The etudes by Chopin are usually described in two categories: as a “compendium on knowledge of piano performance” or as “small musical poems”. Both those definitions are correct, and do not exclude each other. The etudes will always remain an example of exceptional harmony between the instrumental and aesthetic-ematical aspects of a musical composition.

Indubitably, the composition of Etudes Op. 10 and 25 was stimulated by Chopin’s interest in problems concerning piano performance\(^1\). Such interest is testified by the all-sided nature and originality of the instrumental questions introduced in both cycles and the statements made by the author, scarce but, as a result, even more valuable: “I have done an Exercise [...] in a manner of my own”, “I have written a few exercises”. The other, musical aspect of the merit of the Etudes was not always appreciated by Chopin himself. True, while working on Etude in E Op. 10 no. 3 he confessed to a pupil that he had never composed an equally beautiful melody, but in a letter written to a friend about Etude in G\(\text{b}\) Op. 10 no. 5 he declared: “How could [Clara Wieck] have chosen precisely this Etude, the least interesting for those who do not know that it is intended for the black keys, instead of something better”.

In the Etudes the interest demonstrated by Chopin for problems of piano performance is even greater than in other compositions. From the perspective of the time separating us from the origin of the Etudes there come to mind questions concerning the topicality of some of those markings and the degree of their authoritativeness. Such inquiries are usually formulated in the following manner: should the performance markings be treated on par with the pitch and rhythmic text? Did Chopin write metronomic tempi in all the compositions, both from Op. 10 and 25? Should the metronome in Chopin’s time be treated with the pitch and rhythm similarly to modern pianos? This question is particularly valid for the extreme parts of the compositions, in particular Etudes Op. 10 no. 3, Op. 10 no. 5 and Op. 25 no. 7. There are sources from which it follows that the Chopinesque metronome was scaled properly.\(^2\) Chopin wrote metronomic tempi in all the Etudes from Op. 10 and 25\(^2\). The results of a comparison of those markings with contemporary performance practice\(^3\) could be summed up as follows:

The majority of the Etudes (eight from Op. 10 and eight from Op. 25) are played in narrower or wider tempi zones, containing the Chopinesques in tempi inside. It is characteristic that the etudes universally regarded as more difficult (e.g. in C Op. 10 no. 1, in A\(\text{b}\) minor Op. 10 no. 2, in G\(\text{b}\) major Op. 25 no. 6, in D\(\text{b}\) Op. 25 no. 8 and the extreme parts of Etude in B minor Op. 25 no. 10) are performed in rather narrow tempi zones, with the Chopinesque tempo located near the centre of those zones (by way of example: Etude in A minor Op. 10 no. 2, the performance zone \(J=139-160\), the Chopinesque tempo \(J=144\), Etude in G\(\text{b}\) major Op. 25 no. 6, the performance zone \(J=64-78\), the Chopinesque tempo \(J=69\)). The original tempi in certain Etudes are to be found at the end of those zones, i.e. they are performed in Chopinesques tempi or quicker (in F Op. 25 no. 3, in A\(\text{b}\) minor Op. 25 no. 4) or in Chopinesques tempi and slower (in G\(\text{b}\) Op. 10 no. 5, in F\(\text{b}\) minor Op. 25 no. 2).

Five other Etudes containing virtuoso elements (in F\(\text{b}\) minor Op. 10 no. 9, in C minor Op. 10 no. 12, in A\(\text{b}\) Op. 25 no. 1, in A minor Op. 25 no. 11, and in C minor Op. 25 no. 12) are played always in tempi slower than those indicated by Chopin. In the case of both Etudes in C minor and Etude in A minor the reasons for this state of things should be sought in a cumulation of instrumental-ematical-measures, more difficult to render on modern instruments. The latter possess heavier action, slightly wider keys, deeper touch and broader sound volume, indispensable for filling the space of modern concert halls, in contrast to the instruments and halls (salons) from the time of Chopin. The slower tempo of Etudes in F minor and in A\(\text{b}\) could be ascribed to considerable hand spans, less comfortable on our slightly wider and deeper keyboard.

Three etudes with a predominance of expressive elements (the extreme parts of Etude in E Op. 10 no. 3, Etude in E\(\text{b}\) minor Op. 10 no. 6 and in C\(\text{b}\) minor Op. 25 no. 7) are always performed slower or much slower than it is indicated by the Chopinesques tempi (in Etude in E\(\text{b}\) minor the tempo becomes as much as three times slower than the authentic one, thus changing the metronomic unit from \(J=69\) to \(J=69\)). The causes could be discerned in certain performance “traditions” prevailing during the second half of the nineteenth century, which had little in common with those derived directly from Chopin\(^4\). By way of example, from the very outset the Chopinesque conception of Etude in E as a flowing and romantically passionate melody differed considerably from the modern one. This approach is testified by the fact that in the first edition the composition bore the marking Vivace, and in the second — Vivace ma non troppo; only in print did Chopin change it to Lento ma non troppo, simultaneously adding a metronomic tempo. Yet another “inner” argument in favour of the Chopinesque conception is the fact that the middle section, of a more virtuoso nature and always played in a lively tempo, has the marking poco più animato, which suggests only a slight acceleration of the opening tempo. Meanwhile, the reasons for the slow performance of Etude in E\(\text{b}\) minor could be... the absence of tradition — this particular composition is played the rarest of all the Etudes from Op. 10 and 25 — and the establishment of its stereotype as a static and reflective work.

Separate mention is due to the middle parts of Etudes in E minor Op. 25 no. 5 and in B minor Op. 25 no. 10, performed today much slower than is indicated by the original metronomic tempi. The absence of great tempo contrasts between the extreme and middle parts of those compositions is a feature of the creative and performance conception devised by Chopin, who marked it not only in those two Etudes: fluid tempi are indicated by the Chopinesques metronome also in the central parts of both concertos and of Scherzo in B minor Op. 20.

Is it possible to draw, already at this stage, some sort of practical conclusions from the above remarks? In my opinion, we must first establish certain general principles of the attitude of the performer to the author’s metronomic tempi:

1. The metronomic tempo is an abstract concept, which becomes meaningful only after being filled with concrete sound contents. Hence, for example, despite an identical metronomic tempo two performances of the same composition by different pianists could create the impression of different tempi owing to diverse articulation, dynamics, pedalling or other performance elements of the composition.
2. Similarly to the majority of performance directives the metronomic tempo, indicated by the author, possesses zonal meaning. The perception of the width of the zone, in which he wishes to find himself, and thus the “distance” between his tempo and the original one, is an issue to be resolved only by the artist. In other words, the metronomic tempo is not strictly normative but an orientation.
3. In each composition it is necessary to learn whether the metronomic marking indicates the tempo of the beginning or the average tempo of the whole work; this is of importance in the case of, e.g. the rubato in opening sections.
4. The tempo chosen by the performer is always average and entwined by the actual tempo with its shorter or longer agogic deviations, depending on the character of the composition.

---

1. In the Etudes written for Méthode des Mêthodes it is impossible to exclude the suggestion of the authors, Moscheles and Fétis, concerning the application of polyrhythm and polyarticulation.
2. There are sources from which it follows that the Chopinesque metronome was scaled properly.
3. The comparisons were made upon the basis of a number of Chopin Competitions, several representative recordings of all the Etudes and recordings of particular etudes.
4. Quite possibly, those “traditions” of a slow execution of the extreme parts of the Etude in E were influenced by its instrumental and vocal transcriptions, which frequently omitted the middle part. Similarly, transcriptions for the cello could have affected the emergence of a tradition of the slow tempo of the Etude in C\(\text{b}\) minor.
Only the preservation of the above principles makes it possible to formulate conclusions concerning the tempi in the etudes by Chopin.

a) Metronomic tempi are an integral part of Chopin’s text. In certain compositions the metronomic tempo is the sole description of the tempo-character. Hence the performer should become acquainted with the original tempo, and discover his own tempo in relation to the original one, depending on his instrumental possibilities as well as his expressive and aesthetic conceptions.

b) Etudes in C minor Op. 10 no. 12, in A minor Op. 25 no. 11 and in C minor Op. 25 no. 12 should be played in tempi as quick as possible, but always such in which it is possible to attain distinct articulation, a full dynamic scale, a great sound volume and force of expression.

c) Etudes in F minor Op. 10 no. 9 and in A♭ Op. 25 no. 1 should be performed in lively tempi, permitted by the callmness of the hand in the widely stretched positions of those etudes.

d) A rapid tempo is recommended also in Etudes in G Op. 10 no. 5 and in F minor Op. 25 no. 2, so that an excessively calm tempo would not produce the impression of a school performance.

e) Etudes in E Op. 10 no. 3, in Eb minor Op. 10 no. 6 and in C♭ minor Op. 25 no. 7 should be brought close to the original tempi to a degree permitting the performer to preserve their lyrical and narrative elements, the natural quality of the course of the compositions and their sound climate. The same holds true for the middle sections in Etudes in E minor Op. 25 no. 5 and in B minor Op. 25 no. 10.

f) The tempo of Etudes in F Op. 25 no. 3 and in A minor Op. 25 no. 4 should not be exaggerated so that they would not lose their clarity and articulation subtleties.

The above recommendations possess only relative merits and, without generalising the issue at stake, refer to the tempo of particular etudes. Their purpose is to render our conceptions of these works as close as possible to those harboured by the composer.

Fingering

The fingering proposed by Chopin constitutes a new and distinct chapter in the history of this domain of piano performance. Based on the principle of the relaxation, flexibility and calmness of the hand, it is associated closely with Chopinesque piano texture. “Chopin thought with fingers” — such could be the briefest formulation of the mutual feedback which occurs between the texture of his works and its realisation in fingering. With time, the novelty of his fingering, initially misunderstood and criticised, became the daily fare of numerous generations of pianists from all over the world. Particularly copiously marked in the Etudes, it appears also in many other compositions by Chopin, and was supplemented by him in pupils’ copies.

What is the value of Chopin’s fingering today, particularly in the Etudes? Is its topicality affected by the changed parameters of modern pianos? Does its application depend, and to what degree, on the size of the pianist’s hand, its anatomic build and functionality?

First and foremost, it is necessary to say that:

1. Some of the etudes are inconceivable, at least as regards basic fingering, with fingering other than the one indicated by Chopin (in C Op. 10 no. 1, in C Op. 10 no. 7, in F Op. 10 no. 8, in A♭ Op. 10 no. 10 and in C minor Op. 10 no. 12).

2. Certain etudes contain fingering so natural and stemming from the piano texture that it was not given by Chopin in print, and was only sporadically marked in pupils’ copies (in A♭ Op. 25 no. 1, in F Op. 25 no. 3, in A minor Op. 25 no. 4, in E minor Op. 25 no. 5, in G♭ Op. 25 no. 9 and in C minor Op. 25 no. 12).

3. In select etudes Chopin did not recommend fingering; such compositions permit several possibilities (in Eb Op. 10 no. 11, in F minor Op. 25 no. 2, and extreme parts in Etude in B minor Op. 25 no. 10). Apparently, Chopin left the choice to the discretion of the performer.


The above remarks refer to virtuoso etudes, whose fingering could be described as “technical”. In the compositions by Chopin we come across yet another type of fingering, employed in melodic parts and known as “expressive”. Chopin discovered his own tempo in relation to the original one and he should not destroy the charm of striking with a particular finger, but, on the contrary, try to develop it [...] There are as many different types of sound as the number of our fingers [...] The third finger is a great singer". A special instance of this variety of fingering is the “expressive-articulation” fingering, which consists in the repetition of several consecutive melodic notes with the same finger.

Practical conclusions as regards fingering

a) In the case of "technical" fingering it is necessary to first test the usefulness of Chopinesque fingering. If discomfort occurs, the pianist should try editorial fingering or supplant it by his own. The editorial fingering suggested in the musical text or in the part of the Performance Commentary presented below takes into consideration predominantly those difficulties which might be experienced by a smaller hand (owing to the rather wider and deeper keys on our piano), and sometime treats "positional" and "rhythmic" fingering interchangeably (e.g. in Etude in C♯ minor Op. 10 no. 4). In each instance, altered fingering should be compared with the authentic one, so that the final sound effect would not veer from the one suggested by Chopin.

b) Changes should not be introduced, as far as it is possible, in “expressive” fingering and in particular in “expressive-articulation” fingering (in Etudes in F Op. 10 no. 8, in G♯ minor Op. 25 no. 6, in C♯ minor Op. 25 no. 7, in A minor Op. 25 no. 11, in F minor Dbop. 36 no. 1 and in D♭ Dbop. 36 no. 3).

Those and other performance problems concerning the works of Chopin will be discussed more extensively in a separate volume: Introduction to the National Edition (in the part entitled Problems of Performance).

Jan Ekier

Notes on the musical text

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

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

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

Chopin’s original fingering is indicated in large bold-type numerals, 1 2 3 4 5, in contrast to the editors’ fingering which is written in small italic numerals 1 ♯ 2 ♯ 3 ♯ 4 ♯. Whenever authentic fingering is enclosed in parentheses this means that it was not present in the primary sources, but added by Chopin to his pupils’ copies.

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

1. Etude in C major, Op. 10 no. 1

p. 15

Bars 30-32 and 35-36 R.H. In the case of a smaller hand it is possible to change the natural fingering of this Etude into the following:

Bar 30

(analogously bar 32);

Bar 31

Bar 35

Bar 36

While applying this fingering (eventually in other analogous passages) particular attention should be drawn to articulation, which should not differ from that in passages played with natural fingering.

5 It is possible to refer also to the fingering which eminent virtuosos gave in the editions of the Etudes prepared by themselves, e. g. A. Cortot (Senart-Salabert), I. Friedman (Breitkopf & Härtel), and A. Michalowski (Gebethner and Wolff).
Performance Commentary

2. Etude in A minor, Op. 10 no. 2

p. 19  
Bar 1 and following  R.H. Fingering proposed by Chopin and the editors may be combined depending on the anatomical and functional predispositions of the hand, e.g. in bar 1:

\[ \begin{array}{cccccccc}
5 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 3 \\
6 & 5 & 3 & 5 & 4 & 3 & 5 & 4 \\
7 & 5 & 3 & 5 & 4 & 3 & 5 & 4 \\
8 & 5 & 3 & 5 & 4 & 3 & 5 & 4 \\
\end{array} \]

p. 21  
Bar 20 and 22  R.H. In case of difficulties with spanning chords on the third beat it is possible to omit one of the lower notes (f' or a_b in bar 20, g' or b_b in bar 22).

3. Etude in E major, Op. 10 no. 3

p. 24  
Metronomic tempo — see Introductory Comments.

Bar 7, 8  R.H. Performance of ornaments:

a) with an arpeggio

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\uparrow \\
\downarrow \\
\end{array} \]

b) without an arpeggio

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\uparrow \\
\downarrow \\
\end{array} \]

Bars 18-20 and 71-76  L.H. The marking *sempre legato* and the prolongation of the bass notes written by Chopin denote the application of “harmonic legato” (the fingers sustain harmonic notes). A precise record would be as follows:

\[ \begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{c} & \text{d} & \text{e} & \text{f} & \text{g} & \text{a} & \text{c} & \text{d} \\
\text{e} & \text{f} & \text{g} & \text{a} & \text{c} & \text{d} & \text{e} & \text{f} \\
\text{f} & \text{g} & \text{a} & \text{c} & \text{d} & \text{e} & \text{f} & \text{g} \\
\text{g} & \text{a} & \text{c} & \text{d} & \text{e} & \text{f} & \text{g} & \text{a} \\
\end{array} \]

(analogously in bars 71-76).

p. 25  
Bar 21  R.H. The sign written by Chopin in a pupil’s copy means that the first of the grace notes, g^#1, should be struck together with g and e.

