

Comments

pf = piano; *u* = upper staff;
l = lower staff; *M* = measure(s)

Sources

- F_{F1}** French first edition, 1st issue. Paris, Maurice Schlesinger, plate number “M. S. 1832.”, published in February 1835 as supplement to the *Gazette musicale de Paris* of 1 February 1835. Title: *Scherzo | Pour Le Piano | Dédié | à Monsieur T. Albrecht | Secrétaire de Légation de S. M. le Roi de Saxe | PAR | F. CHOPIN.* | [left:] *Opera : 20.* [right:] *Prix : 7^f 50^c | PARIS, chez MAURICE SCHLESINGER, Rue Richelieu, 97.* | [left:] *Londres, chez Wessel et C^e* [right:] *Leipsick, chez Breitkopf et Härtel.* | *Prop^{te} des Ed^{es}.* Copy consulted: Paris. Bibliothèque nationale de France, shelfmark Ac.p. 2674. Top right, handwritten remark: *Déposé à la Direction | février 1835. N^o 43.*
- F_{F2}** French first edition, 2nd issue. Paris, Maurice Schlesinger, published in 1835. Plate number and title page as in **F_{F1}**. Copy consulted: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, shelfmark 4 Mus.pr. 23356 Beibd. 2.
- F_F** **F_{F1}** and **F_{F2}**.
- F_{G1}** German first edition, 1st issue. Leipzig, Breitkopf & Härtel, plate number 5599, published in May 1835. Title: *SCHERZO | Pour Pianoforte | composé et dédié |*

À MONSIEUR T. ALBRECHT | Secrétaire de Légation de Sa M. le Roi de Saxe | par | F. CHOPIN. | *Propriété des Editeurs.* | [left:] *Oeur.20.* [centre:] *à Leipsic,* [right:] *Pr.1Rthlr.* | *Chez Breitkopf & Härtel.* | *Londres, chez Wessel & C^e, _ Paris, chez M. Schlesinger.* | *S^t Petersbourg, chez M. Bernard.* _ *Varsovie chez G. Sennewald. Enregistré dans les Archives de l'Union.* Copy consulted: Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, shelfmark M.S. 40544.

F_{G3} German first edition, 3rd issue (numbering of the issues here and afterwards based on Christophe Grabowski/John Rink, *Annotated Catalogue of Chopin's first editions*, Cambridge, 2010). Leipzig, Breitkopf & Härtel, plate number 5599, published ca. 1867. Title as in **F_{G1}**. Copy consulted: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, shelfmark 4 Mus.pr. 18173.

F_{G4} German first edition, 4th issue. Leipzig, Breitkopf & Härtel, plate number 5599, published ca. 1872–74. Title as in **F_{G1}**, but now supplemented with the indication of the price: *Pr.1Rthlr.= Mk.3.* Copy consulted: Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin · Preußischer Kulturbesitz, shelfmark 4 N. Mus. 5663.

F_G **F_{G1}**, **F_{G3}** and **F_{G4}**.

F_{E1} English first edition, 1st issue. London, Wessel, plate number “(W & C^o N^o 1492.)”, published in August 1835. Title: *LAMATEUR PIANISTE _ N^o 56.* | *LE BANQUET INFERNAL.* | *SCHERZO.* | *pour le | Piano Forte.* | *DEDIÉ À | MONSIEUR T. ALBRECHT.* | *Secrétaire de Légation de S. M. le Roi de Saxe.* | *Par | FRED. CHOPIN.* | *(DE VARSOVIE.)* | *Copyright of the Publishers.* | [left:] *Op.20* [centre:] *Ent. Sta. Hall.* [right:] *Price4/6 | Paris, M. Schlesinger, Leipzig, Breitkopff & Härtel.* | *LONDON,* | *WESSEL & C^o Importers and Pub-*

lishers of FOREIGN MUSIC, | *(by special Appointment) to H.R.H. the Duchess of Kent,* | *N^o 6, Frith Street, Soho Square.* Copy consulted: University of Chicago, Joseph Regenstein Library, Special Collections, shelfmark M25.C54S412.

