

PERFORMANCE COMMENTARY

The commentary presented below pertains to the solo part. Several practical directives referring to the accompanying piano part are to be found on page 4 of this insert.

Introductory remarks

During Chopin's lifetime piano concertos were performed in four versions:

1. The version for one piano. This editorial form, fundamental at the time, of compositions for the piano with an orchestra accompaniment – solo piano in normal print, *tutti* and certain soli of orchestral instruments in smaller print – was also a form of presenting the work in salons and even concert halls, as evidenced by the author's printed variants to be applied "in execution without accompaniment", occurring in Chopin's smaller concert works (Op. 2, 14) and a harmonic accompaniment to the recitative in the second movement of the *Concerto*, written by the composer in a pupil's copy (bars 45-72, cf. *Source Commentary*). We cannot exclude the possibility that Chopin himself performed in public the version for one piano of the *Concerto in E minor*, Op. 11.

Orchestral parts supplemented the printed form of this version. It was possible to purchase a complete set for full orchestra or quintet parts only.

2. The version with a second piano was used while playing at home, during lessons and sometimes at public concerts. Wilhelm von Lenz, Chopin's pupil, described the performance of the first movement of the *Concerto in E minor* Op. 11 given by another pupil, Carl Filtsch, accompanied by the composer himself: "Chopin recreated the whole well-devised, ephemeral instrumentation of this composition in his incomparable accompaniment. He played by heart. Never before have I heard anything to equal the first *tutti*, performed by him on the piano"¹. However, piano reductions of the orchestra part in Chopin's *Concertos* were not published until about 1860. Earlier, use was made of hand-written reductions (extant reductions of the second and third movement of both *Concertos* were made by Chopin's friends J. Fontana and A. Franchomme). Owing to the fact that the *Concerto* was not published in this version during the composer's lifetime, the *National Edition* presents it in series B.

3. The version with a string quartet (quintet) was used both during concerts and in salons. In 1829, Chopin wrote to T. Woyciechowski: "Every Friday Kessler holds small musical meetings [...] A fortnight ago, there was Ries' *Concerto* in a quartet", and a year later he mentioned preparations for a performance of his *Concerto in E minor* Op. 11: "Last Wednesday I rehearsed my *Concerto* in a quartet".

4. The composer intended the version with the orchestra to be the basic one. On 17 March 1830, he performed the *Concerto in F minor* in Warsaw in this version (see quotations about the *Concerto*... prior to the musical text). Chopin prepared the base for printing the *Concerto in F minor* in the form of a handwritten score of precisely this version (cf. a characteristic of sources in the *Source Commentary*).

Notes on the musical text

The variants marked as *ossia* were given this label by Chopin or added in his hand in 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 [].

¹ Wilhelm von Lenz, *Uebersichtliche Beurtheilung der Pianoforte-Kompositionen von Chopin* [...], "Neue Berliner Musikzeitung" 4 September 1872.

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

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

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

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

Concerto in F minor Op. 21

Attention should be drawn to the proper realisation of the authentic slur-ring. Short slurs, characteristic for this period in Chopin's oeuvre, usually do not encompass whole phrases – the beginnings of the slurs should be accentuated by delicate pressure, but the player should be warned against lifting the hand when the end of a slur occurs within a phrase.

In general, the realisation of individual grace-notes does not pose a problem: in the majority of cases, it is unessential whether the grace-note is executed in an anticipatory manner or – in accordance with classical rules – on the downbeat; it is only important that it be played as quickly as possible and with distinct articulation. Situations in which one of the above possibilities appears to be clearly closer to Chopin's style are discussed below in commentaries to particular bars.


I. Maestoso

p. 14 Bar 72 The trill should be started from the main note.

Bar 79 and 80 The arpeggio notation in the form of separate wavy lines for each hand does not determine the manner of their realisation. They can be rendered continuously (1) or simultaneously in both hands (2). The editors recommend arpeggiation only in the L.H. (3), which grants the chords a more decisive character without losing the impression of an arpeggio.




p. 15 Bar 87 R.H. Beginning of the trill with a grace-note:



In each of the above solutions the first note should be struck simultaneously with *db* in the L.H.

p. 16 Bar 95 R.H. Beginning of the trill with grace-notes:



Bar 97 R.H. Beginning of the trill:



- p. 18 *Bar 112* R.H. The editors recommend playing the last semi-quaver with the first finger, which is very comfortable and dependable when applying the following device:




- p. 21 *Bar 127* The script of the L.H. can be regarded as a simplified record of the “harmonic legato” (the fingers sustain the components of harmony). The precise notation would be as follows:




(similarly in bar 275).

Bar 128 R.H. The grace-note g^2 should be played together with the third quaver in the L.H. The graphic form of this grace-note (an uncrossed quaver) does not render precise its rhythmic value. It can be performed as an ordinary crossed grace-note or slightly longer, e. g. in the manner notated by Chopin in analogous bar 276.

Bar 132 and 280 R.H. Taking into account the arpeggio, it should be performed in accordance with the following scheme:



- p. 25 *Bars 165-168 and 315-318* Easier fingering in bars 165-166:



(the note *bb*, the eighth semiquaver in bar 166, can be played in the L.H. or R.H.); analogously in bars 167-168.


Bar 315 and 317 can be performed similarly:



- p. 27 *Bars 179-180 and 335-336* In the opinion of the editors the signs ***tr*** occurring in the notation of the R.H. part mean that the whole combination of the trill and tremolando can be played not only in semiquavers, but also freely, with a speed adapted to the accepted tempo of this fragment and the performance skills of the pianist.

- p. 29 *Bar 208* R.H. Proposal of solving the beginning of the bar:




- p. 37 Bar 272 R.H.  The lower note of the arpeggio, d^1 , should be struck simultaneously with cb^1 in the L.H.

- p. 43 *Bar 321* Facilitation for smaller hand:



II. Larghetto

- p. 46 *Bar 7, 10, 25, 29, 39, 63, 70, 78* R.H. Beginning of the trill with

grace-notes in bar 7: ; d^3 should be played simultaneously with the chord in the L.H.
Analogously in remaining bars.

- p. 49 *Bar 28 R.H.* The first in the group of small notes in the middle of the bar (*a'*) should be struck together with *Bb*, in the L.H., as was marked by Chopin in a pupil's copy in analogous bar 9.

- p. 52 *Bar 52* R.H. Chopin clearly distinguished the *staccato* signs in the autograph by writing wedges instead of dots above the notes *eb* and *bb*. He probably had in mind a more acute distinction of these two sounds.

- p. 55 *Bar 76 R.H. Beginning of trill with a grace-note:*




In both cases, the first note should be struck simultaneously with the chord in the L.H.

Bar 77 R.H. Chopin's fingering – number 1 written twice next to bb^1 and db^2 – is not supposed to denote a simultaneous striking of the two keys with one finger, but their consecutive execution conceived as a beginning of the arpeggiated five-note chord.

- s. 56 *Bar 80* This bar can be played in three ways (cf. *Source Commentary*):
- as in the main text;
 - taking into consideration variants in both hands parts;
 - in the manner described in the footnote, which in practice means that the main text is supplemented with the note c^2 which fills chromatic progression on the third quaver in the bar.

III. Allegro vivace


- p. 59 *Bar 27 and 335 R.H.* Rhythmic notation used by Chopin theoretically can be understood in two ways:





In practice the most important is a smooth rendition of thematic bottom voice.

Bars 37-40 molto legato means here certainly “harmonic legato” (the fingers sustain the components of harmony). Part of each hand should be therefore treated in a two-part manner:



- p. 61 **Bar 71 and 79 R.H.** Beginning of the trill: 
In bar 71 this figure should be – in accordance with the record – preceded by the grace-note *ab*!

- p. 73 **Bar 246 and 250** 

- p. 83 **Bar 412 R.H.** 

- s. 89 **t. 491** Possible realisations of arpeggios – see commentary to the first movement, bar 79 and 80.

- s. 90 **Bars 511-514** In the opinion of the editors the whole ending (from the first chord in bar 511) can be included into the solo part. The accompanying piano part should be then modified:



Comments concerning the performance of the accompanying piano part

Directives describing the entrances of the orchestral instruments serve two purposes:

— a general acquaintance of the soloist with the instrumentation of the orchestra part;

— awakening the imagination of the accompanist so that by means of a suitable choice of hues and articulations, characteristic for particular instruments, he could grant his part an appropriate sonoric climate.

Thematic instrumental entrances of particular significance were given additional markings (*marcato*, *espressivo*).

Square brackets written in dashed line mean that the accompanist can omit the notes contained therein for the purpose of turning the page.

III. Allegro vivace

- p. 82 **Bars 403-409 and 491-494 R.H.** In these bars attention is drawn to the absence of agogic markings. This probably means that Chopin envisaged them played without restraining the natural course of music by slowing down in bars 403-405 and 491-492, as is generally the case in the contemporary performance practice. Thus, the editors recommend the retention of a uniform tempo in these bars. In the second of the discussed passages this could enhance the effect caused by the general pause in bar 493. (Cf. commentary to bars 388-409 in concert version of the score.)

Jan Ekier
Paweł Kamiński

SOURCE COMMENTARY /ABRIDGED/

Introductory comments

In reference to the solo part the commentary presents in abbreviated manner the principles of editing the musical text, discusses more important divergences between authentic sources, and draws attention to the most frequent departures from the authentic text encountered in collected editions of Chopin's works compiled after his death.

