they held this work. Presumably they were both aware, given their editorial experience, that theirs was a copy by Fontana (Fontana I) of an early version of the work, an issue that will be more fully examined later in this thesis.

The title “preludes” surprised and disturbed many a listener, Schumann and Liszt included. Schumann, writing in *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* in 1839, conveyed his sense of the diversity and individuality inherent in each of these works in the following now-famous quotation:

The Preludes are strange [*merkwürdig* can also mean curious or remarkable] pieces. I confess I imagined them differently, and designed in the grandest style, like his Etudes. But almost the opposite is true: they are sketches, beginnings of Etudes, or, so to speak, ruins, [individual eagle pinions],⁴³ a wild motley of pieces. But each piece, written in a fine, pearly hand, shows: “Frederick Chopin wrote it.” One recognizes him in the pauses by the passionate breathing. He is and remains the boldest and proudest poetic mind of the time. The collection also contains the

composers to have their *oeuvre* included in the canon of collected editions produced Breitkopf & Härtel. Whether this had any influence on Wagner’s opinion or not remains a speculation.

⁴¹ Clara Schumann (1819-1896), wife of composer Robert Schumann (1810-1856), was one of the finest pianists of her generation, and also one of the first to perform Chopin’s music on a regular basis. In a period where embellishment and improvisation were the order of the day, she acquired a reputation for respecting the integrity of a composer’s text. She edited her husband’s complete works, allowing Brahms to complete the task by editing Series 14.

⁴² Johannes Brahms (1833-1897) edited music by Franz Schubert, Robert Schumann, and, more importantly, the First Critical Edition of Chopin’s works, where his co-editors were Woldemar Bargiel (1828-1897), August Franchomme (1808-1884), Franz Liszt (1811-1886), Carl Reinecke (1824-1910), and Ernst Rudorff (1840-1916).

⁴³ Jeffrey Kallberg has pointed out that the key word “individual” is missing from this translation of Edward Lowinsky, quoted in Thomas Higgins, ed., *Frédéric Chopin Preludes, Opus 28* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co, 1973) 91. Kallberg’s corrections of this translation have been included in brackets in the above quotation. Kallberg, *Chopin at the Boundaries*, 146.

morbid, the feverish, the repellent. May each search what suits him; may only the philistine stay away! What a philistine?⁴⁴

Liszt too understood both the tradition whence they came and their transcendence of it when he observed:

Chopin's Preludes are compositions of an order entirely apart: they are not [only],⁴⁵ as the title would indicate, pieces destined to be played in the guise of introductions to other *morceaux* [pieces]—they are preludes instinct with poesy [they are poetic preludes], analogous to those of another great contemporary poet, who cradles the soul in golden dreams, and elevates it to the regions of the ideal. Admirable for their variety, the labor and learning with which they abound are appreciable only by the aid of a scrupulous examination; everything seems fresh, elastic, created at the impulse of the moment, abounding with that freedom of expression which is characteristic of works of genius.⁴⁶

Writing of them over a century later in 1948, André Gide stated:

I admit that I do not understand the title that Chopin liked to give to those short *pieces*: Preludes. Preludes to what? Each of Bach's preludes is followed by its fugue; it is an integral part of it. But I find it hardly easier to imagine any one of these preludes ... followed by any other piece in the same key, be it by the same author, than all of these preludes played immediately one after the other. Each one of them is a meditation; nothing can be less a concert piece; nowhere has Chopin revealed himself more intimately.⁴⁷

A lone voice of dissent was Chopin's student Wilhelm von Lenz (1809-1883), who, while complimentary about the works themselves, was hardly able to see beyond the merely technical when he wrote:

The Preludes Opus 28 are on a small scale what the Etudes are on a large one, less developed but no less interesting or full of ideas. They are suitable for use as advanced keyboard exercises,

⁴⁴ From *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, November 19, 1839, No. 14, 163, trans. Edward Lowinsky and quoted in Higgins, *Chopin Preludes*, 91.

⁴⁵ Higgins incorrectly translated "seulement" as "merely" rather than "only" in Higgins, *Chopin Preludes*, 91, implying a subtle value judgment to the genre of the improvised prelude that would not have been understood at that time. This inaccuracy was pointed out by Kallberg in *Chopin at the Boundaries*, 278 n. 34. Kallberg's corrections of this translation have been included in brackets in the above quotation.

⁴⁶ Franz Liszt, "M. Chopin the Pianiste" in *The Musical World* (June, 1841). This was a translation of Liszt's review of a concert by Chopin given in Pleyel's rooms on April 26, 1841, and originally published in *Revue et Gazette Musicale* (May 2, 1841).

⁴⁷ André Gide, *Notes on Chopin*, trans. Bernard Frechtman (New York: Philosophical Library, 1949), 32.

a usage they clearly transcend!⁴⁸

C: Chopin's Praxes of Hermeneutics and Improvisation

Jim Samson, writing in his penetrating introduction to *Chopin Studies 2*, describes the relationship between performance and text in Chopin's early output thus:

The work exemplified a genre (principally variations, fantasies and independent rondos) and the genre exemplified a performance—a particular communicative act directed towards a specific audience. Chopin's early music belonged centrally to this repertoire. He went on to transcend it ... relocating its performance space, distilling originality from its stylistic conformity, promoting the work at the expense of the genre. He transcended it, but he also remembered it. His innovations arose from and were implied by the post-classical repertoire, and they were conditioned in every particular by its central assumption—that work and performance are inseparably fused. To his contemporaries Chopin remained a pianist-composer, writing “pianists’ music” rather than pianoforte music ... there was even some suggestion ... that Chopin the performer held a sort of monopoly on Chopin the composer.⁴⁹

Each performance Chopin gave would, in all likelihood, have been intentionally very different from the last, according to contemporary accounts of many who were privileged to hear him perform live—a testament to his boundless creativity and understanding of the importance of the spontaneous, almost akin to a postmodern performance stance.

Alfred James Hipkins shared his reminiscences of Chopin's playing with his daughter Edith, who later published them:⁵⁰

Chopin never played his own compositions twice alike, but varied each according to the mood of the moment, a mood that charmed by its very waywardness; his playing resembled nothing so much as the tender delicate tints seen in mother-o'-pearl, and rendered apparently without the least effort.⁵¹

⁴⁸ Wilhelm von Lenz, “Übersichtliche Beurtheilung der Piano-Kompositionen von Chopin,” *Neue Berliner Musikzeitung*, 26: 298.

⁴⁹ Samson, *Chopin Studies 2*, 12.

⁵⁰ Alfred James Hipkins (1826-1903), technical adviser to the piano makers Broadwood, and Chopin's piano tuner during his visits to England.

F.-Henry Peru's account strikes a similar note, for this was something about which Chopin's contemporaries were unanimous.⁵² Contrasting Chopin with his contemporary Frédéric Kalkbrenner, he remarked:⁵³

The difference between [Kalkbrenner] and Chopin was remarkable: the latter never played his works twice with the same expression, and yet the result was always ideally beautiful, thanks to the ever-fresh inspiration, powerful, tender or sorrowful. He could have played the same piece twenty times in succession, and you would still listen with equal fascination.⁵⁴

Sir Charles Hallé⁵⁵ recalled a specific instance of how Chopin was forced though ill health to ignore his own dynamic markings to superb effect:

In spite of his declining physical strength, the charm of his playing remained as great as ever, some of the new readings he was compelled to adopt having a peculiar interest. Thus at the last public concert he gave in Paris, at the ... beginning of 1848, he played the latter part of his 'Barcarolle,' from the point where it demands the utmost energy [mm. 84 ff, 93 ff, 103 ff], in the most opposite style, *pianissimo*, but with such wonderful nuances, that one remained in doubt if this reading were not preferable to the accustomed one. Nobody but Chopin could have accomplished such a feat.⁵⁶

The concept of each performance being intentionally very different from another is the exact antithesis to the perspective of many performers today, who spend a great deal of time fine-tuning the art of hermeneutics into a single interpretation and then trying faithfully to reproduce it whenever and wherever they perform. There is, however, a remarkable parallel between the archetype of the performer's quest for the "correct" interpretation and the musicologist's futile search for a Chopin "Urtext." Both of these

⁵¹ Edith J. Hipkins, *How Chopin Played. From Contemporary Impressions Collected from the Diaries and Notebooks of the Late A. J. Hipkins* (London: Dent, 1937), 7.

⁵² F.-Henry Peru (ca. 1830-1922), pupil of Chopin from 1847-1849.

⁵³ Frédéric Kalkbrenner (1785-1849), French pianist, teacher and composer.

⁵⁴ F. Henry Peru, "Mes ouvenirs de Frédéric Chopin," *Revue de la S. I. M.*, 9/12 (1913): 25.

⁵⁵ Sir Charles Hallé (1819-1895), English pianist and conductor, of German birth.

⁵⁶ C. E. Hallé and Marie Hallé, eds., *Life and Letters of Sir Charles Hallé* (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1896), 36, quoted in Rink, "Chopin's 'Structural Style,'" 1: 29.

concepts stand outside the sphere of Chopin's *Umwelt*. In many instances the actual text performed by Chopin would be slightly different, and, on occasion, more markedly so for each rendition of a piece. Gerald Abraham observed that:

Chopin's contact with his sound-medium was more immediate; the printed forms of his works were often, as his own numerous variants and changes of mind show, the records of music that, however finely polished and worked out, was originally and essentially keyboard improvisation; the record remained but the improviser's own moods constantly changed.⁵⁷

Julian Fontana, writing in the preface to his edition of Chopin's posthumous works, recalled:

From his earliest youth, the richness of his improvisation was astonishing ... the few lucky ones who have heard him improvising for hours on end, in the most wonderful manner, never lifting a single phrase from any other composer, never even touching on any of his own works—those people will agree ... that Chopin's most beautiful finished compositions are merely reflections and echoes of his improvisations. This spontaneous inspiration was like an inexhaustible torrent of precious materials in ferment. From time to time, the master would draw out of it a few cups to throw into his mold, and these were found to be full of pearls and rubies.⁵⁸

The significance of Chopin's improvisatory skills in his praxis of composition is immense, again placing him firmly in the Austro-German tradition—a tradition followed by J. S. Bach a century or so earlier in works such as the *Chromatische Phantasie und Fuge*, S. 903,⁵⁹ and continued by his son, C. P. E. Bach, and by Mozart and Beethoven, to name but a few.⁶⁰

These improvisatory skills find their surest expression in this prelude in the two episodes of the five-part rondo form, where the free flight of fancy is given far greater rein. They were, in all likelihood, improvised at the keyboard before being written down,

⁵⁷ Gerald Abraham, *Chopin's Musical Style* (London: Oxford University Press, 1939), 51.

⁵⁸ Julian Fontana, [Preface to] *Oeuvres postumes pour piano de Fréd. Chopin* (Paris: Meissonnier, 1855), 1-2, tr. and quoted in Eigeldinger, *Chopin: Pianist and Teacher*, 282.

⁵⁹ J. S. Bach, *Chromatische Fantasia und Fuga*, S. 903, dating from his Weimar period: 1708-17.

⁶⁰ Schenker quotes such examples by C. P. E. Bach and Mozart in Schenker, *Harmony*, 339-341.

a fact confirmed by an examination of the orthographical differences between a copy of the manuscript of an earlier version of the work and Chopin's autograph score.⁶¹

Moreover, it seems that Chopin consciously disguised the tonal connection between the episodes and main theme in the foreground of this prelude through the use of what C. P. E. Bach termed "*vernünftige Betrügerey*," which William J. Mitchell translates as "rational deceptions"⁶²—harmonic passages that often contained enharmonic keys changes and chromatic harmony.

It is one of the beauties of improvisation to feign modulation to a new key through a formal cadence and then move off in another direction. This and other rational deceptions [*vernünftige Betrügereyen*] ... must not be excessively used, or natural relationships will become hopelessly buried beneath them.⁶³

Peter Schleuning also drew attention to this phenomenon in *The Fantasia*.⁶⁴ Both episodes in Prelude in A-flat reveal striking deceptions at the foreground level—deceptions that, when explored more fully, can be clearly related tonally to the main theme and key. What makes these deceptions so brilliant is that the clues to their deciphering are embedded in the foreground of the work, somewhat akin to clues left at a crime scene. This will be discussed more fully in chapter six. Schenker revealed his understanding of this principle as a central facet of C. P. E. Bach's approach to improvisation in the first chapter of *The Masterwork in Music*:

Thus the realization of C. P. E. Bach's free fantasy blossoms from first note to last from the most rigorous artifice of voice-leading, from the most ingenious diminutions which, striking and beautiful in themselves, fulfill all the relationships of harmony and voice.⁶⁵

⁶¹ These differences will be discussed in detail later in this thesis.

⁶² This phrase has variously been translated "judicious deceptions" (Richard Kramer, translating C. P. E. Bach in Schenker, "The Art of Improvisation," in *Masterwork in Music*, 1: 4, and "reasonable ruses" (A. C. Howie, translating C. P. E. Bach in Peter Schleuning, *The Fantasia*, trans. A. C. Howie, 2 vols. (Cologne: Arno Volk Verlag, 1971) 2: 11.

⁶³ C. P. E. Bach, *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments*, trans. and ed. William J. Mitchell (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1949), 434, quoted in Rink, "Chopin's 'Structural Style,'" 1: 42.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 11. John Rink also comments upon it in "Chopin's 'Structural Style.'"

⁶⁵ Schenker, *Masterwork in Music*, 1: 13.

In doing so, he highlighted the nexus between Chopin's musical heritage—manifested in his improvisations and compositions—and his own analysis of it.

As Jeffrey Kallberg has pointed out, the situation regarding Chopin's somewhat capricious attitude to the performance of his music—his feeling the need constantly to improvise upon it or embellish it—was also exacerbated by his inability to copy it without further addition:

Indeed, he could seldom stifle this compositional impulse: when reading copyists' manuscripts or proof sheets, when writing out manuscripts to give as gifts, and when teaching students from printed editions, he was likely to jot down "revisions" of one sort or another. Composition for Chopin was an open-ended process, unbound by the nature and physical restrictions of the source or the limits of publication.⁶⁶

And again, writing to Friedrich Kistner⁶⁷ in February and April of 1833, Maurice Schlesinger⁶⁸ stated:

Chopin is not only a man of talent but he is anxious to maintain his reputation, so he always still polishes his works after they are long since finished; all that he sold us is done, I have had it many times in my hands, but there is a difference with him between finished and delivered.⁶⁹

While an overstatement in some cases, it is certainly true in many. Kallberg then goes on to cite some of the most obvious examples of this tendency, namely the Nocturne in B Major, Opus 62, No. 1, and the Waltz in D-flat Major, Opus 64, No. 1.⁷⁰ With such a large number of valid variant sources extant in Chopin's work, it is clear that the parameters of the editor's task have, of necessity, changed, making the search for the

⁶⁶ Kallberg, *Chopin at the Boundaries*, 216.

⁶⁷ Carl Friedrich Kistner (1797-1844) owner of a Leipzig firm of publishers originally founded by Heinrich Albert Probst, and acquired by Kistner in 1831.

⁶⁸ Moritz Adolf Schlesinger (1797-1871), founder of the Paris publishing firm that bears his name and Chopin's principal French publisher.

⁶⁹ Zofia Lissa, "Chopin im Lichte des Briefwechsels von Verlegern seiner Zeit," *Fontes artis musicae*, 7 (1960): 55-56.

⁷⁰ Kallberg, *Chopin at the Boundaries*, 218-224.

elusive “Urtext” clearly an entirely inappropriate solution to this situation. While the number of primary sources for Opus 28 is manageable, making it ultimately easier to arrive at some satisfactory solutions to the question of textual integrity, there are several important variants between the primary sources, and many lesser ones, all of which need careful consideration and inclusion in any text which purports to treat to the varying situations of Chopin’s *Umwelt* with real integrity.⁷¹

⁷¹ See volume 2, appendix 3 for a critical text that integrates these several sources and suggests solutions to any conflicts that may become apparent.

CHAPTER THREE

TEXTUAL CRITICISM AND THE SOURCES

A: The Significance of Primary Sources in Schenkerian Theory

In the introduction to *Der freie Satz*, Schenker discussed the shared role that the study of autograph scores has to play in the understanding of a composer's work:

These last [the study of composers' autograph manuscripts] present the additional difficulty of problems of notation which are highly individual, ever new, and never schematic, but which always correspond to the musical content. Autograph-study, a completely new and special field of knowledge, thus goes hand in hand with the theory of musical coherence.⁷²

Adopting a somewhat perplexed tone in a footnote to the above passage, he went on to bemoan the way in which many musicians treated autograph scores, valuing them merely as a codicological artifacts rather than the purveyor of significant analytic and interpretative information:

... this invaluable treasure is appreciated least of all by the musicians. They gaze at the prints as they would at locks of hair, watches, writing desks and the like, which are shown at exhibits that honor the memory of the great dead. I have often stressed that information of the greatest significance regarding the principles of art, the creation of musical coherence, the individual style of notation, etc., is to be derived from autographs as well as sketches.⁷³

In her introduction to the translation of Schenker's essay *Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik*, Hedi Siegel described Schenker's editorial intentions thus:

Schenker, on the other hand, chose to educate the performer by means of an extensively annotated authentic edition—justly termed a “neue kritische

⁷² Schenker, *Free Composition*, 7.

⁷³ Ibid., 7, quoted by Carl Schachter in “The Prelude in E Minor Op. 28 No. 4: autograph sources and interpretation,” *Chopin Studies* 2, 161.

Ausgabe"—that comes to grips with the problems of both performance and understanding.⁷⁴

The establishment of a *neue kritische Ausgabe* for this Chopin prelude would undoubtedly gain Schenker's encomium, for it was he who was among the very first pioneering editors to consult these sources when editing music. He realized just how much they could reveal about a work—a tradition that has since lead to the widespread concept and practice of the so-called "Urtext" or critical edition. Never one to be noted for his personal modesty, Schenker wrote of his role in the establishment of the study of autograph manuscripts in this manner:

The extent to which I have surpassed my few predecessors in this subject—editors, analysts, and the like—is indicated by those works of mine which secure for me the honor of being the true founder of the discipline of autograph-study.⁷⁵

Moreover, he would consider it to be an exigency, such was the import that he attached to the accuracy of a critical text.

It is crucial here to make a clear distinction between the concept of an "Urtext" and that of a critical edition (*kritische Ausgabe*). This is particularly necessary when considering Chopin's music. An "Urtext" seeks to find and present a version that most closely approximates a composer's final intentions—reflecting the credo of the so-called "Fassung letzter Hand"—the one definitive compositional legacy to posterity. A major problem with this approach is that it assumes that a composer either desires or is able to

⁷⁴ Heinrich Schenker, "A Contribution to the Study of Ornamentation," trans. Hedi Siegel, *The Music Forum*, 4 (1976): 3.

⁷⁵ Schenker, *Free Composition*, 7. The works he was referring to are *Ph. Em. Bach Klavierwerke* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1902-3); *J. S. Bach, Chromatische Phantasie und Fuge: kritische Ausgabe* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1910); *Beethovens neunte Sinfonie* (Vienna: Universal, 1912). *Erläuterungsausgaben der letzten fünf Sonaten Beethovens* (Vienna: Universal Edition: 1913-20); *Beethovens fünfte Sinfonie* (Vienna: A. Gutman Verlag, 1925); *Johannes Brahms, "Oktaven und Quinten" u. A., aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben und erläutert von Heinrich Schenker* (Vienna: Universal, 1933).

leave a work as a complete or finished entity. In Chopin's situation this is often not the case. Indeed, almost the opposite is true in many instances. In contrast, a critical edition takes into account all extant relevant sources, relating them to one another while respecting and affirming the composer's integrity in his or her relationship with these materials, and his or her right to revise the work. In such circumstances, a critical edition can present variant versions as appropriate, explaining their relationship to one another and to the composer, sometimes suggesting solutions, at others times leaving these decisions to be made by the performer/analyst. This is the premise followed here, as can be seen in appendix 3.

B: The "Chopin Problem"

Establishing textual integrity in Chopin's music is far more complex a task than might initially be imagined due to the large number of extant primary sources. This has perplexed many a musicologist and editor over the years, to the extent that this situation has been dubbed the "Chopin problem." As Jeffrey Kallberg has pointed out, the various solutions imposed upon this situation have often failed to take account of the historical contexts in which Chopin first produced these variant texts.⁷⁶ Indeed, what may seem to be a "problem" to musicologists and editors was anything but for the composer. It is vital, therefore, to approach this situation from the composer's standpoint if convincing solutions are to be found. A useful image is that of Chopin the working composer and teacher hurriedly producing manuscripts, scribbling off fragments of pieces as gifts, arranging for gifts of his work to be copied and given as presentation manuscripts (Fontana's first copy of this prelude is one such example), re-arranging pieces to allow his less-able pupils to perform them, or altering a dynamic marking to accommodate

⁷⁶ Kallberg, *Chopin at the Boundaries*, 215.

personal ill-health. This list of complicating factors is almost endless, yet it is a vivid and accurate description of the *Umwelt* in which Chopin the composer operated.

Specific areas that add to the labyrinthine nature of the editor's task are the so-called "simultaneous" publication of Chopin's music in three different countries and his well-noted inability to accept that a work was "finished." In the latter case, this frequently led him to re-compose works with each subsequent performance. These recompositions would often occur in contrasting social situations, where a varied form of a work was called for, either because of the taste of the audience or the skills of the performer. Chopin accommodated each of these, reworking passages as necessary in order to facilitate the performance of his music. He was also in the habit of jotting down complete works or fragments as presents for friends and acquaintances, little realizing just how consequential these would become to future generations of performers and musicologists who strive for textual integrity in their performances and editions.⁷⁷ This is not to say, however, that all such revisions were intended to be definitive, for in all likelihood he did not stop to consider such a possibility. Nevertheless, he did allow variant forms of his music to appear in print and achieve wider circulation. By this very act he imbued them with an authenticity that is all their own and which the editor ignores at his or her peril.

Perhaps the clearest way to begin is to pose the question as to why there are three differing first editions of this prelude—published "simultaneously" in Paris, Leipzig, and London in 1839 by three different publishers. Such are the divergences here that two of

⁷⁷ One of the primary source materials for this Prelude—an eight-measure fragment comprising mm. 65–72—was jotted down on a score belonging to Ignaz Moscheles (1794–1870). See appendix 2 for a detailed comparison of this fragment with other primary sources.

these first editions were published without opus number but with the same dedicatee,⁷⁸ whereas the third first edition had an opus number, albeit one not assigned by the composer, and a different dedicatee!⁷⁹ While it was Chopin's intention to have his works released "simultaneously" in France, England, and one of the German states,⁸⁰ in reality, it was rarely possible to achieve this—and it was certainly not in the case with Opus 28. He had two reasons for attempting simultaneous publication: first, by making three sales to three different publishers he would make more money from them than a single sale to a sole publisher; second, achieving a "simultaneous" release of his works in three different countries was the only way to protect his copyright, and hopefully avoid the minefield of a multiplicity of pirated editions and the problems that these created.⁸¹ At this time no international copyright law was in place.

C: A Historiography of Opus 28

The historiography of the threefold publication of Opus 28 in France, Germany, and England, while somewhat convoluted, can be established with a fair degree of certainty from information derived from a variety of sources, including manuscripts, first editions, letters, receipts, and dates of registration in each of the countries concerned.

1 The First French Edition⁸²

In order for Opus 28 to receive legal protection by copyright in France, it was necessary for it to be registered in four different places: the *Dépot légal*, the Collections of the *Conservatoire*, the register of the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, and the *Bibliographie de*

⁷⁸ First French edition published by Catelin et C^e (Paris, 1839); first English edition published by Wessel & C^o. (London, 1839).

⁷⁹ First German edition published by Breitkopf & Härtel (Leipzig, 1839).

⁸⁰ German unification did not take place until 1871 under the leadership of Otto von Bismarck (1815-1898).

⁸¹ An extremely thorough and highly illuminating account of Chopin's dealing with his many publishers is given in Kallberg, *Chopin at the Boundaries*, 161–214.

⁸² The titles OFE (Original French Edition), OGE (Original German Edition), and OEE (Original English Edition) were first used in Eigeldinger, *Chopin: Pianist and Teacher*, and have achieved widespread currency.

le France. An examination of the records for the release of the Opus 28 reveals that the preludes were probably registered at the *Dépot légal* in August 1839. Unfortunately, the records for the period 1829–1841 have not survived. However, as Krzysztof Grabowski has pointed out, a royal decree of March 29, 1834 directed that one copy from the holding of the *Dépot légal* be transferred to the Conservatoire library's collection.⁸³ This document is extant and dates from September 1839. It was also required that two copies of the Preludes had to be deposited with the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, which was done by the publishers Catelin et C^{ie} in August 1839. A month later, they were registered in the *Bibliographie de la France* on September 28, 1839.

The most important manuscript source is undoubtedly Chopin's *Reinschrift*, from 1839, which is now preserved in Warsaw.⁸⁴ Chopin referred to this manuscript in a letter to Fontana, dated January 22, 1839 from Valldemosa near Palma on the island of Majorca, where he was currently staying with George Sand:

I am sending you the Preludes. Copy them out, you and Wolff.⁸⁵ I don't think there are any mistakes. You should give the copy to Probst⁸⁶ and my manuscript to Pleyel⁸⁷... Tell Pleyel to settle with Probst about the date of publication of the Preludes.⁸⁸

In actuality, there were many ambiguous readings and some actual mistakes, full details of which can be seen in appendix 2. On the same day he wrote to Pleyel:

⁸³ Krzysztof Grabowski, *The Original French Editions of Fryderyk Chopin's Music* (Warsaw: Fryderyk Chopin Society in Warsaw, 1994), 9.