Bar 23, 25, 27 and 29  R.H. In accordance with Chopin’s directive given in a pupil’s copy, grace notes should be sounded simultaneously with the lower note of the third (and a corresponding note in the L.H.). Taking into consideration the arpeggio in bar 23:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\uparrow \\
\downarrow \\
\end{array} \]

Bar 31 and 34  R.H. The variant version of bar 31 given in the footnote occurs in one of the sources containing also a variant version of bar 34. The sources thus confirm the following combinations of the main text and variants in those bars:
1. the main text in both bars (recommended by the editors as the most reliable);
2. the main text in bar 31 and a variant in bar 34;
3. variants in both bars.

p. 26  
Bar 44  Facilitation of the L.H. part:

4. Etude in C sharp minor, Op. 10 no. 4

p. 29  
Bars 25-30  R.H. An easier division between hands:

Analogously in bar 26 and 27-28. From the middle of bar 28:

5. Etude in G flat major, Op. 10 no. 5

p. 37  
Bar 65  R.H. The rhythmic differences occurring in the sources at the beginning of the bar (see Source Commentary) permit us to assume that Chopin was concerned not with shortening the second note in the bar but with the introduction of a rest, signifying a natural raising of the hand, not very distinctly rhythmicised; an approximate reading of the first half of the bar:

Bar 66  The original script is unclear from the viewpoint of fingering and division between hands. Most probably, Chopin foresaw the following execution:

In order to retain the fundamental note d_b to the end of the bar one could apply the following device:

Other possible solutions include:
6. Etude in E flat minor, Op. 10 no. 6

p. 38 Metronomic tempo — see Introductory Comments.

p. 40 Bar 50 R.H. The execution of grace notes: \( \text{\textit{\textdegree}} \) = \( \text{\textit{\textdegree}} \).

7. Etude in C major, Op. 10 no. 7

p. 41 R.H. The fingering given in several passages (e.g. in bar 3 and 4), alternative in relation to the natural fingering, is a proposal addressed primarily to pianists with smaller hands.

8. Etude in F major, Op. 10 no. 8

p. 45 Upbeat R.H. Execution of the trill: \( \text{\textit{\textdegree}} \).

p. 51 Bars 94-95 R.H. Both hands should play the arpeggios simultaneously (see commentary to Etude in E\( _b \) Op. 10 no. 11).

9. Etude in F minor, Op. 10 no. 9

p. 54 Bar 50 and 52 Facilitation of the second half of the bars:

p. 55 Bar 64 R.H. When deciding to play the grace note it is best to strike it together with the bass \( F \).

10. Etude in A flat major, Op. 10 no. 10

Articulation

The whole Etude should be played legato (naturally, with the exception of the staccato marked fragment in bars 13-16). The legatissimo marking, which occurs upon several occasions, denotes “harmonic legato” (the fingers sustain harmonic notes). In bar 1, 9 and 17 it refers to the basic figure of the accompaniment, which should be played in the following manner:

In case of difficulties caused by a smaller hand span it is recommended to sustain at least those notes, which have longer values in bars 1-8. Analogously in further parts of the Etude.

In bars 51-53 “harmonic legato” should be applied in the R.H. (if the span of the hand makes this possible):

Accenting

The manner of grouping and accenting figures in the R.H. is of a dual nature: triple and double. This is marked most distinctly in the opening part of the Etude: groups composed of three quavers in bars 1-8 and of two quavers in bars 9-12. In further movements Chopin frequently applied simplified notation, without giving accents or slurs, although the beaming of quavers into groups of three or two always make it possible to easily distinguish both types of groups. The second half of bar 39 and 40 could be regarded as transitory between the double and triple figures.

The accenting of all thematic parts with three-quaver groups should be identical, both in the case of those marked by accents (bars 1-8, 17-20 and 41-42) as well as those deprived of such accents (bars 29-32, 55-58 and 69-74). The execution of parts with two-quaver figures, regardless whether they are slurred or not, should be analogous to the one initially marked by Chopin, starting with bar 9.

p. 56 Upbeat The fact that Chopin removed the marking \( f \) at the beginning of this Etude (see Source Commentary), while retaining \( p \) in bar 9 entitles us to presume that the composition should begin mezza voce, which corresponds to \( f \) rarely used by Chopin.

11. Etude in E flat major, Op. 10 no. 11

Dynamic markings in the main text, given without parentheses, denote the basic skeleton of the dynamics in this Etude. This set, probably expressing Chopin’s final intention, should be recognised as fundamental. By adding to it markings in parentheses and by changing markings in the text in bar 21 and 52 into those given in the footnotes we obtain an alternative set of authentic markings. With the exception of the distinctly different conception of the ending (bar 52), the second set could be acknowledged as one of the possible detailed realisations of dynamics, outlined by markings in the first set. In practice, it is recommended to:

— select markings given in parentheses;
— remember not to obliterate the logic of the construction of longer fragments of the composition by an excessive emphasis of rapidly succeeding nuances;
— choose one of the versions of the dynamics of the ending.

The rhythmic basis of the Etude should consist of highest notes of the chords in both hands, which in the R.H. as a rule constitutes the main melodic line. This means that all the arpeggios should be executed in an anticipatory way:

The lower notes of the arpeggios in the L.H. should be synchronised with the lower notes of the arpeggios in the R.H. The non-arpeggiated L.H. notes (bar 1, 5, 8 and analog.) should also be best played together with the first notes of the arpeggios in the R.H.

p. 62 Bars 33-34 and 37-38 R.H. The execution of the arpeggios with the grace note: \( \text{\textit{\textdegree}} \) = \( \text{\textit{\textdegree}} \).


p. 64 Metronomic tempo — see Introductory Comments.
Performance Commentary

13. Etude in A flat major, Op. 25 no. 1
p. 69
Bars 1-2, 9-10, 26 and 27 On modern pianos bars 1-2 and 9-10 sound better with a single pedal. Similarly, it is possible not take into consideration a change of the pedal on the second crotchet in bar 26 and 27.

Bars 7-8, 28 and 32-34 Pianists with smaller hands may resign from crossing hands and change the notes executed with first fingers.

p. 70
Bar 16, 21, 29 and 32-34 L.H. In those bars Chopin treated groups of five semiquavers probably as quintuplets. Nonetheless, it is possible that he permitted also such execution in which the notes played with the first fingers of both hands were struck simultaneously. Cf. Source Commentary on the script of those groups, as well as quotations about the Etudes... prior to the musical text.

p. 73
Bars 43-44 R.H. The tie starting on the last a# of the bar could signify a retention of this note or the whole chord ab-c'-e'-a'.

Bar 48 L.H. Beginning of the trill: D together with the sixth in the R.H. The trill is without an ending.

Bar 49 The arpeggios should be played in a continuous way (c' in the R.H. after e# in the L.H.).

p. 77
Bar 68 The arpeggios should be played in a continuous way (f' in the R.H. after c' in the L.H.).

15. Etude in F major, Op. 25 no. 3
p. 81
Bars 68-69 R.H. To render execution easier it is possible to take the quavers c' and c'' into the L.H. (from the second one in bar 68 to the first one in bar 69).

16. Etude in A minor, Op. 25 no. 4
In the whole Etude due concern should be shown to providing impulses to the bass notes in order to avoid the undesired impression of shifting the metre by a single quaver.

p. 83
Bars 19-22 The original pedalling can be modified by shifting the change of the pedal a quaver further (to the sixth quaver in bar 19 and 21). The purpose of this operation is to avoid mingling the second and third chord in those bars with a single pedal. Yet another pedalling, which accentuates changes in the articulation in the R.H., sounds well on modern pianos:

Analogously in bars 21-22.

p. 85
Bar 63 Execution:

Bar 65 The arpeggios should be played in a continuous manner (c#' in the R.H. after a in the L.H.).

17. Etude in E minor, Op. 25 no. 5
All the arpeggios in the L.H. should be anticipated so that their highest notes would fall on the beat:

etc., analogously.

In bars 43-44, 124, 126 and 128 the upper note of the arpeggio in the L.H. should be sounded together with the grace note in the R.H.

p. 87
Bars 29-36 R.H. The theme in those bars differs from that at the beginning of the etude primarily due to the necessity of playing the melodic line as legato as possible. Grace notes in the lower voice should be performed simultaneously with the notes of the melody in the upper voice. The rapidity of their execution is less essential: they could have the value of semiquavers, as at the beginning of the etude, or be quicker (e.g. f-...).

Bar 45 and following Metronomic tempo of the middle part — see Introductory Comments.

p. 90
Bars 94-97 On modern pianos the original pedalling proposed by Chopin yields an unpleasant sonority of the semitone a#-c#. In order to avoid this from happening without losing the sound of the root of the E major chord, one may apply the following device:

p. 91
Bars 128-129 Presumably, the intention of releasing the pedal in bar 129 is merely to avoid a mingling of the notes e'-c#. In order to preserve the harmony (cf. pedal in bars 124-125) it seems permissible to use the following device:

Bar 130 The grace notes c# and a' should be sounded together with the notes E-e'-e'.

18. Etude in G sharp minor, Op. 25 no. 6
The markings proposed by Chopin and the fingering suggested in the text by the editors do not exhaust the possibilities of fingering in this Etude. The fingering in bars 1-3 can differ:

Alternative fingering of the minor-thirds chromatic scales, probably devised by Chopin, is given in the Source Commentary to bar 5. (The largest number of assorted possibilities of fingering in this Etude is listed in the A. Cortot edition — Ed. Salabert-Senart, Paris).

p. 98
Introduction In the opinion of the editors the pauses, added by Chopin in a pupil’s copy (in the version at the bottom of the page) are not connected with this rhythmic variant, but possess expressive significance.
— the prolongation of the highest notes of the melody is one of the performance devices typical for tempo rubato. The pianist may, therefore, take them into consideration also by choosing the rhythmic variant given in the main text.

Bar 1 and following Metronomic tempo — see Introductory Comments.

Bar 7 and 51 L.H. The trill should begin together with the chord in the R.H. regardless whether its first note is d♯ or d♭.

Bar 25 and 55 L.H. Beginning of the trill in bar 25: a♯ simultaneously with the chord in the R.H. Analogously in bar 55.

Bars 34-35 R.H. Those pianists whose hands make it impossible to span the chord f♯-b♭-d♭-a (bar 35) comfortably are recommended to take the note f♯ on the last quaver in bar 34 and the first quaver in bar 35 into the L.H. This pertains both to the main text and the variant.

The first note, f♯, of the arpeggio in the main version of bar 35 should be struck simultaneously with b in the L.H.

Bar 37 L.H. Most probably, the trill should begin with the main note g♯.

22. Etude in B minor, Op. 25 no. 10

23. Etude in A minor, Op. 25 no. 11


Performance Commentary

Bar 20, 28 and 76 The first semiquaver on the last beat in those bars should be accented in the L.H. (A in bar 20 and 76, F in bar 28) and not in the R.H. as could be deduced from Chopin’s simplified script. The composer did not suggest crossing the hands for purely instrumental reasons, in order not to render execution difficult. The layout of the voices, which does not take into account the performance aspect, should be as follows:

25. Etude in F minor, Dbop. 36 no. 1

26. Etude in A flat major, Dbop. 36 no. 2

27. Etude in D flat major, Dbop. 36 no. 3

Fingering in the lower voice in the R.H. follows from a natural position of the hand and is based on the first and the second finger. In certain passages the editors propose the consecutive use of the first finger in order to facilitate the legato in the upper voice.

In his edition of the Études (Breitkopf & Härtel) I. Friedman made the interesting remark: “Rosenthal uses exclusively the first finger for the staccato in the lower voice, enabling a larger selection of fingering for the legato in the upper voice. This is much more difficult!”.

261-63 L.H. The pedal should be changed in such a way as not to lose the sound of the As pedal point.

Jan Ekier
Paweł Kamiński
**SOURCE COMMENTARY /ABRIDGED/**

**Introductory comments**

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

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

---

**1-12. Etudes Op. 10**

**Manuscripts**

There are nine extant editorial autographs (Etudes no. 3 and 5-12) and six manuscripts (autographs or copies) of earlier editions of Etudes no. 1-4 and 9. A more detailed characteristic of particular manuscripts is given at the beginning of commentaries to particular etudes.

**First editions**

**FE1** First French edition, M. Schlesinger (M. S. 1399), Paris June 1833, based on an autograph. *FE1* has detailed corrections by Chopin, made at least upon three occasions.

**FE2** Second impression of *FE1* (same firm and number), with several corrections, possibly made by Chopin.

**FE3** Third impression of *FE1*, H. Lemoine (2775. HL), Paris December 1842. The musical text of *FE3* does not differ from *FE2*.

**F.E.** = *FE1*, *FE2*, and *FE3*.

**FED. FES. FEJ** — pupils’ copies of *FE* with annotations by Chopin, containing fingering, performance directives, variants and corrections of printing errors:

**FED.** — copy from a collection belonging to Chopin’s pupil Camille Dubois (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris).

**FES.** — copy from a collection belonging to Chopin's sister Ludwika Jędrzejewicz (F. Chopin Society, Warsaw).

**FEJ.** — copy from a collection belonging to Chopin's pupil Jane Strirling (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris).

**GE1** First German edition, two fascicles containing six Etudes each, Fr. Kistner (1018. and 1019.), Leipzig August 1833. *GE1* is based on the proofs of *FE1*, without the last corrections made by Chopin, and with clearly discernible numerous supplements, predominantly of chromatic signs, and changes introduced in the course of printing. Up to now, some of those changes (e. g. in *Etude in E* no. 3, bar 34, in *Es minor* no. 6, bar 7, in *F* no. 8, bar 95, or in *Es* no. 11, bars 52-53) were recognised universally as authentic; as a result, they occur in a considerable majority of later collected editions. Nonetheless, the absence of arguments confirming Chopin’s participation in the proof-reading of *GE1* renders the authenticity of the *GE1* version extremely doubtful:

— it follows from correspondence between the publishers, Schlesinger in Paris and Kistner in Leipzig, that Chopin maintained direct contact only with the Parisian publisher, who offered the purchased compositions to his colleague in Leipzig; the introduction of improvements in *GE1*, while bypassing the main, Parisian contracting party, would have been an awkward move for the composer, who was beginning to issue his works in France;

— apart from changes which could be regarded as introduced by Chopin *GE1* includes numerous others, obviously mistaken, which cannot be ascribed absolutely to the composer (e. g. in *Etude in C* no. 1, bar 46, in *A minor* no. 2, bar 7, in *F* no. 8, bar 43 and 51, and in *Ab* no. 10, bar 23 and 35).

**GE2** Second German edition (same publisher and number), after 1840, containing corrections of some of the mistakes in *GE1* and a number of arbitrary supplements and changes.

**GE3** Third German edition (same publisher and number), about 1845, including successive arbitrary changes and several errors.

**GE4** Fourth German edition (same publisher and number; each of the *Etudes* was given an additional number from 2961 to 2972), 1865, with primarily small supplements of the text of *GE3*.

**GE5** Fifth German edition (firm and number as in *GE4*) with further slight changes. The editors of the National Edition had at their disposal only the first fascicle (*Etudes no. 1-6*).

**GE.** = *GE1*, *GE2*, *GE3*, *GE4*, and *GE5*.

**[EE1]** First English edition, two fascicles with six *Etudes* each, Wessel & C° (W & C° 960 and 961), London August 1833, based probably on *FE1*. The editors of the National Edition were unable to find a copy of this edition.

**EE2** Second impression of **[EE1]** (same firm and number), 1836-1839, basically reproducing the text of *FE1*. A large number of errors entitles us to presume that the text of *EE2* does not differ from **[EE1]**.

**EE3** Later impression of **[EE1]** (same firm and number), after 1856, correcting numerous errors in *EE2* and introducing many unauthentic changes and supplements (partially upon the basis of *GE3*).

**EE.** = *EE2* and *EE3*.

**1. Etude in C major, Op. 10 no. 1**

**Sources**

**CLI** Copy of the original version of this and the next *Etude*, made probably by Józef Linowski, with the date "2 November 1830" and the titles *Exercise 1* and *Exercise 2* (F. Chopin Society, Warsaw). *CLI* contains a number of mechanical pitch errors, which could not have been committed by Chopin (in *Etude in C*: bar 24, the thirteenth semiquaver ø1; bar 66, the twelfth semiquaver ø1; in *Etude in A minor*: bar 6, the bottom R.H. note on the third beat ø, bar 7, twice A as a bass note, bar 45, the bottom R.H. note on the second beat ø1) and which exclude the possibility suggested in many publications, namely, that we are dealing with an autograph. *CLI* differs from the final version due to many melodic-harmonic details and the total absence of performance markings.