- F_{E4}** English first edition, 4th issue. London, Wessel, published ca. 1858. Plate number as in **F_{E1}**. Copy consulted: London, British Library, shelfmark h.471.f.(5.). Sole extant copy, title page and series title missing.
- F_E** **F_{E1}** and **F_{E4}**.
- OD** French first edition, 2nd issue. Paris, Maurice Schlesinger, published in 1835. Plate number and title page as in **F_{F1}**. Copy from the estate of Chopin's pupil Camille O'Meara-Dubois, with autograph markings by Chopin. These entries cannot always be assigned to the composer with absolute certainty; some could also stem from another hand. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, shelfmark Rés. F. 980 (II, 13) (available as digital copy).
- L** Letter from Karol Mikuli to Ferdinand Hiller, 22 August 1879. Only the cover letter to Hiller has survived; partial reprint in: *Aus Ferdinand Hillers Briefwechsel*, vol. IV (1876–1881), ed. by Reinhold Sietz, *Beiträge zur Rheinischen Musikgeschichte*, vol. 60, 1965, pp. 91 f. The original with Hiller's answer (notated by him on leaves sent by Mikuli) is now lost; a copy survives in Warsaw, Chopin Institute, shelfmark F.7371. While preparing his edition of Chopin's piano works to be published by Friedrich Kistner, Leipzig (see *On reception*), Mikuli (a former Chopin pupil) wrote for advice to Hiller (a friend of Chopin's). Mikuli hoped that Hiller would provide “decisive corrections” for contentious passages with divergent readings in different

works by Chopin. With regard to the Scherzo no. 1, Mikuli notated two music examples, one above the other, with questions listed beneath them in each case. The upper example is of M 43–57 (and applicable to all parallel passages), the lower example is of M 382–385. Mikuli asked Hiller about ties in M 43–57 (cf. comment on M 51/52, 53/54, 55/56 l), and about the 3rd notes in each measure of M 382 f. l (cf. comment on this). Hiller annotated the music examples in Mikuli's letter, commented on his questions and then returned everything to Mikuli (without the cover letter).

On reception

Mikuli

Fr. Chopin's Pianoforte-Werke. Revidirt und mit Fingersatz versehen (zum größten Theil nach des Autors Notirungen) von Carl Mikuli. Band 10. Scherzos, Leipzig: Fr. Kistner, no year, publisher's number 5345–5349.

Scholtz

Frédéric Chopin. Scherzi, Fantasie f-moll. Critically revised by Herrmann Scholtz. New edition by Bronislaw v. Pozniak, Frankfurt on the Main: C. F. Peters, 1948, publisher's number 9099.

Paderewski

Fryderyk Chopin. Sämtliche Werke. V: Scherzos für Klavier. Edited by I. J. Paderewski, L. Bronarski, J. Turczyński. 2nd revised issue. Copyright 1961, by Instytut Fryderyka Chopina, Warsaw, Poland.

About this edition

From the source situation explained in the *Preface*, we can draw the following

conclusions for the present edition: F_F serves as the primary source (the text of F_{F2} is identical to that of the 1st issue F_{F1} in spite of the many engraving errors in F_{F1}). OD was consulted as a secondary source. It contains a few corrections of obvious engraver's errors in F_F as well as only two fingering numbers. OD by no means corrects all the errors of F_F (M 503 l, in F_F last note *A* instead of *B*, OD corrects to *B*. A few measures later on the same page, the obvious errors in M 511 f. were, however, left uncorrected: M 511, 3rd note *d*³ instead of *e*³; M 512 u, *g*³ instead of *b*³). The source value of OD is thus limited.