⁸⁴ It was reproduced in a facsimile edition in 1951. Fryderyk Chopin, *24 Preludia, Faksymilowane wydanie autografów F. Chopina*, ed. Władysław Hordyński (Kraków: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, 1951).

⁸⁵ Edward Wolff (1816–1880), a Polish composer living in Paris, who, presumably did some copying work for Chopin.

⁸⁶ Heinrich Albert Probst (1791–1846), agent for Breitkopf & Härtel in Paris.

⁸⁷ (Joseph Stephen) Camille Pleyel (1788–1855), French publisher, piano maker, and a close friend of Chopin.

⁸⁸ *Selected Correspondence of Fryderyk Chopin, Abridged from Sydnor*, trans. and ed. Arthur Hedley (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963), 167.

I am sending you the Preludes ... I have instructed Fontana to hand over my manuscript [to you]. I am asking 1,500 francs for the French and English rights. Probst, as you know, has bought the German rights for Breitkopf for 1,000. I am no longer under contract to Wessel in London so he can pay more.⁸⁹

Pleyel subsequently sold his rights to Opus 28 to the publishers Catelin et C^{ie}, despite the fact that the preludes were dedicated to him! From this correspondence the background to the first editions in France and Germany can be clearly assembled.

Stemma One—French Lineage

⁸⁹ Ibid., 168.

To our contemporary eyes, the quality of the issues of the OFE seems to be somewhat mediocre; the obvious shortcomings contained therein have been noted by many different writers. It is hard to be completely certain about the reasons for these, particularly when faced with evidence as to the lack of importance Chopin attached to the process of proofreading. While he was more zealous in this regard earlier in his career, by 1839 he was happy to hand off the task to others. Fontana's letter to Ludwika Jędrzejewicz describes someone with little patience to attend to such details:

You may recollect that through the many years after my arrival in Paris in 1835, as many times as he [Chopin] published something, he asked me about looking over first the manuscripts, because he almost never wanted to take time over such minutiae himself, next about proofs.⁹⁰

Robert Schumann also commented about Chopin's inability to find inaccuracies in his score: "He never seems to correct, never even to spot, misprints."⁹¹ Textual problems such as these were fairly frequent, as Maurice Schlesinger confirmed, in a letter to Kistner: "Only today I received from Chopin the first proofs of the first six Etudes, filled with mistakes; he is so anxious that it is difficult to receive something from him."⁹² Even the composer himself was aware of his shortcomings in this area, as the following

⁹⁰ Letter of July 2 1852 from Fontana to Chopin's sister Ludwika Jędrzejewicz as printed in Jan Ekier, *Wstęp do Wydania narodowego dzieł Fryderyka Chopina, I: Zagadnienia edytorskie* [Introduction to the (Polish) National Edition of Chopin's Works: Editorial Problems] (Warszawa, 1974) 105-6, translated by Jeffrey Kallberg in "The Chopin Sources: Variants and Versions in Later Manuscripts" (Ph.D diss., University of Chicago, 1982), 54.

⁹¹ Personal Diary (Leipzig, 12 September 1836), quoted in Eigeldinger, *Chopin: Pianist and Teacher*, 269.

⁹² Lissa, *Chopin im Lichte*, 55-56.

extract from a letter of 1841 illustrates: "I am sending you two nocturnes ... perhaps there still lack flats or sharps."⁹³

This was certainly the case in the Chopin's *Reinschrift*, which contains many crossings-out, inconsistencies, and missing accidentals. It seems clear that Chopin was in the habit of omitting accidentals from his manuscripts, for Schenker noticed just that when examining the manuscript of the Etude in G-flat major, Opus 10, No. 5. Bold as ever in his pronouncement, he states:

... authenticity does not dictate on matters of voice-leading ... no one would dream of reading Chopin's intention into, say, the absence of so many natural signs in the manuscript of this etude ...⁹⁴

Such a sentiment is clearly true for this prelude.

The OFEi was engraved from this manuscript. It was then corrected from a proof copy, and some mistakes were rectified before the publication of the first issue.

Previously, Chopin himself might have made these corrections. However, since he was absent from Paris during 1839, it is clear that he entrusted reading this proof to Fontana. He thanked him for doing so in a letter dated August 8, 1839: "Pleyel wrote and told me you are very obliging and have corrected the Preludes."⁹⁵ From these corrected plates the OFEi was produced. Chopin's letter does not, however, wholly clarify the issue of proof reading. While it makes clear that Fontana did indeed make corrections to the preludes, it doesn't mention at what stage in the publication process he made these corrections.

Given the amount of time the preludes had been in Paris (since January), and the

⁹³ Letter of November 1, 1841 from Chopin to Fontana, *Korespondencja Fryderyka Chopina* [Correspondence of Fryderyk Chopin], ed. Bronisław Edward Sydow, 2 vols. (Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1955), 2: 48, trans. Jeffrey Kallberg in "The Chopin Sources," 54.

proximity of the release of the OFEi, it is a fair assumption that it was the proof copy that Fontana corrected. What is unclear is whether Chopin went on to see this and himself make further corrections, or if it went immediately to the printer. While Chopin was not in Paris at all during this time, it would have been quite possible for the proof copy to be forwarded to him for review. What is clear, however, is that corrections were made at two stages: initially to the proof copy prior to the printing of the first issue, and subsequently, prior to the release of the second issue. The pressure of time on Catelin et C^{ie} to meet the deadline for “simultaneous” release of the Preludes was great, as can be seen from the nature and obviousness of some of the errors that appeared in print. Despite the haste involved, they did acknowledge both sister editions of Opus 28 on the title page, as was their custom. In this first impression of Opus 28, even the composer’s name was itself incorrectly printed on the title page as “J” Chopin. It is hard to imagine this detail—corrected in the second issue—slipping past Chopin’s eye, an indication that he did not get to proof the OFEi. An examination of the differences between the first and second impressions clearly reveals the priorities of the initial proofreader: namely, accuracy of pitch notation. There are only two differences in actual pitches (mm. 15 and 17), although both contain many other kinds of variants and missing accidentals. The main differences between the impressions are a missing dynamic marking in m. 1 and missing indications for pedaling from mm. 37-42, both of which were added in the second issue. What is curious is that, when corrections were made before the printing of

⁹⁴ Schenker, *Masterwork in Music*, 1: 98.

⁹⁵ Hedley, *Selected Correspondence*, 182.

the second issue, pedaling was added for mm. 37-42, bringing it into congruence with the *Reinschrift*, but not to mm. 11-17 or m. 36. These pedal markings, while not appearing in the *Reinschrift*, are clearly warranted. Nor is the lack of pedaling in m. 41 dealt with. This again indicates that it was Fontana's not Chopin's eyes at work here since Chopin would have undoubtedly added these missing pedalings! A complete examination of the variant readings between the *Reinschrift*, OFEi and OFEii is given in appendix 2.⁹⁶

Brief consideration should also be given to the second edition of the Preludes. The property rights to Opus 28 were acquired by the publishing company of Gemmy Brandus et C^{ie}, who announced a new "edition" of the Preludes (OFEii) the first impression of which appeared in 1846. This was no more than a *Titelauflage*—an edition based on the plates of OFEii,⁹⁷ with only the title page altered. It was subsequently reprinted in several further issues.⁹⁸ Grabowski contends that the term "edition" is inaccurate in such cases, preferring the more accurate label "reprint:"

I want to emphasize here that the term you use to indicate the Brandus edition is erroneous. It is a question here of it being a reprint and not a second edition because Brandus used the plates of the Catelin edition, modifying only the title page and the plate number.⁹⁹

⁹⁶ The musical text of the third issue, published by Brandus in 1846, is identical to that of the second issue, and is therefore not listed here.

⁹⁷ Gemmy Brandus (1823-1873) established this firm in January 1846, when he purchased the firm of Maurice Schlesinger. It continued to function until 1886.

⁹⁸ Grabowski has examined all the extant versions of the second "edition," and notes that there are at least six different issues, dating from the period 1846–ca. 1872. Each of these is a *Titelauflage*, where the differences all concern information on the title page (sometimes including the occasional mistake, such as an inaccurate opus number), and the plate number [*cotage*] and price. He notes that in each of these "editions," the musical text is identical. Grabowski 1994: 33-34.

⁹⁹ Grabowski to the present author, August, 1999.

It should be noted that there are no textual variants between the second impression of the OFEii and this second “edition” (OFEII) in any of its further impressions, and they have therefore not been included in appendix 2.¹⁰⁰ The existence of a large number of issues should not come as a surprise, since only a small number of copies of each issue would be made, in normal circumstances certainly no more than 100. If demand were strong, another issue would be made, which, conveniently, allowed a publisher to correct any mistakes in the earlier version.

2. The First German Edition

The background to the publication of the first German edition (OGE) is somewhat more complex, since that country lacked the national unity of France or England, but it ultimately became more influential. Leipzig was a natural counterpart to Paris here, although far more prestigious, and it was thus almost inevitable that Chopin would make a contract with a publisher in that city. While his initial connection was made with the firm of Friedrich Kistner—a move both recommended by Farrenc¹⁰¹ and also influenced by Chopin’s prior connection with Probst—from 1833 he was published solely by Breitkopf & Härtel.¹⁰² Naturally Chopin’s prestige was increased immensely by this connection. Jim Samson has noted the exposure his music received as a result of this:

Its wider dissemination was ensured by his contact with Breitkopf, who had agents and distributional networks throughout the world. Leipzig was, after all,

¹⁰⁰ Léon Escudier (1815-1881), writing in the brochure *Les Pirates de la Littérature et de la musique* (Paris: 1862, 32), notes that the number of copies made of an impression was usually between 25 and 100, hence the reason for further impressions as earlier ones sold out. Mentioned in Grabowski 1994, 14 note 30.

¹⁰¹ Aristide Farrenc (1794–1865), music publisher, flautist, bibliophile and scholar. Contracted to be Chopin’s publisher in Paris from 1832, their relationship was dissolved before the release of a single work.

¹⁰² Probst was the founder of Kistner’s publishing house, prior to working for Breitkopf & Härtel.

the capital of music publishing, and Breitkopf & Härtel was the leading firm ... the Breitkopf edition represented a major landmark in Chopin reception.¹⁰³

The only sources of information available regarding the publication of the Preludes in Germany is the Breitkopf & Härtel receipt for Opus 28, which is dated January 22, 1839, almost six months before their registration in England.

Stemma 2—German Lineage

Publication was already late, as can be seen from Probst's letter of March 15, 1839:¹⁰⁴

You should have the Chopin Preludes engraved right away, since Wessel will issue them in London as early as May, although he only paid 300 francs for them, nevertheless he is pushing like mad.¹⁰⁵ The dedication will not be to Kessler¹⁰⁶ but

¹⁰³ Samson, *Chopin Studies* 2, 5.

¹⁰⁴ Mention of the Preludes had been made as early as May 2, 1838, when Probst recorded a transaction of 1000 francs for the Preludes as being settled. See *Breitkopf und Härtel in Paris: The Letters of their Agent Heinrich Probst between 1833 and 1840*, ed. and trans. Hans Lenneberg (New York: Pendragon Press, 1989), 39.

¹⁰⁵ In the event, Wessel did not issue them until August of 1839.

¹⁰⁶ Joseph Christopher Kessler (1800-1880), pianist and composer, in gratitude for the dedication of his own 24 Preludes, Opus 31.

should read, "24 Préludes pour le piano dédiées à M. Camille Pleyel par son ami Fréd. Chopin."¹⁰⁷

This letter also explains the reason for the different dedicatees in the French and German editions. The dedication in Chopin's *Reinschrift* reads: "24 Preludes pour le piano forte dediés [*sic*] a son ami J. C. Kessler par F. Chopin." This he subsequently revised before the printing of the OFE to bear Pleyel's name. The dedication to Kessler was never altered by Breitkopf & Härtel, perhaps because the plates had already been completed. Thus, the dedicatees of the French and German first editions remained different. The OGE also acknowledged its sister edition in Paris on the title page, but not the English edition. Fontana had been instructed to make a copy of the *Reinschrift* in Chopin's letter of January 22, and it was this copy (henceforth referred to as Fontana II) that was sent to Probst in Leipzig, where it was treated as an actual Chopin manuscript. While this copy is currently missing, photographs of it are available in *Towarzystwo im. Fryderyka Chopina* in Warsaw, Poland. A comparison between Fontana II and the OGE clearly reveals careful editorial input in Leipzig. The greatest divergence occurs in the area of accidentals, several of which are added to clarify pitches left vague in Fontana II (and the *Reinschrift*). There are also instances of the addition of cautionary accidentals that did not appear in the manuscript. A further variant can be seen in the use of reiteration signs. The OGE is the only edition of this work to employ reiteration signs in the printed text. While both Chopin and Fontana made use of these as a timesaving device in their handwritten *Reinschriften* (the latter even more than the former), both the OFEi/ii and

¹⁰⁷ Lenneberg, *Breitkopf und Härtel in Paris*, 62.

OEE print the text in full. A complete listing of the variants between Chopin's *Reinschrift*, Fontana's copy of it, and the OGE is given in appendix 2.

In another letter dated April 25, 1839, Probst discusses the planned joint release of the Preludes: "Chopin's Preludes will come out here [in Berlin] on June 30th. Paris chez Camille Pleyel, London, chez Wessel & C^o."¹⁰⁸ Kallberg has noted that there was a major difference between the situation in Paris and elsewhere.¹⁰⁹ Once the source of a work, in whatever form, left Paris, it left Chopin's area of jurisdiction, and he was therefore rarely able to proof it. In Paris he could and often did correct the text of a work up until the actual point of publication, giving him the opportunity both to make corrections and even to alter or recompose. Probst assigned the Preludes an opus number out of sequence, a fact that explains why no opus number appears in the OFE. This is explained in Probst's letter to Härtel of March 18, 1839:

... I christened Chopin's Preludes Opus 28 (it [the Opus number] was intended for a sonata for four hands according to one of your earlier agreements with him. You may never get that).¹¹⁰

Chopin's was known to have offered a four-hand sonata, Opus 28, to Breitkopf in a letter of June 30 1835.¹¹¹ While there were several further impressions of this edition no revisions were made to it before Chopin's death in 1849.¹¹²

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 64.

¹⁰⁹ Kallberg, "The Chopin Sources," 100.

¹¹⁰ Lenneberg, *Breitkopf und Härtel in Paris*, 61.

¹¹¹ See Chopin's letter of June 30, 1835, published in Gastone Belotti, "Il problema delle date dei Preludi di Chopin," *Revista Italiana di Musicologia* 5 (1970), 165.

¹¹² A second impression of the OGE, dating from after 1852 corrects various errors, but also introduces various inappropriate editorial additions. A few further changes can be seen in the third impression, ca. 1872, when German copyright on the preludes had expired. Neither is considered here.

3. The First English Edition

Christian Rudolphe Wessel (1797-1885) was Chopin's publisher in England. German by birth, he emigrated to London and had maintained a publishing house there since 1823, beginning as an importer of foreign music, and issuing his own editions (with his then partner, the piano maker William Stodart) in 1824. He began handling Chopin's music from at least 1833, and perhaps even earlier. By 1839, however, Chopin was less than satisfied with his work,¹¹³ to the extent that he sold his rights to the English editions of the Preludes to Pleyel, who, ironically, then sold them back to Wessel, as the following receipt from the Wessel archive makes clear:

[1 August 1839]

The undersigned recognizes having ceded to Messrs Wessel & C^o., music publishers in London, the exclusive right to engrave, publish and sell in England, Ireland and Scotland a work by Mr. Frédéric Chopin entitled: twenty-four preludes for Pianoforte dedicated to his friend Camille Pleyel, and for which Mr. Frédéric Chopin has transmitted to me the property rights for France and England—Said assignment to Messrs Wessel & Co. is made at the cost of the sum of Three hundred francs which they have settled with me and by which receipt for sale in Paris the 1st of August 1839.

Camille Pleyel
rue de rochechouart No 20—

The above sale approved
Frédéric Chopin¹¹⁴

¹¹³ Apparently, the main source of this dissatisfaction was the descriptive titles Wessel was wont to add gratuitously to his works.

¹¹⁴ Quoted by Kallberg, *Chopin at the Boundaries*, 200.

Stemma 3—English Lineage

The Preludes were registered in London at Stationers' Hall on August 30, 1839. The Wessel contract for Opus 28 dates from August 1, 1839,¹¹⁵ and makes no mention of whether Chopin's *Reinschrift*, a copyist's manuscript or both were sent to London for the preparation of Opus 28. Both Arthur Hedley and, more recently, Jeffrey Kallberg have pointed out that no manuscripts that can be shown to have been used by Wessel to engrave his editions have ever been located.¹¹⁶ However, a comparison of the *Reinschrift* with the OEE clearly indicates that it was either the *Reinschrift* or a copy of it that was

¹¹⁵ Kallberg, "The Chopin Sources," 357.

¹¹⁶ See Arthur Hedley, "Some Observations on the Autograph Sources of Chopin's Works," in *The Book of the First International Musicological Congress Devoted to the Works of Frederick Chopin*, ed. Zofia Lissa

sent to London, together with either proofs or a copy of OFEii. The OEE's type setting is very different from that of OFEii, clearly indicating that new plates were made by Wessel in London. The OEE also shares many variant readings with the *Reinschrift*, particularly in the area of omitted accidentals, thus indicating the use of the *Reinschrift* or a copy of it in its preparation. Both the OFEii and OEE contain additional pedalings that are not present in the *Reinschrift* or OFEi, an indication that the London editors also had access to OFEii or its plates, as well as the *Reinschrift*. Perhaps the clearest confirmation of this premise, however, can be seen in the engraving of the final chord. In the *Reinschrift*, Chopin's noteheads for the left-hand chord are placed to the left of the downward stem, a detail that the OFEii, Fontana II and the OGE for that matter, alter. In the OEE, however, the noteheads are placed exactly as in the *Reinschrift*, the clearest evidence as to its use in London! This viewpoint is strengthened by the information contained in the Wessel contracts for Opp. 29–32, both dating from 1837, where the contracts specify "Both in 'M.S.'" Perhaps a similar practice was followed for Opus 28. Wessel published the Preludes in two fascicles—the first having fourteen preludes, the second ten—as the "5th and 6th Set of Studies," with the overall nomenclature *Twenty-four Grand Preludes through all the Keys*. Due acknowledgement was made on the title page of the French and German sister editions. (A complete listing of the variants between the OEEii, OFEi and ii and Chopin's *Reinschrift* is given in appendix 2.) From this table, it is a fairly

(Warszawa: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, 1963): 476, quoted in Kallberg, *Chopin at the Boundaries*, 92.

simple task to debunk what became a commonly held myth fairly early on in the history of Chopin reception. In the words of Arthur Hedley, according to this myth,

... the German edition is the best. No real reasons were given; there was perhaps a natural prejudice in favor of a large and important firm like Breitkopf & Härtel, famous internationally for the fine production of their work, whereas French publishers like Schlesinger, Brandus and Troupenas, or the English Wessel, could not achieve such a reputation in competition with the leading firm of Germany
 ...¹¹⁷

In Opus 28/17 there are several inconsistencies perpetuated by the OGE that are clarified by the other first editions, a fact which confirms Hedley's view in this case.

The would-be editor of Chopin having looked at this family of differing first editions, fervently hoping them to be identical triplets, soon comes to realize that they are merely siblings—clearly related to one another yet each with their own unique differences. It is the pragmatic consideration and respect of these differences that leads to the production of a critical edition of integrity.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 474.

CHAPTER FOUR

AN EXAMINATION OF PRIMARY SOURCE MATERIAL

A: Issues of Taxonomy in Chopin's Manuscripts

While it is beyond the scope of this thesis to enter into a detailed account of the history of the taxonomy of Chopin's manuscripts, a brief examination of these issues will prove useful.¹¹⁸ Suffice it to say that until recent times it is an area that has been fraught with problems for scholars such as Peter Wackernagel,¹¹⁹ Alicja Simon,¹²⁰ and, more recently, even Maurice Brown.¹²¹ Perhaps the most successful system for such a categorization came with Jan Ekier's *Wydanie Narodowe Dzieł Fryderyka Chopina* (National Edition of the Works of Fryderyk Chopin) that began publication in Kraków in 1967. Ekier describes five categories of autograph which are extant: sketches, fair copies, fair copies submitted for publication, fragments or complete works given to friends, and *incipits* in an index of his works. While Ekier would be the first to admit that not all of these categories apply to every opus, they do actually categorize the manuscripts by function, a task that had not been achieved before. However, it was certainly not his intention for these categories to be applied rigidly to every work. Thus it is important to observe a certain amount of leeway when applying them to individual pieces. The most important criterion with regard to Opus 28/17 is the timescale associated with its composition. The following observations can be made: no sketch is

¹¹⁸ This topic is thoroughly discussed in Kallberg, "The Chopin Sources," 142–186.

¹¹⁹ Peter Wackernagel, "Handschriften Chopins," in *Chopin-Almanach* (Leipzig, 1949).

¹²⁰ Alicja Simon, "Przyczynek genetyczny do Grande Valse Brillante, Opus 34, Number 1 Fryderyka Chopina," [A Genetic Contribution to Fryderyk Chopin's Grand Valse Brillante, Opus 34, Number 1], in *Kwartalnik Muzyczny* 7 (1949), quoted in Kallberg, "The Chopin Sources," 144.

¹²¹ Maurice J. E. Brown, *Chopin: An Index of His Works in Chronological Order* 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1972).

extant, even though there are sketches of other preludes that have survived.¹²² This, however, is not to suggest that Chopin did not make a sketch of this prelude, but merely that one has never been found. Any sketch of the work would pre-date Fontana's first copy, which was made in 1837, two years before the prelude's publication. While there are no fair copies in existence in Chopin's hand either, it is clear that he must have produced one for Fontana to make the copy (Fontana I) that is now in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* in Vienna. Evidence for this can be seen in the dating of the paper on which the copy is written, ca. 1837, which is the same as for Opus 29, and in a letter dating from that year.¹²³ There, Chopin asks Fontana to copy the A-flat Prelude alone: "Please, if you can, copy out for me the A-flat Prelude; I want to give it to Perthuis."¹²⁴ The date of this letter is significant. While in 1837 the missing manuscript might then be considered a *Reinschrift*, by 1839 it had clearly the status of an *Urschrift*, having been superseded by the revisions he made to the work while visiting Majorca in the winter of 1838/9. The autograph score of Opus 28 (The *Reinschrift*) is the fair copy submitted for publication, often referred to as a *Stichvorlage*—a publisher's copy. The fragment inscribed on the score of Ignaz Moscheles corresponds to Ekier's fourth category, and there is no incipit extant for this piece.

B: Primary Sources Consulted for this Study

This study concerns itself with sources produced during the composer's lifetime with which he (1) had a verifiable connection or (2) might possibly have had a connection. Editions produced after Chopin's death in 1849 have not been considered.

¹²² Four Preludes from Opus 28. Palma, Majorca, November–December, 1838, now in the collection of Mrs. Daniel Drachman, Stevenson, Maryland.

¹²³ Dr. Jeffrey Kallberg was kind enough to provide this information.

¹²⁴ Opieński, *Chopin's Letters*, 182. This is le comte de Perthuis, to whom Chopin dedicated his Mazurkas, Opus 24. Grabowski points out in a letter to the present author that the count's name appears in the letter (which is in Polish) in the masculine form.

Manuscripts:

1. Copy of Prelude in A-flat only (*Urschrift*), in the hand of Julian Fontana (Fontana I), dating from ca. 1837 now in the *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* in Vienna. This is a copy of a now-missing manuscript (*Urschrift*) of the piece in Chopin's hand. It is a presentation score—a gift to Le Comte de Perthuis.
2. Autograph (*Reinschrift*) of the complete set of Preludes in the composer's hand, completed by January 22, 1839, and now in *Biblioteka Narodowa*, Warsaw.
3. A copy of the *Reinschrift*, again in the hand of Julian Fontana (Fontana II), originally sent to Breitkopf & Härtel in Leipzig for the preparation of the first German edition (OGE), the original now lost. Photographs of it are available in *Towarzystwo im. Fryderyka Chopina* in Warsaw.
4. Fragment of Prelude in A-flat, mm. 65–72, inscribed "Paris, 9 Novembre 1839 de la part de l'ami F. F. Chopin" written in the album of Ignaz Moscheles, current location unknown and available only as a photocopy taken from Sotheby's catalog of December 1959.

First Editions:

1. First French Edition (OFE), published by Catelin et C^{ie}. (Ad^e.C.(560) & C^{ie}), Paris, August 1839, in two volumes, without Opus number, in two differing impressions, dedicated to Camille Pleyel and based on the *Reinschrift*;
2. First German Edition (OGE), published by Breitkopf & Härtel (6088), Leipzig, September 1839, in one volume, cited as Opus 28, in several impressions, dedicated to J. C. Kessler and based on Fontana's copy of the *Reinschrift* (Fontana II); later impressions of the OGE date from after Chopin's death and are not considered here; and

3. First English Edition (OEE), published by Wessel & C°. (W & C° 3098 and 3099), London, August 1839, in two volumes, without Opus number, in several impressions, dedicated to Camille Pleyel and based on the *Reinschrift* and OFE. Scholars have yet to locate the OEEi, book two, having only found book one to date. OEEii, dating from the mid-1840's, is the earliest exemplar currently located and used for the purposes of textual comparison here. Later impressions of the OEE (of which there are many) all dates from after Chopin's death and are not discussed.