**Other sources (first editions)** — see above *Etudes Op. 10*.

**Editorial Principles**

We accept as our basis *FE2* as the last authentic source. In those instances where we suspect errors in *FE*, we refer to *CLI*. Annotations made by Chopin in *FED*, *FES* and *FEJ* are also taken into consideration.

p. 13

**Bar 1** The time signature is given according to *CLI*. Although *FE* (→*GE,EE*) contains ø, it would be difficult to assume that the change of the metre was intentional, since contrary to manuscripts the *Etudes* in *FE* do not contain a single marking ø, even in the most obvious cases (*Etudes in F minor*, Op. 25 no. 2, *in Db*, Op. 25 no. 8 and *in F minor*, Dobot. 36 no. 1).

Bars 7-8, 9-10, 11-12, 13-14, 73-74 and 75-76 L.H. in *FE* the upper notes of the octaves are not tied. This is certainly the consequence of a misunderstanding produced by a change of the original abbreviated notation of the octaves, with the help of ø below the top notes (such notation appears in *CLI* and in bars 55-62 in *FE*), into ordinary script.

p. 14

**Bar 26** L.H. The value of ø, for the note d occurs only in *FE*, where it was introduced in place of a semibreve probably during the proof-reading.

p. 16

**Bar 44** R.H. The penultimate semiquaver in *FE* (→*GE1→GE2*) is mistakenly ø. Chopin in *FED*, *FEJ* and *FES* corrected this error.

**Bar 46** R.H. The last semiquaver in *FE1* is mistakenly ø. In *FE2* Chopin corrected it to B; *EE* also contains a correct version. An unauthentic correction of this error introduced into *GE* raises d to ø1.
2. Etude in A minor, Op. 10 no. 2

Sources

AI Autograph of an earlier version, with the title Etude (Stiftelsen Musikkulturens Främjande, Stockholm). AI is written carefully and with a large number of performance markings (even with the metronomic tempo). The following features testify the fact that it presents an earlier version:
- concurrence with CLI as regards certain details, subsequently changed by Chopin in the final version (bar 25, 26, 43 and 47);
- the absence of the lower A₁ at the beginning of bar 2, 6, 10, 14, 37, 41;
- inconsistent notation in the L.H. (staccato crotchets, crotchetts);
- differentiatated length of the sound of lower voices in the R.H.; long notes (crotchets) hamper performance, at the same time weakening the effect of countering the continuum of the upper voice line by means of short, light strokes of the harmonic filling.
FEcor — proof copy of FE with detailed correction added by the composer (Bibliothèque de l'Opéra, Paris). Chopin corrected mistakes, supplemented or changed a number of performance markings, and added fingering in the whole Etude.

Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 10, on page 8.

Editorial Principles

We accept as our basis FE2 as the last authentic source. In those instances where we suspect errors in FE, we take into consideration AI, CLI and FEcor.

p. 19

Bar 1 The time signature is given according to CLI and AI. See commentary to Etude in C Op. 10 no. 1, bar 1.
GE3-GE5 has mistakenly 114 in the marking of the metronomic tempo.

Bar 4, 12 and 39 L.H. Motif slurs below the double notes were added by Chopin in the correction of FE1 (→EE2), later than FEcor. In GE and EE3 they are supplemented arbitrarily with ties sustaining b. Earlier sources disclose the composer's doubts as regards the notation of this motif: there are no slurs in CLI, two slurs in bar 4 and none in bar 12 and 39 in AI.

Bar 7 On the second beat we give the E-minor chord (with b before g°) according to FE (→EE2) and AI. This natural is absent in FEcor and in the copy serving as the basis for GE. In order to avoid a divergence between parts in both hands, the reviser of GE decided to add b before g° in the L.H. This arbitrary change was introduced also in EE3.

Bar 8 L.H. On the second beat we give the long accent sign according to FEcor and AI. In FE (→GE, EE) it was given the mistaken form of a short diminuendo sign on the first crotchet in the bar. Noticing this misunderstanding in the successive proof-reading Chopin added a sign in place of the accent. The accent harmonised better with all the dynamic markings in the Etude (a comparison of AI with the final version shows that while preparing the Etude for print Chopin made a careful selection of markings, i. a. by replacing the signs with accents; see also the following comment).

Bar 12 L.H. Below the second crotchet in this bar FE (→GE, EE) has the sign unjustified in this context (cf. analogous bar 4 and 39). Its presence can be explained by the overlapping of two mistakes:
- Chopin overlooked this passage while reducing the number of the signs in the autograph basis for print (AI has eleven such signs; in the final version Chopin removed them or replaced them with accents);
- the engraver of FE gave instead of : in the whole Op. 10 a similar mistake was committed upon numerous occasions (in Etudes: in E no. 3, bar 54, in C# minor no. 4, bar 1, 8, 16, 28, 54, in Es minor no. 6, bar 21 and 32, and in C minor no. 12, bar 37).

Bar 18 L.H. In FEcor Chopin added the staccato dots below the second and third octave. They were overlooked in FE (→EE), and in GE these octaves were slurred arbitrarily.

p. 22

Bar 37 L.H. The main text comes from FE (→GE, EE), the variant — from CLI. The use of the A alone in this passage could have been intended by Chopin — in this version the appearance of the octaves in the bass is very consistent in the reprise (from bar 36: from bar 41 to the end. It is just as probable that Chopin inadvertently left here the original version (AI) has A in all analogous bars). This possibility is indicated by the fact that in CLI octaves in bar 2 and analog. occur with the exception of bar 14, and in FE — initially with the exception of bar 14 and 37; in FEcor Chopin added the lower A₁ in bar 14.

Bar 43 R.H. The main text comes from FE (→GE, EE) and the variant in the footnote — from CLI and AI. In FEcor Chopin recommended to remove the note in this chord, but it was a mistakenly printed e³. This fact does not offer total certainty as regards the composer’s ultimate intention.

3. Etude in E major, Op. 10 no. 3

Sources

AI Autograph rough copy of a not final version of the Etude, with the date “Paris 25 August [1832]” (The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York).
A Autograph fair copy (F. Chopin Society, Warsaw), intended as the basis for the first French edition.
Mi-Hi Letter by Karol Mikuli, Chopin’s pupil, to Ferdinand Hiller, a friend of the composer, with a request for a solution of doubts concerning the authentic text of nine passages in assorted compositions by Chopin, i.e. in bars 30-31 and 34-35 of this Etude (Bibliothek des Landes Konservatoriums, Graz).

GES — copy (lost) of GE belonging to Chopin’s pupil F. Müller-Streicher.

Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 10, on page 8.

Editorial Principles

We accept as our basis FE2 as the last authentic source, compared with A. We also take into consideration the annotations made by Chopin in FED, FES and FEJ.

p. 24

Bar 1 We give the tempo marking according to FE (→GE, EE). AI has Vivace and A — Vivace ma non troppo, which in the proofs of FE Chopin subsequently changed into Lento ma non troppo.

Bar 7, 8 and 23 R.H. The arpeggios were added, most probably by Chopin, in FED.

Bars 18-20 and 71-76 L.H. We give the crotchet stems which indicate the realisation of "harmonic legato" according to A (cf. Performance Commentary); they were overlocked in FE (→GE, EE).

Bars 30-31 and 34-35 R.H. These pairs of bars, creating a sequence, can be considered jointly (bars 32-33 are transitory). Their sound, different in particular sources, has been the cause of many doubts. At the end of the 1870s K. Mikuli (Mi-Hi) wrote about “assorted versions [of those pairs of bars], resulting from different editions and traditions”. This uncertainty was intensified by the inaccessibility of the autographs of the Etude. Below, we compare and characterise all the manuscript and printed versions of the bars.

Authentic versions

1. The original version of AI, later supplemented by Chopin:

We recreate this version upon the basis of an analysis of corrections made by Chopin and discernible in AI. The chromatic signs in brackets are added by us and constitute the most probable supplementation of the unfinished notation in AI. In this version, each pair consists of two identical bars, diatonically maintained in the A-major and B-minor key.
2. The final version of Al — the result of the addition of chromatically altered thirds of the lower voice in bar 31 and 35 and \( \frac{1}{4} \) before 3 before \( g\sqrt{5} \) in bar 34. In A Chopin wrote a fair copy of this version, adding dynamic markings and accents; in this completed form it was printed in FE1 (→EE2): 

Here, attention is drawn by the absence of \( \frac{1}{4} \) lowering \( c7\sqrt{5} \) to \( c\sqrt{5} \) on the second semiquaver in bar 34. This obvious oversight by Chopin (we found hundreds of similar imprecisions in the manuscripts and first editions of his works) became one of the main reasons for the emergence and dissemination of the unauthentic versions of the fragment in question (versions 5 and 6). In [GES], containing the printed unauthentic version 5, Chopin added \( \frac{1}{4} \) at the beginning of bar 34, in this way restoring the discussed version. In Mi-Hi its authenticity was confirmed additionally by F. Hiller, who in the GE version written by Mikuli (with \( d\sqrt{5} \) and \( d\sqrt{1} \) in bar 34) added naturals before those notes.

**Versions of uncertain authenticity**

3. The FE2 version:

FE2 was corrected by Chopin, but we may doubt whether \( \frac{1}{4} \) lowering \( g\sqrt{5} \) to \( g\sqrt{1} \) in bar 34 is not the outcome of some sort of a misunderstanding in the corrections (connected, e.g. with the similarity between bar 34 and 35).

4. The FED version, in which Chopin added \( \frac{1}{4} \) at the beginning of bar 31 in the FE2 version:

The absence of a similar change in the remaining pupils’ copies (FES, FEJ, [GES]) does not permit us to recognise it as binding.

**Unauthentic versions**

5. The GE version (also EE3):

The author of this version was certainly the reviser of GE1, who corrected the incomplete version of the basis (FE1). Following a conventional harmonic sense he most probably recognised \( \frac{1}{4} \) before the first third in bar 34 as mistakenly placed a bar too early, and thus removed it.

6. Version of most later collected editions:

This is a compilation of versions 4 and 5, carried out in the 1870s; it appears the earliest in editions prepared by Klindworth and Mikuli. It should be stressed that the B-major key occurring in versions 5 and 6 in bar 34 does not exist in any of the sources used by Chopin — Al, A, FE1, FE2, FED, FES, FEJ, [GES].

We accept as the main text version 2, most reliable from the viewpoint of the sources. Musically, it is also the richest:
— the configuration of the intervals of each of those four bars is slightly different;
— in both pairs of bars harmonic differences concur with dynamic contrasts \( f - p \);
— the mentioned pairs of bars differ as regards the mode (major-minor) which corresponds to the ascent of tension associated with raising sequence.

An identical harmonic scheme occurs at the beginning of Allegro de Concert, Op. 46:

---

4. Etude in C sharp minor, Op. 10 no. 4

**Sources**

Al Autograph rough copy of the not final version of the Etude, with the date “Paris August 6, 1832” (private collection, photocopy in the F. Chopin Society, Warsaw).

Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 10, on page 8.

**Editorial Principles**

We accept as our basis FE2 as the last authentic source whose dubious passages are compared with Al. We take into consideration the annotations made by Chopin in FED and FES, and add slurring, careless in FE and marked only fragmentarily in Al, as well as obviously overlooked dots, accents, etc.

**Upbeat** The time signature is given according to Al. See commentary to Etude in C Op. 10 no. 1, bar 1.

Bar 1, 8, 16, 26, 34 and 54 We correct the most probably unauthentic markings \( fp \) or \( f \) occurring in those bars in FE (→GE,EE) to \( fp \) and \( f \), in accordance with musical sense. In the first compositions...
published by Chopin in France, and including Etudes Op. 10. FE frequently omitted after f in those markings (Chopin never used fp). Cf. commentary to Etude in A minor no. 2, bar 12.

Bar 12 in FE (→GE,EE) f is not written until the fourth crotchet. It seems more probable that Chopin was concerned with a forte performance of the whole bar; for this reason, we shift this marking to the beginning, where the dynamic sign — ff — in AI is found. Cf. bar 62.

Bar 14 and 64 L.H. In GE and EE3 the last two semiquavers in bar 64 mistakenly sound G♯ and A. Some of the later collected editions applied this unauthorized version also in bar 14.

Bar 15 and 19 L.H. The third semiquaver in FE (→GE,EE) is A♭ in bar 15, and G♯ in bar 19. These are probably mistakes — cf. analogous bar 13, 14, 63-66; thus we accept the AI version.

Bar 24 R.H. FE (→EE2) has ♯ only before c1 in the last chord. Although the version with e♭ could be possible, it seems much more probable that it originated accidentally in the following manner: — AI does not have naturals both before the discussed chord in the R.H. and the eleventh semiquaver in the L.H. preceding it; this could be the original version or simply imprecise notation (AI has a distinctly tentative character); — in the autograph basis for print Chopin wrote naturals, raising e♭ to e in the L.H. and e♭ to e♯ in the R.H.; — the engraver of FE mistakenly wrote ♯ before c1 in the R.H. (where it is also necessary after the transitory c♭ at the beginning of the bar); errors of this type are rather frequent, e. g. in the middle of bar 17 FE has ♯ before c♭ instead of before f in the L.H.

GE and EE3 contain b♭-c-♭-d.

Bar 26 R.H. Before the eleventh semiquaver GE mistakenly has ♯ instead of x.

Bar 53 L.H. The main text comes from FE (→EE), and the variant — from AI. Rhythmic values in GE correspond to the AI version, and the accent borrowed from FE was given the form of the diminuendo sign.

Bar 75 R.H. In GE there is no ♯ before g♯; the fourteenth semiquaver is in the bar.

5. Etude in G flat major, Op. 10 no. 5

Sources


Editorial Principles

We accept as our basis FE2 as the last authentic source, compared with A. Annotations made by Chopin in FED, FES and FEJ are also taken into account.

Bar 2 and analog. L.H. Chords on the second and third quaver in A additionally include g♯. Chopin removed these notes while proof-reading FE (→GE,EE).

Bar 4, 12 and 52 R.H. A (→FE→GE1,EE2) has d♭ as the ninth semiquaver in bar 4 and d♭ as the fifth semiquaver in bar 12 and 52. The original version was left behind in bar 4 with all certainty owing to inattention (when correcting Chopin often missed one of several similar passages), which is confirmed by a suitable handwritten correction of this bar in FED. EE3 has e♭ only in bar 52. In GE2,GE5 d♭ is accepted arbitrarily in all three places.

Bar 15 L.H. The note e♭ in the chord on the second quaver of the bar is encountered only in A. It is difficult to say whether its absence in FE (→GE,EE) is the outcome of an oversight by the engraver or Chopin’s proof-reading of FE.

Bar 22 L.H. On the third quaver A still has the note a♭, which Chopin removed while correcting FE.

Bar 24 R.H. The seventh semiquaver in A (→FE→GE,EE) is e♭. This mistake was corrected by Chopin in FES. Cf. commentary to bar 72.

Bar 31 R.H. The fifth semiquaver in FE (→GE,EE) is b♭. This error was corrected by Chopin in all three extant pupils’ copies.

Bar 41 and 43 L.H. A has the rhythm | ∥ |, changed by Chopin in the proofs of FE (→GE,EE).

Bar 47 L.H. The chord at the beginning of the bar in GE has mistakenly c♭ instead of d♭.

Bar 55-56 L.H. In the variant we give accents from A since it is uncertain whether the different version of FE (→GE,EE) (our main text) is the outcome of corrections made by Chopin or the imprecise reproduction of A by the engraver of FE.

Bar 59 L.H. The procedure of deciphering Chopin’s intentions as regards the fourth quaver in this bar encounters serious difficulties. A has the chord d♭-g♭-b♭ and we give this unquestionably authentic version in the main text. The four-note chord b♭-d♭-g♭-b♭ in FE (→GE,EE) could be the result either of the proof-reading by Chopin or a mistake committed by the engraver (a version of one of the adjoining and graphically similar bars); this is the reason why we give it as a variant at the bottom of the page. However, in the opinion of the editors the most probable explanation of the described divergence is different: while correcting this passage in FE Chopin wished to replace b♭ by the printed A version by b♭: the engraver realised only the easier part of this task (the printing technique of that period rendered the addition of a note much simpler than its removal). A similar type of “partial” correction is found in several compositions by Chopin, e. g. Etude in E♭ Op. 10 no. 11, bar 4, Scherzo in B minor Op. 20, bar 135 and 292, Polonaise in A Op. 40 no. 1, bar 93, Ballade in G minor Op. 23, bar 171. This supposition leads to the b♭-d♭-g♭-b♭ chord given in the variant (as in analogous bar 57).