Since F_{G1} and F_{E1} correct several engraver's errors from F_F, it has been occasionally assumed that Schlesinger had sent to Breitkopf and Wessel a set of proofs corrected by Chopin to be used as their engraver's copy, although there is no evidence for this. The structure of the Scherzo, with its many written-out repeats, makes it easier to track down errors on the basis of parallel passages, and more plausible to bring parallel passages into line with one another. The proof-readers of F_G and F_E apparently proceeded according to this principle, and nowhere can we find any emendations that could only derive from the composer himself. The changes made in the later issues of F_G and F_E can also be explained by the thoroughness of the publisher's revisions. There are several factors suggesting that the last alterations in F_{G4} and F_{E4} were based on a comparison of the parallel editions from the other countries (cf. e. g., comments on M 51/52, 53/54, 55/56 l and on M 374 f. l). Moreover, F_E contains inauthentic additions, such as extra fingering and the subtitle *Le Banquet infernal*. Thus while the various print-runs from F_G and F_E were only used for purposes of comparison, their readings are important for the reception of the work.

Source L is also of historical importance for its reception. The two passages mentioned there are frequently discussed among scholars; it is striking to witness Mikuli's uncertainty with re-

gard to the correct readings. Hiller's replies offer little source value, however. One wonders why Mikuli asked him, of all people, about the authentic readings. It is true that Chopin's friendship with Hiller flourished particularly intensively during his first Paris years, and especially at the time of origin of the Scherzo in around 1834. However, Hiller can only have judged from memory about events that went back about 40 years in time!

Since no autograph source has survived, our edition had to be based on F_F, also with regard to markings that are often reproduced imprecisely in the printed editions. In F_F, dynamic markings are often placed at pf u instead of in the centre, a practice that we have also followed where it is consistent. In unequivocal cases, double dynamics for both staves have been replaced by single dynamic markings positioned centrally between the staves; single dynamics in the original that had been imprecisely positioned between the staves are treated similarly. The lost engraver's copy clearly distinguished between short and long accents. This distinction can be observed in F_F but is not applied with any regularity; we have adopted it only where it is indisputable. Our edition also broadly follows F_F in the distribution of the notes upon the staves. Fingerings in italics stem from the sources: F_F if not otherwise indicated, from OD only in M 336 u.

Markings that are missing solely by oversight in F_F have been supplemented by the editor in parentheses, and the many parallel passages have been changed to match each other. It is likely that literal repetitions in the lost engraver's copy were not fully notated but were supplied with a reference to a corresponding measure. In many cases one can assume that the musical text should be congruent. But when discrepancies between parallel passages seem intentional, we have refrained from changing them.

Since the engraving of F_F is very imprecise, a few phenomena have been adapted without comment. For example, we do not comment on slurs that are not continued at line breaks or page breaks,

or that start too late. Chains of slurs and slurs enclosing ties have been adapted to parallel passages without comment. Likewise, engraving errors have been corrected without comment whenever the correct reading is unequivocally confirmed by parallel passages. This was the case, for example, with wrong notes and wrong note values (missing or superfluous augmentation dots).

Readings derived from the reception of the work are only mentioned in the following *Individual comments* whenever they have to do with variants relevant to performance practice. Footnotes in the musical text refer to the most important passages.

Individual comments

In F_F , F_E *Con fuoco* above M 1 and *Presto* at the centre before the brace to M 1. In F_F , F_E , metronome marking erroneously $\text{♩} = 120$, in F_{E4} corrected to ♩ .

10 l: In F_F here and in most parallel passages long accent in pf u (generally 1st–2nd notes, sometimes 1st–3rd notes). However, in M 242, 244, 250, 390, 506, 508, 514, accent in pf l. Unclear whether all passages intended for pf u or whether the differences are intentional. We bring all these into line with each other and place accent in pf l. Mikuli has a long accent at pf l, Scholtz a short one at pf l, Paderewski a short accent at 1st note in pf u.