Annotated First Editions:

1. Annotated copy of the second issue of the OFE, owned initially by Chopin himself, bequeathed to his older sister, Ludwika Jędrzejewicz (1807–1855), and now in the collection at *Towarzystwo im. Fryderyka Chopina*, Warsaw;
2. annotated copy of the second issue of the OFE, once owned by Chopin's pupil Marie Tcherkassky, née de Scherbatoff (d. 1892), and now in the collection of the Houghton Library, Harvard University;
3. Annotated copy of the second issue of the OFE, once owned by Chopin's pupil Jane W. Stirling (1804–1859), and now in the collection of the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris; and
4. annotated copy of the second issue of the OFE, once owned by Chopin's pupil Camille Dubois, née O'Meara (1830–1907), and also in the collection of the *Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris.¹²⁵

¹²⁵ Eigeldinger notes that the score of Opus 28 volume 2 owned by Chopin's student Auguste Franchomme has no annotations, while the score of Opus 28 belonging to Zofia Zaleska-Rosengardt has annotations by a multiplicity of hands, making it very difficult to distinguish annotations by Chopin from those of others. Kobylańska appears to concur with this view, since she omits these scores from her catalog (1979). Neither of these sources is cited here. Eigeldinger, *Chopin: Pianist and Teacher*, 231 n. 62, 234–235,

C: Chopin's Compositional Methodology

Chopin was known to compose extensively at the piano, to the extent that it was difficult for him to compose when a piano wasn't available. Indeed, this was the very reason for the late completion of Opus 28, since he had no access to a piano during his trip to Palma with George Sand until Pleyel had one shipped for him from Paris. He recorded his frustration in a letter to Pleyel: "I dream of music, but I can't write any because there are no pianos to be had here—in that respect it is a barbarous country."¹²⁶ The efficacy of his improvisations was also legendary. Eugène Delacroix, astounded by his talent, noted in his journal:

On our way back, Grzymala and I talked about Chopin. He was telling me that Chopin's improvisations were far bolder than his finished compositions. It was evidently something like comparing the sketch of a painting to the finished product.¹²⁷

This journal entry is quite significant. Here the pianist-composer, improvised, it would seem, flawlessly, but was reluctant to commit any one version of his creations to paper for fear that something more interesting, expressive, or imaginative would later occur to him. And indeed, it often did so, with the resulting profusion of variants already discussed, and confusion on the part of so many writers as to just what constitutes a Chopin manuscript, or, for that matter, a Chopin performance! His student Joseph Filtsch gave the following account to his parents, in a letter dated March 8, 1841:¹²⁸

The other day I heard Chopin improvise at George Sand's house. It is marvelous to hear Chopin compose this way: his inspiration is so immediate and complete that he plays without hesitation as if it had to be thus. But when it comes to writing it down, and recapturing the original thought in all its details, he spends days of nervous strain and almost frightening desperation. He alters and re-

¹²⁶ Hedley, *Selected Correspondence*, 163.

¹²⁷ Delacroix, *Journal*, 2: 22.

¹²⁸ Brother of Carl Filtsch (1830-1845), pianist and child prodigy whom Chopin taught from 1841-3.

touches the same phrases incessantly and walks up and down like a madman.
What a strange unfathomable being!¹²⁹

He would create much of his initial material at the piano even before he began to write.

When he finally began to transcribe material, it would usually be in the form of a sketch intended for his personal use.

Schenker concurred with Chopin's views on the importance of sketches:

Anyone who has seen sketches by the great composers must have encountered voice-leading progressions which are far more than brief ideas or mere suggestions. These voice-leading progressions really present structural goals and the paths to them in a manner which could only stem from the far-flung inspiration of a genius ... These sketches reveal musical coherence in the process of evolution.¹³⁰

Once again, Chopin was walking in the footsteps of the German masters in the *modus operandi* of his compositional methodology! The process would be far more condensed than is seen in either his working manuscripts or *Reinschriften*. He would use many abbreviation signs at the sketch stage—including key signatures in words, used only once at the beginning of a piece. He would omit accidentals where the key of a passage seemed obvious, and employ a variety of different repeat signs to save himself from having to write out these passages a second time.¹³¹ In some cases, a working manuscript (*Urschrift*) would be produced, while in others he would proceed directly to the *Reinschrift* without resorting to transcribing a neater version.

¹²⁹ Letter of Joseph Filtsch to his parents in Hungary, translated in Hedley, *Selected Correspondence*, 217. Eigeldinger raises doubts concerning the authenticity of the Filtsch letters in Eigeldinger, *Chopin: Pianist and Teacher*, 142.

¹³⁰ Schenker, *Free Composition*, 7.

¹³¹ For a detailed examination of the semiological significance of Chopin's notation, see Wojciech Nowik, "The Receptive-Informational Role of Chopin's Musical Autographs," in *Studies in Chopin*, ed. Dariusz Żebrowski (Warszawa: Towarzystwo im. Fryderyka Chopina, 1973): 77-89.

D: Fontana's First Copy, ca. 1837

From the evidence already cited, it can safely be assumed that Chopin did produce a working manuscript (*Urschrift*) of this prelude, and it was this manuscript that he asked Fontana to copy. (This copy is examined in detail in appendix 2.) As might be expected, Fontana I contains the highest number of variants with the *Reinschrift*. It has also a most fascinating history. It is the copy alluded to in Chopin's letter to Fontana of 1837, which he needed to give as a presentation score to le comte de Perthuis, adjutant to King Louis-Philippe.¹³² Perthuis was the dedicatee of Chopin's Mazurkas, Opus 24, which date from 1835, and this was, presumably, a follow-up gift. It seems Chopin had firm links with this family, for he dedicated his Sonata in B Minor, Opus 58 to Perthuis's wife, la comtesse Emilie de Perthuis in 1845. The traditional view of this manuscript is that fits all the criteria for a manuscript intended for a dilettante—no indications of pedaling or phrase marks are present, and it contains few dynamic markings. Yet it is neat in appearance, and has hardly any crossings-out (unlike many of Chopin's manuscripts). It was obviously intended for ornamental purposes and not to be used for performance. Hanna Wróblewska-Straus questioned this scenario when she queried whether Chopin considered the quality of Fontana's copy a fitting gift for someone of Perthuis's standing:

However, it scarcely seems decent to offer the comte de Perthuis, aide-de-comp to Louis-Philippe, a copy containing numbered measures, letters and other abbreviations to indicate the repetition of identical passages within the piece. Perhaps Chopin seized the moment to request Fontana a second copy of his

¹³² Opiński, *Chopin's Letters*, 182.

manuscript from Fontana ... or he offered the Autograph to Perthuis and kept Fontana's copy.¹³³

This scenario has several reasons to recommend it. It explains why Chopin's manuscript is missing—it was given to Perthuis—which is why we have only Fontana's mediocre copy extant today. In an era when almost all the nobility knew how to play the piano at least to an elementary stage, a gift such as Fontana's—looking rather shoddy with empty measures containing numbers, scanty dynamic markings, and no phrasing or pedaling—might have appeared somewhat inadequate (or perhaps even insulting) to a man of Perthuis's class.

It should first be noted that this copy is clearly and unequivocally the work of Fontana. The two features that most clearly indicate this are his manner of writing note-heads, which follows the contemporary practice of placing them on the right hand side of the stems when the stems point downwards (a practice Chopin himself did not follow), and the high level of accuracy and neatness it manifests. Such was Fontana's success at imitating Chopin's script, however, that many luminaries later considered it to be the genuine item and not a copy, despite the fact that it was clearly an earlier version of the work. It has often been confused with Fontana's second copy (Fontana II) made from the *Reinschrift* in 1839, an issue that is, alas, confused by Thomas Higgins in the historical background to his edition of the Norton Critical score.¹³⁴ Wróblewska-Straus's hypothesis also explains more convincingly how Fontana I found its way into the

¹³³ Jean-Jacques Eigeldinger, "L'achèvement des Préludes op. 28 de Chopin," *Revue de musicologie* 75, no. 2 (1989): 238 n.17.

¹³⁴ Higgins mentions Fontana's copies of the Preludes, but does not clarify exactly which ones he is discussing, or if there is indeed a difference between them. He hints that the copy owed by Clara Schumann is of the mature work and not an earlier version, as is actually the case. Higgins, *Chopin Preludes*, 6.

possession of Clara Schumann. It is hard to imagine a copy given to Perthuis making that journey, whereas a manuscript still in Chopin's possession could very easily have done so. Clara Schumann personally inscribed the first page "*Handschrift F. Chopins Clara Schumann.*" Presumably she gave it to Brahms, who himself inscribed the date "Dec[ember] [18]54" on the title page. It then made its way into the collection in *Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde* in Vienna, where it currently resides.¹³⁵

From an examination of the photographs of this manuscript, the following information can be gleaned: it is written on manuscript paper 21 cm. x 28 cm., in oblong format with fourteen staves. It is two pages in length, both of which are numbered.¹³⁶ The key signature and time signature appear but once, in the opening measure, where the two staves are braced together—a staff being left free between each braced pair. Fontana was not content merely to copy Chopin's music, it would seem, but to reproduce the very layout of his score, down to the last detail, making it an invaluable link in the history of the composition of this work.¹³⁷

Several differing signs for repetition are employed in Fontana I—a feature that attests to the speed with which it was produced. Fontana utilizes the standard symbol for reiterating a note—a single oblique stroke through the note's stem, signifying that eighth note reiterations should be played. He also employs a single oblique stroke with dots either side to denote the repetition of a complete measure. In addition to both of these, he numbers measures 11–16 "3–8" to correspond to mm. 3–8 (of which they are a literal repetition). Measure 58 is marked "a" and m. 59 "b" and these two measures are

¹³⁵ It seems unlikely, given the many variants between this copy and the *Reinschrift*, that Clara Schumann and Brahms, both experienced editors, considered it a manuscript of the mature work, since both were undoubtedly familiar the later version which was in wide circulation all over Europe in the middle of the nineteenth century.

¹³⁶ Unlike the *Reinschrift*, which is three pages in length.

¹³⁷ Fontana even inserts a dividing line between the figures of the time signature, as Chopin was wont to do.

repeated exactly at mm. 60–61, again speeding up the copying process. It should be noted that this copy has an extra measure at m. 33, which has no corresponding measure in any other extant source. It is also missing a measure (m. 83 of the *Reinschrift*) that is present in all the other sources, thus making it the same overall length as the *Reinschrift*. As already noted, expression marks are sparse and sometimes contradictory, e.g. at m. 32 where the diminuendo hairpin contradicts the ongoing “crescendo” into the reprise of the main theme. There are further variants to indicate that it is an earlier version of the work. The tempo marking in the *Reinschrift* is “allegretto,” whereas in Fontana I this is qualified with the addition of “quasi andantino”—an ambiguous term at best, meaning either slightly faster or slower than “andante,” and surely an earlier marking. Variants can also be seen in the coda (mm. 84–90). $A\flat_1$, a tonic pedal, sounds in Fontana I throughout this section as a series of tied dotted half notes.¹³⁸ In the *Reinschrift* this is treated far more subtly, the tonic being sounded one time in m. 88. Likewise, in Fontana I $A\flat^1$, an upper pedal, is sounded throughout the last three measures; in the *Reinschrift* this note is again only implied. How much more mature is this enigmatic writing in the closing seven measures of the *Reinschrift*, where tonic harmony undulates gently above a single pedal note, clearly delineating this passage as the coda, while simultaneously linking it with the introduction.

E: The Autograph Manuscript (*Reinschrift*), 1839.

The history of Chopin’s *Reinschrift* is recounted in the introduction to the facsimile edition by Władysław Hordyński. It is undoubtedly the most important extant

¹³⁸ For a table of registral designation used in this thesis see 2: 51.

source for this prelude.¹³⁹ It highlights yet again the confusion between the genuine article and Fontana's second copy that has persisted until very recently.

The autograph [of Opus 28], according to information received from the National Library [in Warsaw], was acquired by this library during the last war ... The MS was acquired by Dr. J. Pulikowski ... but it is not now possible to establish from whom or for what price. According to another account, it was already in the possession of the Library in 1939 before the war. This report is probably derived from the fact that when just before the war the National Library was offered as the autograph the copy which Fontana gave to Probst [Fontana II],¹⁴⁰ the Library refused to purchase, on account of the existence of the original itself. The negotiations for the purchase of this autograph [Fontana II] evidently lasted some considerable time, and only came to an end during the war.¹⁴¹

The three-page manuscript is written on now yellowed paper, 211 mm x 279 mm. in size in oblong format, with fourteen staves. The paper contains no watermark.¹⁴² The pages are numbered twice, on each occasion using Arabic numerals: the first by Chopin himself in ink on the top right-hand corner of each side of the page, the second in pencil, from a later date, in the lower right-hand of the page. Both sides of the *bifolia* pages are used. Arabic numerals can be seen in a further context as penciled annotations at the ends of measures (see mm. 9, 14, 18). These numbers are what are known as casting off numbers, added by the publisher to help establish the layout of the engraved page. They represent the number of measures in each system of the planned plates.

The autograph begins with its number being cited as an upper case Roman numeral, in this case "XVII" to the left of the opening staves. These are braced together, with the treble and bass clefs drawn, a practice that Chopin follows for each staff. From

¹³⁹ But not, as Thomas Higgins suggests "the only authoritative source," Higgins, *Chopin Preludes*, 7. Higgins use of the word "authoritative" in the title of his 1973 publication fails to stand up to scrutiny here. The text he reproduces is the Henle edition, edited by Zimmerman, which fails to deal with several important textual issues and ignores significant primary sources. This is an example of the now-discredited "Urtext" edition—a text that is sadly less than authoritative.

¹⁴⁰ This is yet another example of a Fontana copy being passed off as an original Chopin manuscript.

¹⁴¹ Chopin, *24 Preludia*, x.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, x.

the fact that every braced pair contains both treble and bass clefs at the beginning of each system, even when the bass clef is immediately canceled (e.g. m. 33), it can safely be assumed that this was done prior to any notes being written. A staff is left empty between each braced pair to allow room to add marks for pedaling, or, on occasion, to insert a correction, something which happens several times. In all there are five systems of music notated the first two pages; the last page contains five systems, of which three and a half contain music. The key signature is inserted only once, at the opening system—a fact that doubtless contributed the lack of accidentals in the two episodes. The time signature—6/8—has a dividing line between the figures, itself another idiosyncratic feature of Chopin's *Reinschriften*. A peculiarity of Chopin's calligraphy is the placing of note-heads on the left side of their stems, regardless of whether the stems go up or down, a detail that has proven to be extremely useful to scholars in discerning both the authorship of a manuscript and its use in the preparation of a printed edition. Various notational abbreviations are utilized to facilitate what was, for someone of Chopin's temperament, the rather prosaic task of copying a score—a fact attested to in a letter of October 18, 1841 to Fontana:

For God's sake take care of my manuscript [Allegro de Concert, Opus 46] and don't squeeze or dirty it or tear it ... once more I recommend it to your care: I should go mad if I had to write these eighteen pages out again.¹⁴³

For the reiteration of chords where the pitch remained unaltered, Chopin would often write a note the value of a complete measure, in this case a dotted half-note, and add an oblique stroke to the stem, indicating that it should be repeated, (e.g. mm. 62–63). If a subsequent measure were an exact repetition of the current one, he would notate it with an oblique stroke with dots either side drawn in the middle of each staff. Measure 64

¹⁴³ Hedley, *Selected Correspondence*, 210.

illustrates this procedure. He would then proceed to add expression marks, and, from their positioning on the page, it can safely be deduced that these were added later. Sometimes they were cramped into a smaller than ideal space, (e.g. “perdendosi” at m. 84, which would normally be situated above or between the staves, but is here beneath the left-hand staff). A similar fate befell the pedal markings, which can reasonably be assumed to have been added last. This is made clear in m. 67 where the “fz” marking is situated immediately beneath $A\flat_1$, the “ped” marking is beneath that—the last to be added.

F: Fontana's Second Copy, 1839

Fontana's second copy of this prelude (Fontana II) was sent by him from Paris to Härtel in Leipzig, and became the manuscript source for the production of the OGE with the Breitkopf publishing house. While there are some distinct calligraphic differences between it and the *Reinschrift*, such as the placing of note-heads on the right side of descending stems and the lack of crossings-out, both of which are clear indications that it is in Fontana's hand, it is remarkable for its similarity to the *Reinschrift* in the way it recalls Chopin's handwriting. Moreover, this was to become a source of great confusion to many scholars who confused it with Chopin's own manuscript. It even led Arthur Hedley to surmise that Fontana deliberately set out to imitate Chopin's handwriting, based on the close similarity of his copies and that he did so with Chopin's blessing!¹⁴⁴ Hedley puts forward the premise that when they accepted Chopin's manuscripts, they believed them to be originals.¹⁴⁵ These manuscripts were prized by the firm, and passed on over generations as autographs in Chopin's hand. It is also important to note that

¹⁴⁴ Hedley, “Autograph Sources of Chopin's Works,” 475. The inclusion of the dividing line between the figures of the time signature is but one feature that supports this hypothesis.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 474.

Chopin did not always make corrections to Fontana's copies, even if he had the opportunity of doing so, such was the extent of his distaste for copying or correcting.¹⁴⁶ Thus the idea of the authorized copy is, in most cases, a misleading one for a source such as this.

The actual manuscript copy in Fontana's hand is missing, but photographs of it are available for purposes of study. From these it can be deduced that it follows very much the dimensions and practice of the *Reinschrift*, being written on manuscript paper that is 211 mm. x 279 mm. in size in oblong position, each page containing fourteen staves.¹⁴⁷ Arabic numerals can again be seen penciled in various locations, indicating the "casting off" numbers added by Breitkopf & Härtel when preparing the OGE. This manuscript begins by citing the number of the prelude—in this case "XVII"—in the upper left hand corner of the page (and uncannily similar to Chopin's hand), to the left of the top staves, which are braced together. Treble and bass clefs, the key signature, (which appears only once), and the time signature, which has a dividing line between the figures are then written in.¹⁴⁸ An empty staff is left between each system, allowing more space for the inclusion of phrasing and pedaling. In all, five systems of music are notated on each page, with an average of approximately seven measures per system. Fontana follows the *Reinschrift* very closely in his employment of reiteration and repeat signs, and there are thus very few variants between them. None is significant.

G: A Fragment of the Prelude in Chopin's Hand

A final manuscript source comes down to us in the form of a gift from Chopin to his friend Ignaz Moscheles, comprising mm. 65–72 inscribed "Paris, 9 Novembre 1839

¹⁴⁶ See appendix 2 for a listing of the many variant readings between the *Reinschrift* and Fontana II.

¹⁴⁷ The photographs themselves are only 13mm. x 18mm.

¹⁴⁸ The angle of the divider in the time signature is sharper than Chopin's almost horizontal divider in the *Reinschrift* and is another clue that this manuscript is in Fontana's hand.

de la part de l'ami F. F. Chopin." These eight measures were written in Moscheles' album. In this short extract, the first eight measures of the final reprise are quoted by Chopin. Although brief, the fragment confirms an important variant in need of clarification. In m. 65, $A\flat_1$ is marked "fz," as it is in both Fontana copies. This contrasts with the staccato marking in the autograph, and is, in all ways, the more superior reading—the more so because it is confirmed by a contemporary account of Chopin's own performance of the work. Mme. Camille Dubois-O'Meara, Chopin's student and an owner of an annotated OFEii, is on record as saying that Chopin used to play this bass note ($A\flat_1$) in the final section with great strength. Her student Jan Paderewski recorded the following anecdote:

He always struck that note in the same way and with the same strength, because of the meaning he attached to it. He accentuated the bass note—he proclaimed it, because the idea of that Prelude is based on the sound of an old clock in the castle which strikes the eleventh hour. Mme. Dubois told me that I should not make the note diminuendo as I intended, in accordance with the right hand which plays diminuendo continually, but said that Chopin always insisted the bass note be struck with the same strength—no diminuendo, because the clock knows no diminuendo. That bass note was the clock speaking.¹⁴⁹

It is interesting to note that Mikuli's 1879 edition includes the "fz" marking in m. 65 but omits it in m. 73, even though it clearly appears in the *Reinschrift*! This inaccuracy is replicated in the Joseffy/Hunneker edition. Ironically, the Klindworth edition has the strange hybrid "pfz" in m. 65, and then substitutes a regular accent sign for the other ten repetitions of $A\flat_1$.¹⁵⁰ Eigeldinger is mistaken, however, when he then states that the *Reinschrift* and OFEi/ii confirm this reading for m. 65.¹⁵¹ In both of these scores, the "fz" marking is missing on $A\flat_1$ in m. 65, there being only a staccato marking (see appendix 2

¹⁴⁹ Eigeldinger, *Chopin: Pianist and Teacher*, 83, quoting the pianist Ignacy Jan Paderewski (1860-1941).

¹⁵⁰ Karl Klindworth, ed., *Frédéric Chopin, Oeuvres Complètes*, vol. II (London: Augener, 1879).

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 157.

for a comparison of all the sources). In the Dubois/O'Meara annotated copy, however, Chopin marks an accent on this note. Ekier takes a more erudite approach to this issue in his 1992 edition of the Preludes, cogently inserting the marking "fz" in parentheses in m. 65 and adding a footnote to explain his reasoning.¹⁵² In his 1982 Henle edition, Zimmerman ignores the problem completely, leaving only the staccato sign from the autograph notated—clearly an unsatisfactory and inaccurate reading for an edition that advertises itself as an "Urtext".¹⁵³

¹⁵² Jan Ekier and Paweł Kamiński, eds., *Preludia op. 28, 45* (Warszawa: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, 2000), 43.

¹⁵³ Frédéric Chopin, *Préludes*, ed. Ewald Zimmermann (Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 1982), 34.

CHAPTER FIVE

A DETAILED EXAMINATION OF THE VARIANT READINGS

Some consideration will now be given to the nature of the many variant readings and the inconsistencies observed between the several sources.

The variant readings can be categorized thus:

1. Variants that would change a performance

In this category are included:

- a) tempo markings
- b) dynamic markings and accents
- c) phrasing
- d) articulation
- e) ornaments
- f) pedaling
- g) pitch variants caused by altered notes.
- h) pitch variants caused by missing accidentals.
- i) rhythmic variants.

2. Variants in cautionary accidentals

3. Notational variants that would not change a performance

4. Erasures in the hand-written manuscripts

At the outset it should be noted that by far the majority of the variants occur between Fontana I and the other sources, an expected finding that is congruent with Fontana I being a copy of the *Urschrift*. However, the situation is not quite that straightforward. Fontana I reveals several variant readings with the *Reinschrift*, helps to clarify certain analytical points, and should certainly not be dismissed lightly. The annotated editions of

the OFE are all versions of its second issue, and, as would be expected, the only difference between them is their individual annotations, of which there are but few. Full details of these annotations can be seen in appendix 2, all of which are considered by scholars to be in Chopin's hand. Other sources examined are Fontana's copy of the *Reinschrift* (Fontana II), the OGE (1839), the OEE (1839) and the Moscheles fragment. The following list will highlight only the most interesting variant readings.

1. Variants that would change a performance

a) Tempo markings

The variants here are few in number and straightforward. Fontana I and the *Reinschrift* differ on the initial tempo marking; Fontana I is headed "allegretto quasi andantino" while the *Reinschrift* has "allegretto." Fontana II and all the first editions take the *Reinschrift* reading as the source for all tempo markings. "Perdendosi" is also missing from Fontana I in m. 84. However, all sources except the Moscheles fragment concur for the marking "sotto voce" at m. 65, a point that can perhaps be explained by the fact that (1) this source begins at this very measure, and (2) the haste in which it would have been jotted down by the composer.

b) Dynamic markings

There is greater variance here, and, on occasion, the sources are contradictory. An initial variant can be observed almost immediately in the opening two measures between Fontana II/OGE and all other sources. Fontana II and the OGE omit the open/close hairpin dynamic marking, due presumably to an oversight on the part of Fontana while copying the *Reinschrift*. Of particular interest, however, is the annotation in the Dubois-O'Meara score (OFEii) of "*p*" (or possibly "*pp*") on the first beat of m. 53. This clarifies exactly where the "diminuendo" marking of mm. 51–53 ends ("dim" appears in all sources except Fontana I) before the ensuing "crescendo" in m. 54. It is

interesting to note that this concurs exactly with the reading in the OGE, where the hyphens indicating the continuing of the “dim” cease at exactly the same point. This is not the case with any of the other sources, all of which indicate that it should continue until the sixth beat of this measure. Ekier again manifests the quality of his erudition, adeptly placing “p” in parentheses, and explaining it with a footnote; in the Henle “Urtext” edition Zimmerman chooses either to ignore the annotation altogether or dismiss it as spurious, since it receives not a mention.

There is a further example of an ambiguity at m. 32 where Fontana I has what looks like a closing hairpin marking “diminuendo” while all the others have an opening hairpin signifying “crescendo” that prepares for the reprise of A. This can be explained in two ways. Either Chopin thought better of it, revising the dynamic scheme in the *Reinschrift* at this point, or it is one of his oversized agogic accent signs, perhaps confused by Fontana as a dynamic hairpin.¹⁵⁴ The fact that it is written over the right hand staff would seem to favor the latter explanation, since all the other dynamic hairpins are either between the staves or below the left hand staff.

c) Phrasing

With the exception of a lone slur at m. 9, Fontana I has no phrase markings. This slur has a large “X” marked through it, and, while it is not possible to ascertain in whose hand the “X” is written from the photocopy of a microfilm, it is highly likely that this “X” is a later addition—as is the phrase marking itself. It is improbable that that one measure alone would receive such a marking. The marking does not concur with the *Reinschrift* or any other primary sources. The *Reinschrift*, OFEi/ii, and OEE concur completely on phrasing, even to the extent of reproducing Chopin’s own inconsistencies.