Bar 60 R.H. The seventh semiquaver in FE is mistakenly b♭, corrected by Chopin to g♯ in FED and FES. A correct version is found in A and in GE and EE.

Bar 62 L.H. The crotchet chord in A does not have the note a♭. Chopin added it in the proofs of FE (→GE,EE).

Bar 65 R.H. On the first quaver in the bar A has the following rhythm: , which Chopin changed in the proofs of FE (→GE,EE). In Chopin’s oeuvre we encounter this type of ambiguous rhythmical notation upon numerous occasions, e. g. in Scherzo in C minor Op. 39, bar 47 and analog., Mazurka in A& Op. 41 no 3, bar 6, 8, and analog., Sonata in B minor Op. 58, mvt. I, bar 139. See Performance Commentary.

Bar 72 R.H. The highest semiquaver in A is mistakenly e♭, corrected by Chopin in the proofs of FE (→GE,EE). See commentary to bar 24.

Bars 72-73 R.H. A does not have a tie sustaining d♭.

Bar 78 L.H. The main text comes from FE (→GE,EE), and the variant — from A. It is uncertain whether the octaves marked in an abbreviated manner in A with the help of the figure A had not been simply overlooked in FE. Stylistically, both versions appear to be parallel.

Bar 84 R.H. GE has the arpeggio sign next to the chord, which is an arbitrary addition in this edition.
6. Etude in E flat minor, Op. 10 no. 6

Sources
A Autograph fair copy (F. Chopin Society, Warsaw) of the final version, intended as the basis for the first French edition.
Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 10, on page 8.

Editorial Principles
We accept as the basis FE2 as the last authentic source, compared with A, and render uniform the length of accents, varying in the sources — evidently by accident — from one to four semiquavers. We take into consideration the annotations made by Chopin in FES and FEJ.

p. 38
Upbeat A does not have tempo marking (verbal and metronomic) added by Chopin in the proofs of FE (→GE, EE).

Bar 2 and analog. L.H. The last semiquaver in A is f1. We accept the version which Chopin improved while correcting FE (→GE, EE).

Bar 7 R.H. In the second half of the bar we give c#2 according to A (→FE→EE2). Similar harmonic progression occurs frequently in compositions by Chopin, i., a. in Etude in Eb Op. 10 no. 11, bars 23-25. In GE and EE3 this c#2 was changed arbitrarily to c1. In GE the supplementary of missing chromatic signs was a basic component of the revision, although Chopin's intention was not always deciphered aptly (cf. e.g. Etudes in C no. 1, bar 46, in A minor no. 2, bar 7, in A flat no. 10, bar 23 and 25). A similar change of c#1 to c was made in GE at the end of Nocturne in Bb minor Op. 9 no. 1, published by the same firm (the eleventh quaver in bar 83). This change, obviously mistaken, illustrates the schematic approach of the reviser of this edition.

Bar 15 A does not have ♯ lowering the upper note of the first fourth in the R.H. and the sixth semiquaver in the L.H. to f♯ and f; they were added by Chopin while proof-reading FE (→GE, EE).

p. 39
Bar 22 R.H. In GE1 there are no dots prolonging the crotchet e♯-♯f1 in the second half of the bar. In GE2 this incomplete version is supplemented arbitrarily with a quaver rest (adapted in EE3).

Bar 26 L.H. The crotchet G♯, at the beginning of the bar is found only in A. Its absence in FE (→GE, EE) could be explained by a correction made by Chopin in FE or an error. The second eventuality is supported by the fingering presented in FE, meaningful only while sounding the octave.

Bar 28 R.H. A and GE do not have ♯ before the last semiquaver. Most probably, Chopin added it while correcting FE (→EE) already after sending the basis to GE.

Bar 29 L.H. A (→FE→GE, EE) does not have naturals before the first octave. Chopin corrected this mistake in FE2.

Bar 32 At the beginning of the bar FE (→GE, EE) has ♯. We accept the musically more justified f♯, occurring in A. R.H. In A the sixth semiquaver is f♯1. While proof-reading FE (→EE2) Chopin changed it to g♯1. R.H. The last semiquaver in GE (and EE3) is mistakenly f♯1.

Bar 34 R.H. A contains the following version:

\[ \text{\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure}
\end{figure}} \]

In the proofs of FE (→EE2) Chopin changed it to the version accepted in our edition. GE1 (→GE2) is concurrent with FE, although it lacks the precautionary ♯ before e♯ before a♯ at the beginning of the bar. In GE3 and EE3 this note was changed arbitrarily to e1.

Bar 35 R.H. The chord in the middle of the bar in A has a♯ as the highest note. In FE (→GE, EE) Chopin corrected it to a♯.

p. 40
Bar 38 R.H. In A (→FE→GE1) there are no prolonging dots next to d♯-♯f1 in the upper voices. In GE2 this imprecision was eliminated by adding a quaver rest at the end of the bar. EE added dots which, taking into consideration the continuum of the melodic line of the Etude, certainly corresponds to Chopin's intention in this passage. (Cf. commentary to bar 22).

Bar 50 R.H. The final version of the beginning of this bar is uncertain. A contains the version which we give in the main text, albeit written down with a rhythmic mistake — the c#-♭-♭ fourth has the value of only a crotchet, without prolongation dots. Most probably it was precisely this error which was the reason why the first half of the bar in FE was deciphered mistakenly as \[ \text{\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure}
\end{figure}} \], which Chopin corrected for the version we cite in the variant. The distinctly heard parallel ninths f♯-♭♯ and e♭-♭♭, occurring in this version, compel us to believe that Chopin did not wish to complicate the correction of FE excessively and was satisfied with restoring the correct moment of sounding the note c#1. R.H. At the beginning of the bar before c♯ GE2 has mistakenly ♯1. In GE3 this version was arbitrarily supplemented by ♯ before c♯ in the middle of the bar.

Bars 52-53 R.H. A does not have a tie sustaining e♯1.

7. Etude in C major, Op. 10 no. 7

Sources
A Autograph fair copy (The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York), intended as the basis for the first French edition.
Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 10, on page 8.

Editorial Principles
We accept as our basis FE2 as the last authentic source, compared with A. Annotations made by Chopin in FED are taken into consideration.

p. 41
Upbeat In the marking of the metronomic tempo A has 88, corrected by Chopin to 84 in FE (→GE, EE).

Bar 3 R.H. The third semiquaver in A is f♯-g♯1. In FE (→GE, EE) Chopin corrected this version into the one appearing in analogous bars 11 and 36.

Bar 3 and 36 L.H. In the proofs of FE (→GE, EE) Chopin introduced ties sustaining c♯.

Bars 6-8 and 14-15 L.H. A contains only slurs over the four last quavers in bar 6 and 14. While proof-reading FE (→GE, EE) Chopin added slurs in the successive bars. We have linked them, regarding the correction of FE to be simplified for the convenience of the engravers.

Bar 11 L.H. In most of the later collected editions a tie sustaining c♯1 was added arbitrarily between the third and fourth quaver.

p. 42
Bar 16 R.H. In A lowering b♯ to hb♯ is found already before the seventh semiquaver. Chopin improved this version while correcting FE (→GE, EE).

Bars 25, 27-28 and 56-57 ♯ given in parentheses in bar 25 and changes of dynamic markings described in footnotes come from FED.

p. 43
Bar 30 and 31 L.H. In A both g♯1 in bar 30 and both f♯1 in bar 31 are joined by ties. Most probably, Chopin removed them in the proofs of FE (→GE, EE).

Bar 38 L.H. In A the record of this bar is rhythmically unclear. It is most likely that Chopin wrote first the version as found in bar 34, which he then changed — albeit not totally — in the manner of the version as found in bar 35. In FE (→GE, EE) the latter version, in which the uninterpreted quaver movement prepares the rhythmic "stretto" in bars 40-41, was printed correctly. Some of the later collected editions accepted for this bar the version as found in bar 34.

p. 44
Bar 45 and 47 R.H. The fifth semiquaver in A is f♯-g♯1. In the proofs of FE (→GE, EE) Chopin changed it to f♯-a♯2.
Bars 54-55 In both bars A has accents above the third, seventh and eleventh semiquaver. In the proofs of FE (→GE,EE) Chopin changed the configuration of the accents.

8. Etude in F major, Op. 10 no. 8

Sources

A Autograph fair copy (F. Chopin Society, Warsaw) of the final version, serving as the basis for the first French edition.

Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 10, on page 8.

Editorial Principles

We accept as our basis FE2 as the last authentic source compared with A. We supplement and render uniform slurs, dots and accents in the L.H., carelessly written in the sources, and take into consideration the annotations made by Chopin in FE, FES and FEJ.

Page 45

Upbeat We give the time signature according to A. See commentary to Etude in C Op. 10 no. 1, bar 1.

Bar 2 and 4 L.H. The wedges in the first editions are the outcome of a mistake in deciphering the figure 1 in Chopin's fingerling, committed by the engravers. Cf. commentary to Etude in D# Dbop. 36 no. 3, bar 64 and 69-70.

Bar 12 L.H. At the beginning of the bar A has the crotchet chord G-d-f-b. Chopin removed it in the proofs of FE (→GE,EE).

Bar 26 L.H. In FE (→GE,EE) the note c has the mistaken value of a minim.

Bar 43 L.H. In A (→FE→GE,EE) there is no ♯ before the second semiquaver raising f to f♯; it does not occur until after the sixth semiquaver. This obvious mistake was corrected by Chopin in FES. (The reviser of GE added mistakenly ♯ before the second semiquaver.)

Bar 47 L.H. At the beginning of the bar A has the chord A-♯-e. In the proofs of FE (→GE,EE) Chopin removed e.

Bar 47 and 49 L.H. The dot prolonging the minim A in the octave on the second beat in A was overlooked in FE (→GE,EE). We change Chopin’s script in order to emphasise the duration of this note.

Bar 48 and 50 L.H. Errors in deciphering A and later revisions caused first editions and later collected editions to give the two bottom notes in the chords at the beginning of those bars rhythmic values different from those written by Chopin and given by us.

Bar 51 L.H. A has the accent on the second crotchet. In view of several indubitable examples of Chopin’s corrections of accents in Op. 10 (e. g. Etudes in C no. 7, bars 54-55, in A♭ no. 10, bars 1-8, 17-20) it appears probable that also in this case the accent placed at the beginning of the bar in FE (→GE,EE) is the result of proof-reading by Chopin.

R.H. A (→FE) does not have ♯ before the fourth semiquaver. Chopin corrected his error in FED. The reviser of GE1 added mistakenly ♯ before this note.

Bar 60 L.H. In A (→FE→GE1) there is no chromatic sign before the second semiquaver in the last group. Omissions, extremely numerous in bars 57-60 in A, entitle us to assume here the composer’s inattention. In the entire four-bar transition in both hands he used notes of the F-major scale as passing notes (second semiquavers in each group). EE and GE2-GE4 added ♯.

Bar 76 R.H. A (→FE→GE1,EE2) does not have a chromatic sign before the fourteenth semiquaver. Analogously to a similar melodic turn at the beginning of the bar GE2 arbitrarily added ♯. Cf. commentary to bar 80.

Bars 76-77 L.H. Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily added a tie sustaining the bass F.

Source Commentary

Bar 77 L.H. In FE (→GE,EE) the note B♭ was given the mistaken value of a semibreve.

Bars 77-78 L.H. The tie linking c in those bars is to be found in A. In FE (→EE2) it was written so imprecisely that in GE and EE3 it mistakenly linked the notes F.

Bar 80 R.H. The determination of an unquestioned sound of the second and fourteenth semiquaver poses certain difficulties. Before the second semiquaver A and GE1 do not have a chromatic sign, and FE (→EE) has ♯. None of those sources contain a chromatic sign before the fourteenth semiquaver. We should, therefore, accept e♯ for the second note and e♮ for the fourteenth note (the flats in both places in GE2 are an unauthentic addition — cf. commentary to bar 76). The following arguments indicate, however, e♯ and e♮ respectively.

— as the second semiquaver e♭ naturally continues the sound of the e♭ notes belonging to the harmony of the previous bar, especially e♭1; its penultimate semiquaver; in turn, e♮ as the fourteenth semiquaver, prepares the dominant of F major prevailing in the next bar, with e♮ on the second beat.

— despite a slight difference in the figurazione, bar 80 is a repetition of bar 76, in which the presence of e♯1 and e♮ does not give rise to any doubts in authentic sources; — it is highly likely that Chopin forgot to write ♭ before the second note in bar 80; this sort of an omission of accidentals is the most frequent of his errors; in particular, bar 79 in A does not have flats before the first e♭1 in the L.H. and e♭1, the fifteenth semiquaver in the R.H.; — the engraver of FE could have mistakenly printed ♯ instead of ♭ before the second note in bar 80; mechanical errors of this sort occurred frequently, e. g. in FE of Etude in F minor, Op. 25 no. 2, bar 44 and in FE2 of Etude in F minor Dbop. 36 no. 1, bar 18; such a mistake (subsequently corrected) was committed also on the fifth semiquaver in bar 79 of the discussed Etude, where FE discloses visible signs of the removal of ♭ underneath ♭.

Taking into consideration the fact that stylistic arguments are decidedly in favour of the version with e♯1 and e♮, which is not excluded by source arguments, we propose this version as the only one.

Bars 94-95 R.H. A contains the following chords:

Chopin changed them in the proofs of FE (→GE,EE).

Bar 95 L.H. In GE and EE3 the note t♭ was added to the authentic three-note chord F-c-a. Chopin did not correct EE3 and there are no arguments in favour of his possible proof-reading of GE; thus, nothing indicates the authenticity of this change.

9. Etude in F minor, Op. 10 no. 9

Sources

A1 Autograph rough copy of the whole Etude with a sketch outline of the second part (The Pierpont Morgan Library, New York).

A Autograph fair copy (F. Chopin Society, Warsaw) of the final version, intended as the basis for the first French edition.

Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 10, on page 8.

Editorial Principles

We accept as our basis FE2 as the last authentic source compared with A, and take into consideration the annotations made by Chopin in FED and FES.

Page 52

Bar 1 In the marking of the metronomic tempo A has 92. In the proofs of FE (→GE,EE) Chopin changed it to 96.

Bars 2-3, 6-7 and 42-43 R.H. In A the notes d♭ have ♯ signs (with the exception of bar 43; in bar 42 the inverted mordent is written with small notes). In the proofs of FE (→GE,EE) Chopin removed all those ornaments. Cf. commentary to bars 38-39. The majority of later collected editions restored the mordent in bar 42 contrary to Chopin’s final intention; some of them arbitrarily added an inverted mordent in bar 43.
Bar 8 L.H. A (→FE) has f as the ninth semiquaver. The mistake made by Chopin is evident in comparison with A1 and with analogous bar 44.

Bars 17-20 R.H. In A (→FE,GE,EE) the slur over those bars does not start until bar 18. Chopin added its earlier beginning in FED.

Bar 28 R.H. FE (→GE) does not have the 8” sign. In FED and FES this error was corrected by Chopin.

Bars 38-39 R.H. Chopin added the signs □□ in the proofs of FE (→GE,EE). Cf. commentary to bars 2-3, 6-7 and 42-43.

Bar 61 FE (→GE,EE) has mistakenly † instead of ††, found in A.

Bar 64 R.H. The grace note occurs only in A. In this case it is difficult to say whether its absence in FE (→GE,EE) is the outcome of an oversight by the engraver or a correction made by Chopin.

10. Etude in A flat major, Op. 10 no. 10

Sources
A Autograph fair copy (F. Chopin Society, Warsaw) of the final version, intended as the basis for the first French edition. Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 10, on page 8.

Editorial Principles
We accept as our basis FE2 as the last authentic source compared with A. FE lacks numerous dynamic markings and other verbal descriptions found in A; some of them, especially those on the first page of FE (up to bar 18), were most probably removed by Chopin while proof-reading; those which appear to have been overlooked accidentally are given in parentheses.

Upbeat
The marking of the metronome tempo in A is J=80. Chopin corrected it in FE (→GE,EE).
In A the upbeat has the value of a crotchet. In the proofs of FE (→GE,EE) Chopin changed it to a quaver. At the beginning of the Etude A has † removed by Chopin probably in the proofs of FE (together with several other markings — cf. Editorial Principles).