28 l: In F_F neither staccato nor tie at g^1 ; in M 144 staccato, in M 260/261 tie at measure transition, in M 408 no marking, in M 524 staccato. Tie at M 260/261 is presumably an engraving error, we add staccato in all passages. Mikuli has staccato at M 28, 144, 408, 524, in M 260/261 tie in upper voice and staccato in lower voice (cf. M 36 and parallel passages). Scholtz has tie in upper voice, staccato in lower voice in all passages; Paderewski lacks tie in all passages, staccato inconsistently notated.

51/52, 53/54, 55/56 l: In F_{G1} here and in almost all parallel passages (exception: M 435/436) tie at measure transition. F_F has tie only in M 283/284, 547/548, 551/552. F_{E1} has ties as in F_F , but also has an additional tie in M 167/168. In F_{G4} most of the ties from F_{G1} were eliminated (presumably after comparison with F_F ; only in M 53/54 and 285/286 were they left untouched); in F_{E4} however, most of the ties missing from F_{E1} were added (presumably after comparison with F_{G1} ; only M 51/52 remained without tie). In no source are all parallel passages consistently marked; at times, staccato has been added at the 2nd octave in addition to the tie, presumably erroneously. In L Hiller writes that the correct reading is as follows: first two passages (M 51/52, 53/54) with tie, the third (M 55/56) without. Accordingly, Mikuli edits M 51/52, 53/54 with tie, M 55/56 without (thus in all parallel passages; in M 51/52 and 53/54 and parallel passages generally with staccato dot at 2nd octave); Scholtz always has tie (thus as in F_{G1} , but M 435/436 with tie; moreover, consistent staccato dot at 2nd octave in M 51/52, 53/54 and all parallel passages); Paderewski always lacks tie.

The marking was probably already not uniform in the engraver's copy for F_F . It is possible that Chopin began by notating ties there at first and later eliminated them inconsistently (in this case, a publisher's editor must have supplemented the ties analogously in F_{G1}); or the engraver's copy contained ties throughout that were originally engraved in F_{F1} , but then incompletely deleted during the course of Chopin's proof-reading. (Bearing this in mind, it is plausible that Breitkopf & Härtel's engraver's copy might have been an uncorrected galley proof of F_{F1} that still contained the ties; F_{E1} would in this case have been engraved on the basis of the corrected proofs of F_{F1} . However, the argument against this hypothesis is that it would have

entailed Schlesinger dealing quite differently with each of his two publishing partners; furthermore, F_{F1} bears no traces whatsoever of plate corrections at the places in question.) On the basis of what we find in F_F (tie only in three passages, probably the remainder of a rejected reading), the present edition assumes that there should be no ties in any passages here.

52/53, 54/55, 56/57 l: In F_F here and in all parallel passages inconsistent slurring, either up to last note before measure transition or to 1st note after measure transition. We always place slur up to 1st note after measure transition.

58–60 l: In F_F * at 2nd note M 60, but without any corresponding ♩ before; in analogy with M 61–63 and 297–304, ♩ could have been intended at last note of M 57 or on 1st note of M 58. F_{G1} places ♩ at M 58 and * at last note M 60; F_{G3} supplements accordingly for M 174–176; in F_{E1} each time without pedal marking; added in F_{E4} for M 58–60, 174–176, 290–292, 438–440. Mikuli has ♩ at M 58 and * at 2nd note M 60 (without pedal markings in any parallel passages); Scholtz has ♩ at beat 1 M 57 and * at M 58 (accordingly in all parallel passages); Paderewski has no pedal markings in any passages. We delete * as given in F_F M 60, since all parallel passages have no pedal markings.

62–64, 65^b–67^b, 178–183: In F_F slurring irregular; we change to match M 442–447 (there, however, slur missing at 446–447 l). The same slurring was surely intended in the three parallel passages.

77/78 u: In F_F slur at measure transition only to 1st note M 78; in the parallel passage M 193/194 slur extends to 1st note M 194, renewed beginning of slur from this note to last note in measure. In parallel passage M 457/458 1st slur as in M 77/78 and 193/194, 2nd slur after change of line but open to the left. Presumably uninterrupted slur intended for all three passages.