¹⁵⁴ Fontana also failed to notice the difference between the size of accent signs in the *Reinschrift*. See p. 58 for a more thorough explanation of Chopin’s use of accent signs.

An example can be seen in mm. 65-66, where he omits a phrase marking altogether, perhaps because of the page turn at this point in the *Reinschrift*.¹⁵⁵ A phrase mark is most certainly needed here since, with the exception of the reiterated chords of measures 62-64, these are the only unphrased measures in the complete score. There are, however, several variants between the *Reinschrift* and Fontana II/OGE, almost all of which stem from either Fontana's omissions of Chopin's phrasing (e.g. mm. 35-36) or his misreading of Chopin's phrase markings at the ends of systems (e.g. mm 39-40).

d) Articulation

There are several important instances of variants in the use of articulation markings. Staccato markings will be considered first. In m. 3, the *Reinschrift* marks Eb_1 staccato, a marking that recurs in both the OFEi/ii and OEE. Fontana II also contains this marking, yet the OGE does not. This was, presumably, a decision of the Breitkopf editors, and is consistent with the reading in m. 35 and m. 65, where the staccato marking is also omitted, even though the *Reinschrift* and Fontana II include it.¹⁵⁶ While clearly indicated in the *Reinschrift*, it is, in any event, an inconsistent marking at best, since one would expect it either to recur continually in the left hand writing throughout the piece or not be included at all.¹⁵⁷ Moreover, it is also incompatible with the effect of the pedal marking in this measure, which ensures that Eb_1 will hold throughout it, regardless of any staccato marking to the contrary. Thus the Breitkopf solution, while going against all the other sources, seems to be the stronger editorial reading here.

¹⁵⁵ Ekier again exhibits his superior editorial skills here, adeptly adding a phrase marking for these measures in parentheses.

¹⁵⁶ It is interesting to note that in m. 35 the OFE has the staccato marking while the OEE does not. In m. 65 neither edition has it.

¹⁵⁷ For the sake of thematic consistency, if nothing else, one would expect Eb_1 in m. 11 to be marked *staccato*, which it is not in any source.

The situation concerning Chopin's use of accents is rather more complex than initially apparent. Two issues are in need of consideration: that of variants in the inclusion of actual accent markings, and that of variation in the size and meaning of the accent signs themselves. A variant reading concerning the inclusion of an accent symbol in some sources occurs in m. 21. The *Reinschrift* has a¹ marked with an accent above the staff. In the OFEi/ii the accent is included, but is placed in between the staves. The accent does not appear in Fontana II, the OGE, and the OEE. This is, presumably, an oversight on the part of Fontana, as far as the OGE is concerned and by the London editors for the OEE. Any connection between the OGE and OEE readings here would seem to be entirely coincidental. Of far greater import, however, is Chopin's actual notation of the accent signs. Eigeldinger and Ekier are careful to draw a distinction between the semiotic subtlety of dynamic and agogic accents, pointing out that Chopin clearly differentiates between these two signs himself, using the familiar ">" for the customary dynamic accent, and the longer "➤" for an agogic one, a sign which implies an expressive stress (akin to the use of *rubato*), and whose length is reflective of the amount of expression to be employed:

Last and most important, the dynamic accent ... should be distinguished from the agogic accent which lengthens the note ... Chopin graphically differentiates between these two accents, sometimes taking the trouble to mark both signs on the same note or the same beat.¹⁵⁸

Both signs can be seen in this prelude: the former in mm. 21 and 32, the latter in many places, but particularly in mm. 6 and 8, and, significantly, in m. 31.¹⁵⁹ Here it is in such close proximity to the shorter sign in m. 32 that it is quite clear this is no mere

¹⁵⁸ Eigeldinger, *Chopin: Pianist and Teacher*, 148. Ekier also concurs with this reading in his introduction to the Wiener *Urtext* edition of the Impromptus, (1977) ix of the preface. "For Chopin, the short accent (>) denotes a louder dynamic, whereas the long accent (➤) implies an expressive stress.

¹⁵⁹ The first note to receive an accent (an agogic one at that) is e^{b2} in m. 6, the primary tone (*Kopftön*).

calligraphic coincidence but Chopin's clear intention. Another significant contrast of an agogic accent versus a dynamic one occurs in mm. 57 and 59. In m. 57 Chopin marks an agogic accent on e^2 , a detail of analytical significance in that it marks the end of the prolongtion of the dividing dominant and the return of $\hat{5}$ once more. When e^2 is repeated in m. 59—an event of less significance—a dynamic accent suffices. That these hermeneutic details were missed by the OFEi/ii is hardly surprising since Fontana failed to make this distinction in Fontana II (his copy of the *Reinschrift*), and would therefore be unlikely to have included them in OFEi/ii. Consequently, this distinction does not appear in the OGE either, again due to Fontana's lack of attention to detail. However, in the OEE, the only first edition in which Fontana was not at all involved, the distinction is made, albeit inconsistently, a fact that must again attest to the availability of the *Reinschrift* to the London editors. They missed the agogic accents both in mm. 6 and 8, and at the repeat of this material in mm. 14 and 16, substituting the more customary dynamic ones. However, at mm. 29 and 31, they did observe and replicate the larger agogic accent sign, while missing altogether either form of accent on d^2 in m. 32! This inconsistency is maintained in the two currently available "Urtext" editions. Zimmermann again fails to come through by ignoring this detail altogether, while Ekier faithfully reproduces Chopin's semiological subtleties.

e) Ornaments

Unlike much of Chopin's *oeuvre*, ornaments are used very sparingly in this work. A variant reading can be seen in m. 43 for the right hand ornament on beat 4. Fontana I has no ornament here. The *Reinschrift* reads $b^1-c^2-b^1$, as do Fontana II and the OGE. OFEi/ii and the OEE have $b^1-c^2-b^1$, with a natural sign printed for c^2 . This is, presumably, a careless misreading of Chopin's handwriting in the *Reinschrift*, since the use of a natural sign would be abstruse here—a sharp being the only congruent reading in

this context. In m. 89, the OEE notates the acciaccatura on beat 5 differently from every other source, using a smaller font sixteenth-note more congruent with an appoggiatura instead of the customary acciaccatura sign.

f) Pedaling

There are multiple variants in the indication for the use of the pedal between all the sources. Fontana I contains no indications for pedaling at all, a fact consistent with its being both an early version of the work and the haste in which it seems to be been prepared by Fontana. It should be pointed out that Chopin himself was inconsistent in the *Reinschrift*, with the result that there are two extended passages where no indications for pedaling are given, even though they are clearly needed: mm. 11–17 and 36–42.¹⁶⁰ In Chopin's defense, one can, perhaps, cite the time constraints that were undoubtedly working against him while copying out the *Reinschrift*. In his haste to complete this score, he naturally assumed that it would be seen that mm. 3–10 and 11–17 are very similar phrases that require identical pedaling. A successful critical text would need to include pedalings for these measures, following the pattern established by Chopin in mm. 3–10, with a footnote pointing out this connection, but bracketing the added pedalings to indicate that they are editorial editions.¹⁶¹ The *Reinschrift*, OFEi, OFEii, and OEE are often divergent here; in one passage, pedal indications have been added to the OFEii and OEE that are not present in the autograph or OFEi. The passage in question is mm. 36–42. In the *Reinschrift* there are no pedal indications whatever. The OFEi follows the *Reinschrift* exactly, leaving this passage devoid of pedaling. In OFEii, pedaling is added for mm. 37–42, with the pedal release being placed on the final eighth note rather than

¹⁶⁰ Neither Ekier (1992) nor Zimmerman (1982) deals with these measures in a satisfactory manner. Both editors are content merely to reproduce the readings of the *Reinschrift* without comment.

¹⁶¹ See appendix 3 for a solution to this inconsistency.

after it (as it was in a similar passage at mm. 5–10). This is one of several reasons leading to the suspicion that Chopin did indeed see and correct the proofs of the OFE before publication, since these additions are, perhaps, substantial enough to have warranted his involvement. However, unless further evidence in the form of correspondence or manuscript sources comes to light, this fact cannot be established with certainty. It is curious that m. 36 is left without a pedal indication in both the OFEii and OEE, a curious oversight on the part of all concerned. The OEE adds pedaling from mm. 37–42, with the releases on the final eighth note in exactly the same manner as the OFEii—yet another indication as to its use in the preparation of its English sibling. Pedal releases in the *Reinschrift* and the OFEi/ii often differ. Releases are moved from after the third eighth note (*Reinschrift*) to being directly on the third eighth note (OFEi/ii). This can be seen in mm. 7, 35, 44, 54, 55, and 65 and also in the pedaling found in the OEE. This is consistent both with the *Reinschrift* and OFEi/ii and is another indication of its presence in London. Finally, attention should be drawn to a measure where there are several variant readings: m. 54. The release of the pedal is indicated on the third eighth-note (*Reinschrift*), after the second eighth-note (Fontana II and OGE), or after the first eighth-note (OFEi/ii, OEE). Here, neither the three first editions nor Fontana II are consistent with Chopin's autograph!¹⁶²

g) Pitch variants caused by altered notes

All the significant variants here occur between Fontana I and the *Reinschrift*. Fontana II, OFEi/ii, OGE and OEE concur almost completely with the *Reinschrift*. The most substantive variants occur in m. 32, where Fontana I gives an extra measure of E Major harmony, and m. 83 where a measure of A-flat harmony is missing. This measure

¹⁶² Ekier and Zimmerman are also in disagreement here, the former adopting the OGE reading, while the latter follows the *Reinschrift*.

is highly significant analytically, in that it is the very measure that contains the final descent of the *Urlinie*.¹⁶³ Many of the others involve the scoring of octaves in the left hand (mm. 37), small melodic variants (m. 55), or how fully a chord should be spaced (mm. 47, 50), all of which are clear signs that this is indeed an earlier version of the work.

h) Pitch variants caused by missing accidentals

These form by far the greatest number of variant pitch readings between all the sources, in keeping with the lack of consensus over the need for notation of accidentals or inclusion of cautionary accidentals in the first half of the nineteenth century. The Moscheles fragment is the only source that is immune. Many missing accidentals occur in both the *Reinschrift* and OFEi/ii, a fair number in Fontana I, and some in Fontana II (although rather fewer than the *Reinschrift*, indicating that Fontana was indeed making some corrections as he made his copy of this manuscript). The OEE includes more accidentals and cautionary accidentals than any of the former sources. However, the largest number can be found in the OGE, a fact that reflects, perhaps, the greater experience of the Breitkopf & Härtel editors. The majority of these occur between mm. 19–33 and mm. 43–54, where E major and other related keys are tonicized. It is important to remember that Chopin's scores are being judged through our twenty-first century *Urtext*-orientated eyes. He himself was merely following the custom of the day in omitting accidentals from passages where it was obvious what the intended note or key was.¹⁶⁴ Thus such variants would be considered normal at that time and no cause for concern. An interesting discrepancy can be seen in the places where the *Reinschrift* and

¹⁶³ See p. 85 for a fuller description of this passage.

¹⁶⁴ A parallel to this practice can be seen in the tradition of *musica ficta* in the Renaissance—everyone knew which notes received an accidental, and there was no need to notate them unless a passage was directly ambiguous.

OFEi/ii are divergent, as in m. 46 where in the *Reinschrift* the reading is $g\sharp^2$, while in the OFEi/ii the sharp sign is omitted.¹⁶⁵ The most reasonable explanation here is a copyist's slip, which was not picked up at the proof stage by either Fontana or Chopin. One of the annotations in the Dubois/O'Meara copy of OFEii clears up this variant, adding the missing sharp sign for g^2 here.

i) Rhythmic Variants

The majority of the rhythmic variants again occur between Fontana I and the *Reinschrift*, where missing dots (Fontana I, m. 9) and added ties (Fontana I, mm. 20–21, 45) can be seen. Chopin uses the arpeggiation sign twice in this work—in mm. 43 and 47. While the second of these is notated consistently in all the sources save Fontana I, the first appears far more sporadically. This probably stems from the way it is notated in Chopin's manuscript—it is a short, somewhat squiggly vertical line, something which could easily be mistaken for small cacographic slip. Fontana made this assumption, omitting it from his copy as did all other editors, for it is absent from all three first editions, despite the fact that the passage from mm. 43–46 is the first occurrence of a rising linear intervallic progression,¹⁶⁶ and all editions include the arpeggiation for its second repetition at m. 47! The most significant rhythmic variant occurs in mm. 86–87, where the upper voice is notated as two quarter notes in a 6/8 measure without either eighth-note rests on beats 3 and 6 or dots after them. From an examination of the voice leading, it would appear that rests are the intended reading, since the sounding of $\flat^1$ would clash with g in the left-hand accompaniment—something Chopin seems intent on

¹⁶⁵ Fontana II, the OGE and OEE all have $g\sharp^2$ here.

¹⁶⁶ The term "linear intervallic pattern" was first used by Allen Forte and Steven Gilbert, *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis* (New York: Norton, 1982), 83. The more familiar term is sequence.

avoiding, as the pedaling of this passage makes clear.¹⁶⁷ A close examination of the *Reinschrift* reveals two crossings-out in this measure, at the precise point where the eighth-note rests would be, making Chopin's intentions here less clear. Did he intend to add dots to the two $\sharp^1$'s, as the editor of the OEE assumed? Or perhaps he intended to add rests back in, but forgot to do so? There is a third possibility, however; perhaps he considered the reading in the *Reinschrift* to be quite clear and saw no need to add rests for purposes of clarification at all. In Fontana I, the stems of the $\sharp^1$ quarter notes are downward and connected to c^1 (in contrast to the *Reinschrift*, where they are upward), and this reading makes the intended gaps clearer to such an extent that the addition of rests seems unnecessary. It is highly likely that Chopin was looking at this very passage in his (now missing) *Urschrift* while copying it out. Initially he added rests here because he had placed the stems of the two $\sharp^1$'s upwards, but then crossed them out, considering that the passage to be quite clear as it stood, the way it appears in Fontana I. Ultimately, the most significant issue here is one of voice leading. In his second copy, Fontana reproduces the reading in the *Reinschrift*, only without the crossings-out. The OFEi/ii follow the reading in the *Reinschrift*, omitting both rests and dots, as does the OGE, following Fontana II. Interestingly enough, the OEE includes dots in mm. 86–87—the only first edition so to do!¹⁶⁸ While this reading does cover the issue of rhythmic meticulousness, it has no authority in any manuscript source. On reflection, while this attention to rhythmic exactitude here might appear somewhat trifling, it is significant to note that neither of the contemporary “Urtext” scores deals with this problem. In both cases both Ekier and Zimmermann leave the measure without either dots or rests, neither

¹⁶⁷ An examination of the voice leading in mm. 84–5 helps to clarify this passage. $\sharp^1$ is congruent with the collection $c^1-\sharp^1-b^1-c^1$ of beat 5, but is not congruent with the collection $c^1-g^1-b^1-c^1$.

¹⁶⁸ Mikuli also added dots at this point in his 1879 edition.

editor commenting upon this decision—a decision that has to be considered flawed. A solution that achieved without dots or rests can be seen in appendix 3.

2. Variants in cautionary accidentals

There are two examples of variants between Fontana I and the *Reinschrift* concerning cautionary accidentals: m. 26, where the former notates the natural for g and g¹, but the latter does not, and m. 33 where the accidental is missing in the former (on *ab*) but resolved in the latter, where the note is spelled enharmonically as g[♯]. Of the three first editions, the OFEi/ii is most sparing in its use of cautionary accidentals. There are more in the OEE, and more still in the OGE, many of these being supplemented to the Fontana II text by the Breitkopf & Härtel editors. This has the result of making the OGE the clearest text as far as the issue of accidentals is concerned.

3. Notational variants that would not change a performance

In this category come signs for repetition, stem direction, and issues of orthography.

There are several instances of variants in the type of repetition or reiteration sign used, all of which are detailed in appendix 2. It should be noted that the use of such signs applies only to Fontana I, the *Reinschrift*, Fontana II, the OGE¹⁶⁹ and the Moscheles fragment, all the other published sources being notated in full.

Carl Schachter has drawn attention to Chopin's practice of maintaining stem direction through a musical line, often going against notational custom so to do.¹⁷⁰ An example can be seen in mm. 3–18, where, in the right hand staff Chopin uses upward stems throughout this passage, despite the fact that mm. 5 and 7 would customarily use downward stems. Fontana faithfully reflects Chopin's usage, whereas all three first editions use downward stems in these measures. It might be wise not to read too much

¹⁶⁹ The OGE is the only printed score to employ reiteration signs.

¹⁷⁰ Schachter, *Chopin Studies* 2, 180.

into this practice, however, since Chopin himself is inconsistent at the reprise of A, where, in m. 35 he uses downward stems, in clear contradiction to his notation of m. 3. A more interesting passage occurs from mm. 19–21. In the *Reinschrift*, Chopin uses upward stems in the right hand staff for both the melody (as one would expect) and also the inner-voice accompaniment—not the clearest way by any means to notate this passage. Fontana reflects Chopin's usage, as do the OFEi/ii and OGE. In the OEE, however, the inner-voice eighth notes in m. 20 have downward stems (reflecting the layout in m. 22, a sequential repetition of m. 20), and clearly a better solution (it is one adopted by Chopin in the *Reinschrift* for m. 22). Sadly the OEE mistakenly notates $g^{\sharp 1}$ in m. 19 as an eighth note rather than the intended dotted quarter, marring what would otherwise be in all respects the superior solution. A complete listing of the variations in stem direction can be found in appendix 2.

Issues of orthography come to the fore in the enharmonic symbiosis of A-flat major and E major, and here there are distinct and telling variances between Fontana I and the *Reinschrift*. Measures 32 and 33 form the nexus between E major and A-flat major. The pivot chord for this connection is a chord of G-sharp minor—which, in enharmonic guise, is A-flat minor. Fontana I does not make it clear where sharps end and flats begin. Thus, in m. 34 the chord reads $g^{\sharp}-b-g^{\sharp 1}-b^1-e^2$, while in the *Reinschrift* it reads $a^{\flat}-c^1-e^1-a^1-c^2-e^2$ (this reading restores the missing accidentals), a reading far more congruent orthographically with the move back to the area of A-flat. The reading in Fontana I clearly indicates composition at the keyboard—where the most common spelling of a note would usually be employed—a practice which Chopin is known to have preferred. Indeed, it is easy to picture the composer in the heat of his inspiration all too humanly scribbling down a chord in its most obvious spelling. Gerald Abraham might almost have been writing about this very episode when he observed:

There can be little doubt, I think, that Chopin's harmony—the most important, most individual, and most fascinating of all aspects of his music—was also largely inspired, or at any rate discovered in the same way: by improvisation at the keyboard. There may have been precedents for some of his harmonic exploits, notably in Spohr, but it is obvious that many of them were directly inspired by the timbre of the instrument or brought to light by the improviser's delicate fingers.¹⁷¹

The reading in the *Reinschrift* is correspondingly more mature, reflecting the theoretical concerns of an orthography congruent with an enharmonic transition from E major to A-flat major. This reading again strengthens the argument for Fontana I being a copy of an earlier version of the work.

4. Erasures in the hand-written manuscripts

A final area to be considered is the issue of corrections made to the *Reinschrift* and Fontana's two manuscripts. Fontana I contains no notable erasures and is conspicuous in its overall neatness and clarity. This is in distinct contrast to the *Reinschrift*, which, on examination, contains many erasures—some comparatively insignificant, while others comprising large tessellations on the page. In some cases, alternate readings are supplied above or below, while others are left without addition. It is often not possible to see just what is beneath several of the erasures without actually examining the manuscript itself. While several scholars have already done this, Jeffrey Kallberg perhaps most recently, none has published a written report on the finding for this prelude.¹⁷² A full list of the erasures appears in appendix 1. By far the most interesting detail concerning erasures comes to light when a comparison is made between them and similar sections in Fontana I. It transpires that many of these crossings-out are identical to the readings in Fontana I, leading to the conclusion that Chopin utilized his

¹⁷¹ Abraham, *Chopin's Musical Style*, 77, quoted in Rink, "Chopin's 'Structural Style,'" 1: 33.

¹⁷² Dr. Kallberg informed the present writer that the only notes he made during his examination of the manuscript of this prelude concern the erasing of a pedal release in the final measure (see appendix 1 for further information).

now-missing *Urschrift* (or Fontana's copy of it) when transcribing the *Reinschrift*, sometimes changing his mind about a passage after copying it out. The deletions at mm. 44 (RH erasure of b's), 51 (LH erasure of b¹'s), 54 (RH erasure of the chord on beat 6 which included d² instead of e^{b2}) and 69 (RH erasure of e^{b1}) are all congruent with this hypothesis. There are hardly any erasures in Fontana II that merit consideration here.¹⁷³ The most significant feature of this manuscript is the several omissions it makes from the *Reinschrift*, all of which have already been mentioned.

In conclusion, this examination of the sources of Chopin's Prelude in A-flat has shown that there was originally very likely to have been a sketch for this work, and certainly an *Urschrift* or both in existence. It was from the latter of these that Fontana made his first copy (Fontana I), on Chopin's instruction, sometime in 1837. As has already been shown, there are several convincing arguments for making this assumption. In most aspects, the *Reinschrift* is the superior source. It is not without its problems, however, some of which have been resolved by the examination of the annotated editions of the OFEii used by Chopin's pupils, and others by scrutinizing the three first published editions. Given the complexity of all these sources, it is perhaps understandable why there is not, as yet, a completely satisfactory edition of this work, a situation appendix 3 attempts to rectify. It is clear that Chopin's music provides some of the most difficult editorial challenges that can be faced when endeavoring to produce an edition of textual integrity. Some of the variants observed are seemingly insignificant, while others are of far greater import. All are issues in need of consideration by both performer and analyst alike.

¹⁷³ One example is the inclusion of superfluous dots after the left-hand chord on the fourth beat of m. 15, an obvious error that was corrected in the OGE.

CHAPTER SIX

A SCHENKERIAN ANALYSIS

A: The Theoretical Etiology

This analysis takes as its theoretical point of reference the concepts of Heinrich Schenker explicated in *Das Meisterwerk* and *Der freie Satz*. While no single analytical approach can hope to capture every aspect or intimate detail of a work, Schenker's method of graphic analysis, resting as it does on an *a priori* system of tonal logic, reveals the strong tonal architecture upon which a work is built—described by him as “composing-out” (*Auskomponierung*) of the fundamental edifice or *Ursatz* that underpins its organic unity. This analysis is presented in the form of five graphs, using hierarchic notation, that reveal the morphology of the piece as seen initially in the fundamental structure (*Ursatz*) through three levels (*Schichten*) of middleground (*Mittelgrund*) to a foreground graph (*Vordergrund*). These show clearly how the apparently complex chromatic foreground events are a highly imaginative composing-out of the basic chords (*Stufen*) of the *Ursatz*. (See appendix 4, graphs 2–6, 2: 52-62). The distinction between structural and contrapuntal harmonies is central to Chopin's musical thought, particularly in the two episodes (B and C), both of which are contrapuntal prolongations of two single harmonies— $\flat$ VI ($F\flat$) in A and V ($E\flat$) in B—as is made clear in the structural synopsis (see appendix 4, graph 1, 2: 51).

It is interesting to note that Schenker was not alone in considering Chopin's music in this manner. Gerald Abraham, in the introduction to his tome *Chopin's Music Style*, observed:

More than sixty years ago Sir Henry Hadow wrote:¹⁷⁴ “In the twelfth bar of the well-known Nocturn in E-flat (Opus 9, Number 2), there is a connecting passage which, when we see it on paper, seems to consist of a rapid series of remote and recondite modulations. *When we hear it played in the manner which Chopin intended* [my italics] we feel that there is only one real modulation, and that the rest of the passage is an iridescent play of colour, an effect of superficies, not an effect of substance.” Without a real understanding of Chopin’s style, it is impossible to distinguish between “effects of superficies” and “effects of substance,” and hence to play them as they were intended to be played. To put it another way: the passage is a harmonic parenthesis—and the parenthetical effect must be conveyed by the player.¹⁷⁵

The arguments put forward here bear a marked congruity with Schenker’s concept of prolongation, and could well describe both of the episodes in this prelude.

B: Views of Other Writers on Opus 28, No. 17

While many writers have considered this work both individually and in the context of an examination of Opus 28 as a whole, there are three substantive pieces that merit discussion here. Hugo Leichtentritt was the first to produce a detailed analysis the work in his extensive work *Analyse von Chopinschen Klavierwerken*, published in 1921. Leichtentritt did actually observe the E major/F-flat major connection but he failed to notice what a rich harvest it might have yielded. He wrote: “the first development section, B, [mm. 19-34], places E major directly next to A-flat major: the enharmonic equivalence of A $\flat$ —F $\flat$ or G $\sharp$ —E offers the explanation.”¹⁷⁶ He actually came tantalizingly close to an understanding of the harmonic function here too: “The harmonies are easy to understand if one interprets the many chromatic transitions as ornamentation.” His contemporary, Schenker, would certainly have affirmed this statement. Leichtentritt remained deceived by Chopin’s foreground opulence however, for when he came to

¹⁷⁴ Sir Henry Hadow, *Studies in Modern Music* (London: Kennikat Press, 1893-5). Hadow lived from 1859-1937 and was a distinguished British educator and musicologist.

¹⁷⁵ Abraham, *Chopin’s Musical Style*, vii.