Bars 1-8 R.H. At the beginning of the Etude A has the following accents and slurs:

The short slurs are still marked in bar 2, while the pattern of the accents is repeated up to bar 4 inclusively; in bars 5-8 accents are placed on the first, fourth, seventh and tenth quaver. The majority of the accents has been removed in the proofs of FE, with all certainty upon Chopin’s request. Despite the fact that this operation was conducted rather imprecisely — some of the eliminated accents remained partially visible — the intention of the composer to accent only the fourth and tenth quaver is completely clear. In this situation, the retention of short slurs, associated with the original accenting, should be recognised as a compromise aiming at the avoidance of an additional and complicating correction. Consequently, we omit those slurs in the final version of the accenting. Cf. commentary to bars 17-20 as well as to Etude in C Op. 10 no. 7, bars 54-55. See also Performance Commentary.

Bars 3 and 6 L.H. The notes ek in the second half of both those bars in the sources have the value of a minim. We correct this impression of Chopin’s notation according to harmonic sense.

Bar 16 L.H. The fifth quaver in A is b♭. We accept the FE (→GE,EE) version which is most probably the result of a correction made by Chopin.

Bars 17-20 R.H. The accenting of all the sixths in A was corrected by Chopin in FE (→GE,EE). Cf. commentary to bars 1-8.

Bar 23 and 35 R.H. A does not have accidentals before the fifth pair of quavers. Either Chopin forgot to write ♩ next to the upper note of the sixth (a in bar 23 and d♭ in bar 35) or he omitted ♩ a quaver earlier (ak1 and db♭). The second eventuality appears to be much more probable:
— mistakes of this type are ones of the most frequently committed by Chopin (cf. commentary to Etude in G# minor Op. 25 no. 5, bar 4, 8, 20, 36),
— in the melodic scale progressions in this Etude Chopin introduced chromatic notes between those of the actual key, and not instead of them,
— in the last proof-reading of FE (→EE) restoring db♭ was added in bar 35, most probably by Chopin.
In both bars in GE and in bar 23 in EE3 the reviser added ♩ before the upper note of the sixth.

Sources
A Autograph fair copy (Stiftelsen Musikkulturens Främjande, Stockholm), probably intended as the basis for the first French edition. Certain doubts are produced by the absence of engravers’ signs in A and the considerable number of differences, especially as regards dynamic markings, between A and the edition.

Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 10, on page 8.
Editorial Principles

We accept as our basis FE2 as the last authentic source, compared with A. Annotations made by Chopin in FED are taken into consideration.

Dynamic markings in the main text (without parentheses) come from FE (→GE,EE), while markings in parentheses and given in footnotes occur in A. The FE version is probably, at least partly, the result of proof-reading by Chopin; it is, however, quite likely that a certain number of markings in A has been accidentally omitted in this edition.

Bar 3 and analog. R.H. In the second quaver in bar 3 GE mistakenly contains the additional note bb1 (bar 11 and 35 have the correct version). Some of the later collected editions applied this version, extremely uncomfortable for the performer, also in bar 11 and 35.

Bar 3, 11 and 34 At the beginnings of those bars A has the sign θ which is not followed by φ. In FE (→GE,EE) it was omitted upon the first occasion (bar 3), and in the second instance (bar 11) it was supplemented by the sign θ at the end of bar 12. Presumably, Chopin wished bars 3-4 to be played with a pedal, but he regarded a precise record of this otherwise obvious pedalling (on each quaver) as too laborious.

Bar 4 L.H. The first chord in FE (→GE,EE) has an extra e#. This is most probably the result of an erroneous correction of the chord eb-g-e#1, mistakenly engraved in this passage (as indicated by certain traces visible in FE): instead of adding Ba and removing φ, the engraver carried out only the easier part of the task and added Ba. Similar mistakes were committed in FE, i.a. in Scherzo in B minor Op. 20, bar 135 and 292, Ballade in G minor Op. 23, bar 171 and Polonaise in A Op. 40 no. 1, bar 93. Cf. commentary to the Etude in G Op. 10 no. 5, bar 59.

Bar 4, 12 and 36 L.H. A does not have the note g in the fourth chord. Additionally, it is clear that in bar 4 this note was deleted by Chopin (bar 12 is only indicated as a repetition of bar 4). Most probably, while proof-reading FE Chopin returned to the original version.

Bar 7, 15 and 39 L.H. The middle note of the fourth chord in A is e#1, which in bar 7 Chopin changed into f# in the proofs of FE (→GE,EE). The absence of a corresponding correction in bar 15 and 39 should be recognised as the composer's oversight (when correcting Chopin often overlooked one of several similar passages).

Bar 9 R.H. Starting with the second quaver some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed e#2 to g# (cf. Prelude in E Op. 28 no. 19, bar 1 and 33).

Bar 15 L.H. FE (→GE,EE) overlooks the note a# in the first chord.

Bar 20 L.H. Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed the upper note in the last two chords from f# to a#1.

Bar 21 R.H. Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed the lower note on the fifth quaver from c#1 to b#1.

In the last two chords some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed f# to f# and f# to f#.

Bar 22 R.H. The lower note of the third chord in A is c#1. Chopin changed it to f#1 probably while proof-reading FE (→GE,EE).

Bar 24 In the last two chords some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed c#1 to c#1 and c#1 to c#1.

Bar 30 L.H. EE and some of the later collected editions arbitrarily lowered the upper note on the fifth quaver from f# to f#1.

Bar 32 R.H. The highest note in the first chord in A is f#. In the proofs of FE (→GE,EE) Chopin changed it to c#1.

R.H. The main text of the fifth chord comes from A, and the variant — from FE2. In FE1 (→GE,EE) there is no sign before its middle note. The FE2 version is probably the outcome of proof-reading by Chopin, although it is impossible to exclude some sort of misunderstanding since f# was added before the discussed note, an unnecessary combination within this context and one which Chopin himself never used.

This is the reason why in the main text we accept the indubitably authentic version of A.

Bar 37 and 38 R.H. The lowest note in the third chord in A is c#. This remnant of the original version of those bars was corrected by Chopin probably in FE (→GE,EE).

Bar 40 L.H. Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed the lower note on the second quaver from b# to a.

Bar 40-42 R.H. The sources do not have slurs over those bars. This is probably the result of Chopin's inadvertence: in A those bars end the page of the manuscript; the shape of the slur placed on the new page above the two quavers in bar 43 indicates that Chopin intended it to be the ending of a slur starting earlier, most probably in bar 40.

Bar 43 L.H. In FE (→GE,EE) the chord on the second quaver does not have the note e#1, which occurs in A. This is probably an oversight.

Bar 46 R.H. The main text is the version added by Chopin into FED as a supplement of the version given in A (→FE,EE). We grant priority to the annotation in the pupil's copy since this type of a diversification of repeated phrases is very characteristic for Chopin, who applied it frequently in the last phase of composing or in already completed works. In this case, an additional argument is the analogy with bar 27.

Bars 48-49 A does not have e#2 in the R.H. chords on the second quaver nor d2 in the L.H. chords on the third quaver (in bar 49 d2 is deleted). We give the version supplemented by Chopin probably while proof-reading FE (→GE,EE).

Bar 50 L.H. The middle note on the first quaver in GE is mistakenly b#1.

Bar 51 R.H. FE (→GE,EE) overlooked the tie sustaining g#2.

Bars 52-53 The last chord in bar 52 and the first in 53 are given according to A (→FE,EE2). GE and EE3 added an 8va sign above the two chords, both in the R.H. and in the L.H. Since Chopin did not correct EE3 and there are no arguments in favour of his proof-reading of GE, nothing indicates the authenticity of this change. The assumption that Chopin forgot to write ottavas above those chords is unacceptable:

— an upward octave transference in the bass clef is never applied in piano music; if Chopin's intention was to lead the chord progression further upward then he would have simply written the last two chords in the L.H. in the treble clef;

— the completion of chord progression on b#2 and e#2 anticipates the sounding of leaps ending the Etude, thus weakening their virtuoso effect.


Sources

A Autograph fair copy (Stiftelsen Musikkulturens Främjande, Stockholm), probably intended as the basis for the first French edition. Certain doubts are produced by the absence of engravers' signs in A and the considerable number of differences, especially as regards performance markings, between A and the edition.

Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 10, on page 8.

Editorial Principles

We accept as our basis FE2 as the last authentic source, compared with A. Annotations made by Chopin in FED are taken into consideration.

The performance markings in A (accents, dynamic signs, verbal descriptions), supplementing the markings in FE and omitted in it probably by accident, are given in parentheses. Those fragments in which the image of the music resulting from interpretation directives in FE differs distinctly from the image in A are retained without supplements (bars 1-10, 41-50, 73-81). Verbal markings in bar 15, 18 and 20, added certainly in the last correction of FE1 (they are absent in GE), prove that in FE Chopin examined the Etude in this respect at least once.

p. 63

Bar 37 and 38 R.H. The lowest note in the third chord in A is c#. This remnant of the original version of those bars was corrected by Chopin probably in FE (→GE,EE).

Bar 40 L.H. Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed the lower note on the second quaver from b# to a.

Bar 40-42 R.H. The sources do not have slurs over those bars. This is probably the result of Chopin's inadvertence: in A those bars end the page of the manuscript; the shape of the slur placed on the new page above the two quavers in bar 43 indicates that Chopin intended it to be the ending of a slur starting earlier, most probably in bar 40.

Bar 43 L.H. In FE (→GE,EE) the chord on the second quaver does not have the note e#1, which occurs in A. This is probably an oversight.

Bar 46 R.H. The main text is the version added by Chopin into FED as a supplement of the version given in A (→FE,EE). We grant priority to the annotation in the pupil's copy since this type of a diversification of repeated phrases is very characteristic for Chopin, who applied it frequently in the last phase of composing or in already completed works. In this case, an additional argument is the analogy with bar 27.

Bars 48-49 A does not have e#2 in the R.H. chords on the second quaver nor d2 in the L.H. chords on the third quaver (in bar 49 d2 is deleted). We give the version supplemented by Chopin probably while proof-reading FE (→GE,EE).

Bar 50 L.H. The middle note on the first quaver in GE is mistakenly b#1.

Bar 51 R.H. FE (→GE,EE) overlooked the tie sustaining g#2.

Bars 52-53 The last chord in bar 52 and the first in 53 are given according to A (→FE,EE2). GE and EE3 added an 8va sign above the two chords, both in the R.H. and in the L.H. Since Chopin did not correct EE3 and there are no arguments in favour of his proof-reading of GE, nothing indicates the authenticity of this change. The assumption that Chopin forgot to write ottavas above those chords is unacceptable:

— an upward octave transference in the bass clef is never applied in piano music; if Chopin's intention was to lead the chord progression further upward then he would have simply written the last two chords in the L.H. in the treble clef;

— the completion of chord progression on b#2 and e#2 anticipates the sounding of leaps ending the Etude, thus weakening their virtuoso effect.


Sources

A Autograph fair copy (Stiftelsen Musikkulturens Främjande, Stockholm), probably intended as the basis for the first French edition. Certain doubts are produced by the absence of engravers' signs in A and the considerable number of differences, especially as regards performance markings, between A and the edition.

Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 10, on page 8.

Editorial Principles

We accept as our basis FE2 as the last authentic source, compared with A. Annotations made by Chopin in FED are taken into consideration.

The performance markings in A (accents, dynamic signs, verbal descriptions), supplementing the markings in FE and omitted in it probably by accident, are given in parentheses. Those fragments in which the image of the music resulting from interpretation directives in FE differs distinctly from the image in A are retained without supplements (bars 1-10, 41-50, 73-81). Verbal markings in bar 15, 18 and 20, added certainly in the last correction of FE1 (they are absent in GE), prove that in FE Chopin examined the Etude in this respect at least once.
Bar 1 We give the time signature according to A. See commentary to Etude in C Op. 10 no. 1, bar 1.

In A the metronomic tempo is marked as $\approx 76$. We give the value changed by Chopin probably in FE (→GE, EE).

Bars 2-5 Above the chord in bar 2 A has the marking energico. Furthermore, from the fourth beat in bar 2 to the beginning of bar 5 it contains the marking cresc., ending with $f^\#$. In bar 5 it has con forza instead of con fuoco.

Bar 10 R.H. A has appassionato above the octaves.

Bars 14-15 R.H. At the beginning of bar 15 A has the chord $d^2-g^2-a^2$. The version with the sustained $a^2$ was introduced by Chopin probably while correcting FE1 (→EE). GE does not have a tie sustaining this note. Most of the later collected editions arbitrarily give this tie the form of the $a^2-d^2$ motif slur. Cf. commentary to bars 54-55.

Bar 27 L.H. The highest notes ($g^1$ and $f^1$) in A have the rhythm $\uparrow \downarrow$. In the proofs of FE (→GE, EE) Chopin resigned from this detail, possibly in connection with a change of the tempo into a slightly more rapid one. Cf. commentary to bar 30 and 32.

Bars 27-28 R.H. A has the following version of the second half of bar 27 and the beginning of bar 28:

We give the version introduced by Chopin in the correction of FE (→GE, EE). In the chord on the fourth beat in bar 27 we correct $g^2$, evidently mistakenly printed in FE, to $f^4$.

Bar 30 and 32 R.H. On the fourth beat in the bar A has the rhythm $\uparrow \downarrow$. Chopin changed it while correcting FE (→GE, EE). Cf. Commentary to bar 27.

Bar 37 FE (→GE, EE) has $f^1$ instead of $f^\#$. This is probably an error — cf. commentary to Etude in C# minor Op. 10 no. 4, bar 1, 8 and following.

Bar 50, 55 and 62 R.H. We modify slurs in those bars, given in the sources, in this way completing the changes (in bar 52, 56 and 60) and the supplements (in bar 10 and following) made by Chopin, which the FE version demonstrates in relation to A.

Bars 54-55 R.H. The tie linking the notes $a^2$ in A (and EE) was written imprecisely in FE (→GE1); consequently, in GE2-GE4 it was given the form of the $a^2-d^2$ motif slur.

Bar 56 R.H. GE3 and GE4 have mistakenly $d^2$ instead of $c^2$ on the first semiquaver of the bar. Some of the later collected editions changed the note arbitrarily to $d^2$.

Bar 75 L.H. A does not have accidents before the second and eighth semiquaver. Chopin added them in the proofs of FE (→GE, EE), L.H. GE2-GE4 arbitrarily added $\uparrow$ raising $b^\#$ to $b$ before the fifth semiquaver in the bar.

Bar 80 R.H. In FE (→GE, EE) the sustained note $c^2$ in the second half of the bar was given the value of a minim (probably by mistake).


Manuscripts
The basis for the first three editions (French, German and English) prepared by Chopin consisted of a collection of 36 manuscripts (three sets with twelve manuscripts each), encompassing the autograph and presumably two copies of each of the twelve Etudes. The copyists were Fontana and, probably, Gutmann. Extant manuscripts of this collection include three autographs (Etudes no. 1, 4 and 8), six copies by Gutmann (Etudes no. 2, 3, 7, 9, 10 and 11) and four copies by Fontana (Etudes no. 4, 5, 6 and 12). Furthermore, there are three extant autographs and two copies of the first two Etudes unintended for print. A more detailed characteristic of particular manuscripts is given at the beginning of commentaries to particular Etudes.

First editions
FE1 First French edition, M. Schlesinger (M.S. 2427), Paris October 1837. FE1 is based probably on a set of manuscripts (autographs and copies examined by Chopin — the majority non-extant), and was corrected by Chopin.

FE2 Second impression of FE1, H. Lemoine (2776. HL), Paris December 1842, including corrections of several mistakes.

FE = FE1 and FE2.

FED, FE3, FEJ — as in Etudes Op. 10.

GE1 First German edition, two fascicles with six Etudes each, Breitkopf & Härtel (5832 and 5833), Leipzig October 1837. The basis of this edition is a set of manuscripts composed of two autographs and ten copies, with annotations by Chopin. In GE1 Chopin corrected Etude in Eb, no. 1 and introduced several improvements; the remaining Etudes lack unquestioned traces of his proof-reading. GE1 contains a number of mistakes and arbitrary revisions by the publisher. There are copies of GE1 with different prices on the covers and additional pagination at the bottom of the pages, different for each Etude (quite possibly, particular Etudes were published separately or such plans were made; the editors of the National Edition have not come across a copy of this version of GE1).

GE2 Second German edition (same firm and number), after 1852, with a correction of the majority of errors from GE1 and numerous arbitrary changes. Particular Etudes in this version were also published separately.