85: F_F has *poco a poco cresc.* only from 2nd half M 86; we change to match M 201, 465.

121–124 l: F_F lacks > ; parallel passages M 237–240 also lack > , in M 501 f. there is an > there, but not in M 503 f. We assume an oversight in M 501 f. and have thus deleted these two > . In addition to M 501 f. there are a few inconsistent > that were supplemented at all three passages in F_C , F_E . Mikuli as in F_F ; Scholtz and Paderewski add > in all cases.

201 l: F_F has * at end of measure, presumably engraving error, for M 202 has no § but *. Pedal probably intended for M 201 f., cf. also M 85 f., 465 f.

226 l: F_F has § in addition to M 225; presumably engraving error, cf. M 110, 490.

276–279, 424–427 l: In F_F slur only to M 277/426; we adapt to M 540–543 (there chain of slur instead of slur enclosing tie); cf. also M 44–47, 160–163.

279–281, 427–429 l: In F_F slur always only up to last octave M 280/428; changed to match M 543–545, cf. also M 48/49, 164/165.


307, 308, 309 f.: In F_F the hairpins are shorter, we change to match M 339, 340, 341 f.

316/317 u: In the sources legato slur from last note of M 316 to 1st note of M 317. Apparent engraving error in F_F (confusion with tie M 317/318).

321, 325, 342 l: In F_F , F_{C1} 4th note always *B* instead of *G#*, *f#* instead of *d#*, *d#* instead of *B#*. Correctly engraved in F_E presumably on the basis of the parallel passages M 353, 357, 310. We amend accordingly.

In F_{C4} M 321, 325 corrected, in F_{C4} M 342 *d#* as before.

323, 355 u: In order to adjust the part-writing to the context, Paderewski

writes here  contrary to the sources.

329–333, 361–365: F_F has



(M 365 lacks > , however). Only M 330 has < rather than < ; without an autograph it is difficult to decide what Chopin meant. Either < are engraving errors, and intended is:



Or:



Scholtz has:



Paderewski has:



(M 365 without marking). In M 329 ff. Mikuli has:



In M 361 ff.:



331–336 u: In F_F end of slur already at M 333 (chain of slur instead of slur enclosing tie); we change to match M 363–368.

336 u: Fingering in italics stems from OD.

356, 359 u: F_F seems to have slur instead of tie from 1st grace note to main note. However, presumably intended as given in the present edition.

360–362 u: In F_F slur only from grace note at M 361, but cf. M 328–330.

369–372: In F_F hairpins partly longer or shorter. We change to match M 337–340.

374 f. l: 2nd note always a^\sharp and g^\sharp according to F_F , F_{G1} , F_{G3} ; 2nd note always a and a^\sharp in F_{G4} , F_E . Not corrected in OD, which is why the reading F_F is probably valid. Mikuli has a and a^\sharp , Scholtz a and g^\sharp , Paderewski a^\sharp and g^\sharp .

382 f. l: In F_F the two \flat at a are missing; supplemented each time in OD. The \flat are also missing in F_{G1} , F_{G3} , and were added in F_{G4} . In F_E in M 382 g^\times (presumably corrected by a publishing house editor), in M 383 a^\sharp again. Mikuli, Scholtz, Paderewski consistently have a . In L, Hiller is also in favour of a in both measures.

424 l: In F_F portato dots at 2nd and 3rd octaves, presumably erroneous.

445 u: F_F lacks \sharp ; supplemented in OD.

451: In F_F *cresc.*, presumably engraving error. See parallel passages as well as the *cresc.* in M 453.

454 u: F_F lacks \sharp ; supplemented in OD.

559 l: F_F erroneously has \ast already at end of M 558.

585 l: F_F lacks \sharp at $g^\sharp1$ and $g^\sharp2$; supplemented in OD.

Munich, spring 2016
Norbert Müllemann