¹⁷⁶ Leichtentritt, *Analyse*, 161.

analyze harmonic passages from this episode, he was content merely to label chords and relate them to sharp keys. A deeper structural explanation relates this episode to the tonic and explains it as a composing-out of the upper neighbor $\flat^2$, supported by $\flat VI$ (F-flat major). In this he fell foul of Chopin's dazzling deceptions, and his analysis considered only the foreground of the work. He was unable to explain the deep background connection between $A\flat$ major and E major through the relation to $\flat VI$, or the prolonging function of the surface harmony in this episode. However, his portrayal of the final reprise of A^2 on the surface level is telling:

Each recurrence of the A section is marked with a different dynamic ... the third *sotto voce*, *pianissimo*, floating above a drone-like low $A\flat$ as "*Glocken-Orgel point*" [*Glocken-Orgelpunkt*].¹⁷⁷

This description captures brilliantly the unique texture of this passage, contrasting the quietly undulating harmony with the percussive quality of the low $A\flat_1$'s.

Seventy years later, Kenneth DeLong considered this prelude in detail in the article "Roads Taken and Retaken: Foreground Ambiguity in Chopin's Prelude in A-flat, Op. 28, No. 17."¹⁷⁸ In it, he discussed the foreground of the two episodes in depth. His opening statement described "foreground harmonic ambiguity ... in the two central modulating episodes," and at once the road the reader is traveling becomes a cul-de-sac. The two episodes do not modulate. Rather they prolong two different elements of a "deeper structural level" that he merely hinted at yet failed to identify: namely the structural chromatic neighbor note, $\flat^2$, and the dividing dominant, E-flat major. He described the first episode as beginning in A major, "the enharmonic Neapolitan," and came so close to finding the solution to these episodes, yet this is the only time he

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 161.

¹⁷⁸ Kenneth DeLong, "Roads Taken and Retaken: Foreground Ambiguity in Chopin's Prelude in A-flat, Op. 28, No. 17," in *Canadian University Music Review* 11, No. 1 (1991), 34-49.

mentioned enharmonicism—the key to unraveling the deception. He continued: “Chopin, clearly concerned to confirm E major as tonic [mm. 24-26], tonicizes G-sharp minor and F-sharp minor.” Chopin’s disingenuousness sent him down yet another road that goes nowhere. He did not connect these surface tonicizations to the deeper background anchors that underpin them. He failed to observe that E major is itself merely a deceptive tonicization (*Tonikalisierung*)—not a tonic in its own right, but rather an upper neighbor that prolongs the *Kopftón* e^2 . He also contradicted himself, initially pointing out that “both episodes conclude with a return to a point harmonically congruent with their openings,” as indeed they do—the first from I (m. 18) and the second from V (m. 42). However, he showed in the graphs in Examples 3 and 4 that they both begin from A^b . While this is certainly true at the deepest level, it leads to confusion at the foreground and middleground levels, where the second episode clearly begins from E^b , the dividing dominant.¹⁷⁹ Ultimately, it would seem that rather than being ambiguous, Chopin is being downright deceptive here!

The third substantive view of this work is by David Neumeyer and Susan Tepping in *A Guide to Schenkerian Analysis*.¹⁸⁰ Their basic premise is that the fundamental line (*Urlinie*) unfolds $c^2 - b^1 - a^1$ supported by the bass arpeggiation $A^b - e^b - A^b$. While there is not time here to give a detailed critique of all the errors to be found in this reading, a few points can be made. To begin with, the edition of the prelude used by them is unsatisfactory and leaves several important issues unresolved, not least of which is the issue of dynamic versus agogic accent signs. It is unclear where editorial intervention has occurred, although it clearly has on several occasions. The initial

¹⁷⁹ There is surely a half note e^1 missing between a^1 and e^1 in the second system of this example.

¹⁸⁰ David Neumeyer and Susan Tepping, *A Guide to Schenkerian Analysis* (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1992), 92-101

appearance and regaining of the primary tone (*Kopftón*), which they give as c^2 , is unconvincing, and is, perhaps, the fundamental point of disagreement. This note itself does not even appear in mm. 4, 36 or 66, or at the local level at mm. 12 or 74, but on each occasion is shown in their graphs in parentheses, as a note implied by the context.¹⁸¹ Undue significance is given to the initial appearance of c^1 , which is described as the *Kopftón* in the lower octave. Schenker is clear in *Free Composition* about the role of the obligatory register (*obligate Lage*) in the structure of the upper line:

No matter how far the composing-out may depart from its basic register in ascending or descending linear progressions, arpeggiations, or couplings, it nevertheless retains an urge to return to that register ... In the upper voice it is usually the register of the first tone of the fundamental line which is later confirmed as the true register.¹⁸²

From this standpoint, Neumeyer and Tepping would have to consider $c^1-b^1-a^1$ as the obligatory register, which of course it is not. If $\hat{3}$ were the *Kopftón*, it would either have to appear immediately, or there would have to be a clear ascending motion to it. In actuality, it does not appear until m. 9, by which time e^2 has already been reached, and any sense of initial ascent or arpeggiation to c^2 has clearly been negated by this time.¹⁸³ At no point in their graph of mm. 1–18 (Example 7.4) is c^2 shown actually appearing as the *Kopftón*. It is only shown in parentheses—clearly an unsatisfactory reading for so significant an event. In contrast, e^2 (the *Kopftón* in the present analysis),—a note relegated to the role of a cover tone (*Deckton*) in their reading—does indeed appear in mm. 6, 38 and 68, and at mm. 14 and 76 locally. Not only is it present and prepared for by an initial ascent by arpeggiation, but Chopin also emphasized its delayed appearance,

¹⁸¹ c^2 in m. 3 cannot be considered as the *Kopftón* since it is merely decorative, being a lower neighbor note to d^2 .

¹⁸² Schenker, *Free Composition*, 107.

¹⁸³ c^2 in m. 8 cannot be considered the *Kopftón* either, since it is a lower neighbor note to d^2 .

marking all but its last two occurrences with a larger agogic accent sign—the first note to be accented in the score. He seems to be flagging it as if to say, “You may have been waiting, but here it is!” Had the authors used a good critical edition, such as that by Ekier, this would have been clearly apparent. The authors cite the placement of the hands in the opening measure as an indication that c^1 is the *Kopftón* in the lower register. A more convincing reading here would be that this hand placement introduces and isolates the half-step motive $c^1 - d^1$, a feature that plays a crucial role organically in both its original and transposed versions at all levels of the work, a point Neumeyer and Tepping make tellingly. Rather than isolating c^1 as the *Kopftón*, this hand placement presents it as the beginning of an initial ascent (*Anstieg*) by arpeggiation: $c^1 - a^2 - e^2$ arriving at the *Kopftón*— e^2 —in m. 4. The treatment of motive is perceptive throughout, however, as is much of the harmonic commentary. It is disappointing that the reading of the upper voice remains unconvincing.

C: The *Ursatz* Archetype

This textual commentary is designed to elucidate findings in the five graphs from the *Ursatz* to the foreground via three levels of middleground.¹⁸⁴ The overall form of the work is highlighted in the Structural Synopsis (appendix 4, graph 1). It should be noted that the graphs, when viewed together, themselves form by far the most substantial and important element of this analysis. Indeed it was Schenker’s contention that they should speak for themselves, as can be seen in his collection of *Five Graphic Music Analyses*, each of which appears without commentary.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸⁴ Schenker’s original term *Ursatz* has been used here when referring to the background level throughout this thesis, although for many other terms the English translation is employed, mentioning the German term in parentheses only at its first appearance. Three other German terms are used interchangeably in the text: *Kopftón* (head note), *Urlinie* (fundamental line) and *Auskomponierung* (composing-out).

¹⁸⁵ Heinrich Schenker, *Fünf Urlinie-Tafeln* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1932), reprinted as *Five Graphic Music Analyses*, ed. Felix Saltzer (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1969).

The *Ursatz* archetype is shown in appendix 4, graph 2, (2: 53). The *Urlinie* unfolds a fifth (*Quintzug*): $\text{e}^2 - \text{d}^2 - \text{c}^2 - \text{b}^1 - \text{a}^1$. It is supported by the bass arpeggiation (*Bassbrechung*) $\text{A}^b - \text{e} - \text{A}^b$, with d^2 occurring as a dissonant passing tone, the *Ursatz* completing the full contrapuntal expression of the A-flat major triad.¹⁸⁶ This then is the organic and morphological core—the foundational grounding of the work. In an attempt to define such an organic structure, Schenker said:

the essential feature—that of organicism— ... is determined by the creation of the parts from the unity of the principle triad, i.e. by the composing-out of the *Urlinie* and the bass arpeggiation.¹⁸⁷

It is precisely this phenomenon that will now be observed as an examination of the middleground commences.

D: The First Level of Middleground

Two forms of prolongation at this level: the prolongation of the structural neighbor-note (*Nebennote*) and interruption (*Unterbrechung*). See appendix 4, graph 3 (2: 53). Schenker describes the neighbor-note's function at this level:

The neighboring note, however humble it may appear to be in content and nature, carries within itself a fundamental musical idea, a great voice-leading occurrence. The neighboring note of the fundamental line is in most cases form generative; its inherent delaying quality brings organic unity to that which in the foreground is a two- or three-part form.¹⁸⁸

In the current context, this neighbor-note pattern is a chromatic variation of one of the middleground voice-leading archetypes seen in the second volume of *Der freie Satz*:

Figure 32, Number 4. Schenker goes on to describe exactly the function of the neighbor-note: "the neighboring note in such a setting can be expanded at the foreground level to

¹⁸⁶ Schenker, *Free Composition*, 25.

¹⁸⁷ Heinrich Schenker, "On Organicism in Sonata Form," *The Masterwork in Music*, Vol. II, trans. William Drabkin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 23.

¹⁸⁸ Schenker, *Free Composition*, 43.

become the middle part of a three-part form.”¹⁸⁹ In this case, it is the undoubted harbinger of events to be realized at later levels, being enharmonically tonicized as E major at the foreground level as one of the foreground deceptions that make this work so interesting. It is the generator of the B section. Similar structural neighbor-note archetypes have been observed in Chopin’s music by John Rink.¹⁹⁰ The paradigm here is $\hat{5} - \flat\hat{6} - \hat{5}$, supported by $I - \flat VI - I$, a chromatic variant of the model NN_1 in the series Rink describes.¹⁹¹ The fundamental line displays the neighbor-note motion $\flat^2 - \flat^2 - \flat^2$, ($\hat{5} - \flat\hat{6} - \hat{5}$). $\flat^2$ is a chromatic variant of $\hat{6}$ and is supported by the flattened submediant $\flat b$ in the bass. The means of retransition to I is also shown in graph 3. F-flat major is seen in a Neapolitan relationship to E-flat major, the dominant, which then makes the customary resolution to the tonic. There follows a division by means of interruption of the fundamental line, exhibiting the customary $\hat{2}$ dividing dominant (*Teiler*), through the fall of a fourth (*Quartzug*) shown graphically by two vertical lines above the right hand staff and occurring in m. 42, supported in the bass by $e\flat$. This marks the end of the first branch of the divider. The *Kopftön*, $e\flat^2$, is regained at m. 68, and the linear descent of the *Urlinie* is resumed. Use of division here is also significant, since it is the final chord of the divider— $\hat{2} / V$ that is prolonged to generate the second episode, something that will become apparent at the next level of middleground. The order these two types of prolongation occur is deliberate, a point made by Schenker in *Der freie Satz*: “In contrast to the interruption, the neighboring-note formation remains at the same pitch level and

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 43.

¹⁹⁰ Rink, “Chopin’s ‘Structural Style,’” 1: 230.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 2: 4, ex. 3 for the Model NN_1 archetype. Another chromatic variant on $\hat{3}$ can be observed in Schenker’s analysis of Chopin’s Mazurka in A-flat major, Opus 17, Number 3, where $\flat VI$ supports the chromatic neighbor-note motion $c^2 - \flat^2 - c^2$. See Schenker, *Free Composition*, supplement: fig. 30a.

thus reinforces the primary tone."¹⁹² He also notes that both concepts can successfully be combined, as they are here.

E: The Second Level of Middleground

Appendix 4, graph 4 (2: 55) shows the second level of middleground, where further forms of prolongation are revealed. The opening of the upper voice is of particular interest. It combines two types of prolongation: an initial ascent (*Anstieg*) with an arpeggiation (*erste Brechung*), unfolding as $c^1 - a^{\flat 2} - e^{\flat 2}$ from mm. 1–6. This manifestation in open form contrasts with the more usual close form: $a^{\flat 2} - c^2 - e^{\flat 2}$. A subordinate descent of the upper line through the fifth in what is known as an *Ursatz* parallelism can be seen at this level. This is an adumbration of the final descent, and occurs from mm. 14–18. It is the generator of the A section at the foreground level of this five-part Rondo form. At this level the progression from I to $\flat VI$ becomes apparent. A chord of $B^{\flat\flat}$ (Neapolitan) is prolonged through a chromatic voice exchange (*Stimmtausch*) from mm. 20–26, before the tonicization of F-flat major occurs in m. 27. The brilliant use of enharmonic notation according to the principles of *vernünftige Betrügerey*, where the underlying prolongation of the structural neighbor note is disguised, can be seen at this point. $f^{\flat 2}$, appears disguised as e^2 in m. 27, and is anticipated by a local descent through a third ($a^{\flat 2} - g^{\flat 2} - f^{\flat 2}$) in the deceptive key of E major.¹⁹³ At this level of middleground, the prolongation of the dividing dominant chord (E-flat major) can be seen.¹⁹⁴ It comprises a descent through the fifth that begins at m. 42 with $\hat{S}$ ($b^{\flat 1}$) supported by $e^{\flat}$ in the bass. This descent is interrupted by an echappée motion

¹⁹² Schenker, *Free Composition*, 43

¹⁹³ Use of similar enharmonic deceptions can be seen in the Mazurka in A-flat major, Opus 7. No. 4, and even more successfully in the Etude in A-flat major, Opus 10, No. 10. Here a chain of falling thirds in the bass is tonicized: $A^{\flat} - E$ ($F^{\flat}$) — $D^{\flat} - A$ ($B^{\flat\flat}$ major) — $G^{\flat} - E^{\flat}$.

¹⁹⁴ Schenker discussed this process briefly in Schenker, *Free Composition*, 132 §310. 2.

from b^1 to c^2 above e^1 in the bass, before continues from m. 51 through m. 57:

$a^1 - g^1 - f^1 - e^1$, bringing the first branch of the divider to a close.

F: The Third Level of Middleground

Appendix 4, graph 5, (2: 56-57) reveals how, at this level, the tonicizations that will become so rich in the foreground level are manifesting themselves ever more fully. Further types of prolongation can now be seen. The opening measures reveal the fleshing out of the initial ascent by arpeggiation, $c^1 - a^1 - e^2$ from mm. 1-6. Interpolated between $c^1 - a^1$ is an arpeggiated dominant seventh: $d^1 - g^1 - b^1$, supported by E^1 in the bass. This is mirrored by the insertion of an arpeggiated subdominant: $a^1 - d^2 - f^2$, supported by d^1 in the bass—in between $a^1 - e^2$. e^2 , the *Kopftön* appears here in the obligatory register, supported locally in the bass by e^1 , but fundamentally by A^1 , as the diagonal line indicates. Within the first A section of the rondo form, there is a local interruption, preceded by a descent in the first branch of $e^2 - d^2 - c^2 - b^1$, supported in the bass by e^1 . This lays the groundwork for an antecedent/consequent (*Vordersatz/Nachsatz*) relationship at the foreground level.¹⁹⁵ In the second branch of the divider, e^2 is regained, before the *Ursatz* parallelism already mentioned occurs, (mm. 14-18), an event that adds greatly to the structural coherence and organic unity of this prelude. The arrival finally at a full close in the tonic at m. 18—an event delayed by Chopin until now—marks the end of the A section. It now becomes clear that the B section of the piece, mm. 19-31, is generated from the aforementioned structural neighbor-note, f^2 , shown as a rational deception e^2 . An example of the type of prolongation known as reaching over (*Übergreifen*) can now be seen. Schenker describes the goal of reaching-over at the later middleground levels thus: “to produce an ascending motion in order to gain an upper

¹⁹⁵ Schenker describes this technique in Schenker, *Free Composition*, 70 section 2.

neighboring note," precisely its function here.¹⁹⁶ It is shown in graph 5 (2: 56) by upward pointing arrows. This supported by the three-fold rising linear intervallic pattern 7—10, 7—10, 7—10 in an ascending third relationship, outlining a bass arpeggiation of the Neapolitan chord: B $\flat$ —d $\flat$ —f $\flat$. This reinforces the chromatic voice exchange from mm. 20–26. The structural neighbor note, f $\flat^2$, is reached at m. 27, preceded by a descent through a third (*Terzzug*), a $\flat^2$ —g $\flat^2$ —f $\flat^2$. Measures 27–34 again function as a re-transition to A¹. The descent of the *Urlinie* through the fourth from mm. 38–42, supported contrapuntally by the bass (A $\flat$ —e $\flat$) leads to the structural interruption and dividing dominant at m. 42. At this level, it is clear that the reprise of A is half the length of its original appearance, cunningly allowing the ensuing episode to begin from a different starting point. The echappée motive b $\flat^1$ —c $\flat^2$ —a $\flat^1$, initially seen in the C section in the previous level of middleground, is now extended to form a falling melodic sequence: b $\flat^1$ —c $\flat^2$ —a $\flat^1$ —b $\flat^1$ —g $\flat^1$ —a $\flat^1$ —f $\flat^1$ —g $\flat^1$ —a $\flat^1$ —f $\flat^1$ —g $\flat^1$ —e $\flat^1$, the opening disguised once more by the use of enharmonic equivalents. Measures 57–64 function as a retransition to A², a parallel passage to mm. 29–34, only this time prolonging V rather than the $\flat$ VI. The final reprise of A contains the fundamental descent of the *Urlinie*, preceded as it was in the initial A section by local dividing dominant at m. 72. This final descent through the fifth occurs from mm. 76–84, with d $\flat^2$ functioning as a passing tone from e $\flat^2$ —c $\flat^2$, all supported contrapuntally in the bass by progression A $\flat$ —e $\flat$ —A $\flat$.

G: The Foreground Level

Appendix 4, graph 6 (2: 58–61) shows the foreground level, where the surface deceptions are at last exposed in their full harmonic luxuriousness.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 83.

The formal synopsis of the prelude can be charted as follows:

Measures	Formal Division	Main harmonic area
1-2	Introduction	I (A-flat)
3-18	A	I
19-27	B	$\flat$ II (A) to $\flat$ VI (E)
28-34	Retransition	$\flat$ VI to I
35-42	A ¹	I to V
43-57	C	$\flat$ VI to V (E-flat)
58-64	Retransition	V
65-84	A ²	I
85-91	Coda	I

Each section is clearly delineated by surface key (tonicization) and thematic content, and by voice-leading at the middleground levels. The Structural Synopsis, Graph 1 (2: 51), highlights the formal plan. Contrasts in dynamic levels also serve to add variety to the reprises of the A section.

A: mm. 3 – 18.

The first chord seems initially deceptive, having an ambiguous six—four feel, but clearly implies the presence of $A\flat$ —a reading affirmed in the coda (mm. 84–90), where the chord is similarly scored over a sustained $A\flat_1$. This confirms that it is a root position tonic rather than part of a six-four—five-three dominant collection. This stance is also supported both by its length, which spans two measures, and also by m. 18, where this chord is voiced in exactly the same way, only with the bass $A\flat$ now physically present in the bass on the first eighth-note of the measure. The use of the pedal in mm. 1–2 also creates sympathetic overtones that would allow $A\flat_1$ to be heard. It thus functions as a

two-measure introduction to the work, charged with subtly establishing the tonality.¹⁹⁷ A brief comparison of the other contexts in which this chord can be seen, particularly in mm. 88-90 makes it quite clear that it is a root position tonic collection. In Fontana I, the pedal $A\flat_1$ is held throughout these final measures, and, while certainly a less subtle reading, nevertheless clarifies this harmonic function here.

The early introduction of $g\flat^1$ in m. 4 is highly significant—on the surface it functions as a tonicization of the subdominant at the local level. More importantly, however, at a deeper level it is a foreground clue to solving one of the deceptions. At a point where a clear tonic harmony would be expected, this tonic chord is colored by the inclusion of the nascent $g\flat^1$. This foreshadows one of the “rational deceptions” that is seen in the second episode, since it hints at the covert nature of the sharp keys at the foreground level, which seek to camouflage their flat namesakes. The $g\flat^1$ presages the tonicization of G-flat major, mm. 47–50—the furthest departure from the dividing dominant in the C episode. The initial arpeggiated ascent to $e\flat^2$ is further fleshed out with $d\flat^2$ functioning as a consonant skip within the prevailing V^7 harmony, mirrored by $a\flat^2$ as a consonant skip within the following IV harmony. The remainder of the A section is elaborated with many small passing motions, appoggiaturas, and added chords, all of which are clarified in graph 6 (2: 58–61). There are two symmetrical phrases of eight measures each, mm. 2–10 and 11–18, following an antecedent/consequent construction that is reflected in the activity of the upper and lower voices. Dynamic contrast also serves to add variety here: mm. 3–10 being *piano*, while 11–18 are *forte*. The end of the antecedent is marked by a local dividing dominant at the foreground level in m. 10, the top line descending through a fourth, which serves as a local precursor of the descent

¹⁹⁷ It is surprising that Jim Samson sees this chord as part of a dominant six-four—five-three collection. The evidence for a root position seems conclusive. Samson, *The Music of Chopin*, 78.

of the *Urlinie* from e^2 to b^1 in mm. 38–42. Yet again, this connection emphasizes the organic unity of the work. The upper voice ascends from a^1 again reaching the *Kopftón* e^2 at m. 14, this time to descend locally through a fifth at the foreground level, culminating with a^1 at m. 18. This marks the end of the consequent. The subtle use of agogic accents has already been noted. e^2 —the *Kopftón*—received one in m. 6. Now, in relation to the first local descent of the *Urlinie* another can be seen in m. 16. Here, c^2 does not receive an accent, since it is merely a lower neighbor note to d^2 . d^2 does get one, however, since it is $\hat{4}$ of the local descent.¹⁹⁸ These accents serve to affirm—if affirmation be necessary—that it is from $\hat{5}$ rather than $\hat{3}$ that the *Urlinie* begins.

B: mm. 19–34.

The artifice of *vernünftige Betrügerey* becomes ever more apparent here, as the linear intervallic progressions seen in the middleground are expanded to generate these foreground deceptions. The falling melodic third, g^1 to e^1 that opens this section is an adumbration of the descent from g^2 that affirms the tonicization of F-flat major in mm. 27–28 (seen enharmonically as E major). The ascending linear intervallic pattern 7–10, 7–10, 7–10 moves locally in an ascending third relationship via A-major and C-sharp minor to E major from mm. 19–24, combining with the upper line reaching over from c^2 via the upper neighbor e^2 and then on to g^2 . From m. 24, the descending chromatic linear intervallic pattern $\sharp 6$ –8, $\sharp 6$ –8, $\sharp 6$ –8 is now fully harmonized, in a brilliant concatenation, each of its exotic detours merely serving to prolong the deception of local Neapolitan A major harmony through to the cadence (*Hilfkadenz*) at m. 26, the upper line

¹⁹⁸ It should be noted that throughout the work Chopin restricts his use of accents to notes of the *Urlinie* or closely related to it. Thus the only accents seen in the two episodes are on e^2 (B section, m. 29, which is b^6) and e^2 (C section, mm. 57, 59 and 61, the return of the *Kopftón*).

descending through a third. Mm. 28—34 function as a retransition to section A¹, prolonging the flattened submediant.

A¹: mm. 35—42.

This reprise is half the length of the initial A section, the main structural difference being that the *Urlinie* makes its structural descent to the dividing dominant, which is reached at m. 42. Dynamic contrast is also in evidence here, with this reprise being heard *fortissimo*, making a clear contrast with A. While it might be expected that this shortened reprise comprise the second (consequent) section (mm. 11-18), ending with a full close in A^b, it actually comprises the first (antecedent) section (mm. 3-10), ending with a half close in m. 42. This paves the way for the prolongation of the dividing dominant. Ending this section on V allows Chopin to begin the ensuing episode from a varied starting point tonally, giving him full opportunity to utilize the variety and richness of *vernünftige Betrügerey* in the prolongations here—V rather than ^bVI is being prolonged.

C: mm. 43—64

It is here that the machinations of *vernünftige Betrügerey* become ever more striking. The upper voice ascends sequentially twice through the sixth from b¹—g^{#2} (mm. 43—46) and c^{#2}—a^{#2} (mm. 47—50). What this actually conceals through enharmonic rational deception is an ascending register transfer (*Höherlegung*) from b^{b1} in m. 42 to b^{b2} (disguised as a^{#2}) in m. 50. This is supported by a chromatically ascending bass: e^b—e (f^b)—e[#](f)—f[#] (g^b)—d[#](e^b), e and f[#] being tonicized in a brilliant example of subterfuge on Chopin's part! The seeds sown in the nascent g^{b1} now bear rich fruit! The strategic placement of this upper voice ascending register transfer gives Chopin just the space he needs to flesh out all the harmonic complexities of this episode. Having reached b^{b2} (concealed as a^{#2}) in m. 50, supported in the bass by e^b (disguised as d[#])—a prolongation of the dividing dominant from m. 42—the upper voice now moves to the chromatic upper

neighbor, c^2 (obscured as b^2) in an *échappée* motion already described. The descent is now fleshed out $g\sharp^2(a^2) - g^2 - f\sharp^2(g^2)$. The line continues the descent to the *Kopfton*: $a^1 - b^1 - g^1 - a^1 - f\sharp^1 - g^1 - a^1 - f^1 - g^1 - e^1$ in a whirlwind 6—10, 6—10, 6—10 falling linear intervallic progression. The brilliant camouflage of this episode, achieved by enharmonic deception, with both the connection of b^1 to b^2 and the descent from b^1 to e^2 obscured by the use of sharp keys is only to be marveled at! Gerald Abraham, whose view echoes with surprising congruity the Schenkerian standpoint, encapsulated this brilliantly when he observed:

Now although the charm of Chopin's harmony lies almost entirely in its iridescent chromaticism, it is, like his melody, fundamentally diatonic. The diatonic basis is usually chromatically embroidered, frequently even temporarily broken up altogether. But its presence is always felt.¹⁹⁹

Indeed it is, and Schenker could not have expressed it better himself.