GE3 Later impression of GE2 which in several passages arbitrarily restored versions of GE1 and even those of A (e.g. in Etude in Ab, no. 1, bar 21). There are copies of GE3 with different prices on the covers.

GE = GE1, GE2 and GE3.

EE1 First English edition, two fascicles with six Etudes each, Wessel & C° (W & C° 1832 and 1833), London October 1837. EE1 is based most probably on the lost manuscript set (autographs and copies corrected by Chopin). Chopin did not take part in its production.

EE2 Later English edition (same firm and number), after 1848, correcting numerous mistakes from EE1 and introducing a number of arbitrary changes.

EE = EE1 and EE2.

Remarks to the Editorial Principles
Most probably each of the first editions was based on a separate set of the manuscripts (autographs or copies) of particular Etudes. A comparison of the sources shows that in completed manuscripts (both autographs and copies) Chopin made improvements and supplements prior to their presentation to the publishers. The majority of the changes coincide or supplement each other; the differences can be explained by their sometimes hurried introduction in different periods. The extant complete set intended for GE includes two autographs and ten copies, while only an autograph of a single Etude is extant from the set intended for FE. Not a single manuscript survived from the set intended for EE. In this situation it is possible to determine the chronology of the changes only in a few cases. We accept as the basis of every Etude an authentic source (manuscript or first edition corrected by Chopin) prepared by the composer with greatest care, and compared with the others, with particular attention paid to the corrections of FE made by Chopin.

13. Etude in A flat major, Op. 25 no. 1

Sources
A1 Autograph rough copy of an earlier not definitive version of the Etude with the date "Dresden 1836" and inserted into an album belonging to Maria Wodzińska (lost, photocopy in the F. Chopin Society, Warsaw).
A Autograph fair copy intended as the basis for the first German edition (National Library, Warsaw).
CDP Copy from an album belonging to Delfina Potocka, written by two unidentified persons (National Museum, Cracow). This is most probably a copy of A prior to the introduction of final corrections by Chopin. Other sources (first editions) — see above Etudes Op. 25.
Bars 15-16 R.H. The crotchet stems written in parentheses were introduced into FE.

Bar 16 L.H. In AI, CDP, FE and EE the last group of semiquavers still ends with G, as is the case in the previous figures. In A (→GE) Chopin deleted this note, rendering the link with the following bar smoother.

Bar 17 R.H. The main text comes from AI, A (→CDP,GE) and EE, and the variant — from FE. The FE version could be the result of a correction by Chopin, although one cannot exclude a mistake committed by the engraver.

Bar 20 R.H. The fourth semiquaver in A is written too low, so that it was deciphered as db both in CDP and in GE1, as well as in FE and EE through the copies of A which served as the basis. While proof-reading FE Chopin corrected this mistake; AI also contains the correct version.

Bar 21 L.H. AI has the following version of this bar:

\[ \text{A (→CDP)} \text{ and EE contain the following version:} \]

\[ \text{The final version was introduced by Chopin in the proofs of FE and GE1 (→GE2; in GE3 the A version was restored arbitrarily in the first half of the bar). Cf. commentary to Etude in A minor Op. 25 no. 4, bar 60.} \]

R.H. The main text comes from GE, where, together with changes in the L.H., it was probably introduced by Chopin while proof-reading (this version, albeit with a different accompaniment, is also found in AI). The variant is a version of A (→CDP), FE and EE.

Bar 22 Chopin waved whether the figures on the last beat should be noted with a → by A (a and a¹) or by A² (g² and g²'). AI has g²', changed to a, and A (→CDP) and EE have g². Most probably, both in the proofs of GE1 and FE1 he wished to change g² to a, but in none of these editions was this alteration conducted fully and without mistakes: — in GE1 the only change concerned the R.H. part; — in FE1 sharps were unnecessarily transferred together with the heads of notes, resulting in a totally false version with a and a¹. FE2 restored g²; in GE2 the change to a² was introduced also in the L.H.

Bar 25 R.H. The lowest semiquaver in the second group in FE is e¹. R.H. and L.H. The flats lowering A and a¹ to A² and a² in the last group of semiquavers were added — most likely by Chopin — in the proofs of GE1. In this passage the other sources have A and a¹. The GE version, in which the connection with the following bar is much smoother thanks to a common note (a²), possesses all the features of an improvement made by Chopin; this is the reason why we give it as the basic version (changing, in accordance with the rule binding in the whole Etude, the note head of A² in the L.H. into a larger one). Nonetheless, the reason why Chopin did not introduce such an essential change either in FE or in any of the pupils' copies (FED and FES) remains interesting.

Bars 26-28 and 30-31 We give the signs — — and — — according to FE and EE. Their absence in A (→GE) could be regarded as an oversight on the part of Chopin.

Bar 29 R.H. In CDP, FE and EE the slur from the previous bar spans the entire bar 29; the next slur starts in bar 30.

Bar 33 R.H. The fourth semiquaver in GE1 is mistakenly f¹.

Bar 34 L.H. In AI, A (→CDP), FE, EE, GE2 and GE3 the last group of semiquavers has six notes: \[ \text{In the proofs of GE1 Chopin removed the third note, e², thus smoothing the connection with the previous figure, both as regards rhythm and piano technique. Cf. an analogous correction in bar 16.} \]

Bar 35 R.H. The third semiquaver from the end in FE is mistakenly b²¹.

Bar 37 R.H. The main text comes from A (→CDP,FE), GE and EE. This version contains a parallel transference of a chord from A major in the previous bar to Bb minor; we are entitled to doubt whether this was Chopin's intention. Consequently, we give the AI version in the variant.

Bar 39 R.H. Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed the fourth semiquaver from a² to f¹.

Bar 43 R.H. The tie leading from the last a² to the next bar is found only in A.

Bar 48 R.H. The second crotchet in AI, FE and EE is a², a³, a². We accept the probably later version of A (→CDP,GE).

L.H. At the end of the bar some of the later collected editions arbitrarily added D and E as the ending of the trill.


Sources

[A] There is no extant editorial autograph.

[AT] Autograph in an album belonging to A. Teichmann, with the date "Paris 27 January 1836" (F. Chopin and G. Sand Museum, cell no. 2, Valladossa). It encompasses the opening twenty bars of the Etude, written in rhythmic values twice as short, in the 2/4 metre. Several details differ from the final version.

[AW] Autograph with the date "1836 Dresden", written in an album belonging to Maria Wodzińska (lost, photocopy in the F. Chopin Society, Warsaw). The autograph contains the Etude in a version very similar to the final one, and with numerous performance markings.

[CDP] Copy from an album belonging to Delfina Potocka, by an unknown copyist (National Museum, Cracow), made upon the basis of the lost autograph. We cannot exclude the possibility that the latter was [A].

[CG] Copy of [A], probably by Gutmann, intended as the basis for the first German edition (National Library, Warsaw). The copy contains supplements and changes introduced by Chopin.

Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 25, on page 16.

Editorial Principles

We accept as our basis CG compared with FE, EE and AW, and take into consideration the annotations made by Chopin in FED and FES. See Remarks to the Principles on page 16.
Source Commentary

15. Etude in F major, Op. 25 no. 3

Sources

CG
Copy, probably by Gutmann, intended as the basis for the first German edition (National Library, Warsaw). The copy contains traces of at least two examinations by Chopin, who introduced supplements and changes. Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 25, on page 16.

Editorial Principles

We accept as our basis CG compared with FE and EE, and take into consideration the annotations made by Chopin in FED and FES. See Remarks to the Editorial Principles, on page 16.

p. 79
Bar 21
The marking $f$ is found only in FE; thus we give it in parentheses. Apparently, it is a natural and logical supplement of the marking $p$ in bar 23; together, they define the dynamics of this fragment, intended by Chopin, more clearly.

Bar 23
 EE does not have the marking $p$.

Bars 26-27
The marking $dim.$ is found only in EE. Its lack in other sources could have been intended by Chopin in order not to impose identical dynamics in analogous bars 26-28 and 46-48.

Bar 29
The marking $f$ at the beginning of the bar is found in FE and EE. In CG it had been situated below the second quaver where it was deleted probably by Chopin (it is absent in GE). On the other hand, we cannot exclude the possibility that Chopin did not complete his correction and that he intended not to remove this marking but to transfer it to the beginning of the bar. In bar 43 Chopin transferred $p$ in precisely this manner — he crossed out the sign written by the copyist below the second quaver and added it at the beginning of the bar.

p. 80
Bar 37 and 39
Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed the last quaver in these bars: in bar 37 — to $b_1$, and in bar 39 — to $A_1$.

Bar 38 and 40
In both bars some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed the first two strokes to those which occur in successive two figures.

Bar 51
The third quaver in CG ($→GE1, GE3$) and EE is c. In the proofs of FE Chopin changed it to d, which in all the sources occurs in analogous bars 3 and 11. An identical change was made in GE2.

p. 81
Bars 68-69
In CG ($→GE$) the slur is interrupted over the bar-line.

16. Etude in A minor, Op. 25 no. 4

Sources

A
Autograph (Bibliothèque de l’Opéra, Paris), the basis of a copy which, in turn, served as the basis for the first German edition and, most probably, of another copy for the first English edition. Subsequently, A served as the basis for the first French edition.

CF
Copy made by Fontana, intended as the basis for the first German edition (National Library, Warsaw). CF contains traces of at least two examinations by Chopin, who introduced a number of supplements and corrections.

Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 25, on page 16.

Editorial Principles

We accept as our basis CF compared with A, FE and EE, and take into consideration the annotations made by Chopin in FED. See Remarks to the Editorial Principles, on page 16.

p. 82
Upbeat
For the metronomic tempo we accept the value $f=160$, written by Chopin in CF ($→GE$) and occurring also in EE. A ($→FE$) has $f=120$, which could be a mistakenly copied marking from the previous Etude. The time signature in FE and GE1 is erroneously $c$.

Bar 12
L.H. GE2 and GE3 arbitrarily added the note a to the sixth on the second quaver.

p. 83
Bars 17-19
R.H. Slurs in the text come from CF ($→GE$), where they were corrected by Chopin. An uninterrupted slur occurs in A ($→FE$) and EE.

Bar 27
R.H. In FE and EE the note g$^2$ on the fourth quaver in the bar has the value of a crotchet; it corresponds to the phrasing given by us and introduced by Chopin in CF ($→GE$). The quaver written in A ($→CF→GE$) is a remnant of the original conception of this bar in which it was divided into two two-note motifs (indicated by the crossed-out slurs visible in A). L.H. On the last quaver CF ($→GE$) and EE have the fifth f-c$. In A ($→FE$) Chopin changed it to the third as-c$. In this version, the lower voice of the two-note chords is more independent — the chord in question and the next one do not create parallel octaves with the R.H. (cf. similar progression in Ballade in A, Op. 47, bars 73-76).

Bar 52
R.H. At the end of the bar all the sources (except for GE2 and GE3) do not have — probably by mistake — a quaver hook next to g$^2$.

Bar 60
L.H. The third quaver in A is E which Chopin altered to C both in CF ($→GE$) and EE. EE also has C. Chopin introduced a similar change in Etude in A, Op. 25, no. 1, bar 21, making it possible to avoid parallel octaves between extreme voices.

Bar 63
R.H. CF ($→GE$) and EE do not have the grace note d$^3$.

17. Etude in E minor, Op. 25 no. 5

Sources

CF
As in Etude in A minor, Op. 25 no. 4.

Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 25, on page 16.

Editorial Principles

We accept as our basis FE compared with CF and EE (in particular, we give dynamic markings according to CF where they are the most precise). See Remarks to the Editorial Principles, on page 16.

p. 86
Bar 8 and 105
L.H. In the last chord CF ($→GE$) and EE have a instead of $. We give the FE version, most probably corrected by Chopin in print. (In analogous bar 36 all the sources contain $\#$).

Bar 9 and 37
L.H. The main text comes from FE, and the variant — from EE1. CF ($→GE$) has the EE1 version in bar 9, and the FE version in bar 37. It seems impossible to determine whether Chopin recognised one of those versions as final. At the beginning of bar 9 in CF he crossed out $E$ and wrote $\#$; presumably, in the basis for EE he made a
similar correction in both bars. Nonetheless, in later correction of FE Chopin did not introduce this change despite the fact that he corrected the last chord in neighbouring bar 8. This is the reason why we give both versions, granting priority to the version in the basic source, i.e. FE (in an analogous figure in bar 106 all the sources have E).

In bar 9 some of the later collected editions made an arbitrary attempt at joining the authentic versions by giving $f$, preceded by the grace note E.

Bars 35-36 L.H. We give the FE notation as probably the last and most consistent — accents, minims, and pedalling jointly render precise the manner of performance. It follows from the remaining sources that Chopin tried to mark the possibility of distinguishing the tenor voice in assorted ways.

**EE** contains the following version:

```
\begin{verbatim}
 D--E--F--G--A--B--
\end{verbatim}
```

Attention is drawn to the original form of the first chord (with a), a mistake in pedalling, and accents placed on the wrong side.

The notation in CF:

```
\begin{verbatim}
 D--E--F--G--A--B--C
\end{verbatim}
```

is inconsistent (an accent above $f^\prime$, a separate stem for $e^\prime$) and incomplete (the absence of pedalling). It was simplified further in GE — $e^\prime$ is not distinguished and GE1 overlooked the accent.

Bar 42 L.H. We give the grace note chord according to FE. In CF ($\rightarrow$GE) it sounds $b_{\flat}--g^\prime$ and in EE $b_{\flat}--c^\flat--g^\prime$. The presence of a doubled third $e^\prime$ in both those versions appears to be the result of a mistaken deciphering of the autograph (in manuscripts by Chopin the establishment of the presence of an inner note in the chord, written on ledger lines, poses a very difficult task — cf. commentary to bar 73 and 111 of this Etude, and to Etudes in Gb Op. 10 no. 5, bar 15, in Ab Op. 10 no. 10, bars 76-77, and in Es Op. 10 no. 11, bar 43). Cf. Prelude in E minor Op. 28 no. 4, bar 23.

FE and EE have $f^\prime$ here. In CF ($\rightarrow$GE1) Chopin crossed out $*$.

**Bar 45** FE and EE do not have a marking of the metronomic tempo.

Bars 58-60 R.H. The lower voice is distinguished only in FE, in which Chopin added it probably while proof-reading.

Bar 73 L.H. In the last chord CF ($\rightarrow$GE) and EE do not have $c^\flat$.

Bars 73-76 R.H. In the main text we give slurs from FE. Slurs in the footnote come from CF ($\rightarrow$GE). In EE the four bars are spanned by a single slur, which is a variant of the slurring in CF, does not exert greater influence on the performance and is possibly the outcome of an imprecise deciphering of the manuscript.

Bar 87 L.H. CF ($\rightarrow$GE) does not have a dot and a tie prolonging the sound of $d^\#$.

Bar 92 R.H. In FE1 the penultimate semiquaver does not have the note $g^\sharp$. This error was corrected in FE2.

Bar 97 The marking poco ritinumto is found only in FE.

Bar 109 The main text (equal quavers) comes from FE, and the variant in the footnote — from CF ($\rightarrow$GE) and EE.

Bar 111 L.H. On the second beat FE does not have the note $c^\flat$ (probably an oversight).

Bar 122 L.H. In CF ($\rightarrow$GE1), FE and EE1 the lowest note in the last chord is $d$ (written without a precautionary $\frac{1}{4}$). GE2, GE3 and EE2 changed it arbitrarily to $d^\#$, depriving the bass line of a repetition of the note at the beginning of the following bar, so characteristic for the voice-leading in this Etude.

---

**18. Etude in G sharp minor, Op. 25 no. 6**

**Sources**

- **CF** As in Etude in A minor, Op. 25 no. 4.
- Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 25, on page 16.

**Editorial Principles**

We accept as our basis FE compared with CF and EE, and take into consideration the annotations made by Chopin in FED, FES and FEJ. See Remarks to the Editorial Principles, on page 16.

---

Bar 1 The time signature in FE and GE1 is mistakenly $e$. Bar 4, 9, 20 and 36. R.H. In CF ($\rightarrow$GE1), FE and EE there are no accidentals in the second, third and fourth groups of semiquavers. The omission of signs in situations of this type is one of the most frequent mistakes made by Chopin.