In reference to the orchestra part (the accompanying piano) the editors give the principles of preparing the piano reduction and only the most essential differences between source versions. More data is to be found in commentaries to the score of the *Concerto*.

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”.

Order of the Concertos

The titular issue calls for additional explanation in view of the inconsistency between the order of the origin of both *Concertos*, their performance by Chopin and their publication.

First mention of the *Concertos* was made in Chopin's correspondence in October 1829, in which the composer described the *Concerto in F minor* simply as “my concerto”. Its first performance, with Chopin as the soloist, took place on 17 March 1830 in the National Theatre in Warsaw (see quotations *about the Concerto in F minor*... prior to the musical text). From April 1830, Chopin already wrote about his “new” or “second concerto” by which he meant the *Concerto in E minor* (cf. quotations prior to the musical text of *Concerto in E minor*). The première of this work took place on 11 October 1830, also in the National Theatre. In view of the date of origin and the first performance the rank of the first *Concerto* is thus due to the *Concerto in F minor*.

After his arrival in Paris, Chopin gave several public performances of the *Concerto in E minor* in 1832-1833. The success of those presentations contributed directly to stirring the interest of the publishers. It is not surprising, therefore, that it was precisely the *Concerto in E minor* which was among the first group of compositions (Op. 6-11) issued in Paris in the first half of 1833 (they were also published at a close date in Leipzig and London). The marketing calculations of M. Schlesinger, Chopin's prime Parisian publisher, were decisive for delaying the publication of the *Concerto in F minor* until 1836.

Already while preparing the handwritten bases for the publishers Chopin took into consideration the sequence created by the dates of publication; hence, the autograph of the piano reduction of the *Tutti* opening the *Concerto in E minor* is entitled “1^{er} Concerto” and the semi-autograph of the score of the *Concerto in F minor* – “2^d Concerto” (these are the only preserved autographs of the *Concertos*).

The sequence perpetuated in the editions and stemming from the dates of publication and the associated opus numeration contradicts, therefore, the chronology of the origin of the *Concertos*, which is of essential significance both for research dealing with Chopin's oeuvre and certain aspects of performance. Taking these facts into consideration the editors of the *National Edition* decided to omit the reference numbers in the titles, and left only the key and the number of the opus for the purposes of identifying the *Concertos*.

Concerto in F minor, Opus 21

Sources

As Sketch autograph of a one-and-a-half bar long fragment of the first movement of the *Concerto* (written together with several other unconnected sketches on the last page of the autograph of *Trio* Op. 8; Chopin Society, Warsaw). It encompasses the full record of bar 225 arranged for two pianos and an outline of the further sequence.

[SI] Lost manuscript of the *Concerto* score, probably an autograph, completed in Warsaw (possibly at the beginning of 1830). **[SI]** comprised a point of departure for the extant semi-autograph of the score, and in all likelihood served Julian Fontana for editing the piano reduction of the orchestra part.

½A Semi-autograph of the *Concerto* score (National Library, Warsaw), prepared by Chopin together with an unknown copyist as the basis for the first German edition, probably at the turn of 1835. Chopin wrote the whole solo part and a decisive majority of the supplementary piano reduction of the purely orchestral fragments as well as the title page, the metronomic tempi and a number of supplements and corrections in the orchestral parts. The copyist wrote – possibly upon the basis of **[SI]** – parts of the orchestral instruments and presumably fragments of the piano reduction of several *Tutti* (only in the second and third movement; in some cases the copyist most probably thickened the text delicately marked by Chopin).

Characteristically, fragments of the orchestra part, which can be recreated upon the basis of the piano part (predominantly the so-called *Tutti*), differ as regards certain details from the version stemming from the parts of orchestral instruments.

Later on (about 1860) – **½A** was used also for editing the second German edition and the first edition of the *Concerto* score (Breitkopf & Härtel, Leipzig, no. 10721); some of the supplements, also in the solo piano part (e. g. accidentals in first movement, bars 316, 322 and 324), could originate from this period.

The piano part in **½A** was prepared by Chopin extremely carefully as evidenced by the great variety and precision of performance markings as well as the numerous corrections (scratching and deletions). Haste, growing in the course of writing, is discernible especially in the record of the third movement of the *Concerto*. Numerous imprecision in the notation of the accidentals (characteristic especially in Chopin's earlier compositions) as a rule does not hamper a correct deciphering of the text.

A, M^{orch} – piano part and parts of orchestral instruments in **½A**, constituting Chopin's autograph and a manuscript by an unknown copyist (with annotations by Chopin), respectively.

ReF manuscript of a piano reduction of the orchestra part of the second and third movement of the *Concerto* (lost, photocopy in the Archive of New Acts, Warsaw), made by Julian Fontana most probably upon the basis of **[SI]**. In the longer fragments, marked as *Tutti* and played by the orchestra alone, Fontana possibly copied the original edition of Chopin's piano reduction contained in **[SI]**. Some of the pencilled annotations testify to the fact that the manuscript was used for practical purposes, most likely by Fontana himself.

GE1 First German edition, Breitkopf & Härtel (5654), Leipzig March 1836, encompassing the *Concerto* in a version for solo piano and orchestral parts. **GE1** is based on **½A**, as evidenced by:

- the concurrence of the texts of both sources (more serious doubts are produced only by the slurring, discussed below);
- the storage of **½A** in the Breitkopf & Härtel archives;
- more than ten signs visible in **½A** possibly added by the engraver of this edition and corresponding to the endings of the pages of the piano part in **GE1**;
- several places in which the concurrent text of the editions is a modification of the script of **A** (primarily the supplementation of the missing accidentals); traces of an introduction of those changes can be perceived in **GE1** and are absent in the remaining editions.

Piano part in **GE1** contains traces of detailed proofreading. Only some of the introduced alterations can be unreservedly ascribed to Chopin (e.g. first movement, bar 224, second movement, bar 28, and third movement, bars 366 and 368), and the majority is probably the work of a reviser. Some errors remained uncorrected.

Separate discussion is due to the slurring which in **GE1** differs greatly from the slurring in **A** (e. g. first movement, bars 31-34, 225-228, 300, second movement, bars 15-23, third movement, bars 29-31). A precise analysis, especially of the state prior to the proofreading which can be recreated upon the basis of the visible traces of changes on the plates (more than a hundred), leads to the following conclusions:

- unfamiliar with Chopin's manner of writing the slurs (which in the composer's autographs encompass, contrary to the universally accepted convention, the first and the last note, as in our edition), the engraver of **GE1** frequently did not understand their meaning and was unable to properly place the beginnings and endings of the slurs;
- the slurring printed originally in **GE1** frequently corresponds to the habits of the engraver rather than recreates the notation in **A** (the most frequent alterations include: adapting the slurs to the metric structures, especially half-bars and whole bars, the avoidance of excessively long slurs, the addition of slurs in adjoining or analogous figures, e. g. in the second hand);
- the proof-reading, certainly made upon the initiative of Chopin and partially under his control, as a rule restored the slurring from **A**; a considerable number of the alterations, however, remained uncorrected.

GE1a – later impressions of **GE1**, after 1840, with a changed price on the cover and containing solely slight graphical retouching.

GE = **GE1** and **GE1a**.

GE^{piano}, **GE^{orch}** – piano part and orchestral parts from **GE**; these symbols are used only in those cases when 'GE' alone could lead to vagueness. The editors of the National Edition had at their disposal a single copy of the parts; thus it was impossible to describe its affiliation to **GE1** or **GE1a**. Nonetheless, the existence of different impressions of the orchestral material in **GE** appears to be rather unlikely.

GE2 Second German edition (same firm and number), about 1860, thoroughly revised, mainly in comparison with **A** (**A** versions have been restored in several places even in those cases when the alterations in **GE1** were probably made by Chopin). The alterations encompassed the pitch and rhythmic text, and predominantly the dynamic and articulation markings, including slurring. Furthermore, this edition revised the accidentals, corrected errors (also those taken from **A**, not always aptly), and altered the layout of the text on the staves and pages. Edited after Chopin's death, **GE2** does not influence the determination of the text; we discuss versions of this edition only in the most important cases. There are copies of **GE2** with different prices on the cover.

FE First French edition, M. Schlesinger (M.S.1940), Paris, encompassing the *Concerto* in a version for solo piano and orchestral parts:

FE1 First impression of **FE**, August 1836, based on **GE1** and corrected by Chopin. This edition contains a large number of mistakes concerning the pitch, accidentals, etc. (some had been taken from **GE1**).

FE2 Second impression of **FE** (same firm and number), prepared soon after the first edition and containing about 30 corrections, primarily of pitch errors. It is very possible that Chopin participated in the proofreading of **FE2**, which was probably carried out in two phases (cf. the characteristic of **EE** proposed below). There are copies of **FE2** different only as regards details of covers, i. a. prices, originating from impressions by Brandus, Schlesinger's successor.

FE^{piano} (**FE1^{piano}**, **FE2^{piano}**), **FE^{orch}** – piano part and orchestral parts from **FE** (analogous to **GE^{piano}**, **GE^{orch}**). The editors of the National Edition saw only the parts of the first and second violins and the viola (one copy each); upon this basis it is impossible to determine the impression from which those parts originate, and whether there were any different impressions of the **FE** orchestral material.