A²: mm. 65—90

While the final section of the prelude is similar to A in many respects, it is in the differences that Chopin's formal and compositional mastery become apparent. John Rink, who has probably analyzed more works by Chopin using the Schenkerian system than anyone else, makes the following stylistic observation concerning the style of his early works from the period 1817-32:

Given that Chopin tends not to make even subtle changes in the (repeated) last section which would highlight the "real" fundamental line and differentiate it from earlier statements of the same linear progression, structural weaknesses result—weaknesses inherent not in the models Chopin uses but in the literal nature of the recapitulation ... Nothing but its appearance at the end of a work differentiates the "real" fundamental line from the others.²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁹ Abraham, *Chopin's Musical Style*, 77.

²⁰⁰ Rink, "Chopin's 'Structural Style,'" 1: 63.

Nothing could be further from the truth in this instance! How far his stylistic development had come can be clearly observed when comparing this prelude to the earlier repertoire Rink is describing. By far the most significant alteration is that the whole of this final reprise occurs above a continuous tonic pedal, enhancing the tonic pull to the final descent of the *Urlinie*, and also giving a far stronger sense of return and ultimate resolution. It is indeed rare for such a feature of the background to function so strongly at the foreground level and for such a lengthy span. The power of this pedal point is felt immediately at m. 65, where the main theme is reintroduced above it. It is significant that, unlike mm. 4, 12 and 36, g^b is not added to the tonic chord here, perhaps for two reasons: the desire that the final return to the tonic should be clear and unequivocal, and that there is no longer a reason to give clues to the deceptions, since they have already occurred. The g^b is not absent for long, however, since the pull of the subdominant is already deceiving the listener into sensing the beginning of the coda. Chopin colors the harmony with it three times at mm. 70, 74 and 78, so that by the time the coda actually begins there is no need for g^b to be included, its work having already been done. Dynamic contrast is again in evidence, the whole of this section being marked *pianissimo, sotto voce*, in a brilliant sense of understatement. Chopin's compositional mastery is again evidenced by the extension of the A^2 section, adding a passage that delays the final descent of the *Urlinie*. This is achieved by making subtle changes—adding three more measures here, the melodic structure of A^2 now comprising $8 + 8 + 3$. And how significant they are. The half-step motive $e-b$ is repeated at the foreground level two times, doubled in octaves in the left hand harmony, while $\hat{3}$ is prolonged melodically, as Chopin almost plays with the final descent. “Is it this time—or perhaps this?” the listener asks, being brilliantly deceived two times by Chopin's disingenuousness in anticipated descents at mm. 81 and 82 before its final resolution onto

1̂ in m. 84. And such is the strength of the tonic pedal's influence that, in m. 83, when the treble and bass meet in the final descent, the dominant chord is only implied by context rather than physically present. The significance of ♭ here goes far beyond its motivic function in mm. 79–82, for it is a reflection on the tonicization of the first episode, now seen albeit briefly without the sharp-side artifice. It is as if Chopin is almost joking with his listener (since he did not plant this seed earlier), laying down a challenge to notice the connection between E and F♭!

There are also subtle alterations of surface-level texture and harmony throughout this reprise, again due to the presence of the tonic pedal A♭₁, which is sounded eleven times, each marked *forzando*.²⁰¹ Paramount in importance is the avoidance of the dominant chord—yet another accommodation to the influence of the tolling A♭₁'s. In fact only once in this whole section, at m. 72, is there a dominant chord in root position (the local dividing dominant), such is the influence of the tonic. While it is unusual to have scale-step 2̂ of the fundamental line unsupported by dominant harmony, as is the case here, the unique circumstances of this final reprise above a tonic pedal appear to warrant an unique solution. The final descent having occurred in mm. 83–84, mm. 84–90 serve as a coda, prolonging I. It is almost as if the coda merges imperceptibly into the close of A², with no dominant chord to articulate this final cadence.

It is interesting to contrast Chopin's early version of the coda (Fontana I) with this final one. There, root position chords are glaringly spelled out—A♭₁ being physically sustained throughout from mm. 84–90. How much more mature is the final version, where they are again enigmatically implied. The final chord is placed in exactly the same position as it was in the very opening of the piece (mm. 1-2), the difference here being

²⁰¹ The programmatic significance to the eleven repetitions of A♭₁ has already been mentioned earlier (see p. 52). Their analytic influence is clearly also highly significant.

that $A\flat_1$ is actually sounded in the penultimate measure. All of these features give an unequivocal sense of closure—something entirely apposite at this point in the overall structure of the work.

H: Motive

The use of motive as an organic element permeating the piece can clearly be seen at all structural levels. At the background level, the *Ursatz* itself functions as an all-embracing foundational motive, embedded in work at the deepest level. So, too, the *Ursatz* parallelism, seen at mm. 3—18, functions as motive at the middleground level. In the same way, the division at the first level of middle ground (mm. 35—42) and the local division at the third level of middleground (mm. 3—10) also function motivically. The importance of the rising and falling half-step motive in the overall organic unity is considerable (see graph 1 (2: 52)). It is significant that c^1 appears in the right hand, while $\flat^1$ appears above it in the left hand since it emphasizes, at the very outset of the work, the importance of this motive in relation to the *Kopfton*.²⁰² It functions at the foreground level at various points: mm. 1—3 (and the various reprises of this phrase); in both the re-transitions (mm. 28—34 and 58—60); in the final reprise of the antecedent (m. 69—70) and consequent (mm. 77—78), where it is heard as $g^1 - g\flat^1 - f^1$, recomposing the accompaniment in both instances to introduce $g\flat^1$.²⁰³ Perhaps the most crucial place it is heard is at the point of the final descent of the *Urlinie*, mm. 79—83, where it is used to prolong tonic harmony beneath $\hat{3}$ being heard as $\flat - \flat - \flat$. And, in a wonderful gesture of symmetry with the opening, it is heard again in the penultimate measure as the last melodic event (m. 89: $\flat^1 - c^1$). In the first level of middleground it functions in both the

²⁰² It can of course be found at the background level in the *Urlinie* as $\flat^2 - \flat^2$.

²⁰³ The pull of the tonic pedal is significant here, already influencing the harmony in the direction of the subdominant area—traditionally the preserve of the coda—following the final descent.

upper and lower voices, providing a crucial link between the two episodes. In the first B episode, it functions in the upper voice as $e^2 - f^2 - d^2 - e^2$ —the chromatic structural neighbor note. In the second C episode, it functions in the lower voice in the foreground throughout the bass line (mm. 43–55), supporting the various chromatic harmonic shifts above. The echappée pattern, first seen in the second level of middleground (2: 55, m. 42–51), provides a significant cohesive connection in the C episode. Its significance as a motive becomes clear at the third level of middle ground (2: 57, mm. 42–57, where it is repeated in a falling sequence.

I: Thematic Transformation

Inner unity is enhanced by Chopin's practice at the foreground level of what Schenker calls *Prinzip der Mannigfaltigkeit* (Principle of Variety),²⁰⁴ whereby the first theme is never presented in exactly the same manner, but seems ever new on each subsequent repetition. The first theme is initially introduced as $(d^1) g^1 - c^2 - d^2 - f^1 - g^1$ in m. 3, an idea characterized by the angular interval of the fourth between the first two notes, and heard at the *piano* dynamic level. The phrasing is also varied on each appearance. This initial hearing is part of a larger phrase structure that includes the introduction from mm. 1–4.²⁰⁵ An integral feature of this manifestation of *Prinzip der Mannigfaltigkeit* is the role of the first note in this theme. Sometimes it is present, at others an eighth-note rest is substituted; on further appearances the first eighth-note is tied to the final note of the previous phrase. These subtle variations are also reflected in its phrasing. When it is reprised as the opening of the consequent phrase in m. 11, it is

²⁰⁴ Heinrich Schenker, ed., *J. S. Bach Chromatische Phantasie und Fuge* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1910), 20. English translation from *J. S. Bach's Chromatic Fantasy and Fugue: Critical Edition with Commentary*, trans. Hedi Siegel (New York: Longman, 1984), 25.

²⁰⁵ It should be noted that Fontana II (and therefore the OGE) does not follow the phrasing in Chopin's *Reinschrift* here. Full details can be found in appendix 2.

transformed thus: (tied $b^{\flat 1}$ —) $b^{\flat 1}$ — c — $d^{\flat 2}$ — $f^{\natural}$ — $g^{\natural}$, the opening fourth having been smoothed out to a second, now played *forte*. The phrase length here is shortened to begin on the second eighth-note of m. 11 and continue to m. 12. On its next appearance in m. 35, it appears in another variant that is very similar to the original at m. 3: $(g^{\flat 1})$ — $g^{\natural}$ — c^2 — $d^{\flat 2}$ — $f^{\natural}$ — $g^{\natural}$, only this time played *fortissimo* accompanied by doubled octaves in the bass, and phrased from the first eighth-note of m. 35 to m. 38. In its final reprise during A², it appears as in m. 11: $b^{\flat 1}$ — c — $d^{\flat 2}$ — $f^{\natural}$ — $g^{\natural}$ for both repetitions in mm. 65 and 73.²⁰⁶ However, even these two repetitions are contrasted. In m. 65, the dynamic level is marked *pianissimo*, *sotto voce*, and the harmonic texture is reduced to four voices, producing the most delicate of sonorities—undoubtedly a moment that conjures up the adjective “himmlisch” which Meyerbeer used to describe this work.²⁰⁷ At m. 73 the same melodic shape is again used, this time preceded by an eighth-note rest and with fuller accompaniment. It is interesting to note that mm. 65—66 do not receive a phrase mark in any of the original sources, surely an omission on Chopin’s part, and something a critical edition must address.²⁰⁸

J: Foreground Tonal Operations

Graph 7 (2: 62) illustrates the manner in which the foreground deceptions are achieved tonally, revealing the hidden connections between the sharp and flat side of the enharmonic divide. Stemmed half notes show tonal areas. Unstemmed noteheads

²⁰⁶ Several editors have seemed unhappy with Chopin’s compositional desire to achieve thematic transformation, and took it upon themselves to alter some of his variants to achieve what they felt was a better sense of homogeneity and less angularity of line. Unfortunately, no indication of these alterations is given in their scores. Thus m. 3 is altered by Klindworth (1880) and Cortot (Chopin, *24 Préludes, Édition de travail*, ed. Alfred Cortot [Paris, 1926]) to read $(g^{\natural})$ $b^{\flat 1}$ — c^2 — $d^{\flat 2}$ — $f^{\natural}$ — $g^{\natural}$. This happens again at m. 35. Cortot, amongst others, used this inaccurate version in his recordings of the prelude. So widespread had these variants become that even Maurice Brown misquotes the opening theme of this work as $(d^{\flat 1})$ — $b^{\flat 1}$ — c^2 — $d^{\flat 2}$ — $f^{\natural}$ — $g^{\natural}$ in Brown 1972, 96!

²⁰⁷ See footnote 38.

²⁰⁸ See appendix 3 for a suggested solution.

indicate progressions to and from tonal areas. Broken ties indicate retained pitch classes. Graph 7 (a) shows the fundamental tonality of A-flat major, which is prolonged at the background level throughout the first episode. Graph 7 (b) shows the enharmonic pivot function of $a\flat/g\sharp$, which enables the deception to E major ($\flat VI$) to occur. Graph 7 (c) shows the progression from A-flat major to tonicized E major, and the means of return to $A\flat$ via V^7 . It is interesting to observe that the collection in m.19 is approached from the tonic (A-flat major)—as a German sixth ($F\flat - A\flat - C\flat - D$) but left as a dominant seventh (an enharmonic pivot chord), briefly tonicising A major ($B\sharp$ major, m. 20) at the foreground level ($E - G\sharp - B - D$), with D functioning as the pivot note between them. Thus the first tour-de-force of sharp key subterfuge begins! At the end of B, in mm. 32 a passing chord of E^7 is reinterpreted as $F\flat^7$, its enharmonic equivalent—a journey from four sharps to eight flats. This could be described as an enharmonic simultaneity—a process that is theoretical rather than aural in its application.²⁰⁹ The listener is only aware that an enharmonic change has occurred after the event, when the shortened reprise of A begins on the dominant two measures later. Graph 8 (2: 63) shows the enharmonic voice-leading model for this episode.

Graph 9 (2: 64) illustrates the deceptions in the second episode. Graph 9 (a) shows the prolongation of the dividing dominant (V) that is active throughout this episode. Graph 9 (b) shows the enharmonic pivot functions of $e\flat/d\sharp$, and $f\sharp/g\flat$, and the tonicizations that occur. Graph 9 (c) fleshes out the enharmonic connections, showing how the tonicizations are achieved. In mm. 42–43 the chords of E-flat major (the dividing dominant) and B major are juxtaposed as the deceptions of the second episode commence. B major can be enharmonically reinterpreted as C-flat major, a Neapolitan

²⁰⁹ The sum total of accidentals in an enharmonic simultaneity between the sharp and flat sides is always twelve.

relationship, both chords sharing the pitch $e/d\sharp$, which provides the flat side nexus with what follows. There is a clear parallel with the transition into the first episode here.

Chopin uses the exact same progression to achieve the deception: $I-\flat VI-\flat II$. For the first episode, the tonal relationship is $A\flat-F\flat-B\flat$, beginning from the tonic, while here it is $E\flat-C\flat-F\flat$, beginning from the dominant, both being Neapolitan relationships at the local level. The influence of his improvisatory skills here is quite clear. Chopin uses the same harmonic archetype to move into each episode, thus making a clear connection between them. Graph 10 (2: 65) shows the enharmonic voice-leading model for this episode. It is in the return to the dominant in this episode (mm. 51–55) that the enharmonic deception is at its greatest. The descent through the fifth b^2-a

$b^2-g^2-g\flat^2-g^2-f^2-e\flat^2$ is brilliantly concealed in the following manner:

$a\sharp^2-g\sharp^2(a\flat^2)-g^2-f\sharp^2(g\flat^2)-g^2-f^2-e\flat^2$. The enharmonic connection is made from mm.

51–52. In m. 52, E-flat major (enharmonic D-sharp major) forms the connection back to the flat side. Adding to the harmonic instability here is the fact that all these secondary dominants are in first inversion. The ornamental dexterity of the decorative harmony is almost breathless here, and the sense of return as the prolongation ends is quite palpable.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CHOPIN AND SCHENKER: CONNECTIONS THAT BIND

“Textual Integrity and Foreground Deceptions”—ultimately, it is the charting of these two seemingly disparate journeys and the demonstration of their nexus that is the *raison d’être* of this thesis. The first is a long voyage taken between three European capitals, as the text of this prelude was “simultaneously” published in three separate and differing editions—a tale of a missing sketch, a presentation manuscript, a handwritten fragment, copies masquerading as autographs, differing dedicatees, missing opus numbers and annotated first editions that was ripe for unraveling. The latter journey is a tonal one—a chronicle of the influence of *vernünftige Betrügerey* in deceptive episodes, obscured in a web of sharp keys, only to be revealed via reductive analysis as composings-out of a chromatic structural neighbor note and a dividing dominant chord—both related in clear and fundamental terms to the tonic key. What first appeared to be a distant digression via the cycle of fifths is, in the final reckoning, deceptively simple, surprisingly close.

These two journeys interweave at many levels. The charting of the tonal journey cannot commence until the textual odyssey has reached its conclusion, with sources examined, editorial choices made, and a critical text established. For only then is a model available that allows the completion of the analytical task. In Schenker’s mind, textual integrity was an essential prerequisite for the process of analysis to begin, and it is, in all actuality, impossible to imagine the successful achievement of the latter without completion of the former.

However, these journeys connect in a more fundamental way in two individuals. First there is Fryderyk Chopin the socialite pianist/composer who ornaments and revises

in an almost postmodern fashion, and is laden so brim-full with creative ideas that it is almost impossible to capture him—to cage him—to confine him to a single version of his invention! Chopin, the Polish pianist and improviser who loved to deceive his public as he moved tonally into seemingly distant territory that in reality turned out to be far closer than it appeared. And then there is Heinrich Schenker—the scholar, performer and pioneering editor, determined to root out an accurate and authentic text of a work—the perceptive analyst, who sought to illumine the structural unity and organicism of a composition through a series of reductive graphic analyses. This connection, that germinated in the person of Karol Mikuli—Chopin’s student and Schenker’s teacher, grew to be so strong that Schenker ushered the Chopin—his musical forebear—into his famed pantheon of German composers, bestowing, albeit posthumously, upon his teacher’s teacher the prestigious title of “honorary German,” undoubtedly the greatest honor he could confer!

And at journey’s end what is left is a critical text that respects the integrity and idiosyncrasies both of the pianist/composer who constantly reworked his music and of the performer/analyst who came searching after him. And it is this text that becomes the catalyst for the generation of an analysis that reveals a fundamental tonal unity that permeates this work at every structural level. Chopin himself cunningly sows the seeds to the solution of the rational deceptions seen in the two episodes, planting these clues— f^b and g^b —in the A sections of the work. This analysis reveals how the whole piece “is related organically, and finds its conceptual origin in the fundamental

structure.”²¹⁰ It is in this very structure—the *Ursatz*—“the ground of all being, as it were,” embedded in the heart of the work, that this unity is achieved.²¹¹

²¹⁰ Paul M. Ellison, “Beethoven and Schenker: Unraveling Those Graphs,” in *The Beethoven Journal* 16, 2 (Winter 2001): 73.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abraham, Gerald. *Chopin's Musical Style*. London: Oxford University Press, 1939.
- Bach, C. P. E. *Versuch über die wahre Art, das Clavier zu spielen*. Part I. Berlin: C. F. Henning, 1753. Part II. Berlin: G. L. Winter, 1762. *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments*, trans. William J. Mitchell. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1949.
- Beach, David. *Aspects of Schenkerian Theory*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- _____. "The Current State of Schenkerian Research." *Acta musicologica*, Vol. 57 (1985).
- Bent, Ian. "Heinrich Schenker, Chopin and Domenico Scarlatti." *Music Analysis* 5, 2-3, 1986.
- Berry, Wallace. *Structural Functions in Music*. New Jersey: Dover Publications, 1976.
- Brown, Maurice J. E. *Chopin: An Index of his Works in Chronological Order*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1960, rev. 1972.
- Cadwallader, Allen and David Gagné. *Analysis of Tonal Music: A Schenkerian Approach*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Chomiński, Józef Michał and Teresa Dalila Turło. *Katalog dzieł Fryderyka Chopina*. Kraków: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, 1990.
- Chopin, Fryderyk. *Selected Correspondence of Fryderyk Chopin*. Ed. Arthur Hedley. London: Heinemann, 1962.
- _____. *24 Preludia, Faksymilowane Wydanie Autografów F. Chopina*. Ed. Władysław Hordyński. Kraków: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, 1951.
- Delacroix, Eugène. *The Journal of Eugène Delacroix*. Trans. Walter Pach. New York: Crown, 1948.
- DeLong, Kenneth. "Roads Taken and Retaken: Foreground Ambiguity in Chopin's Prelude in A-flat, Op. 28, No. 17," in *Canadian University Music Review* 11, No. 1 (1991).
- Ekier, Jan. *Wstęp do Wydania narodowego dzieł Fryderyka Chopina*. Kraków: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne-Towarzystwo im. Fryderyka Chopina, 1974.

- Ekier, Jan and Paweł Kamiński, eds. *Preludia op. 28, 45*. Warszawa: Polskie Wydawnictwo Muzyczne, 2000.
- Eigeldinger, Jean-Jacques. *Chopin: Pianist and Teacher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- _____. "L'achèvement des Préludes op. 28 de Chopin," in *Revue de musicologie*, 75 (1989).
- Ellison, Paul M. "Beethoven and Schenker: Unraveling Those Graphs," in *The Beethoven Journal*, 16, 2 (Winter 2001).
- Forte, Allen and Steven Gilbert. *Introduction to Schenkerian Analysis*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1982.
- Gide, André. *Notes sur Chopin*. Paris: L'Arche, 1948; *Notes on Chopin*, trans. Bernard Frechtman. New York: Philosophical Library, 1949.
- Grabowski, Krzysztof. *The Original French Editions of Fryderyk Chopin's Music*. Warsaw: Fryderyk Chopin Society in Warsaw, 1994.
- Hedley, Arthur. *Chopin*. London: Dent, 1949.
- _____, trans. and ed. *Selected Correspondence of Fryderyk Chopin, Abridged from Sydow*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- Higgins, Thomas. "Chopin Interpretation: A Study of Performance Directions in Selected Autographs and Other Sources." Ph.D. diss., University of Iowa, 1966.
- _____, ed. *Chopin Preludes, Opus 28*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1973.
- Hudson, Richard. *Stolen Time*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Jordan, Ruth. *Nocturne: A Life of Chopin*. London: Taplinger Publication Co., 1978.
- Kalib, Sylvan. *Thirteen Essays from the Three Yearbook "Das Meisterwerk in der Musik" by Heinrich Schenker: An Annotated Translation*. 3 vols. Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University, 1973.
- Kallberg, Jeffrey. *Chopin at the Boundaries*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- _____. "The Chopin Sources: Variants and Versions in Later Manuscripts and Printed Editions." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1982.

Kobylańska, Krystyna. *Frédéric Chopin: Thematisch-bibliographisches Werkverzeichnis*. Ed. Ernst Hettrich, trans. Helmut Stolze. München: Henle, 1979.

Laskowski, Larry. *Heinrich Schenker: An Annotated Index to his Analyses of Musical Works*. New York: Pendragon Press, 1978.

Leichtentritt, Hugo. *Analyse von Chopinschen Klavierwerken*. 2 vols. Berlin: Max Hesses Verlag, 1921

Lenneberg, Hans, trans. and ed. *Breitkopf und Härtel in Paris: The Letters of their Agent Heinrich Probst between 1833 and 1840*. New York: Pendragon Press, 1989.

Lissa, Zofia. "Chopin im Lichte des Breifwechsels von Verlegern seiner Zeit," in *Fontes artis musicae*, 7, 1960.

Melville, Derek. *Chopin: A Biography with a Survey of Books, Editions and Recordings*. London: Clive Bingley, 1977.

Neumeyer, David and Susan Tepping. *A Guide to Schenkerian Analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1992.

Niecks, Frederick. *Frederick Chopin as a Man and Musician*. 2 vols. London: Novello, Ewer and Co., 1888, repr. 1973.

Opiński, Henryk, ed. *Chopin's Letters*, trans. E. L. Voynich. New York: Dover, 1988.

Platzman, George W. *A Catalogue of Early Printed Editions of the Works of Frédéric Chopin in the University of Chicago Library*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Library, 1997.

Rink, John S. "The Evolution of Chopin's 'Structural Style' and Its Relation to Improvisation." Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1989.

Rink, John and Jim Samson, eds. *Chopin Studies 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Rosen, Charles. *The Romantic Generation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Salzer, Felix. *Structural Hearing*. New York: Charles Boni, 1952, rev. 1962.

Samson, Jim. *Chopin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

_____, ed. *Chopin Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

_____, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Chopin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

_____. *The Music of Chopin*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985.

Schenker, Heinrich. *Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik als Einführung zu Ph. Em. Bachs Klavierwerken*. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1904. "A Contribution to the Study of Ornamentation," trans. Hedi Siegel, *The Music Forum IV*. New York: Columbia University, 1976.

_____. *Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien*, Part II, *Kontrapunkt*, Vol. I. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1910. *Counterpoint*. Trans. John Rothgeb and Jürgen Thym, ed. John Rothgeb, 2. Vols. New York: Schirmer Books, 1987.

_____. *Der Freie Satz*. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1935; *Free Composition*. Trans. and ed. Ernst Oster. New York: Longman, 1979.

_____. *Fünf Urfurien Tafeln*. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1932. Reprinted as *Five Graphic Music Analyses*. New York: Dover, 1969.

_____. *Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien*, Part I, *Harmonielehre*. Vienna: Universal Edition, 1906. *Harmony*. Ed. Oswald Jonas, trans. Elisabeth Mann Borgese. Chicago; The University of Chicago Press, 1954.

_____. *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*. Jahrbuchen I-III. Munich: Drei Masken Verlag, 1925-30.
The Masterwork in Music. Vol. I (1925). Ed. William Drabkin, trans. Ian Bent, William Drabkin, Richard Kramer, John Rothgeb and Hedi Siegel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
 Vol. II (1926). Ed. William Drabkin, trans. Ian Bent, William Drabkin, John Rothgeb and Hedi Siegel. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
 Vol. III (1930). Ed. William Drabkin, trans. Ian Bent, Alfred Clayton and Derrick Puffett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Smialek, William. *Frédéric Chopin: A Guide to Research*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 2000.

Sydow, Bronisław Edward. *Bibliografia F. F. Chopina*. Warszawa: Towarzystwo Naukowe Warszawskie, 1949.

_____. *Bibliografia F. F. Chopina. Supplement*. Warszawa: Polskie Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1954.

Taruskin, Richard. *Text and Act: Essays on Music and Performance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Wintle, Christopher. "Corelli's Tonal Models," in *Nuovissimi Studi Corelliani Atti del Terzo Congresso Internazionale, Fusignano, 1980*, ed. S. Durante and P. Petrobelli. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1982.