**Bar 5** R.H. FED contains the following fingering:

```
\begin{verbatim}
   \end{verbatim}
```

We do not give it in the text since it is contrary to the precise and consistent fingering which Chopin prepared for print in the whole Etude.

Bars 5-6, 9-10, 21-22, 25-26, 35-38 and 39-41 We extend the signs $\rightarrow$ to the end of the thirds progression as dictated by musical sense. In the sources, this is marked only in bar 22 and 38 (FE) and 26 (CF, GE and EE). In the remaining passages the signs end earlier or do not appear at all. It is clear that the reason for shortening them in the manuscript (CF) was the absence of space between the staves in a situation when the LH. part was written high in the bass clef and the R.H. part — with the application of an $f^\prime$ sign.

Bars 7-8 R.H. In those bars the sources do not have accidentals before the second semiquaver (only GE2 and GE3 added naturals), and thus its upper note should be read as $a^\#$. The following arguments, however, speak in favour of an accidental omission of the naturals by Chopin:

- while writing the G-$\flat$-minor key Chopin was not quite certain whether $f$, raising a to $a^\#$, should be written in a key signature or next to each note; similarly, he was not certain whether note $a$ requires a natural. This uncertainty is evidenced by Mazurka in Gb minor Op. 33 no. 1, written with only four sharps as well as by the notation in this Etude, in which a totally superfluous $f$ is placed in CF before the notes $a^\#$ upon eight occasions, while the necessary $h$ lowering $a^\#$ to $a$ is absent upon seven occasions;
- the distinctly four-bar structure of the beginning of the Etude (bars 3-6 and 7-10) renders much more probable the use in all the four bars of a single set of passing notes for the subdominant C-$\flat$-minor chord, with $a$ or $a^\#$; the unquestionable $a$ in the L.H. in bar 9 clearly points to $a$;
- the acceptance of $a^\#$ would change, in relation to bars 3-4, the interval structure of motifs in the R.H., unjustified at the beginning of the Etude.

Bar 12 L.H. FE and EE have $F\flat$ as the third quaver. In CF its notehead is removed; distinct traces entitle us to declare that this was a mistakenly written $A\flat$ which the copyist wished to correct; he did not complete this change. GE printed $A\flat$ in GE2 and GE3 this mistaken version was amended by adding $x$ before the fifth quaver ($F\flat$).

Bars 30-31 R.H. The tie sustaining $b_{\flat}$ is found in CF ($\rightarrow$GE) and EE. The absence of the tie in FE could be regarded as a mistake, if not for $f$ at the beginning of bar 31, found only in this source. It is possible that while proof-reading FE Chopin simultaneously added the dynamic sign and removed the tie.

Sources
CG As in Etude in F, Op. 25 no. 3. Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 25, on page 16.

Editorial Principles
We accept as our basis CG compared with FE and EE, and take into consideration the annotations made by Chopin in FED, FES and FEJ. See Remarks to the Editorial Principles, on page 16. The number of variants, especially rhythmic ones, larger than in other Etudes, results from: — the untypical character of this Etude, brimming with problems of expression, — numerous changes, introduced by Chopin into the already completed manuscripts during the last phase of preparing the Etude for print (testified by the large number of corrections in CG); in many cases, this makes it impossible to establish the chronology of the alterations and the eventual final intention of the composer.

Introduction FE and EE mark the metronomic tempo already at the beginning of the composition. In CG (→GE) and EE the whole introduction is written in notes of normal size, probably due to a misunderstanding of the autograph. The main text comes from CG (→GE) and EE, and the variant given in the footnote — from FE. The crotchetts in FE could be the consequence of a mistake (presumably, the engraver forgot to join the stems of the notes, as indicated by the spaces between them, corresponding to quavers), but the absence of corrections in pupils’ copies and especially the addition in one of them of fingering below those notes proves that Chopin permitted this version.

CG (→GE1) and EE do not have $\frac{1}{2}$ restoring $\frac{1}{4}$ before the ninth semiquaver.

Bar 1 L.H. In CG (→GE) and EE a new slur starts at the beginning of the bar. In FES Chopin joined it with the preceding one. EE also does not interrupt the slur here. The accent above $e'$ was added in FES.

Bar 4 R.H. The main text comes from CG (→GE) and EE, and the variant — from FE.

Bar 31 R.H. CF (→GE) has mistakenly $g\frac{1}{2}$-$d\frac{1}{2}$ at the beginning of the bar. L.H. The version given in the footnote comes from CF (→GE), FE and EE. All three preserved extant copies containing annotations by Chopin have, however, additions testifying to a change in his intention. In FEJ $\frac{1}{2}$ was added, which lowers $c'\frac{1}{2}$ to $c'$ in the fourth chord, while in FES such naturalis are found before the fourth and sixth chord. Despite the fact that it is placed lower, $\frac{1}{2}$, added by Chopin before the fourth chord in FED, refers probably to the middle note ($c'$) since $a$, even without the necessary $\frac{1}{2}$, could not give rise to any doubts. Most probably, in all three instances Chopin changed, in an enharmonically simplified manner, the inner note in chord 4 to 7 from $c'$ to $b$. This version (our main text) contains features of a Chopinesque improvement — in the original version the effect of a substitution of $c'\frac{1}{2}$ for $b\frac{1}{2}$, taking place at the beginning of bar, is weakened by the later return of $c'$ in the middle of bar 42.

Bar 47 FE and EE have $f$, CF (→GE) has $f$.

Bar 49 L.H. The first quaver in CF (→GE) and EE is erroneously $B$.

Bar 53 The marking $pp$ is found only in FE and EE.

Bar 61 Here FE has sotto voce. In CF Chopin crossed it out and wrote $p$. The latter marking is found also in GE and EE.

Bars 62-63 R.H. The main text comes from CF (→GE) and FE, and the variant — from EE.

Bar 7, 51 L.H. The grace notes defining the way to begin the trill were added by Chopin in FED. Cf. commentary to bar 37.

Bar 8 L.H. The main text comes from CG (→GE), and EE, and the variant — from FE.

Bar 12 R.H. The main text comes from CG (→GE), and the variant — from FE and EE.

Bar 22, 24 and 52-53 Bars 22 and 24 in FES contain the following simplification of the L.H. part:

In bar 52 the sign crossing out the passage in the L.H. and the grace note added at the beginning of bar 53 denote probably the replacement of those bars by the easier bars 8-9. The application of those changes in concert praxis is unthinkable — cf. commentary to bars 32-33 and 36-53 in Etude in E Op. 10 no. 3.

Bar 25 R.H. For the last four quavers in the lower voice we accept the FE and EE version. CG (→GE) contains additionally the note $b'\frac{1}{2}$. A precise analysis of the sources discloses traces of two changes in Chopin’s decision: — the original version without $b'\frac{1}{2} (EE)$, — $b'$ added by Chopin in CG, — $b'$ removed by Chopin in the proofs of FE.

Bar 26 L.H. Originally (in FE and EE) the group of demisemiquavers on the first beat included thirteen notes, without the eighth one, $g\#$. Chopin added this note in CG (→GE).

Bar 27 CG (→GE) and EE have $fff$ here. In the proofs of FE Chopin removed a single $f$.

R.H. In CG (→GE) and EE the note $f'$ on the third beat belongs to the lower part and is a quaver. The FE version, accepted by us, was introduced by Chopin probably while proof-reading this edition.

Bar 30, 32 and 34 R.H. In the sources the chords in bar 30, 32 and 34, sounded on the fourth quaver of the bars, were written as tied quavers. This notation (certainty in bar 30 and 32 and most probably in bar 34) was the result of amending the already existing notation of the original version without any sustaining. This is the reason why we changed it to a more lucid script, as a rule applied by Chopin in situations of this sort (cf. bar 35, and, e. g. Nocturne in B Op. 9 no. 3, bars 88-91).

Bar 32 Pedalling without parentheses comes from CG (→GE), and the one in parentheses — from FE and EE.

R.H. The second half of the bar in EE has the following form: $\frac{1}{2}$ The CG (→GE) version differs due to the absence of ties sustaining $e'\frac{1}{2}$ and $g'\frac{1}{2}$ (possibly the result of an oversight). We accept the version introduced by Chopin in the proofs of FE (cf. commentary to bar 30, 32 and 34).

Bar 33 R.H. The slur is broken in FE and EE. CG (→GE) contains a visible prolongation of this slur made by Chopin.

R.H. On the fifth quaver in the lower voice EE has the fourth $h'\frac{1}{2}$-$b'\frac{1}{2}$ instead of a rest. The deletions visible in this passage in CG prove that this is the original version, left behind due to inattention.

Bars 34-35 R.H. The ossia variant comes from FES.
Bar 37 L.H. FED contains an added grace note defining the note which starts the trill. Nonetheless, it was written imprecisely, so that it can be deciphered in three ways as a, g♯ or g.

Bars 38-39 R.H. CG (→GE) and EE do not have naturals lowering g♯ to g. This is probably an oversight committed by Chopin in the autograph (cf. bars 41-45 of Etude in F minor D3p. 36 no. 1), and subsequently corrected in FE. Most of the later collected editions accepted the version with g♯ in bar 38 and g' in bar 39, without source bases.

Bar 44 CG (→GE) and EE have pp on the second beat, below the semiquavers in the L.H. FE does not contain this marking, but it has the sign —→—, added probably by Chopin in the proofs of this edition. We give the dynamics from FE as the probably later one.

Bar 45 In CG (→GE1) the figures of the fingering (two ones) are ascribed mistakenly to the grace notes C♯ and c♯; in GE2 and GE3 they are changed into wedges, while EE does not have them at all. We give the correct FE version. In FED and FES Chopin marked additionally the execution of e' with the first finger in the R.H.

Bar 47 L.H. The mordent, probably added by Chopin, is found only in CG.

Bar 50 L.H. We give the grace note F♯, in the form in which Chopin added it in CG. In FE it has the form of a crochet, and is absent in EE.

Bar 52 L.H. The sign f is found in FE and EE. In CG this passage contains a deletion; it is not certain, however, whether the crossed out marking was this particular one. R.H. On the fifth quaver of the bar FE does not have g♯. Presumably, this is the original version, corresponding with the L.H., as in bar 8.

Bar 55 L.H. In some of the later collected editions grace notes describing the way to begin the trill were repeated arbitrarily as its ending.

Bars 60-61 L.H. In the main text we give the slurs from EE and CG. The single long slur described in the footnote is found in FE. L.H. The markings ten. come from EE.

Bar 62 In CG (→GE) and EE the sign —→— is given below the L.H.; there is no accent on c♯, FE contains an accent, but does not have the crescendo sign, which Chopin supplemented in FES in a way accepted in our text.

Bar 66 R.H. On the first quaver of the bar CG (→GE) and EE have the chord e-c♯-e'; Chopin removed e' in the proofs of FE.

20. Etude in D flat major, Op. 25 no. 8

Sources
A Autograph fair copy intended as the basis for the first German edition (National Library, Warsaw)

Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 25, on page 16.

Editorial Principles
We accept as our basis FE compared with A and EE, and take into consideration the annotations made by Chopin in FED and FES. See Remarks to the Editorial Principles, on page 16.

Bar 1 The time signature in FE and EE is mistakenly c.

Bar 3 R.H. Directly above the notes we give the fingering proposed by Chopin in FE, where he probably added it while proof-reading. The upper fingering comes from A (→GE). EE does not have fingering in this bar. R.H. Before the tenth quaver GE2 (→GE3) arbitrarily added 3, lowering g' to g♯.

p. 103 Bar 19 L.H. At the beginning of the bar EE has only A#. Chopin doubled it in the upper octave, correcting both A (→GE) and FE.

p. 104 Bars 25-26 L.H. In A (→GE) and EE the bass descends in single notes B♭-A#. In the proofs of FE Chopin added doubling in the lower octave.

Bars 26-27 R.H. In A (→GE) and EE the sixths g♯-e♯ are not tied. Chopin added the ties probably while correcting FE.

Bar 28 and 30-31 The sources testify to two authentic dynamic conceptions. In the main text we give the first, written in EE and — less precisely, without the diminuendo in bars 30-31 — in A (→GE). The second — p added by Chopin in FED — is given in the footnote. FE does not have any markings in those bars.

21. Etude in G flat major, Op. 25 no. 9

Sources
CG As in Etude in F, Op. 25 no. 3.

Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 25, on page 16.

Editorial Principles
We accept as our basis CG compared with FE and EE, and take into consideration the annotations made by Chopin in FED, FES and FEJ. See Remarks to the Editorial Principles, on page 16.

Bar 1 The tempo marking in EE is Allegro non tanto, in FE — Allegro vivace, and in CG (→GE) — Allegro assai. We accept the marking in the basic source (CG), which shows that Chopin himself changed "vivace" to "assai".

Bar 4 L.H. On the last quaver FE has the chord a♯-c♯-f♯. In CG (→GE) it was changed (probably by Chopin) to c♯-b♯-f♯ (this is the version also in EE).

Bar 8 L.H. CG, FE and EE (as well as GE2 and GE3) have a four-note chord with a♯ on the second quaver. We cannot exclude the possibility that the absence of a♯ in GE1 is the result of a correction made by Chopin; thus we give this note in a variant form (in parentheses).

Bar 9, 12 and 13 L.H. CG (→GE1), EE and FE do not have naturals raising the notes c♯ to c. The missing signs were supplemented by Chopin in all pupils' copies.

Bar 12 L.H. FE and EE do not have g♯ in the chord on the second quaver. Chopin added this note in CG (→GE).

Bar 25 The marking marcato is found only in FE and EE.

Bar 34 L.H. On the second quaver FE and EE have the sixth b♭-g♭1, and CG (→GE) — a chord with eb1.

L.H. Chopin forgot to write naturals before the third quaver; cf. commentary to bar 9, 12 and 13.

Bars 37-38 L.H. FE contains the following version:

Chopin improved it in CG (→GE; with mistakes in GE1) — this is the form given by us. The improved version (although without a tie sustaining dk) is found also in EE.

Bar 50 CG (→GE) overlooks pp found in FE and EE.
22. Etude in B minor, Op. 25 no. 10

Sources
CG  As in Etude in F, Op. 25 no. 3.

Other sources (first editions) — see Etudes Op. 25, on page 16.

Editorial Principles
We accept as our basis CG compared with FE and EE, and take into consideration the annotations made by Chopin in FED. See Remarks..., on page 16.

Bar 1 and 104 The time signature in FE and GE1 is mistakenly č. At the beginning of the composition EE has the additional marking sempre legato.

Bars 3-4 and 21 FE has Čo on the last quaver of each triplet. In CG (→GE) Chopin replaced them by accents, which occur also in EE.

Bar 10 L.H. The last octave in CG (→GE) is erroneously E-a.

Bar 23 At the beginning of the bar FE has ČČ. In CG (→GE) this marking was crossed out, most probably by Chopin; it is absent also in EE.

Bar 24 R.H. Apart from a slur over this whole bar CG has additional slurs spanning the third and fourth triplets. This is probably a vestige of the original version (preserved in FE); GE does not have these slurs. In EE one slur spans bars 23-25.

Bar 25 R.H. The second quaver in CG is g-ť1, which GE1 mistakenly changed to g-ť1. GE2 (→GE3) contains the correct version.

Bar 26 There are no chromatic signs in CG, FE and EE before the ninth quaver; a comparison with bar 25 proves that Chopin forgot the naturals. GE1 erroneously added Č, raising Č to ČČ; GE2 (→GE3) has the correct version.

Bar 28 Since at the end of the bar the sources have a crotchet rest, the bar contains only three crotchets. It seems improbable that Chopin had this abbreviation in mind, since he prolonged the rest with a fermata. This is the reason why we change the rest into a minim one.

Bar 31 FE and EE do not have metronomic marking.

Bars 31-82 In the proofs of FE Chopin added almost the whole pedalizing of this part (with the exception of bar 35). This points unambiguously to the arpeggiation of the tenths in the L.H.; thus, we give the arpeggio wavy lines (in square brackets).

Bars 37-38 L.H. The tie sustaining ČČ is found in CG (→GE) and EE. It is possible that its absence in FE is the result of a correction by Chopin.

Bar 38 L.H. Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily added Č, raising Č to ČČ.