FED, **FES** – pupil's copies of **FE2^{piano}** with annotations by Chopin:

FED – copy from a collection belonging to Chopin's pupil Camille Dubois (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris), containing fingering, performance directives and corrected printing errors;

FES – copy from a collection belonging to Chopin's pupil Jane Stirling (Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris), containing amended errors, fingering and predominantly a different version of the middle section of the second movement to be used in a solo performance, in which the recitative (the upper line performed with the right hand) is supplemented with a figurate harmonic accompaniment.

FEJ copy of **FE2^{piano}** from a collection belonging to Chopin's sister, Ludwika Jędrzejewiczowa (Chopin Society, Warsaw), containing pencilled corrections of several errors.

EE First English edition, Wessel & Co (W & C^o N^o 1642), London November 1836, encompassing the *Concerto* in a version for solo piano (the orchestral parts were not printed by Wessel). **EE** is based most probably on a copy of **FE2** which does not contain several last retouches and was carefully revised by the publisher. Nothing indicates that Chopin participated in its preparation.

Editorial principles for the solo part

We accept **A** as the basis, and take into consideration later changes in **GE** and **FE** according to the following principles:

- we give the corrections of **A** version, made unquestionably by Chopin and introduced in these editions, as the only text;
- whenever Chopin corrected a text published with errors we give the amended version in the main text, and version **A** – in the variant;
- whenever Chopin wavered between two versions we give both, one in the main text and the other as a variant;
- we also give variants when the **GE** or **FE** version can be ascribed, with lesser or greater probability, to Chopin, but there is no distinct proof of its authenticity.

We also take into consideration Chopin's annotations in **FED** and **FES**.

The principles of preparing the piano reduction of the orchestra part (the second piano)

The basis of the *Tutti* parts consists of suitable fragments of the version for one piano taken from **A**. The more difficult fragments were simplified owing to the predominantly practical character of the second piano part.

The reduction of the accompanying parts was based on **M^{orch}**, compared with **ReF** in the second and third movements. It gives all the fundamental elements of the orchestral accompaniment while bypassing the doublings unnecessary in the two-piano texture.

In view of the rapidly weakening sound of the piano some of the long-sustained notes are repeated. Directives concerning instrumentation are given in the characteristic passages.

I. Maestoso



- p. 10 *Beginning GE (→FE→EE)* has mistakenly **c** as the time signature. Errors of this sort were often committed in Chopin's works, e. g. in five out of the six *Etudes* from Op. 25, maintained in the **♩** metre.

The solo piano part

- p. 14 *Bars 71-72 GE (→FE→EE)* omits pedal markings.

Bars 77-78 R.H. In **GE (→FF→EE)** the first part of the slur beginning on the fourth crotchet in bar 77 (this bar ends the page in $\frac{1}{2}$ **A**) was mistakenly deciphered as a tie sustaining *f*¹. (Cf. beginning of bar 4 where an accent was placed above a repeated *f*¹).

- p. 15 *Bar 81 R.H.* Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily reduced the first note *ab*³ on the third beat to the value of a demi-semiquaver. We leave the rhythmically undefined notation from the sources since it does not give rise to doubts concerning the manner of performing this figure, and most probably does not

contain an error – it could be understood as  or .

Bar 84 L.H. The first quaver in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) is mistakenly the c-e third. Chopin corrected this error in **FED**.

Bar 85 R.H. In the sources the slur is interrupted in the middle of the bar. In **A** the slurs initially encompassed only irregular rhythmic groups on the fourth beat of bar 84 and in the second half of bar 85. Chopin then prolonged the first slur, but did not extend it to the beginning of the second one. In an analogous situation in **A** the slurs in bars 92-93 were linked in a manner which does not produce any doubts. (Cf. also slurs in bar 83 and 91).

Bar 87 R.H. The main text comes from **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**), and the variant from **A**. We do not know whether the change in the pitch of the grace-note is the result of Chopin's proofreading or the carelessness of the engraver, but the fingering written by Chopin in **FED** testifies to his acceptance of this version. Cf. second movement, bar 76.


Bar 89 R.H. In the main text we give the **A** rhythm which does not give rise to source or musical doubts. The version in the footnote comes from **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**). The error most probably committed by the engraver is evidenced by:

- the arrangement of the text in **GE**, which practically excludes the possibility of correcting the rhythm in this place;
- the unnatural character of the dotted rhythm on the third beat combined with authentic phrasing (cf. the previous bar).

The sign written by Chopin in **FED** (a cross characteristic for pupil's copies) testifies to some sort of spoken remarks made by the composer which could have pertained to the rhythm.

Bar 90 R.H. In **GE** the *staccato* dots for the lower voice, visible in **A**, were omitted possibly due to carelessness and then supplemented in **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).

p. 16 **Bar 93** R.H. In the second half of the bar we leave rhythmic notation from the sources, in which the run is written in semiquavers (except the last note). Chopin frequently used this type of script, which probably contained a suggestion concerning a *poco ritenuto* performance of this figure. Cf. second movement, bar 41, and, e. g. *Prélude in D♭* Op. 28 no. 15, bar 4 and 79. L.H. In the sources both notes of the f-ab third on the fourth beat have the value of a semiquaver. Cf. analogous bar 83, 85 and 91.

Bar 96 In **A** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE**) the sign  is placed above the R.H. since the purpose of depressing the pedal is predominantly to retain the sound of the minim g². Chopin used a similar script in *Prélude in F♯* Op. 28 no. 13, bars 33-35.

In **FED** Chopin added the sign assigning f¹ on the fourth beat to the L.H.

Bar 98 L.H. In **A** there are no stems prolonging ab and f¹ on the first and fourth beat nor the note c² on the seventh quaver. Those elements were supplemented in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE**). In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin added to the **GE** version a tie sustaining c². The supplements partially eliminate the distinct gap in the continuous rendition of the bass line in this phrase (with the help of a prolongation of suitable notes and the pedal). This is the reason why we suggest prolonging also the remaining two bass notes.

R.H. In **FED** Chopin added *staccato* marking above the fifth on the second beat.

Bar 100 R.H. **A** lacks naturals rising d♭ to d (they are found in the L.H.). This imprecision was only partially corrected in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE**) by adding ♮ before the second semiquaver in the third group.

p. 17 **Bar 103** L.H. In **A** there are no naturals before the fourth and fifth semiquaver. In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE**) they were mistakenly added before the third and fourth note.

Bar 105 and 107 L.H. The sources lack ♮ restoring f on the seventh quaver in bar 105. Similarly, in bar 107 Chopin overlooked ♮ before f¹.

p. 18 **Bars 108-109** L.H. In the sources there is no tie sustaining c². This is probably a Chopin's oversight – cf. analogous bars 106-107 and the note, made below, concerning the R.H.

R.H. **A** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE**¹) does not have a tie sustaining bb². Chopin added it in the proofs of **FE**² (\rightarrow **EE**).

Bar 109 L.H. In the last chord **GE** has an additional note c¹. In **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin corrected this mistake.

Bar 109 and 110 R.H. In **A** the thirteenth semiquaver in both bars does not have ♭ restoring db². The accidentals were added in the proofs of **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**).

Bars 110-111 L.H. It is not clear whether Chopin wished to sustain or repeat f at the beginning of bar 111:

— there is no tie in **A**, but this could be an oversight (bar 111 starts a new page; in bars 109-110 f is sustained in an almost identical context);

— the tie is present in **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**), but its authenticity can be questioned (the engraver of **FE** could have in this manner interpreted the slur in **GE**, of unclear purpose and spanning from g in the last chord of bar 110 to one of the bottom notes in the first chord of bar 111, and possibly constituting a deformed slur, which in **A** is written above those chords).


Bar 111 In **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) both f¹ signs are omitted.


L.H. In **A** the slur ends on the penultimate quaver, and in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) – on the last one. This change is probably accidental, but the fingering added later by Chopin – on the last quaver in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**), on the first sixth in **FED** – enjoins to recognise this slur as accepted by the composer.

Bar 112 R.H. The fingering above the last two semiquavers is written in **FED**. The 2 above ab² was most probably replaced by 1, while the result of alterations concerning the same figures above f³ remains uncertain.

p. 19 **Bar 113** **FED** contains Chopin's unclear annotation discussed in the footnote.

p. 20 **Bar 119 and 120** R.H. The sources lack ♮ restoring f³ on the twelfth semiquaver in bar 119 and f² in bar 120.

Bar 120 R.H. The sign  above the fourth semiquaver is found only in **A**. We do not know whether its absence in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) is the result of Chopin's proofreading or the carelessness of the engraver.

Bar 121 L.H. **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) has mistakenly p instead of  before the chord on the third crotchet. Cf. commentary to bar 283.

p. 21 **Bar 127** R.H. **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) omitted eb², the eighth note of the run.

Bar 132 L.H. Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily added the upper octave eb to the authentic Eb on the fourth beat. See commentary to bar 280.

Bar 132 and 280 R.H. In **FED** Chopin added arpeggios at the beginning of those bars.

Bar 133 R.H. The marking *ten.* was added by Chopin in **FED**.


Bar 135 and 283 L.H. In both bars in **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) the note eb, sustained from the earlier bar, has the value of a crotchet. In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin changed it in bar 135 into a dotted minim, which should be accepted also in bar 283 (the omission of one of several recurring fragments while introducing corrections is one of his most frequent mistakes).

p. 22 **Bar 138** R.H. **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) omitted ♭ prior to the first note of the melody.

L.H. In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin added the marking *sem-pre legato* and the pedalling.