Yeston, Maury, ed. *Readings in Schenker Analysis and Other Approaches*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977. (Includes annotated bibliography by David Beach.).

TEXTUAL INTEGRITY AND FOREGROUND DECEPTIONS:

CHOPIN'S PRELUDE IN A-FLAT, 28/17

Volume Two: Appendices

Paul Martin Ellison

San José State University

APPENDIX ONE

A List of Erasures in the *Reinschrift*

- m.1 The key signature C is erased and replaced with 6/8.
- m. 9 A note on the first beat in the right hand is erased, and this is left empty.
- m. 19 The first working of this is erased, and the replacement is written in the measure following. It is just possible to decipher some flat signs at the beginning of the left-hand staff, indicating that Chopin was perhaps intending to begin writing the B section in F-flat major, and then thought better of it. It would be fascinating to see exactly how much could be deciphered from the actual manuscript here.
- mm. 19–25 Chopin's original intention was to have the *crescendi* and *diminuendi* ebb and flow more, from mm. 19-21, and 21-23, reflecting the reaching over of the upper line, with the climax occurring at 23—the structural upper neighbor note e^2 . These hairpins are all erased, and replaced with the general crescendo from m. 19 to m. 24, where the highest point of the line is reached. This reworking has significant analytical implications, for it reflects the rising structure of the upper voice rising to $g\sharp^2$, before a local descent to e^2 via $f\sharp^2$, a structure that is even more effective supporting the structural upper neighbor, since it reflects the importance of the falling third descent $g\sharp^2$ - e^2 .
- m. 20 Two notes are crossed-out in the left hand upper voice, and an early indication to depress the pedal is erased.

- m. 23 The final syllable of “crescen-do” is erased and placed just after $g\sharp^2$ in m. 24. Source 3 removes the inconsistency of having “crescen-do” and “dim” on the same beat, moving the “dim” to beat two.
- m. 24 Crossings-out in the right hand on beats three and four. At the end of this measure the depress pedal sign is erased. It is extremely hard to make out if Chopin restored the sign as all the first editions do, because the erasure is really heavy.
- m. 27 Large smudge in the second half of the measure. Chopin is known for being messy in his *Reinschriften*, and it looks as if it is just that, and covers nothing.
- m. 28 Erasure on beat four in the right hand, probably to do with the positioning of this right-hand chord beneath $f\sharp^2$.
- m. 34 Erasure in the right-hand inner voices, maybe of an incorrect accidental ($\sharp$).
- m. 37 Crossings-out in the right hand before $d\flat^2$, maybe of a redundant $\flat$ sign, and a smudge in the left hand.
- m. 39 The left-hand chords on beats 4-6 are erased and replaced with an alternative reading on the empty staff beneath.
- m. 44 Right-hand inner voice erased on beats 5-6. This would be of two b ’s that do appear in Fontana 1.
- m. 46 Crossings-out in between the staves, and before the right-hand chord on beat four.
- m. 47 Erasures in between the staves, presumably of a dynamic marking, and also on the first right-hand chord, which is not replaced.
- m. 50 The release pedal sign is erased after beat three and placed under beat five.

- m. 51 b^1 is erased from the left hand, because it already appears in the right hand. There is also a crossing out beneath the left-hand staff, maybe of a former pedal marking?
- m. 53 The left hand chord on beat five is crossed-out and replaced.
- m. 54 There is a smudge between beats two and three in the right-hand, and the chord on beat five is erased and replaced.
- m. 58 The complete right-hand part of this measure is scratched out and replaced with the current reading in the free staff above the right-hand part.
- m. 60 Erasures in the right-hand on beats three and four, and before beat six, presumably of a redundant flat.
- m. 66 A dotted half-note e^2 is erased, in a reworking of the spacing of this chord.
- m. 67 A crossing-out on beat one in the right hand of a redundant beam.
- m. 69 Erasure of a tied f^2 in the right-hand, and four ϕ^1 's in the inner voice.
- m. 72 Chopin changed his mind over the type of repetition sign he wished to employ, and erased the redundant one.
- m. 73 The dynamic marking "*ppp*" is erased.
- m. 78 Release pedal sign is erased and moved to the left.
- m. 80 The complete left-hand part is erased, and replaced with the current reading in the empty staff beneath the left hand. Again Chopin decided to use a different reiteration symbol.
- m. 83 Two c^1 's are erased here, in another change of mind over reiteration.
- m. 86 Two erasures on beats three and six, presumably of eighth-note rests.
- m. 88 An erasure beneath the staff, maybe of a release pedal sign, which he forgot to add back in! Since this is the final measure, there is no last release pedal sign.

APPENDIX TWO

Variants between the Sources of Prelude in A-flat, Opus 28. Number 17

This table compares the following sources:

- 1 Copy of Prelude in A-flat (*Urschrift*) by Julian Fontana (Fontana I)
- 2 Autograph (*Reinschrift*) in the hand of Fryderyk Chopin
- 3 First French Edition, first impression (OFEi)
- 4 First French Edition, second impression (OFEii)
- 5 Copy of the *Reinschrift* by Julian Fontana (Fontana II)
- 6 First German Edition (OGE)
- 7 First English Edition, second impression (OEEii)
- 8 Annotated copy of the First French Edition, second impression (OFEii),
owned by Ludwika Jędrzejewicz
- 9 Annotated copy of the First French Edition, second impression (OFEii),
owned by Marie Tcherkassky, née de Scherbatoff
- 10 Annotated copy of the First French Edition, second impression (OFEii),
owned by Jane W. Stirling
- 11 Annotated copy of the First French Edition, second impression (OFEii),
owned by Camille Dubois, née O'Meara
- 12 Fragment of Prelude in A-flat, mm. 65–72, written in the album of Ignaz
Moscheles, in the hand of Fryderyk Chopin

For further information about each of these sources, please see 1: 39-41.

The following abbreviations are used:

Musical signs such as $\flat$ and .

Material such as “cresc” or “.” within quotation marks is taken directly from one of the sources.

RH: Right hand

LH: Left hand

OFEi: Original French Edition, first impression

OFEii: Original French Edition, second impression

OGE: Original German Edition

OEii: Original English Edition, second impression

The system for designation of register used throughout this thesis is the one employed by Heinrich Schenker in his published analyses. See 2: 51 for a detailed chart.

TABLE OF VARIANT READINGS BETWEEN PRIMARY SOURCES
THAT DATE FROM BEFORE 1849

Measure	1: Urschrift	2: Reinschrift	3: OFEi	4: OFEii
Before 1	"Allegretto quasi andantino"	"Allegretto"	As 2	As 2
1-10	No pedal markings	Pedal markings	As 2	As 2
1	No marking	"p"	No marking	As 2
1	RH, LH use reiteration sign on second ♩.	LH uses reiteration sign on second ♩.	Notated in full	As 3
1-2	No marking	Open/close hairpin	As 2	As 2
1-4	No phrase mark	Phrase mark	Continues to m. 11	As 3
2	Repeat previous bar sign	Repeat previous bar sign	Notated in full	As 3
3	No staccato mark	Staccato on E ¹	As 2	As 2
4	Notated in full	LH uses reiteration sign on second ♩.	Notated in full	As 3
5	RH stays on a ¹	RH rises to d ²	As 2	As 2
5	No pedal markings	Release after sixth ♩.	As 2	As 2
5	Notated in full	LH uses reiteration sign on second ♩.	Notated in full	As 3
5	LH chord notated a ^b -d ¹ -a ^b	LH chord notated a ^b -d ¹ -f ¹	As 2	As 2
6	No accents marked	RH agogic accents on e ² and f ²	RH dynamic accents on e ² and f ²	As 3
7	Notated in full	LH: reiteration sign on second ♩.	Notated in full	As 3
7	No pedal marking	Pedal release after last ♩.	As 2	As 2
8	No dot on f	LH ♩. f	As 2	As 2
8	No accents marked	RH agogic accents on c ² and d ²	RH dynamic accents on c ² and d ²	As 2
9	No dot on e ^b	Dot on e ^b	As 2	As 2
9	Sole phrase mark annotated with "X"	Already part of phrase from 1-11	Phrase mark from 13-15	As 2
10	Chord reads e ^b -b ^b -e ¹ -g ¹	Chord reads e ^b -g ^b -b ^b -e ¹ -g ¹	As 2	As 2
10	Notated in full	RH, LH use reiteration signs on second ♩.	Notated in full	As 3

5: Fontana II	6: OGE	7: OEEii	8: Jedrzejewicz	9: Scherbatoff
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 3	As 3	As 3	As 3	As 3
No marking	No marking	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	No staccato mark	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	Release omitted	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	a ^b missing on second	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 3	As 3	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	Pedal release on last	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
Already part of phrase from 5-11	As 5	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3

10: Sterling	11: Dubois/O'Meara	12: Moscheles	Preferred Reading	Comments
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1/3
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearer reading
As 2	As 2	None	2	5/6 Fontana's error
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 editorial oversight
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearer reading
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1/6
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearer reading
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	7 editorial oversight
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearer reading
As 2	As 2	None	2	7 is misreading by Berlin editors
As 3	As 3	None	2	All editors missed accent size
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearer reading
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 6
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All editors missed accent size
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	Phrase mark and "X" in 1 probably spurious
As 2	As 2	None	6	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearer reading

Measure	1: Urschrift	2: Reinschrift	3: OFEi	4: OFEii
39-45 (40-46)	No phrase mark	Phrase mark	As 2	As 2
39 (40)	RH/LH reiteration sign on second	RH/LH reiteration sign on second	Notated in full	As 3
39-45 (40-46)	LH octaves scored F-f, B ^b -b ^b	LH octaves scored F ₁ -F, B ₁ -B ^b	As 2	As 2
40 (41)	No accents notated	Accents on c ² and d ^{b2}	As 2	As 2
41 (42)	LH chord on third scored b ^b -e ¹	LH chord on third scored e ^b -b ^b -e ^{b1}	As 2	As 2
41 (42)	RH chord on fourth scored d ²	RH chord on fourth scored d ¹ -a-d ²	As 2	As 2
41 (42)	LH chord from second is e ^b -g-e ¹	LH chord from second notated e ^b -e ^{b1}	As 2	As 2
42 (43)	No reiteration signs	No reiterationsigns	As 2	As 2
42-45 (43-46)	No phrase mark	Phrase mark	Part of phrase from mm. 39-45	As 3
43-44 (44-45)	No ornament	Ornament b ¹ -c ² -b ¹	Ornament b ¹ -c ² -b ¹	As 3
43 (44)	No arpeggio sign	Arpeggio sign is merged with , looks like	No arpeggio sign since it resembles	As 3
43 (44)	b ¹ is tied	No tie	As 2	As 2
43 (44)	Marking unclear, but could be "p"	"p" marked	As 2	As 2
43 (44)	Notated in full	LH reiteration sign on second	Notated in full	As 3
44 (45)	e, e ¹ and c ¹ all have accidentals	e ^b , e ^{b1} and c ¹ all missing accidentals	As 2	As 2
44 (45)	c ¹ on sixth has	c ¹ missing accidental	As 2	As 2
44 (45)	b and b ¹ have	b ^b and b ^{b1} missing	As 2	As 2
44 (45)	No pedal marks	Release pedal on fourth	Release pedal after fourth	As 3
44 (45)	e and e ¹ have 's	e ^b and e ^{b1} missing 's	As 2	As 2
44 (45)	LH sixth c ¹ has	LH sixth c ¹ missing	As 2	As 2
44 (45)	b ¹ tied on second	No tie	As 2	As 2

5: Fontana II	6: OGE	7: OEEii	8: Jedrzejewicz	9: Scherbatoff
M.39 has phrase mark	As 5	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
RH/LH use reiteration signs	As 5	As 2	As 2	As 2
Phrase mark continues from m. 40	As 2	As 2	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 3	As 3	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3
e and e' missing ♯'s	e, e' and c' all have accidentals	As 6	As 2	As 2
c' has ♯	As 5	As 5	As 2	As 2
As 2	b and b' have ♯	b' needs ♯	As 2	As 2
As 3	As 3	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	e and e' have ♯'s	As 6	As 2	As 2
As 2	LH sixth ♯ c' has ♯	As 6	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2

10: Sterling	11: Dubois/O'Meara	12: Moscheles	Preferred Reading	Comments
As 2	As 2	None	2	Misreading of 2
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearer reading
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	2 is clearer reading
As 3	As 3	None	2	Fontana's misreading of 2. A small break is just visible at m. 42
As 3	As 3	None	2	# congruent with key
As 3	Arpeggio sign annotated	None	11	Chopin's annotation confirmed by comparison with 2
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearer reading
As 2	As 2	None	6/7	Only readings congruent with key
As 2	As 2	None	5/6/7	Only readings congruent with key
As 2	b ^b and b ^b have annotated b's	None	6/11	Only readings congruent with key
As 3	As 3	None	3	Editorial error
As 2	As 2	None	6/7	Only readings congruent with key
As 2	As 2	None	6/7	Only readings congruent with key
As 2	As 2	None	1/7	All agree except 1

Measure	1: Urschrift	2: Reinschrift	3: OFEi	4: OFEii
45 (46)	b ¹ missing ♯	b ¹ has ♯	As 2	As 2
45 (46)	b has ♯	b ² missing ♯	As 2	As 2
45 (46)	LH has d ¹	LH has c ¹	As 2	As 2
45 (46)	e ² , f ² have accidentals	e ² , f ² missing accidentals	As 2	As 2
45-46 (46-47)	No phrase mark	Phrase mark	As 2	As 2
45-46 (46-47)	Hairpin in m. 45 (46) only	Hairpin extends to m. 46	As 2	As 2
46 (47)	RH g ²	RH g ²	g ² needs ♯	As 3
46 (47)	LH E ² missing ♯	LH E ² and e ² missing ♯'s	As 2	As 2
46 (47)	LH chord b ¹ -e ¹ -b ¹ missing ♯'s	LH chord b ¹ -e ¹ -b ¹ missing ♯'s	As 2	As 2
46 (47)	RH b ¹ has ♯	RH b ¹ missing ♯	As 2	As 2
46 (47)	No hairpin	Open hairpin from fourth	As 2	As 2
47 (48)	g ² not tied	g ² tied	As 2	As 2
47 (48)	LH/RH: first chord scored C ₁ -E ₁ -C ₁ -g ¹ -b ¹ -e ² -g ²	LH/RH: First chord scored C ₁ -C ₁ -g ² (tied)	As 2	As 2
47 (48)	c ² missing ♯	g ¹ and c ² missing ♯'s	As 2	As 2
47 (48)	No grace notes	Grace notes c ² -d ² ; c ² on fourth	As 2	As 2
47 (48)	No arpeggio sign	Arpeggio sign on fourth	As 2	As 2
47-49 (48-50)	No phrase mark	Phrase mark	As 2	As 2
48 (49)	c ² has accidental	c ² missing ♯	As 2	As 2
48 (49)	Notated in full	RH lower voices have reiteration sign for second	Notated in full	As 3
48 (49)	c ² has ♯	c ² missing ♯	As 2	As 2

5: Fontana II	6: OGE	7: OEEii	8: Jedrzejewicz	9: Scherbatoff
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	b has $\sharp$	As 6	As 2	As 2
As 2	$\sharp$ notated but placed before b	$c^{\sharp 1}$ has accidental	As 2	As 2
As 2	$e^{\sharp 2}$, $f^{\sharp 2}$ have accidentals	As 6	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
Hairpin in m. 45 only	As 5	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 3	As 3
As 2	E and e have $\sharp$'s	As 6	As 2	As 2
As 2	b has $\sharp$, $e^{\flat 1}$ - $b^{\flat 1}$ missing $\sharp$	b- $e^{\flat 1}$ - $b^{\flat 1}$ have $\sharp$'s	As 2	As 2
As 2	$b^{\flat 1}$ has $\sharp$	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	$g^{\sharp 1}$ and $c^{\sharp 2}$ have accidentals	As 6	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2, $c^{\sharp 2}$ on previous $\sharp$ has $\sharp$	As 6	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
Phrase mark for mm. 47-48 only	As 5	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	$c^{\sharp 2}$ has accidental	As 6	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3
$c^{\sharp 2}$ has $\sharp$	As 5	As 5	As 2	As 2

10: Sterling	11: Dubois/O'Meara	12: Moscheles	Preferred Reading	Comments
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	6	h is only reading congruent with key
As 2	As 2	None	6/7	i's only reading congruent with key
As 2	As 2	None	1/5/6	h/i only readings congruent with key
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	5 is Fontana's error
As 3	i marked as annotation	None	2/11	All agree except OF Ei/ii
As 2	As 2	None	6/7	h's only readings congruent with key
As 2	As 2	None	7	h is only reading congruent with key
As 2	As 2	None	1/6	h is only reading congruent with key
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	6/7	i's only reading congruent with key
As 2	As 2	None	6/7	i's only reading fully congruent with key
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	5 is Fontana's error. 6 copied it.
As 2	As 2	None	1/6/7	i's only reading congruent with key
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearer reading
As 2	As 2	None	5/6/7	i's only reading congruent with key

Measure	1: Urschrift	2: Reinschrift	3: OFEi	4: OFEii
48 (49)	c ¹ tied on second ♪	c ² not tied	As 2	As 2
49 (50)	RH f ¹ , g ¹ missing ‡'s	RH f ¹ , g ¹ missing ‡'s	As 2	As 2
49-50 (50-51)	No hairpin	Open hairpin through first ♪ of m. 50	As 2	As 2
50 (51)	RH a ²	RH a ²	a ² ‡ missing	As 2
50 (51)	f, c ¹ , f ¹ missing ‡'s	f, f ¹ missing ‡'s	As 2	As 2
50 (51)	Beats 4, 5 and 6 read f-c ¹ -f ¹ , e- c ¹ -f ¹ , e-c ¹ -f ¹	Beats 4, 5 and 6 read F ¹ -f, E ¹ -e ¹ , E-e	Beats 4, 5 and 6 read F ¹ -f, E ¹ -e ¹ , E-e	As 3
50 (51)	RH c ² has ‡, scored from second ♪	RH c ² missing ‡, scored from fourth ♪	RH c ² missing ‡, scored from fourth ♪	As 3
50 (51)	No hairpin	Open hairpin from fourth ♪	As 2	As 2
51 (52)	No D ¹ scored	D ¹ scored	As 2	As 2
51 (52)	b ¹ scored for LH	b ¹ scored for RH	As 2	As 2
51-53 (52-54)	"Dim" not marked	"Dim" marked	As 2	As 2
51-53 (52-54)	No phrase mark	Phrase mark	As 2	As 2
52 (53)	Cautionary accidentals needed for b ¹ , e ¹ , f ¹ , b ¹ , g ²	Cautionary accidentals needed for b ¹ , e ¹ , f ¹ , g ¹ , a ¹ , b ¹ , e ² , f ² , g ²	As 2	As 2
53 (54)	No marking	No marking	As 2	As 2
53 (54)	LH a ¹ missing ♯	LH a ¹ missing ♯	As 2	As 2
53 (54)	Accent on f ²	No accent	As 2	As 2
53-54 (54-55)	No hairpin	Open hairpin	As 2	As 2
54 (55)	RH scored f ¹ -c ² , f ¹ - c ² , f ¹ -c ² , f ¹ -a ¹ -c ² , f ¹ -a ¹ -d ² , f ¹ -a ¹ -d ²	RH scored f ¹ -b ¹ , f ¹ - a ¹ -b ¹ , f ¹ -a ¹ -c ² , f ¹ -a ¹ - d ² , f ¹ -a ¹ -d ² , f ¹ -a ¹ -e ²	As 2	As 2
54 (55)	No phrase mark	LH phrase mark: second to sixth ♪	As 2	As 2

5: Fontana II	6: OGE	7: OEEii	8: Jedrzejewicz	9: Scherbatoff
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	f ¹ missing ‡, g ¹ has accidental	As 6	As 2	As 2
Open hairpin through end of m. 49	As 5	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	f ¹ , f ¹ have accidentals	As 6	As 2	As 2
As 2	Beats 4, 5 and 6 read F ¹ -f ¹ , E ¹ -e ¹ , E-e	As 6	As 3	As 3
RH c ² has ‡, scored from fourth	As 5	As 5	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
Phrase mark extends to m. 54	As 5	As 5	As 2	As 2
As 2	Cautionary accidentals needed for e ¹ , f ¹ , g ¹ , g ²	Cautionary accidentals needed for e ¹ , f ¹ , g ¹ , a ¹ , e ² , f ² , g ²	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
a has	As 5	As 5	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	Hairpin starts m.54	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
Phrase mark to m. 55, first	As 5	No phrase mark	As 2	As 2

10: Sterling	11: Dubois/O'Meara	12: Moscheles	Preferred Reading	Comments
As 2	As 2	None	1/7	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	None	No source has # for f ¹
As 2	As 2	None	2	5/6 result from Fontana's misread- ing
a ² has # marked as annotation	As 10	None	5/6/7/10/11	a ² is only reading congruent with key
As 2	As 2	None	6/7	Only readings congruent with key
As 3	As 3	None	6/7	Only readings congruent with key
As 3	As 3	None	5/6/7	Only readings congruent with key
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	2 is authority here
As 2	As 2	None	None	Each source is missing several cautionary accidentals
As 2	"p" or "pp" marked as annotation	None	11	Only source that clarifies this is Chopin's annota- tion in 11
As 2	As 2	None	5/6/7	Only readings congruent with key
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1/6
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2/3	2 is authority here

Measure	1: Urschrift	2: Reinschrift	3: OFEi	4: OFEii
54 (55)	a ^{b1} missing $\sharp$	a ^{b1} has $\sharp$	a ¹ has $\sharp$	As 3
54 (55)	e ^{b2} notated as d ^{#2}	e ^{b2} missing cautionary accidental	As 2	As 2
54-57 (55-58)	No phrase mark	Phrase mark	As 2	As 2
54 (55)	LH octaves from third ♪ scored D-d, C $\sharp$ -c $\sharp$, C-c, C $\flat$ -c $\flat$	LH octaves from second ♪ scored D-d, C $\sharp$ -c $\sharp$, C-c, C-c, C $\flat$ -c $\flat$	As 2	As 2
54 (55)	No pedal mark	Pedal release on third ♪	Pedal release before second ♪	As 3
55 (56)	No dynamic marking	"f"	As 2	As 2
55 (56)	RH reads g ² -f $\sharp$ ² -g ²	RH reads g ² -a ^{b2} -e ²	As 2	As 2
55 (56)	No pedal mark	Pedal releases after third and sixth ♪ 's	Pedal releases on third ♪ and after sixth ♪	As 3
56 (57)	RH reads g ² -a ^{b2} -e ² -f ² -g ² -d ²	RH reads g ² -f ² -e ² -f ² -g ² -d ²	As 2	As 2
56 (57)	No ornament	Ornament placed before second ♪ on f ² -g ²	As 2	As 2
56 (57)	a ^{b1} -d ² in first ♪	Eighth rest on beat 1	As 2	As 2
56 (57)	LH first ♪ is b $\flat$ -f ¹ -b $\flat$ ¹	LH first ♪ is B $\flat$	As 2	As 2
56 (57)	No pedal marking	Pedal release after sixth ♪	As 2	As 2
57 (58)	No accent	Agogic accent on e ^{b2}	Dynamic accent on e ^{b2}	As 3
57 (58)	No reiteration signs	RH/LH reiteration signs on second ♪	Notated in full	As 3
58 (59)	LH uses bass clef	LH uses treble clef from second ♪	As 2	As 2
58-59 (59-60)	No phrase mark	Phrase mark	As 2	As 2
58 (59)	Measure marked "a"	No marking	As 2	As 2
59 (60)	No accent	Agogic accent on e ^{b2} between staves	Dynamic accent in e ^{b2} above RH stave	As 3
59 (60)	LH has e $\flat$	LH has E $\flat$	As 2	As 2

5: Fontana II	6: OGE	7: OEEii	8: Jedrzejewicz	9: Scherbatoff
As 3	As 3	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	e ² has caution- ary accidental	As 5	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	A 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
Pedal release after second	As 5	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	No pedal release	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 3	As 3	As 2	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
No accent	As 5	As 2	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2

10: Sterling	11: Dubois/O'Meara	12: Moscheles	Preferred Reading	Comments
As 3	As 3	None	3	Only reading congruent with key
As 2	As 2	None	6/7	Only readings congruent with key
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	None	2	2 is authority here
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	None	2	2 is authority here
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	6 is editorial error
As 3	As 3	None	2/7	2, 7 correct accents
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearer reading
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	None	2/7	2, 7 correct accents.
As 2	As 2	None	2	5 is Fontana's error
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1

Measure	1: Urschrift	2: Reinschrift	3: OFEi	4: OFEii
59 (60)	LH has e^b	LH has E^b	As 2	As 2
59 (60)	M. 60 marked "b"	No marking	As 2	As 2
60-61 (61-62)	No phrase mark	Phrase mark	As 2	As 2
60 (61)	"a" to be repeated	Reiteration sign for second $\downarrow$ in LH	Measure notated in full	As 3
61 (62)	"b" to be repeated	Reiteration sign for second $\downarrow$ in RH and LH	Measure notated in full	As 3
61 (62)	No accent marked	Agogic accent on e^2 between staves	Dynamic accent on e^2 above stave	As 3
62 (63)	"cres" marked	Not marked, but shown by hairpins	As 2	As 2
62 (63)	Reiteration sign for second $\downarrow$ in RH and LH	Reiteration sign used for whole measure	Notated in full	As 3
63 (64)	Repeat previous measure sign used	Reiteration sign used	Notated in full	As 3
63 (64)	"dim" marked	No marking	As 2	As 2
64 (65)	Repeat previous measure sign used	Repeat previous measure sign used	Notated in full	As 3
64 (65)	"p" marked	No marking	As 2	As 2
65 (66)	No ties	RH e^1 and b^1 tied to previous measure	As 2	As 2
65 (66)	A_2^b marked "fz"	No marking	As 2	As 2
65 (66)	No "." marked on A_2^b	"." marked on A_2^b	No "." marked	As 3
65 (66)	"Sotto voce" marked between staves	"Sotto voce" marked above RH stave	"Sotto voce" marked between staves	As 3
65-66 (66-67)	No phrase mark	Phrase mark missing	As 2	As 2
65 (66)	LH chord on second and third $\downarrow$'s scored A^b-e-c^1	LH chord on second and third $\downarrow$'s scored A^b-e	As 2	As 2
65 (66)	LH chord on fourth $\downarrow$ scored $e-b-e^1$	LH chord on fourth $\downarrow$ scored A^b-e-b	As 2	As 2
65 (66)	No marking	"Ped" mark on last $\downarrow$ of m. 64	"Ped" mark on first $\downarrow$ of m. 65	As 3

5: Fontana II	6: OGE	7: OEEii	8: Jedrzejewicz	9: Scherbatoff
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3	As 3
No accent marked	As 5	As 2	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	Reiteration sign used	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
A ₂ ^b marked "fz"	As 5	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
"Ped" mark beneath bass clef	As 5	As 3	As 3	As 3

10: Sterling	11: Dubois/O'Meara	12: Moscheles	Preferred Reading	Comments
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	Time-saving device
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearest reading here
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearest reading here
As 3	As 3	None	2/7	7 only edition to observe agogic accent
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearest reading
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearest reading
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearest reading
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	As 2	2	All agree except 1
As 2	Accent on A_2^b marked as annotation	As 5	1/5/6/12	"fz" consistent with verbal reports of Chopin's playing
As 3	As 3	As 3	3	3 is consistent with the other ten A_2^b
As 3	As 3	No marking	2	All agree except 12
As 2	As 2	As 2	None	A phrase mark is clearly needed
As 2	As 2	As 2	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	As 2	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	"Ped" mark before first	3/7	Position in 2 avoids "."