Bar 42, 62 and 82 R.H. On the last quaver FE and EE have only b in bar 42 and the octave b-b in bar 62 and 82. Originally, this version was found also in CG, but Chopin then crossed out b in bar 82, a change adopted in GE1. The retention of the original version with the octave in bar 62 is certainly an oversight committed by Chopin. Cf. commentary to bars 47, 67 and 68.

Bar 45, 65 and 85 The marking rit. was added by Chopin in CG (→GE1) in bar 45 and 65. It is absent in FE and EE. Since slowing down is connected closely with a following pause, we give this directive also in bar 85. See below commentary to bar 47, 67 and 68.

Bar 46, 66 and 86 L.H. In the sources the sustained ČČ at the beginning of those bars has different values: a minim in bar 86 and in FE and EE also in bar 46, a dotted minim in FE and EE in bar 66, and a minim with two dots in CG (→GE1) in bar 46 and 66. From the practical viewpoint it is clear that Chopin had in mind a simultaneous sounding-out of the chord ČČ-ďď-b-b; this is the reason why we accept notation which signifies this execution.

Bar 47, 67 and 87 R.H. In CG (→GE1) Chopin added the grace note before the first octave in bar 47 and 67. We add it also in bar 87, since when correcting Chopin often missed one of several similar passages. FE contains the grace note only in bar 47, and EE — in bar 67.

Bars 47-49 and analog. In the proofs of FE Chopin added the marking ď dim. absent in other sources.

Bars 50-51 and 70-71 L.H. In bars 70-71 the ďď minim in FE are tied. One could assume that the tie was written mistakenly since other sources do not have it either in bars 70-71 or bars 50-51. Some of the later collected editions applied the version with a tie in both passages.

Bar 56 L.H. CG (→GE1) does not have a tie linking ďď and ěČ. Cf. bar 76.

Bars 58-60 and 78-80 R.H. Only in the proofs of FE did Chopin distinguish consistently the phrase in the lower voice. CG (→GE) and EE do not have:
— a slur spanning it,
— an accent emphasising its beginning on the note ěČ in bar 58 and 78,
— a crotch stem for the note ďď, ending the phrase in bar 60 and 80.
See following comment.

Bar 60 and 80 R.H. On the last quaver CG (→GE) and EE have the octave b-b. We give the version improved by Chopin in the proofs of FE. Cf. commentary to bars 58-60 and 78-80.

Bar 71 R.H. The version with the crotchet (our variant) comes from CG (→GE) and FE. The absence of corrections in CG proves that this version was found also in the autograph rewritten by the copyist. The EE version, containing only quavers, had to be introduced instead of the preceding one into the manuscript, which served as the basis for this edition. This is the reason why we give it — as the last one — in the main text. Such substitution of shorter rhythmic values for a longer one is a typically Chopinesque way of enhancing the melodic line while repeating phrases (cf. e. g. Mazurkas in Ák Op. 7 no. 4, bars 25-32, in C Op. 24 no. 2, bars 97-104, in C4 minor Op. 50 no. 3, bars 77-78, in A minor Op. 59 no. 1, bars 3-6 and 27-30, and in WALTZ in E♭ Op. 18, bars 37-51).

Bars 75-77 R.H. The slurring in the main text comes from FE and EE. In CG (→GE1) shorter slurs are found; due to an obvious mistake committed by the copyist, we corrected them, and described in the footnote. Analogous bars 55-57 show that in CG Chopin joined the primary single-bar slurs; short slurs are thus the original conception. At any rate, it appears permissible to apply the phrasing given in the footnote as a variant.

Bars 89-90 L.H. FE does not have a tie sustaining ěČ.

Bar 93 and 97 R.H. In FE and EE the notes b in bar 93 and ěČ in bar 97 have the value of only a minim. We give the more precisely written values in CG (→GE1). In order to avoid misunderstandings, in bar 93 we change the dot applied by Chopin and prolonging the minim b into a tied crotchet.

Bars 95-96 and 97-98 L.H. In view of the absence in all the sources of a tie sustaining ďď in bars 93-94, we should accept that Chopin took into consideration the fading of sound on the piano and the necessity of repeating the pedal point. In the discussed bars the sources differ as regards the presence of ties sustaining this note. CG (→GE) contains the version given in the main text. EE has a tie also in bars 95-96 (ďď sustained in bars 94-97 and 98-99), FE — in both pairs of bars (ďď sustained in bars 94-99). Each of those versions corresponds to another possible grouping of bars 94-99 — 2+2+2, 4+2 or 6 bars.

Bar 107 R.H. CG (→GE) and EE fill octaves only with minimas ďď (as in bar 5). In the proofs of FE Chopin added ďď.
23. Etude in A minor, Op. 25 no. 11

Sources
CG As in Etude in F, Op. 25 no. 3.
GE8 Copy of GE1 with the composer's dedication to Hector Berlioz and with fingerings probably added by Chopin. In 1966 it was displayed in the Bernard Lolièe antique shop in Paris, where the editor-in-chief of the National Edition examined it. The editors of the National Edition do not possess any information about the current owner.
Other sources (first editions) — see Études Op. 25, on page 16.

Editorial Principles
We accept as our basis CG compared with FE and EE, and take into consideration the annotations made by Chopin in both FED and FEJ as well as the fingerings in GE8. See Remarks to the Editorial Principles, on page 16.

p. 115
Bar 1 The time signature in FE and GE1 is mistakenly ē.
Bar 11 and 75 R.H. CG, FE and EE do not have sharps raising f to ē.
Bar 15 R.H. Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed the second semiquaver in the last group from b to b. Cf. commentary to bar 33.
Bar 23 L.H. At the beginning of the bar EE has, probably erroneously, only ē.
Bar 24 R.H. The last semiquaver in CG (→GE) is mistakenly b'.

Bar 33 R.H. The second semiquaver in the last sextuplet in CG (→GE) is ē. This is probably an arbitrary revision made by the copyist. The autograph has ē before the last semiquaver (f), testified by its presence in CG, EE and originally in FE. This unnecessary sign probably drew the attention of the copyist who, wishing to justify its presence, added ē four semiquavers earlier. In the proofs of FE Chopin requested the removal of the superfluous ē at the end of the bar; this change dispels all doubts as regards his intention.
Bar 43 R.H. The first crotchet in FE is ba'g'2b2. In CG (→GE) Chopin crossed out ba'2; this note is absent also in EE.
Bar 45 L.H. FE does not have the note c' on the third crotchet. This version could be the original — cf. commentary to bar 47 — or an oversight.
Bar 46 R.H. The entire bar in FE and CG (→GE1) does not have any chromatic signs before the notes a' or ak'. The presence of ak' in the second half of the bar does not give rise to doubts, but the pitch of the fifth semiquaver is not so evident. In EE ē, lowering a' to ak', is written precisely before that note. This sign is, however, probably an unauthentic addition (made by the reviser of EE or the copyist). The following arguments speak in favour of this supposition:
— a similar melodic figure in bar 48 has of' as the fifth semiquaver and there is no ē in the sources restoring of' in the second half of the bar;
— an oversight made by Chopin appears to be much more probable in the second half of the bar, where ak' is obvious anyhow; the first half of the bar would have been written without a mistake;
— an identical revision was carried out in GE2 (→GE3).
R.H. CG (→GE) has equal quavers on the second beat. It follows from the manner of writing the notes below the semiquavers in the R.H. that this is a mistake committed by the copyist. FE and EE have dotted rhythm. L.H. GE1 (→GE2) overlooked the tie sustaining ak'.
Bar 47 L.H. In CG Chopin added the note ǧt (without ē, supplemented in GE). This note is absent in FE and EE.
Bar 57 R.H. The sources do not have sharps raising f to ē (naturals are added in GE2). The possibility that Chopin inadvertently omitted the sharps is supported by the following arguments:
— in bars 55-58 odd semiquavers create a distinct, descending melodic line (echoed in higher octaves): c-b, b-a, a-g, g-f, f-Č, and ē-d; the acceptance of ē in bar 57 would have interrupted and deformed this progression;
— the introduction of a chord with a minor ninth f already in bar 57 would have unnecessarily anticipated the appearance of this chord in bar 59;
— Chopin rather frequently overlooked accidentals (cf. commentaries to bar 11 and 75 as well as 46 in this Etude and to Etude in G minor Op. 25 no. 6, bars 7-8 and in F Minor D Op. 36 no. 1, bars 41-45).
Bar 59 L.H. Chopin added the grace note E in the proofs of FE.

p. 120
Bar 83 L.H. For the last crotchet we accept the octave g2-1, probably corrected in the bases for FE and EE. Here CG (→GE) has the chord f-c'1-g2.
Bar 89 L.H. The thirteenth semiquaver in CG (→GE) is ē. This mistake originated in the following manner:
— while copying eight groups, with four semiquavers each, in bars 89-90 the copyist wrote the fifth, sixth and seventh group (with ē, ē and ē, and ē as the lowest notes) instead of the fourth, fifth and sixth group (with f, ē, and ē);
— while proof-reading CG Chopin corrected two mistaken notes in bar 90 and left A ē uncorrected.
In the FE and EE version given by us the accepted bass notes in bars 89-90 create the rhythmically simplified main motif of the Etude.


Sources
CF As in Etude in A minor, Op. 25 no. 4.
Other sources (first editions) — see Études Op. 25, on page 16.

Editorial Principles
We accept as our basis CF compared with FE and EE, and take into consideration the annotations made by Chopin in FED. See Remarks..., on page 16.

p. 122
Bar 1 The time signature in FE and GE1 is mistakenly ē.
Bar 16, 24 and 72 R.H. CG (→GE) and EE have additional accents on the eleventh and fifteenth semiquaver in those bars. We give the FE version, in this respect corrected by Chopin.

25-27. Études D'bop. 36 (“Méthode des Méthodes”)

The title Trois nouvelles études, found in many later collected editions, was introduced, certainly without the participation of Chopin, into the second German edition of the Études.

Sources
A Autograph fair copy serving as the basis for the first French edition (the F. Chopin and G. Sand Museum, cell no. 2, Valldemosa). Certain supplements, mainly accidentals, were made in the course of work on this edition.
FED Copy of the rough version of Méthode des Méthodes by Fétis and Moscheles, M. Schlesinger (M.S. 2345bis), Paris January 1840. The second part of Méthode..., contains études by assorted composers, including Études by Chopin. FED is based on A, has numerous mistakes, and was not corrected by Chopin.
FE1 First French edition (same firm and number), Paris November 1840. This is the final corrected version of Méthode des Méthodes. The majority of mistakes in the Études by Chopin was corrected according to A; presumably, the proof-reading was conducted by one of the authors of Méthode... in collaboration with Chopin.
FE2 Second French edition, including only Études by Chopin, M. Schlesinger (M.S. 4102), Paris April 1845. It is based on the FE1 copy in which Chopin introduced several changes and supplements.
FES Pupil's copy of FE2 from a collection belonging to Chopin's pupil Jane Stirling (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris).
GE1 First German edition, A. M. Schlesinger (S. 2207 <3>), Berlin August-September 1840, including études which constitute the second part of Méthode des Méthodes. GE1, based on FE1, was not corrected by Chopin.

23
25. Etude in F minor, Dbop. 36 no. 1

Sources and Editorial Principles — see Etudes Dbop. 36, on page 23; additional sources: Three album autographs of the first fragment of the Etude with the dates: — Paris, 12 May 1841, from an unidentified album, with twenty one bars (photocopy in the F. Chopin Society, Warsaw); — Paris, 16 June 1841, from an album belonging to Jean-Pierre Dan- tan, with fourteen bars (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris); — Paris, 8 December 1841, from an album belonging to Jenny Véna, with twenty three bars (The Houghton Library, Cambridge, USA).

Bar 1 We give the time signature according to A. E have the marking c. Cf. commentary to Etude in C Op. 10 no. 1, bar 1.

Bar 18 R.H. Before the second note FE2 has mistakenly b instead of d. 

Bars 41-45 The absence of flats lowering g to gb is most probably a mistake made by Chopin. The modulation progressing from bar 32 clearly aims at the E\text{-}major key as indicated by the constant use of the notes c\text{#} in bars 34 to 44. The presence of the E\text{-}major chord in bars 41, 43 and 45 would weaken a distinct rise in the dynamics and harmonic tension.

Bars 53-56 Originally, the only dynamic marking in those bars in A was probably dim. in bar 53; this is the case also in FE0. Subsequently, \(\equiv\) were added in bars 53-54 and dim. — in bar 55; those supplements are found also in E. We are entitled to assume that the sign \(\equiv\), written by Chopin, was intended to replace the marking dim., transferred from bar 53 to bar 55. Nonetheless, we cannot exclude the possibility that the composer had in mind precisely such a combination of those seemingly contradictory markings (see Performance Commentary). Most of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed \(\equiv\) to \(\equiv\).

Bars 57-58 L.H. The main text comes from FE2, and the variant — from A (\(\equiv\)E1).

26. Etude in A flat major, Dbop. 36 no. 2

Sources and Editorial Principles — see Etudes Dbop. 36, on page 23. Sequence of etudes — see Etude in A\text{♭}.

Bar 1, 25-28, 39-40, 43 and 56 Dynamic markings come from FE2. The dashes prolonging cresc. in bar 25 are found only in this bar. This is certainly a mistake — in FE1, which served as the basis, this bar ends the line, a fact which frequently created this type of an error in compositions by Chopin.

Bar 2, 6 and analog. R.H. In bar 2 and 6 the main text comes from FE2, and the variants — from A (\(\equiv\)E1). It is not certain whether leaving analogous bars 42 and 46 unaltered corresponded to Chopin’s intentions — when correcting, he often missed one of several recurring fragments. The likelihood of a mistake is, however, reduced by the fact that Chopin did not make a similar mistake in adjoining bar 45 (see below commentary to bar 5 and 45).

Bar 5 and 45 R.H. The main text comes from FE2, and the variants — from A (\(\equiv\)E1).

Bars 57-59 L.H. The main text comes from FE2 and the variant — from A. Bar 57 in E1 contains the following version: \raisebox{1pt}{\textbf{C\text{	extsuperscript{8}}}}\text{\textsuperscript{♯}}\text{\textsuperscript{♯}}, which presumably is mistaken — instead of a crotchet rest in the second half of the bar A has a sign resembling a minin rest, which was interpreted by the engraver probably as a repetition sign for the previous figure. Regardless of the change in the pitch of the first note the FE2 version shows distinctly what sort of a rhythm Chopin had in mind from the very beginning.

27. Etude in D flat major, Dbop. 36 no. 3

Sources and Editorial Principles — see Etudes Dbop. 36, on page 23. Sequence of etudes — see Etude in A\text{♭}.

Bar 3 and 33 R.H. In A the second note in the upper voice in bar 3 is e\text{♭} (bar 33 is marked in an abbreviated manner as a repetition of bar 3). Both bars in FE0 (\(\equiv\)E), however, contain f'. True, this could be an uncorrected mistake made by the engraver of FE0, but it is likely that Chopin accepted this version while preparing FE2. This is the reason why we give both versions.

Bars 15-16 R.H. The tie sustaining d\text{♭} in A was overlooked in FE0 (\(\equiv\)E).

Bars 19-20 R.H. The sources do not tie c\text{♯}. The sustaining of ak\text{♯} in a phrase which is a sequential repetition of those bars (bars 21-22) indicates a probable mistake by Chopin.

Bar 24 L.H. The note b\text{♭} on the third beat is found only in A.

Bar 39 R.H. The absence of grace notes creating the mordent is probably an error made by Chopin — cf. bar 9 and 41.

Bar 42 R.H. In GE1 the lower note at the beginning of the bar is mistakenly g\text{♭}. R.H. The fourth quaver in the lower voice in A is b\text{♭} in FE0 (\(\equiv\)E) this note was misread as a\text{♭}.

Bars 55-59 L.H. The main text comes from FE2, and the variant — from A (\(\equiv\)E1).

Bar 59 L.H. On the second beat FE0 (\(\equiv\)E) overlooked the note d\text{♭}.

Bar 64 R.H. We give the fingering (1) found in A. It was omitted in FE0, and E mistakenly added staccato dots instead of the fingering. Cf. following comment.

Bars 69-70 R.H. The engraver of FE0 (\(\equiv\)E1) misread the fingering figures (1) in A as staccato wedges. Chopin restored the correct markings while preparing FE2. Cf. previous comment and commentary to Etude in F Op. 10 no. 8, bar 2 and 4.

Jan Ekier
Pawel Kamiński