Bar 138 and 286 R.H. In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin added the tie sustaining eb^2 in the second half of bar 138. This is a characteristic Chopinesque execution device guaranteeing a strict legato of the melody led in chords (cf. e. g. *Polonaise in Ab* Op. 53, bar 97). This alteration can be also applied in bar 286 (see above commentary to bar 135 and 283).

Bar 139 R.H. In **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) the first half of the bar has the follow-

ing mistaken form: . In **FED** Chopin amended the majority of errors, restoring the **A** version (with the exception of a mordent on the first note).

Bar 139 and 287 R.H. In **A** there is no b restoring db^2 on the penultimate quaver. Chopin corrected the error in bar 287 in the proofs of **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**), and in bar 139 – only in **FED**.

Bars 139-140 R.H. The *staccato* dots in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) were mistakenly assigned (contrary to **A**) also to the first notes in both bars and the four last semiquavers in bar 140.

Bar 140 R.H. **FE** omitted \flat prior to the second semiquaver. In **EE** this version was mistakenly revised by adding \flat before this note.

Bar 141 L.H. In this bar **A** has six *staccato* dots, overlooked in **GE**. In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin added the dots, but only next to the bass notes, as in bar 289.

Bar 142 L.H. There are no articulation markings in **A** (\rightarrow **GE**). In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin added a dot and a slur.

R.H. The tie sustaining the minim ab^1 is present in **A** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**). We should not exclude the possibility that Chopin deleted the tie while adding a note in **FED** (see below).

R.H. In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) the crotchet eb^1 in the bottom voice was omitted in the middle of the bar. Chopin added it in **FED**.

Bar 143 L.H. The first quaver in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) is G. Chopin corrected this mistake in the proofs of **FE** \rightarrow **EE**.

R.H. The sources lack \sharp before the penultimate note. In this type of figures transferred by an octave Chopin frequently did not repeat accidentals, which he regarded as obvious. The fact that he heard \sharp^2 is testified by \flat added in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) before the f^1 - f^2 octave in the following bar.

p. 23 **Bar 144 L.H.** In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin added stems prolonging c on the second and sixth quaver.

Bar 146 R.H. **A** has the sign $\text{—} \text{—} \text{—}$ above the second half of the bar. Instead of it, **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) has the marking *cresc.* between the staves, between the fifth and sixth quaver of the bar. In **FED** Chopin transferred this marking further, which we accept in our edition.

Bars 147-148 GE (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) overlooked the marking *cresc.* - - -.

Bar 148 R.H. In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin added a fermata above the crotchet c^4 .

p. 24 **Bar 151, 153 and 155 Signs f and p** were written in **FED**. The signs in bar 151 and 155 are unclear, but combined with the incontestable p in bar 153 deciphering them as f appears to be highly probable.

Bar 151, 153, 155 and 157 R.H. On the first semiquavers **A** has signs tr in bar 151 and 153, and v in bar 155 and 157 (in this context, these signs are equivalent). In **GE** tr was mistakenly deciphered also in bar 155. In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin altered all tr into v (the correction was imprecise, and thus there is no sign in bar 153 in **FE**).

Bars 151-155 ff. In this whole fragment **A** has only one \flat raising db to d . The majority of the missing signs was added in the proofs of **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**). Owing to the harmonic context, omissions of individual accidentals are encountered also in the successive four bars.



Bar 156 and 158 L.H. We give the slurs from **A**. **GE** has half-bar slurs (four or three quavers each). In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin linked the slurs within the bars, leaving the imprecisely marked moment of their beginning, presumably considered less jarring.

Bar 157 L.H. **A** has F as the first quaver of the second half of the bar. In the proofs of **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) Chopin changed it into D .

p. 25 **Bar 163 R.H.** In **FE** there is no tie sustaining eb^2 .

Bar 164 R.H. **A** has an accent above c^3 . In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) it was placed erroneously a semiquaver later, above the db^2 - f^2 third.

Bar 165 and 168 R.H. **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) has the following version of the

third beat in bar 165:  and the beginning of bar 168: . In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin,

who probably took into consideration the ease of execution, changed c^2 to db^2 in bar 165, and to bb^1 in bar 168. We give this corrected version, analogous to bar 315 and 318, as the only one.

p. 26 **Bars 169-170 and 319-320 L.H.** In **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) there are no flats in the second half of the bar, restoring eb in bars 169-170 and ab in bars 319-320. These errors were amended in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).

Bar 171 R.H. In **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) the slur extends only to the third beat, and the last chord has a *staccato* dot (overlooked in **GE**). We give the longer slur, introduced by Chopin in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).

Bar 171 and 321 L.H. In **A** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE**) there is no accidental before the 14th semiquaver third from the end in bar 171. **EE** added \flat raising Eb to E . The fact that this did not correspond to Chopin's intention is testified by similar bar 321, where in an analogous situation – the absence of the sign in **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) – Ab was restored by adding \flat in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).

p. 27 **Bar 174 L.H.** In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) the marking fz was unnecessarily printed twice, mistakenly placed also at the beginning of the bar. **L.H.** In the chord on the second beat **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) overlooked c^1 . In similar contexts Chopin, as a rule, used the arpeggio of a full four-note chord, cf. e. g. *Concerto in E minor* Op. 11, first movement, bar 210, 219 and 570, *Ballade in G minor* Op. 23, bar 124, *Scherzo in Bb minor* Op. 31, bar 470.

Bar 178 L.H. The third semiquaver in **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) is bb instead of ab . This error was corrected in **FED** and **FEJ**.

The accompanying piano part

p. 28 **Bar 187 R.H.** The note bb^1 on the fifth quaver of the bottom voice appears in **A** and **Morch** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE**). **GE**^{piano} has a probably mistaken c^2 , which in the proofs of **FE**^{piano} (\rightarrow **EE**) was replaced by the e^1 - c^2 sixth. We do not take into consideration this version since it disturbs the harmonic progression consistent in $\frac{1}{2}$ **A** and is incompatible with the sound of the orchestra.

Bar 190 For the strings motif **A** (\rightarrow **GE**^{piano}) gives *pp*. Chopin most probably removed this marking in the proofs of **FE**^{piano} (\rightarrow **EE**). **Morch** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE**) contains *p*.

Bars 195-196 In **A** *cresc.* leads only to **ff** at the beginning of bar 195. In the proofs of **FE**^{piano} (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin extended it to the end of bar 196.

The solo piano part

p. 29 Bar 208 R.H. In **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) the db^2 appoggiatura was mistakenly placed after a chord. Chopin corrected this error in **FED**.

p. 30 Bar 216 The last three semiquavers in **A** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE**) do not have accidentals. This imprecision of the script is characteristic especially for Chopin's earlier compositions.

Bar 219 R.H. In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) the sign of the accent was unnecessarily placed also at the beginning of the bar.

p. 31 Bar 220 L.H. The last two quavers in **A** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE**) are cb^1 and d^1 . In **EE** this version, incomprehensible from the viewpoint of sonority, was changed – in an analogy to bar 218 – to $c\sharp^1-d^1$. A similar alteration was introduced in **GE2** (written as db^1-d^1) and in the overwhelming majority of the later collected editions. Strict analogy was not, however, Chopin's intention as testified by his handwritten correction in **FED**: writing \flat and \flat , Chopin altered both notes to c^1-db^1 . We give this version, which does not produce musical or source doubts, as the only one. In our edition it appears in print for the first time.

Bar 224 R.H. We give the version corrected by Chopin in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**). Changes of rhythm and articulation visible in **A** make it possible to decipher the two earlier editions of this passage:



All three versions, which are rather interpretation variants, prove that Chopin sought the most suitable way of performing and recording this passage, and, at the same time, provide an insight into some of the secrets of his *rubato*.

p. 32 Bar 227 R.H. In **A** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE1**) there are no accidentals next to the semiquavers gb and a . In the proofs of **FE2** flats for gb^2 and gb^3 were added. **EE** lacks these signs, which probably means that they were added in the last phase of the proofreading.

Bar 230 R.H. The eleventh semiquaver in **A** is mistakenly ab , amended in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**). Another error could be the presence of ab as the fifteenth semiquaver in **FE**. This is the way it was treated in **EE** where it was changed to f . We give the **FE** version as a variant, since Chopin's correction is also possible – ab the penultimate note is reasonably linked with the first chord of the next bar.

p. 33 Bar 233 L.H. The third group of semiquavers in **FE** has f instead of db . This mistake was corrected in **EE** and **FES**.

Bar 233 and 235 R.H. Chopin added fingering above the first two semiquavers in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).

Bar 234, 236, 238 and 240 L.H. Only **A** has accents below semiquavers written on the upper staff.

Bar 237 **A** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) has fingering in the L.H. on the second beat. Chopin added fingering below the first two semiquavers in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) and above them (for the R.H.) in **FED**.

p. 35 Bar 247 **ff** occurs in **A**. In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) it was mistakenly deciphered as **f**.



L.H. The semiquaver third from the end in **GE** is mistakenly f^1 , which in **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) was corrected to db^1 , as in **A**.

Bar 249 **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) has erroneously **f** instead of **ff**.

The accompanying piano part

p. 36 Bars 255-256 R.H. **M**^{orch} does not have an accidental prior to the top note in the chord on the second beat (part of the first violins) and thus it should be read as db^1 , which we give as the main text. Since it is impossible to eliminate completely the possibility of an omission of \flat we also permit a version with d^1 . The naturals in both bars were added in **GE**^{orch} (\rightarrow **FE**^{orch}), but the revision of the parts was certainly not conducted by Chopin.