Measure	1: Urschrift	2: Reinschrift	3: OFEi	4: OFEii
65 (66)	LH chord on fifth and sixth ♩ 's scored e-b-e^1	LH chord on fifth and sixth ♩ 's scored e-b	As 2	As 2
65 (66)	No pedal markings	Pedal release after sixth ♩	Pedal release on sixth ♩	As 3
66 (67)	RH lower voice has γ on first ♩	RH lower voice has c^1 on first ♩	As 2	As 2
66 (67)	LH second ♩ uses reiteration sign	LH whole measure uses reiteration sign, placed at left side	LH notated in full	As 3
67-68 (68-69)	No phrase mark	Phrase mark	As 2	As 2
67 (68)	No pedal mark	Pedal release after sixth ♩	No pedal release until m. 68	As 3
67 (68)	Notated in full	LH second ♩ uses reiteration sign	Notated in full	As 3
68 (69)	LH chord scored g-b-g^1	LH chord scored $\text{g-b-d}^1\text{-g}^1$	As 2	As 2
68 (69)	Notated in full	RH and LH use reiteration signs	Notated in full	As 3
68 (69)	No pedal markings	Depress pedal before first ♩ , release after third ♩ , depress pedal before fourth ♩ , release after sixth ♩	Pedal holds until after sixth ♩	As 3
69 (70)	Notated in full	LH second ♩ uses reiteration sign	Notated in full	As 3
69-70 (70-71)	No phrase mark	Phrase mark	As 2	As 2
70 (71)	RH a^1 only reiterated on fourth to sixth ♩ 's	RH a^1 reiterated on each ♩	As 2	As 2
70 (71)	Notated in full	Reiteration signs used in RH lower parts and LH	Notated in full	As 3
71 (72)	e^1 notated for RH	e^1 notated for LH	As 2	As 2
71 (72)	Notated in full	Notated in full	As 2	As 2
71-72 (72-73)	No phrase mark	Phrase mark	As 2	As 2

10: Sterling	11: Dubois/O'Meara	12: Moscheles	Preferred Reading	Comments
As 2	As 2	As 2	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	As 2	2/12	12 confirms the reading in 2
As 2	As 2	As 2	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	As 3	3	3 is clearer reading
As 2	As 2	As 2	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	As 2	2	3 is an engraver's error
As 3	As 3	As 3	3	3 is clearer reading
As 2	As 2	As 2	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	RH notated in full, LH uses reiteration sign	3	3 is clearer reading
As 3	As 3	As 2	2	2 avoids incongruent harmonies merging
As 3	As 3	As 2	3	3 is clearer reading
As 2	As 2	As 2	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	As 2	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	As 2	3	3 is clearer reading
As 2	As 2	As 2	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	As 5	2	5 is time-saving device to avoid copying
As 2	As 2	As 2	2	All agree except 1

Measure	1: Urschrift	2: Reinschrift	3: OFEi	4: OFEii
71 (72)	No error	No error	As 2	As 2
71 (72)	No marking	"Ped" under first	As 2	As 2
72 (73)	LH second uses reiteration sign	RH and LH use reiteration signs	Notated in full	As 3
73 (74)	LH chords scored $e^b-b^b-e^b$	LH chords scored e^b-e^b	As 2	As 2
73-74 (74-75)	No phrase mark	Phrase mark	As 2	As 2
74 (75)	LH second uses reiteration sign	LH has reiteration sign throughout	Notated in full	As 3
75-76 (76-77)	No phrase mark	Phrase mark	As 2	As 2
77 (78)	LH chords on second scored $g-b^b-e^b-g$	LH chords scored $g-b^b-d^b-e^b-g$	LH chord scored $g-b^b-d^b-g$	As 2
77 (78)	Second and third g^1 and second e^b and g^1 written on RH stave	All notes written on LH stave	As 2	As 2
78 (79)	LH g^1 on first three	LH g^1 on first three	LH g^1 missing b	As 3
78 (79)	Notated in full	Reiteration sign used in RH and LH	Notated in full	As 3
79-80 (80-81)	No phrase mark	Phrase mark	Phrase mark extends to m. 81	As 3
79 (80)	RH d^2 tied from previous measure	No tied note	As 2	As 2
79 (80)	RH reads d^2 a^b on first	RH reads d^b-a^b on first	As 2	As 2
79 (80)	Notated in full	LH second uses reiteration sign	Notated in full	As 3
80 (81)	LH second uses reiteration sign	Reiteration sign used in all voices except melody	Notated in full	As 3
81-90 (82 onwards)	No phrase mark	Phrase mark	As 2	As 2

10: Sterling	11: Dubois/O'Meara	12: Moscheles	Preferred Reading	Comments
As 2	As 2	As 2	2	Error by Fontana
As 2	As 2	As 2	2	Editors' error
As 3	As 3	As 2	3	3 is clearer reading
As 2	As 2	None (fragment ends)	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearer reading
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	Sole example of pitch discrepancy between OFEi and ii
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3 added to g ¹ as annotation	None	2	3 is engraver's error
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearer reading
As 3	As 3	None	2	Various editorial misreadings
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearer reading
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 is clearer reading
As 2	As 2	None	2	5 is Fontana's misreading of 2's phrasing over system

5: Fontana II	6: OGE	7: OEEii	8: Jedrzejewicz	9: Scherbatoff
As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2	As 2
As 2	As 2	Appoggiatura notated as	As 2	As 2
As 3	As 3	As 2	As 3	As 3
No final pedal release	As 5	As 3	As 3	As 3
“Fine” marked between staves after final double barline	As 2	As 3	As 3	As 3

10: Sterling	11: Dubois/O'Meara	12: Moscheles	Preferred Reading	Comments
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 2	As 2	None	2	All agree except 1
As 3	As 3	None	3	3 reflects traditional placing of stem ¹
As 3	As 3	None	3	Proof revision
As 3	As 3	None	2	2 is authority here

¹ Chopin frequently placed stems thus and every instance of this has not been listed. The significance here is that it is the only place the OEEii positions an LH stem this way, giving clear evidence that the *Reinschrift* was available to the London editors.

APPENDIX THREE

A Critical Text of Opus 28, No. 17

Edited by Paul M. Ellison

17 *Allegretto*

p

Note 1

Rea * *Rea* * *Rea* *

5

Note 2

Rea * *Rea* * *Rea* * *Rea* * *Rea* * *Rea* *

9

Note 3

f

Rea * *Rea* * *Rea* * (*Rea* * *Rea* *

13

Rea * *Rea* * *Rea* * *Rea* * *Rea* *

Note 1: Eb is marked “” in the *Reinschrift*, and the OFE/OEE, but not in the OGE. This is inconsistent with the pedal marking and the same note in other contexts (see m. 11) and is omitted here.

Note 2: Chopin differentiates between smaller dynamic accents and larger agogic accents.

Note 3: Pedaling from mm. 11–18 does not appear in any primary source but is clearly necessary.

17

Tea * Tea *) Tea * Tea * Tea *

21

Note 5

scen- do dim.

Note 6

Tea * Tea * Tea * Tea * Tea (*)

25

Note 7

Tea * Tea (*) Tea * Tea * Tea * Tea *

29

Tea * Tea * Tea * Tea *

Note 4: f¹ is not marked with a § in any of the sources

Note 5: A smaller dynamic accent

Note 6: Release pedal sign crossed out in the *Reinschrift*.
It does appear in all the first editions

Note 7: Release pedal sign omitted in *Reinschrift*.
It does appear in all the first editions

33

cresc.

ff

Note 8

Note 9

Ped * Ped * Ped * (Ped *

37

Ped * Ped * Ped * Ped * Ped * Ped *

41

p

Ped * Ped * Ped *) Ped * Ped *

45

Ped * Ped * Ped * Ped *

Note 8: $E\flat_1$ is marked "*" in *Reinschrift*. See Note 1

Note 9: Pedaling from mm. 36—42 does not appear in any primary source

49

dimin.

Tea * Tea * Tea * Tea * Tea *

53

(p)

Note 10

f

Tea * Tea * Tea * Tea *

57

Tea * Tea * Tea * Tea *

61

Note 11

Note 12
pp sotto voce

Note 13
fz

Tea * Tea *

Note 10: "p" (or possibly "pp") is an annotation in Chopin's hand in the score of his student, Camille Dubois (née O'Meara)

Note 11: accent is placed between the staves in the *Reinschrift*.

Note 12: the phrase mark for mm. 65-66 does not appear in any primary source

Note 13: "fz" appears in Fontana II, the OGE, the Moscheles fragment, and as an annotation in the Dubois/O'Meara score. In the *Reinschrift* it is only marked "f."

66

Rea * *fz* Rea * Rea * *fz* Rea *

70

Rea * Rea * *fz* Rea * Rea * *fz* Rea *

74

Rea * Rea * *fz* Rea * Rea * *fz* Rea *

78

Rea * Rea * *fz* Rea * Rea * *fz* Rea *

82

perdendosi

Rea * Rea * Rea * *fz* Rea

86

Note 14

Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea * *fz* Rea (*) Fine

Note 15

Note 14: Editorial stemming in this measure makes the voice leading clear

Note 15: No final pedal release in the Reinschrift, Fontana II and the OGE. OFEi/ii and OEEii have one as an editorial addition.

KEY TO GRAPHIC NOTATION EMPLOYED

This analysis uses the following analytic notational symbols:

Stemless noteheads signify notes that are part of the immediate foreground and not part of the deeper structure.

Stems are added to noteheads to indicate notes of greater structural significance. The length of the stem further emphasizes a note's hierarchic importance. Stemmed noteheads are used to indicate middleground structures such as arpeggiations, divisions, and so-called *Ursatz*-parallelisms (replicas of the fundamental structure at the middleground level).

Beams are used to join stemmed notes together to indicate their relationship to one another. When half notes are beamed it indicates progressions of the fundamental structure (*Ursatz*). Beamed quarter notes indicate a descent of lesser structural significance.

Slurs are used to group notes that are related to one another, often in a linear motion or progression. Notes that are more structurally significant are assigned a stem, and noteheads that lead to them slurred.

Broken slurs, ties and beams indicate a retained pitch class over a more extended span, often with other notes intervening.

Doubly curved slurs applied to the bass line indicate a progression to the dominant usually by way of II or IV.

Lines are used to indicate notes that are related harmonically, but separated spatially. When two lines cross diagonally, it indicates a voice exchange.

Arrowheads are added to lines to indicate the direction of a voice when this might not be clear.

Careted numbers above the upper voice denote notes from the *Urlinie*. When the numbers are in parentheses, it indicates notes from an *Ursatz* parallelism (a mirrored descent at the middleground level).

Two parallel vertical lines at the top of the upper staff indicate an interruption on V, known as a dividing dominant or divider.

Bolded Roman numerals denote primary structural harmonies. Roman numerals that are plain text and smaller indicate harmonies of local tonicizations.

Arabic numerals in between or below the staves indicate voice leading.

Parentheses are used to signify a note implied by melodic or voice leading context, but not actually present in the text.

REGISTRAL DESIGNATIONS

A musical notation diagram showing registrational designations on a grand staff. The staff consists of a treble clef and a bass clef. The notes are as follows:

- Treble clef: C₂, B₂, C₁, B₁, C, B, c, b, c¹, b¹, c², b², c³, b³.
- Bass clef: C₂, B₂, C₁, B₁, C, B, c, b, c¹, b¹, c², b², c³, b³.

Below the bass clef, there are four groups of three horizontal lines, each with a note head. The first group is labeled "8vb" with a dashed line extending to the right. The other three groups are labeled with notes: C₂, B₂, and C₁.

GRAPH ONE: STRUCTURAL SYNOPSIS

The image displays two systems of musical notation for a piano prelude in A-flat major. Each system consists of a treble and bass staff. Above the treble staff, structural annotations include scale degrees (e.g., $\hat{5}$, $\hat{6}$) and section labels (A¹, B, A², C, A³) with their respective measure numbers. Below the bass staff, Roman numerals indicate the harmonic structure (I, $\flat$ VI, I, V, V, I, V, I). A specific annotation 'V of V' points to a chord in the bass staff of the second system. Slurs in the treble staff of the second system indicate half-step motives. The first system covers measures 1 to 42, and the second system covers measures 57 to 84.

System 1 (Measures 1-42):

- Treble staff annotations: $\hat{5}$ (measures 1-11), $\hat{5}$ (measures 11-19), $\flat\hat{6}$ (measures 24-27), $\hat{5}$ (measures 35-42).
- Section labels: 1 A¹ 11 19 B 24 27 35 A² 42.
- Bass staff annotation: $\flat$ II (measures 19-24).
- Harmonic structure: I $\flat$ VI I V.

System 2 (Measures 57-84):

- Treble staff annotations: $\hat{5}$ (measures 57-65), $\hat{5}$ (measures 65-73), $\hat{5}$ (measures 73-78), $\hat{4}$ (measures 78-81), $\hat{3}$ (measures 81-83), $\hat{2}$ (measures 83-84), $\hat{1}$ (measures 84-84).
- Section labels: C 57 65 A³ 84.
- Bass staff annotation: V of V (measure 65).
- Harmonic structure: V I V I.

Slurs show half-step motive

GRAPH TWO: URSATZ

GRAPH THREE: MIDDLEGROUND LEVEL ONE

The image displays a musical score for a piece titled "GRAPH THREE: MIDDLEGROUND LEVEL ONE". The score is written on two staves: a treble staff (top) and a bass staff (bottom). The key signature is three flats (B-flat, E-flat, A-flat), and the time signature is 4/4.

Treble Staff:

- Measures 1-2: A dotted half note chord. Above the staff, a bracket connects the notes with fingerings $\hat{5}$ and $\hat{b}6(N)$. A dashed line connects the two notes.
- Measures 3-4: A descending eighth-note scale. Above the staff, a bracket connects the notes with fingerings $\hat{5}$, $\hat{4}$, $\hat{3}$, and $\hat{2}$.
- Measures 5-6: A descending eighth-note scale. Above the staff, a bracket connects the notes with fingerings $\hat{5}$, $\hat{4}$, $\hat{3}$, $\hat{2}$, and $\hat{1}$.

Bass Staff:

- Measures 1-2: A dotted half note chord. Below the staff, a bracket connects the notes with chord symbols bVI and V .
- Measures 3-4: A whole note chord. Below the staff, a bracket connects the notes with the chord symbol V .
- Measures 5-6: A whole note chord. Below the staff, a bracket connects the notes with the chord symbol I .
- Measures 7-8: A whole note chord. Below the staff, a bracket connects the notes with the chord symbol V .
- Measures 9-10: A whole note chord. Below the staff, a bracket connects the notes with the chord symbol I .

Chord Symbols:

The chord symbols I , bVI , V , and I are written below the bass staff, corresponding to the measures. The bVI symbol is positioned under the first measure, and the V symbol is positioned under the second measure. The I symbol is positioned under the fifth measure, and the V symbol is positioned under the seventh measure. The I symbol is positioned under the ninth measure.

GRAPH FOUR: MIDDLEGROUND LEVEL TWO

Musical score for Graph Four, Middleground Level Two, measures 1-35. The score is written for two staves (treble and bass clef) in a key signature of three flats (B-flat, E-flat, A-flat). The melody in the treble staff begins with an arpeggiated/ascending (arp./asc.) figure at measure 1, marked with a ^5 above the staff. It then features a descending sequence of notes marked (4 ^3 ^2 ^1) at measure 18. A 3-measure phrase (3-prg.) is indicated at measure 27. The bass staff provides harmonic support with chords labeled A^b. II, F^b. IV, V, and ^bVI. Measure numbers 1, 18, 20, 26, 27, and 35 are marked below the staves. A large bracket connects the treble staff at measure 20 to the bass staff at measure 26.

Musical score for Graph Four, Middleground Level Two, measures 42-84. The score continues in the same key signature. The treble staff shows a descending sequence of notes marked ^5, ^4, ^3, ^2, ^1 at measure 42, followed by a 5-measure phrase (5-prg.) at measure 51. An ascending (asc.) figure is marked at measure 65. The bass staff includes chords labeled ^bVI and II³. Measure numbers 42, 51, 55, 57, 65, and 84 are marked below the staves. A bracket connects the treble staff at measure 42 to the bass staff at measure 51.

GRAPH 5: MIDDLEGROUND LEVEL 3

Musical score for measures 36-57. The piano part (bottom staff) features a descending line of chords: $\hat{5}$, $\hat{4}$, $\hat{3}$, $\hat{2}$, and $\hat{5}$. The vocal part (top staff) includes an ascending line (asc.) and a phrase (5 prg.). Measure numbers 36, 38, 42, 51, 55, and 57 are indicated. The piano part has a $\flat$ VI chord and a V of V chord. The score is marked with Roman numerals I and V.

Musical score for measures 65-84. The piano part (bottom staff) features a descending line of chords: $\hat{5}$, $\hat{4}$, $\hat{3}$, $\hat{2}$, and $\hat{1}$. The vocal part (top staff) includes an ascending line (asc.) and a phrase (5 prg.). Measure numbers 65, 68, 73, 76, 78, and 84 are indicated. The piano part has a $\flat$ VI chord and a V of V chord. The score is marked with Roman numerals I and V I.

GRAPH SIX: FOREGROUND

Measures 1-10 of the musical score. The treble staff shows a melodic line with notes 1, 4, 6, and 10. Above the staff, a line with a hat symbol (^) and the number 5 is shown. The bass staff shows a bass line with notes 1, 4, 6, and 10. Below the staff, a line with a hat symbol (^) and the number 5 is shown. The score includes various musical notations such as chords, accidentals, and articulation marks.

asc./arp.

asc.

1 4 6 10

V^7 V^7 IV of IV V V^{b3} of II I V V^7 IV of IV

I

Measures 14-20 of the musical score. The treble staff shows a melodic line with notes 14, 18, and 20. Above the staff, a line with a hat symbol (^) and the number 5 is shown. The bass staff shows a bass line with notes 14, 18, and 20. Below the staff, a line with a hat symbol (^) and the number 5 is shown. The score includes various musical notations such as chords, accidentals, and articulation marks.

14 18 20

V^{b3} of II V^{b3} of II bII arp.

I

6(N)

24 #6—8 #6—8 #6—8 27 29/31

-10 7—10

6VI

Detailed description: This musical system, labeled 6(N), consists of two staves. The upper staff is in treble clef and the lower in bass clef. Both staves are in a key with three flats (B-flat major or D-flat minor). The music features complex chromatic passages with many accidentals. A large slur encompasses the first 24 measures, with a dashed line indicating a continuation or a specific phrasing. Measure numbers 24, 27, and 29/31 are marked. Interval markings include #6—8 and -10. A vertical line connects the system to the label 6(N) above. Below the staves, the Roman numeral 6VI is centered.

(5) 5 4 3 2

asc.

35 38 42

V⁷ IV V⁷ of IV V V⁷ of II V

V⁷ I V

Detailed description: This musical system continues the piece. The upper staff is in treble clef and the lower in bass clef. The key signature remains three flats. Measure numbers 35, 38, and 42 are indicated. Above the staves, a series of notes with stems are labeled (5), 5, 4, 3, and 2. An 'asc.' (ascending) marking is placed over a melodic line. Below the staves, Roman numerals indicate harmonic structure: V⁷, IV, V⁷ of IV, V, V⁷ of II, and V. At the bottom, the Roman numerals V⁷, I, and V are aligned with the measures. A vertical line connects the system to the label 6(N) above.

reg.

44 48 50 51 54

6—10 6—10 6—10

6—5

$\hat{5}$ $\hat{4}$

$\flat II$
of V

Detailed description: This musical system covers measures 44 to 54. The treble clef staff features a melodic line with various ornaments and a 'reg.' (register) marking. The bass clef staff provides harmonic support with chords and a 'bII of V' marking. Measure numbers 44, 48, 50, 51, and 54 are indicated below the staff. Interval markings '6—10' appear above the treble staff in measures 50, 51, and 52, while '6—5' is marked above the bass staff in measure 51. A slur connects measures 50 and 51. A dashed line indicates a continuation or a specific phrasing in the treble staff.

3 2 1)

asc.

57 59/61 65 68

6—5 4— $\flat_3$

9—8

V of V

V⁶

V I

Detailed description: This musical system covers measures 57 to 68. The treble clef staff shows a melodic line with a descending sequence of notes marked 3, 2, 1) and an 'asc.' (ascending) marking. The bass clef staff features harmonic accompaniment with a 'V of V' marking and a 'V⁶' marking. Measure numbers 57, 59/61, 65, and 68 are indicated below the staff. Interval markings '6—5' and '4— $\flat_3$ ' are shown above the bass staff in measure 57, and '9—8' is shown above the bass staff in measure 65. A slur connects measures 57 and 59/61. A dashed line indicates a continuation or a specific phrasing in the treble staff. A large bracket connects the 'V of V' marking in the bass staff to the 'V' marking below the system, and another bracket connects the 'V⁶' marking to the 'I' marking below the system.

Measures 69-76. The score is in G major (one sharp). Measures 69-72 show a descending line in the treble with fingerings $\hat{4}$, $\hat{3}$, and $\hat{2}$. Measure 73 has a repeat sign. Measures 74-76 show an ascending line in the treble, marked "asc.", with a final note marked $\hat{5}$. The bass line consists of whole notes. Chord symbols below the bass line are V^7 of IV (at measure 73), IV^6 (at measure 74), and V^6 (at measure 75).

Measures 78-91. The score is in G major. Measures 78-83 show a descending line in the treble with fingerings $\hat{4}$, $\hat{3}$, $\hat{2}$, and $\hat{1}$. Measures 84-91 show a descending line in the treble, with a dashed line indicating a continuation of the pattern. The bass line consists of whole notes. Chord symbols below the bass line are I (at measure 83), (V) (at measure 84), and I (at measure 85).

GRAPH SEVEN: TONAL OPERATIONS IN EPISODE ONE

a)

I

b)

I $\flat V$ VI I

c)

I VI $\flat V$ V^7 I

18 19 20 26 27 32 33 34 35 36

GRAPH EIGHT: HARMONIC MODEL OF EPISODE ONE

Graph Eight: Harmonic Model of Episode One, measures 18-25. The notation is presented in two staves, Treble and Bass. The key signature is B-flat major (two flats). The time signature is 3/8. The measures are numbered 18 through 25 below the staves. The Treble staff contains complex chords and melodic lines, while the Bass staff provides a harmonic foundation with sustained notes and moving lines.

Graph Eight: Harmonic Model of Episode One, measures 26-36. The notation is presented in two staves, Treble and Bass. The key signature is B-flat major (two flats). The time signature is 3/8. The measures are numbered 26 through 36 below the staves. The Treble staff contains complex chords and melodic lines, while the Bass staff provides a harmonic foundation with sustained notes and moving lines.

GRAPH NINE: TONAL OPERATIONS IN EPISODE TWO

a)

V

b)

V V

c)

42 43 44 47 48 51 54 55 56 57

V V

GRAPH TEN: HARMONIC MODEL OF EPISODE TWO

Graph Ten: Harmonic Model of Episode Two, measures 42-52. The notation is presented in two staves, Treble and Bass. The Treble staff contains complex chords and melodic lines, while the Bass staff contains simpler harmonic support. Measure numbers 42, 43, 44, 47, 50, 51, and 52 are indicated below the Treble staff.

Graph Ten: Harmonic Model of Episode Two, measures 53-57. The notation is presented in two staves, Treble and Bass. The Treble staff contains complex chords and melodic lines, while the Bass staff contains simpler harmonic support. Measure numbers 53, 54, 55, 56, and 57 are indicated below the Treble staff.