The solo piano part

p. 37 Bar 272 R.H. In **A** the arpeggio with grace-notes is written as follows: , which in **GE** was altered to . The notation we accept was introduced by Chopin in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**). All three scripts certainly denote uniform performance, described in the *Performance Commentary*.

p. 38 Bar 275 R.H. **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) overlooked \flat prior to the second note of the run.

R.H. The sources do not have accidentals before the sixth and tenth note in the run (in accordance with the convention binding in Chopin's time the eventual sign was required only prior to the sixth note). From a formal point of view we should read bb^2 and bb^3 , but in upward arpeggios Chopin as a rule used raised passing notes (cf. e. g., bar 87, 95, 143, 175-178, 247-248, 331-334 in this movement), which decisively speaks in favour of b^2 and b^3 . We give both possibilities, awarding priority to the version based on the assumption that Chopin's script does not contain an error.

Bar 280 L.H. The main text comes from **A**, and the version given in the footnote is contained in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**). **GE** does not have any sort of traces of alterations, which suggests a mistake committed by the engraver. The doubling of eb on the fourth beat appears to be superfluous: the note eb occurs in the cello part, and the introduction of octaves from the first chord in bar 281 subtly accentuates the entrée of the reinforced repetition of the first phrase of the theme. In the appropriate bar of the exposition (bar 132) the note eb does not appear in the solo part in any of the sources.

Bars 282-283 L.H. The tie which in **A** sustains the note eb , in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) incorrectly links eb and bb . Cf. bars 134-135.

Bar 283 R.H. The main text comes from **A**, the version in the footnote was introduced in the proofs of **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**). The removal of c^1 gives rise to stylistic doubts – leaving the unresolved db^1 from the first half of the bar deforms the line of the accompanying quaver voice. The fact that the chord on the third beat in **GE** contains visible traces of removing the superfluous note g^2 entitles us to presume that a misunderstanding took place during the correction of some sort of a more serious error. Cf. bar 135.

L.H. In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) the sign ff was mistakenly deciphered as **p** referring to the $ab-eb^1$ fifth. Cf. commentary to bar 121.

Bar 285 L.H. The sixth quaver in **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) is mistakenly db instead of f .

p. 39 Bar 287 L.H. The last quaver in **FE** is erroneously g instead of ab .

Bar 290 R.H. The main text comes from **A**, the version in the footnote is contained in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**). The omission of c^2 (written in **A** without a precautionary \flat) could be a mistake of the engraver, who repeated the two-voice notation of the melodic notes from the previous bar. Cf. bar 142.


p. 41 Bar 300 R.H. **FE** mistakenly repeated two preceding notes, f^1 and bb^1 , on the sixth and seventh semiquaver.

- p. 42 **Bar 315** R.H. Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed the top note on the tenth semiquaver from gb^2 to f^2 .

Bar 316 and 324 L.H. **A** contains precautionary \flat before G at the beginning of those bars. The absence of those signs in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) could testify to their later addition in **A** (different handwriting?). Cf. commentary to bar 322.

- p. 43 **Bar 318** R.H. Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily altered the top note on the second semiquaver from eb^2 to f^2 .

Bar 320 R.H. The first chord in **A** is written incorrectly as:



(the dot next to eb^2 is dubious). We accept a solution analogous to bar 170. In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) both notes of the eb^2-ab^2 fourth have the value of a quaver with two dots.

Bar 322 On the first beat **A** has three \flat lowering g to gb . The absence of those signs in **GE** could indicate their later addition in **A** (cf. commentary to bar 316 and 324). In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) all four flats necessary in this bar were added.

- p. 44 **Bar 328** In **A** there are no accidentals before the eighth semiquaver in the L.H. and the eleventh semiquaver in the R.H. A flat lowering g^2 to a gb^2 on the eighth semiquaver was added in **GE**. In **FE** this sign was probably first placed mistakenly three notes further on, and then both places were suitably amended. **EE** contains the correct version.

Bar 330 R.H. The third semiquaver in **FE** is db , most probably by mistake.

- p. 45 **Bar 335** **ff** was added by Chopin in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**). The dynamic markings added in **FE** at the end of this movement could be recognised as a supplement to the markings in **A**. Cf. commentaries to bar 337 and 341.

Bars 335-336 L.H. In **A** the trilled note is mistakenly c^2 . A similar error, consisting of writing the upper second of the trilled note, which begins the performance of the trill, instead of the trilled note itself was made by Chopin also in *Bolero* Op. 19, bar 187 and *Sonata in Bb minor* Op. 35, second movement, bar 20. In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) c^2 was changed to bb^1 not only in bar 335, but also – possibly due to a misunderstanding – at the beginning of bar 336.

Both parts

Bar 337 **fs** in the solo part as well as **ff** and the accent on the second octave in the L.H. come from **A**. They were overlooked in **GE**^{piano} and only partially supplemented by Chopin in the proofs of **FE**^{piano} (\rightarrow **EE**) by adding **f**.

The accompanying piano part

Bar 341 **p** and — were added by Chopin in the proofs of **FE**^{piano} (\rightarrow **EE**). See commentary to bar 335.

II. Larghetto

The solo piano part

- p. 46 **Bar 6** R.H. In each source the notation of the second half of the bar is different:



A 
GE 




FE 
EE 

Since each script is incorrect from the viewpoint of rhythm it appears doubtful whether we could recognise the version of any of the editions as amended by Chopin. This is the reason why as the point of departure we accept the notation in **A**, removing the second dot prolonging eb^1 (the simplest of all possible corrections, see also commentary to the first movement, bar 320). Owing to the fermata and the improvised and free character of the whole bar, this change has, for all practical purposes, no impact upon execution.

Bar 7, 9, 26 and 75 In **FED** Chopin added signs enjoining the commencement of the ornament simultaneously with the bass note.

Bar 8 R.H. **A** contains mistaken rhythmic values:



Accepting the natural premise that the slur and the beam of the fourth, fifth and sixth note of the bar denote a semiquaver triplet, we ascertain that the bar consists of nine quavers. The mistake made by Chopin (committed presumably as a consequence of corrections in **A**) can be perceived in the notation of the first, second or last beat:



In **A** the alignment of the R.H. part in relation to the quavers in the L.H. indicates unambiguously that the second of the given schemes is the one which corresponds to Chopin's intention; this is the reason why we give this version as the only one.

GE (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) repeated without any alterations the mistaken rhythmic values from **A**. Nonetheless, they were arranged in such a manner that eight semiquavers uniformly fill the second half of the bar. In **GE2** this version was revised by removing the then unnecessary dots prolonging ab^2 on the second beat. This is certainly a misreading since the authentic prolongation dots together with the accent indicate the unquestionably syncopated character of this note.

L.H. On the fifth quaver **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) mistakenly contains the additional note c^1 . Cf. bar 27 and 76.

Bar 13 and 32 R.H. In **A** the demisemiquaver in both bars is the penultimate note g^3 . In bar 32 this version is contained also in **GE**. In bar 13 in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) and bar 32 in **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) the value of the demisemiquaver was given – most probably as a result of the engravers' errors – to the last note. Cf. commentaries to bar 41 and 81.

Bar 15 L.H. Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily omitted the tie sustaining ab , probably because Chopin did not mark the prolongation of this note in the chord on the third quaver. This sort of simplified script is encountered also in other Chopin's works: *Polonaise in C minor* Op. 40 no. 2, bar 82 and 109 or *Allegro de Concert* Op. 46, bar 162 and 163.

Bar 17 R.H. In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) the vertical arc on the fourth beat marking the arpeggio of the c^2-c^3 octave was mistakenly written as encompassing a grace-note, which altered its meaning. This type of script, enjoining a simultaneous sounding of an octave after a grace-note, is contained in the majority of the later collected editions. In some of these editions the grace-note was arbitrarily linked with the bottom note of the octave. Cf. commentary to bar 85.

Bar 18 and 86 R.H. **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) omitted accents in the form of horizontal strokes perhaps because their application was not yet universal. (Accents of this sort were added by Chopin in a pupil's copy of *Ballade in G minor* Op. 23, bar 194, 196 and 198.)

- p. 47 **Bar 20** R.H. On the third beat **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) has the $eb^1-ab^1-c^2$ chord. Chopin removed ab^1 in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).
R.H. In the last chord **GE** contains a^1 instead of c^2 . This is most probably a mistake of the engraver, revised by adding \flat . In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin restored the version from **A**.

Bar 21 The main text comes from **A**. **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) has neither accents nor *dim.* and the slurs in the R.H. are arranged differently. It is very unlikely that any of those changes was made by Chopin. Nonetheless, in **FED** he added **pp** on the second quaver of the bar, which should be recognised as at least a partial acceptance of the version from the first editions. We give this supplemented version in the footnote.

Bars 21-22 In **A** the naturals raising $d\flat$ to d do not appear until the fourth crotchet in bar 22, which was corrected in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**).

- p. 48 **Bar 24** R.H. Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily altered the last note from db^3 to f^3 .

Bar 25 L.H. The first chord in **A** is mistakenly Eb_1-G_1-Eb-G . Chopin removed Eb_1 in the proofs of **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**). **GE2** gives G_1-Bb_1-Eb-G .

Bar 27 R.H. After the first semiquaver the sources contain a quaver rest. Since the "thrifty" rhythmic notation characteristic for Chopin can, in our opinion, hinder a proper deciphering of the rhythm, we change γ to two semiquaver rests.

- p. 49 **Bar 28** R.H. In **A** the ornament before db^3 on the second beat amounts to four semiquavers (with two f'). In the proofs of **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) Chopin removed the second note, but this was probably a mistakenly engraved ab^1 . Hence, Chopin's intention to remove the correct note (f') remains uncertain.
R.H. As the second small semiquaver before the passage in the second half of the bar **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) mistakenly has c^2 instead of eb^2 .

Bar 33 and 82 L.H. At the beginning of the bar **A** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE**) does not have Eb_1 , the bottom note of the octave. Chopin added it in **A** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**; in the latter edition it was added also in bar 82) written as δ , when this phrase first appeared in bar 14. It is most likely that this correction can be applied also in the discussed bars since the omission of one of several recurring fragments while introducing corrections is one of Chopin's frequent mistakes. Cf. commentary to bar 89. It must be kept in mind that while writing the *Concerto* in Warsaw (see *The Order of the Concertos* at the beginning of this commentary) Chopin practically did not have the note Eb_1 at his disposal because the range of his piano extended only to F_1 .

- p. 50 **Bar 36** L.H. The graphic distinction of the inner voice of the three last chords with a separate beam comes from the editors. This solution was necessary to mark that it is precisely this progress that is designated by the sign \longleftarrow written by Chopin in **A** between the notes of the chords in a way impossible to recreate in print.

Bar 39 R.H. In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) the first grace-note before the trill on the fourth beat is mistakenly ab^2 . In **FES** Chopin restored bb^2 , which is found in **A**.

Bar 40 The sign \longleftarrow given in the main text comes from **A**. In **GE** it was placed in the first part of the run, and in **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) it was changed to \longleftarrow . The shifting of the hairpin in **GE** was, in all likelihood, accidental, but the alteration in **FE** could have been introduced by Chopin, although we cannot exclude the possibility that it is also a mistake committed by the engraver

(cf. commentary to *Variations* Op. 12, bar 94). In the footnote we give the version from **FE**.

R.H. The sources do not contain \flat prior to the last note in the first half of the bar.

Bar 41 R.H. Changes in the pitch of the second note in particular sources testify to Chopin's wavering. **A** has bb^1 , **GE** – bbb^1 , in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin restored bb^1 , and in **FED** he added bb . This is the reason why we give both versions. The composer's indecision appears to pertain to the fundamental structure of the phrase: the beginning of the bar is melodically connected with the preceding figure containing bbb^1 , and harmonically inclines towards the successive chord (on the fourth beat of bar 41), containing bb . A melodic motif tantamount to the variant version Chopin used against the background of a similar harmony in *Ma-zurka in A minor* Dbop. 42B, bar 52.

L.H. **GE** overlooked cb^1 on the third and fifth quaver of the bar. Chopin corrected this error in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).


R.H. We write the figure ending the bar with semiquavers, as in **A** (see commentary to the first movement, bar 93). In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) the last note was mistakenly given the value of a demisemiquaver (a reduction of the value of the last note after a rest was frequently encountered in figures of this type – e. g. in bars 37-38 – and could have been conducted by the engraver "automatically", cf. commentaries to bar 81, as well as 13 and 32). The majority of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed the notation of this figure in assorted ways, and usually used the version from the first editions as a point of departure.

- p. 51 **Bar 43** In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin added flats restoring Bb and bb on the fourth beat. They were mistakenly placed not until the eighth demisemiquaver.

Bars 45-72 In **FES** Chopin wrote a simplified reduction of the orchestra accompaniment to the recitative, which could be applied by performing this movement solo. This type of alternative L.H. parts for fragments rendered *unisono* was given by Chopin also in the printed versions of *Variations* Op. 2 and *Krakowiak* Op. 14. In the *Concerto* Chopin replaced the figurate harmonic accompaniment of the original L.H. part as well as supplemented or changed the R.H. part (bar 45, 49-50, 58-60). We give this text in the version for one piano, volume 14 **A XIIIb**.

- p. 53 **Bar 63** In **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) dots prolonging the first quaver are missing in both hands parts.
In some of the later collected editions the grace-notes beginning the trill (in both hands) were arbitrarily repeated as its ending.

Bar 65 Before the sixth semiquaver in the second half of the bar in **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) there are no \flat lowering d to $d\flat$ in both hands. Chopin supplemented them in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).

- p. 54 **Bar 68** We shift the second quaver slightly to the right, as Chopin wrote in **A**. This notation may signify that he foresaw the rhythm  (in contemporary notation). See commentary to bar 433 and 437 in the third movement of the *Concerto*.

Bar 69 **A** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE**) has no \flat lowering g to $g\flat$ before the penultimate note in both hands; this is an obvious oversight by Chopin.

Bars 72-74 R.H. From the last quaver in bar 72 to the end of bar 74 **A** does not have an 8^{va} sign (bar 74 is written an octave lower), so that the whole phrase is written an octave too low.

- p. 55 **Bar 76** The main text comes from **A**, the variant – from **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**). We cannot exclude the possibility of Chopin's correction in **GE** (cf. commentary to the first movement, bar 87), but a mistake made by the engraver seems much more probable – cf. analogous bar 8 and 27, where g^2 does not appear until the end of the bar.

Bar 77 R.H. In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin gave the fingering for the first chord.

L.H. GE (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) contains the Bb - gb sixth on the sixth quaver. This is the outcome of a misreading of **A**: originally, the stem of gb ended at the level of the note Bb (later, Chopin extended it to a beam running below); the end of this stem is characteristically widened (the result of a rapid transference of the pen elsewhere), which the engraver mistakenly took for a note (there are hundreds of such broadening or "hooks" in **A**). Chopin wished to correct this error and mistakenly deleted gb in **FES**.

Bar 79 R.H. The note g^3 on the fourth quaver in **A** mistakenly has the value of a crotchet.

Bars 79-80 R.H. The repetition or sustaining of f^1 at the beginning of bar 80 gives rise to doubts since despite a distinct tie this note is accented in **A**. Presumably, Chopin changed his opinion and added one of the markings – the tie or the accent – later, without noticing the resultant vagueness.

The absence of the accent in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) could be the outcome of an ordinary oversight and not Chopin's proofreading.

p. 56

Bar 80 Variants in both hands come from **A** (Chopin mistakenly marked a group of eight notes on the third quaver as a demi-semiquaver septuplet). In **GE** this version is written with mistakes on the third beat: d^3 (with a superfluous \sharp) was repeated as a third semiquaver while \sim above the fourth semiquaver and the dotted rhythm at the end of this figure were overlooked. The main text comes from **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**). Changes in the second half of the bar were certainly introduced by Chopin in the proofs of **FE1**, as confirmed by visible traces of corrections in print. On the other hand, traces of this sort cannot be noticed on the third quaver of the bar, making it necessary to take into consideration also the possible omission of c^2 in this figure.

R.H. Only **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) contains an accent below f^4 . It is difficult to say whether in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) it was removed or omitted.

Bar 81 R.H. Only **A** has a tie sustaining c^2 at the beginning of the bar. Its absence in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) can be explained both as an oversight of the engraver or the result of Chopin's proofreading. **L.H.** In the chord on the seventh quaver **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) overlooked bb . Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed the resultant ab - f^1 sixth to an ab - db^1 fourth.

R.H. In **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) the figure closing the bar is as follows:



We give the version amended by Chopin in **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).

The last note in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) is mistakenly written as a hemidemisemiquaver (cf. commentary to bar 41).

Bar 82 R.H. The tie sustaining bb^2 at the beginning of the bar is contained only in **A** (and **GE2**). It is difficult to say whether it was overlooked in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) or removed by Chopin in the proofs.

Bar 83 L.H. In the second half of the bar **FE** mistakenly has a c^1 - db^1 second.

R.H. **A** erroneously contains an eb^2 - c^3 sixth on the fourth beat. **GE** (\rightarrow **FE**) also mistakenly has a c^2 - c^3 octave. Chopin wrote a correct version (analogous to bar 15) into all three extant pupil's copies; it is also in **EE** and **GE2**.

Bar 85 R.H. On the fourth beat **A** has a grace-note and an arpeggio (in the form of a vertical arc), as in bar 17. **GE** omitted the arpeggio sign. The alternative notation of the ornament, given by us, was introduced by the composer in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**). Both Chopin's scripts denote the same execution.

Bar 87 R.H. f was added by Chopin in **FED**.

R.H. The last chord in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) does not have eb^2 . This is most possibly an oversight, cf. bar 19.

p. 57

Bar 89 Chopin added the marking *appassionato* in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).

L.H. The octave at the beginning of the bar – written as δ – is found only in **A**. Its absence in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) is possibly the result of an oversight, although we cannot totally exclude Chopin's proofreading.

L.H. In the penultimate quaver **GE** overlooked c^1 . Chopin supplemented the missing note in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).

Bar 90 R.H. Chopin wrote a rather illegible annotation more or less on the second quaver of the bar in **FED**. Presumably, it relates to dynamic, although it is difficult to describe its meaning and purpose.

III. Allegro vivace

p. 58

Bars 5-6 L.H. The text from **A** (given by us) was recreated in **GE**

(\rightarrow **FE**) with errors: (in **EE** the second f^1 was removed). Probably for this reason some later collected editions introduced here the version from analogous bars 329-330.

Bar 11 R.H. At the beginning of the bar **A** contains the grace-note ab^1 - f^2 (our variant). Imprecise notation (the absence of a section of the stem linking both notes of the sixth) is the reason why only the upper note f^2 was printed in **GE**. Chopin corrected this mistake in **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) in a manner analogous to bar 27, which we accept in the main text.

The accompanying piano part

Bar 19 and 343 R.H. The second note of the melody in **A** (\rightarrow **GE**^{piano} \rightarrow **FE**^{piano}) is eb^2 . **Morch** (\rightarrow **FE**^{orch} \rightarrow **GE**^{orch}) also has eb^2 in the part of the first violins. In the last phase of proofreading **FE2** Chopin added naturals raising eb^2 to e^2 (they are absent in **EE**). In **ReF** \sharp was added later (in pencil; probably after a comparison with **FE2**^{piano}). In all versions of the *Concerto* we accept the **FE2**^{piano} version amended by Chopin as the last and most likely the final one.

The solo piano part

p. 59

Bar 27 In **FED** Chopin marked the simultaneous sounding of the first grace-note with the bass note.

Bars 30-32 and 374-376 L.H. At the beginning of these bars **A** has chords in which the dyads of the orchestra accompaniment are written in smaller script below the solo part: (in bar 376 Chopin wrote only the note of the solo part). The different sizes went unnoticed in **GE**, and all the notes of the chords were printed in identical typeface. In **FE** Chopin corrected this error in bars 374-376 by distinguishing even more markedly the solo part from the accompaniment (and supplementing the dyad in bar 376 (**FE1** mistakenly added db^1 - f^1 , which was amended to c^1 - f^1 in **FE2**). **EE** repeated the text from **FE2**, without, however, preserving the different sizes of the notes. All the later collected editions followed the example of **GE** and erroneously included the dyads of the accompaniment into the solo piano part.

p. 61

Bar 65 R.H. **A** does not have an δ^{va} sign, a mistake corrected already in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**).

Bar 68 and 76 On the second beat **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) has the octave F - f in bar 68 and Eb - eb in bar 76, on the first beat in bar 76 it has Eb . We give the version introduced by Chopin in **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).

p. 43 **Bar 75 L.H.** At the beginning of the bar **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) has $E\flat$. In the proofs of **FE1** Chopin changed it to $G\flat$ (\flat indispensable next to this note was not added until **FE2** (\rightarrow **EE**)). The majority of the later collected editions arbitrarily introduced the octave $E\flat_1-E\flat$ with the top note tied to the last $E\flat$ in the previous bar (by analogy to bar 67).

Bar 77 L.H. The last chord in **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) is $a-e\flat^1-g\flat^1-a^1$, and in **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) – $a-g\flat^1-a^1$. In **FE** the chord was corrected twice (in **FE1** the bottom note is g), but it remains uncertain whether the removal of $e\flat^1$ was the aim of those corrections or the accidental effect of an imprecise amendment of a more serious error.

Bar 78 and 79 We give dynamic markings from **A**. In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) p in bar 79 was mistakenly read as f . Moreover, f was added at the beginning of bar 78 (**FE** omitted the accent), which could have been an unfinished attempt at correcting the mistake from bar 79: Chopin could have wished to transfer this marking to bar 78, which was realised “partially” by adding a new sign without removing the old one.

p. 62 **Bars 81-82 L.H.** The fingering written by Chopin comes from **A**. **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) omitted the figures **1** (the one in bar 82 was mistakenly deciphered as a *staccato* dot).

p. 63 **Bar 96 A** does not have the sign \ast . The sign in parentheses comes from **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**); it is uncertain whether it was added by Chopin. The sign in brackets, proposed by the editors, is justified by the authentic pedalling in bars 85-88.

Bars 102-103 R.H. The second and third triplet in bar 102 as well as first and second triplet in bar 103 in **GE** were mistakenly written an octave higher.

p. 64 **Bar 113 and 115 R.H.** The sources lack \flat prior to the penultimate notes.

p. 65 **Bar 119 R.H.** The penultimate quaver in **A** is g^2 alone. This is most probably an oversight by Chopin, which he amended in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**).

Bar 124 On the fourth quaver **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) does not have \flat lowering g^1 and g^2 to $g\flat^1$ and $g\flat^2$. In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin supplemented them (together with precautionary naturals before g in bar 125).

The accompanying piano part

p. 66 **Bars 141-144 L.H.** The main text comes from **A** (\rightarrow **GE**^{piano} \rightarrow **FE**^{piano} \rightarrow **EE**), and the variant corresponds to the orchestra version – **ReF** as well as the parts of the violas and cellos in **M**^{orch} (\rightarrow **GE**^{orch} \rightarrow **EE**^{orch}). It is most likely that Chopin intentionally differentiated these four bars in versions for the solo piano and orchestra, taking into consideration differences between the sound of the piano and the strings (the only such instance in both *Concertos*).

The solo piano part

p. 68 **Bars 177-189 and 353-360 L.H.** The slurs and dots accepted by us were introduced, most probably by Chopin, in the proofs of **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**). **A** does not contain dots, and the slurs are marked unclearly so that it is uncertain whether they are to encompass whole bars or only the second and third crotchet (they are absent in bars 354-356 and 358-360).

p. 69 **Bar 191 L.H.** On the second beat **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) has the $c^1-e\flat^1-ab^1$ chord, which in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin altered to $ab-c^1-ab^1$.

p. 70 **Bar 210 L.H.** The main text comes from **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**), where it could have been introduced by Chopin in the proofs. The variant is the **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) version.

p. 71 **Bar 217 L.H.** The sources of the solo part – **A** (\rightarrow **GE**^{piano} \rightarrow **FE**^{piano} \rightarrow **EE**) – have F in the bass. At the same time, the fundamental bass note in the orchestra part – **ReF** and **M**^{orch} (\rightarrow **GE**^{orch}) – is indubitable G . At the beginning of the bar this gives an interval of the second as the foundation of harmony; it is difficult to accept that Chopin intended this in such an accompaniment. It is most likely that while writing **A** Chopin envisaged only the solo part (the orchestral parts in $\frac{1}{2}$ **A** were written by someone else), in which the real bass line in bars 213-218 is arranged as follows (smaller notes were used for writing the harmonic scheme of the higher voices):



Taking into consideration the whole sonority with the orchestra, the bass note in bar 217 must be G , since the lower sounds of the piano create, together with the cellos and double basses, the following progression:




There are no premises for believing that Chopin wished to change the fundamental bass note from G to F in this version. The necessity of solving the seventh would require altering the root also in the next bar (to $E\flat$), which we do not find in any of the sources (such a change was introduced in some of the later collected editions).

Bar 219 R.H. The seventh quaver in **A** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE1**) is g^1 (**A** shows that Chopin originally wrote another note, most probably c^2). We give $b\flat^1$, introduced by Chopin in **FE2** (\rightarrow **EE**).

Bars 220-221 L.H. **A** has the following version:



which in **GE** was noted as:



We give the text corrected by Chopin in **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).

p. 72 **Bar 237 R.H.** \flat before f^3 was added in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).

p. 73 **Bar 243 L.H.** The last chord in **FE** has a superfluous quaver flag, possibly owing to a misunderstanding during the proofreading (see below).

Bars 243-244 L.H. **A** contains the following version (in smaller type-face we give the cello and double bass parts according to the concurrent version unaltered by Chopin in **ReF**, **M**^{orch} and **GE**^{orch}):



In **GE** the solo piano part was changed as follows:



The final version, accepted by us, was introduced by Chopin in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**). Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily compiled fragments of the **GE** and **FE** version.

Bar 248 L.H. In **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) f on the first beat has the value of a dotted minim, and the $e\flat^1-ab^1$ fourth – that of a minim. We give the rhythmic values amended by Chopin in **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).

Bar 252 L.H. On the second beat **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) mistakenly has the cb^1ab^1 sixth. We give the indisputable version from **A** (\rightarrow **GE**).

Bar 253 In the sources the sign *p* is at the end of this bar. Chopin probably applied an old convention of placing the sign near the middle of its mandatory range (in this case: bars 253-254).

- p. 74 Bar 256 R.H. On the sixth and seventh quaver **FED** has a pencilled annotation which could signify sustaining the sixth quaver:



We do not take these supplements into consideration since the deciphered version is uncertain, and its sound effect – taking into account the authentic pedal markings – imperceptible.

Both parts

t. 260 $\frac{1}{2}$ **A** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) contains the following version (the solo piano part is in Chopin's handwriting, and the strings chord is in another hand):

Attention is drawn to the mistaken record of the trill on eb^3 (the absence of an accidental above this trill denotes f^2 as the upper note, which is obvious nonsense). The suspicion of an error is also suggested by the inept voice-leading, in which the solo piano takes on the orchestral eb^1 with a delay and only in the top voice. **ReF** makes it possible to identify this mistake: the part of the second violins should contain not eb^1 , but fb^1 . The version with fb^1 appears to correspond to Chopin's intention, and we give it in the main text.

The not completely parallel voice-leading occurring only in the solo part – db^1 in the L.H. passes directly to eb^1 in bar 261, while db^3 passes to eb^3 in the R.H. *via* eb^3 – is a phenomenon encountered in several compositions by Chopin, such as *Concerto in E minor* Op. 11, second movement, bar 29 and third movement, bars 279-280, *Waltz in Gb* NE 42, bar 56, *Fantaisie in F minor* Op. 49, bar 104 and 273 and possibly *Polonaise in C# minor* Op. 26 no. 1, bars 69-70. A similar situation took place also in bars 243-244 of this movement of the *Concerto*, in which Chopin finally smoothed out the harmonic progression (see commentary to those bars). Taking into consideration the above correction made by the composer, and the fact that the combination of db^1 and eb^3 , multiplied by a trill and not immersed into the chord texture, appears more distinctly in the discussed passage, we propose the version given as the variant, in which a harmonically smoothed sonority is achieved at the cost of a slight modification of the rhythm (alleviated by the fermata).

Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed db^1 to d^1 in the triplet on the second beat, deforming the characteristic melodic motif in the L.H.

The solo piano part

- p. 76 Bar 285 and 287 **A** has *cresc.* in bar 285, prolonged with dashes to the end of bar 289. In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) this marking appears twice: in bar 285 and 287 (the dashes were overlooked). The repetition of the marking, unjustified here, probably testifies to Chopin's correction in **GE**. Two possibilities come to mind: — Chopin shifted *cresc.* to bar 287, but the correction remained unfinished and the earlier printed marking was unnecessarily left (cf. commentary to bar 78 and 79);

— Chopin restored *cresc.* in bar 285, leaving the marking mistakenly printed in bar 287 as consistent with the preceding one.

Bar 296 L.H. The last note in **A** is mistakenly ab^1 .

Both parts

- p. 77 Bar 313 and 325 Only **Morch** (\rightarrow **GEorch** \rightarrow **FEorch**) contains the markings *ritenuto* in bar 313 and *a tempo* in bar 325.

The solo piano part

- p. 78 Bar 327 R.H. **FE** has mistakenly the grace-note ab^1 .
- p. 79 Bar 329 L.H. There is no \sharp before the third third in **A** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**). An oversight by Chopin is proved by a, concurrently appearing in **ReF** and **Morch** (\rightarrow **GEorch**). Cf. also bar 5.

Bars 330-331 L.H. Ties sustaining the $bb-db^1$ third were added by Chopin in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).

Bar 337 L.H. In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) c^1 was overlooked on the first beat.

Bars 337-340 R.H. As a result of the overlapping errors made by Chopin and the engravers none of the sources contains the correct text:

- in **A** the line delineating the range of the *all'ottava* sign, which started on the second beat in bar 337, ends with the last quaver in bar 339; the word *loco*, used by Chopin to denote a return to the normal pitch, is also missing;
- **GE** added to the **A** notation a mistaken beginning of the 8^{va} sign, which was shifted above the first crotchet in bar 337;
- in **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) the whole 8^{va} was removed.


The discussed bars end the 16-bar period (bars 325-340), comprising particularly its melodic close. Their transference an octave higher than in analogous bars 1-16 deforms the course of the melodic line of the theme. Notation **A** is, therefore, unquestionably incorrect. This conclusion is confirmed by the later correction of **FE**, despite the fact that the proofreading was imprecise and unnecessarily eliminated the 8^{va} sign above the second crotchet in bar 337 (the characteristic leap to the f^3-f^4 octave plays an important role in this part of the *Concerto* – cf. bar 13, 29-32 and 369-376).

Bar 340 L.H. The small note *F*, beginning the reduction of the orchestral *Tutti*, is written in **A** at the beginning of the bar below the *f* ending the solo part. In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) this note was mistakenly included into the solo part.

- p. 80 Bar 352 R.H. **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) does not have the note d^2 at the beginning of the bar. Chopin added it in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).

Bar 356 R.H. The penultimate note in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) is mistakenly g^2 . Chopin restored bb^2 in the proofs of **FE** \rightarrow **EE**.

Bar 366 and 368 L.H. In these bars the sound of the last crotchets was shaped in three phases. **A** contains the following version:



In **GE** Chopin altered the bottom notes of the chords to *B* in bar 366 and *c* in bar 368:



In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin introduced the final version, harmonically the smoothest and the most convenient from the viewpoint of execution.

- p. 81 Bar 369 L.H. Some of the later collected editions arbitrarily changed the highest chord note at the beginning of the bar to f^1 .

p. 82 **Bar 388** R.H. The sources do not have an accidental before the bottom note of the third quaver, which should be read as eb^2 . Some of the later collected editions added \flat prior to that note. There are no sufficient bases, however, to regard the notation in the sources as incorrect (cf. the beginning of this progression with $c^3eb^3ab^3$).

p. 83 **Bars 415-417** R.H. **A** does not have an g^{va} sign from the second beat in bar 415 to the first beat in bar 417.

Bar 415, 423, 455 and 463 L.H. On the penultimate quavers of the bars **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) has $d\sharp^2$ (single or in a chord). In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin changed the script of those notes to eb^2 .

Bar 416 **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) has a crotchet $g\sharp^2$ (R.H.) and a quaver $g\sharp^1b^1$ (L.H.). In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin altered them to ab^2 and ab^1b^1 .

L.H. In the chord at the end of the bar **A** (\rightarrow **GE**) has g^1 as the bottom note. In the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin changed it to e^1 .

p. 84 **Bar 422** L.H. On the third beat **A** has the $bb-f^1$ fifth. This is a remnant of an earlier version of the bar, with db in the bass (Chopin deleted this db on the first beat and wrote Bb). In **GE** (\rightarrow **FE1**) Chopin changed the fifth to a third, but b before the bottom note was forgotten in an inaccurate correction. In the proofs of **FE2** the sign was mistakenly supplemented prior to f^1 . **EE** has the correct text.

Bars 432-433 R.H. **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**) most probably overlooked the tie sustaining f^2 .

p. 85 **Bar 433 and 437** R.H. The treatment of the quavers on the first beat of those bars as the first and third in a quaver triplet seems to be recommended both for musical reasons (the triplet motion rules indivisibly in the coda of this movement of the *Concerto*), and for the purposes of execution (transference of the hand). We encounter this type of notation in several of Chopin's compositions, e. g. in *Sonata in B minor* Op. 58, first movement, bar 54, first crotchet in the R.H. and fourth crotchet in the L.H. In the latter Chopin added in a pupil's copy a rest between two quavers (cf. *Performance Commentary* and *Source Commentary* about this bar).

Bar 435 It would be difficult to say whether Chopin wished to mark the pedalling in this bar. Initially, bars 435-436 in **A** had pedal markings (identical as in the following bars). Then Chopin deleted both signs in bar 436 and \ast in 435. We do not know, therefore, if the mistake in the last bar consisted of deleting \ast or leaving ped .

p. 88 **Bar 476** R.H. Chopin wavered as regards the pitch of the last quaver. Deletions in **A** testify to two changes of decision: Chopin started with g^2 , altered it to d^2 , and then returned to g^2 . **GE** has g^2 , but in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**) Chopin changed it once again to d^2 . In the main text we give his last decision.

p. 89 **Bar 485** R.H. **GE** overlooked a^3 and a^2 on the first and fourth quaver of the bar. Chopin supplemented the missing notes in the proofs of **FE** (\rightarrow **EE**).

Bar 486 R.H. The last quaver in **A** (\rightarrow **GE** \rightarrow **FE1**) is d^2 . Chopin changed it to e^2 in the proofs of **FE2** (\rightarrow **EE**).

Bars 489-490 Chopin carefully wrote the combination of the trill and tremolando (cf. first movement, bar 335) in notes, describing even the number of strokes (three groups with four strokes each).

He erred, however, by marking their value as demisemiquavers instead of semiquavers. This mistake was revised in **GE** (\rightarrow **FE** \rightarrow **EE**), increasing the number of strokes to eight in each group, which is nonsense (it cannot be played in the tempo marked by Chopin, or even in one close to it).

The accompanying piano part

Bars 491-492 The sources contain an indubitably flawed text, different in each source. The reason for the divergences and mistakes was probably the unclear notation in **[SI]** and Chopin's only partial participation in editing the orchestra part. Here are the source versions:

ReF

The bottom notes C, written in parentheses, are deleted with a pencil. Attention is drawn also to the distinctly mistaken second chord in the R.H.

Morch (\rightarrow **GE**orch)

The sound of the fourth chord, which contains neither the note f , present in **ReF** and **FE2**^{piano}, nor the sound bb occurring in **A** (\rightarrow **GE**^{piano} \rightarrow **FE**^{piano} \rightarrow **EE**), gives rise to doubts. Emphasis should be also placed on the full, four-note seventh chord occurring as the last one.

A

It should be stressed that the visible part of this fragment is not in Chopin's handwriting. Unquestionable errors include d^1 instead of c^1 in the fourth chord, and the absence of bb in the fifth one. **GE**^{piano} (\rightarrow **FE**^{piano} \rightarrow **EE**) amended only the first of those mistakes, and omitted bb in the first chord.

FE2^{piano}

Chopin introduced the change of e to f in the fourth chord during the last phase of the proofs (**EE** contains e).

Our conjecture takes into account the most certain elements of the sources – the first three chords according to **A**, the fourth chord in the version corrected by Chopin in **FE2**^{piano}, and the fifth chord according to **Morch** (in an arrangement corresponding to the preceding chords in **A**). It is very likely that this version corresponds to Chopin's intention. As regards the most doubtful bar 492, the harmonic progression in the version accepted by us was used by Chopin – in a similar rhythm – in *Impromptu in F#* Op. 36, bar 31, 35 and analog.

Jan Ekier
Paweł Kamiński