CONTENTS

Preface v Préface vi Vorwort viii	
ETUDE IN F MINOR Page No.	
Andantino (p)	
ETUDE IN A MAJOR Allegretto (p) 3 3 (p) 3 4 4	
Allegretto Allegretto Staccato St	

Trois Nouvelles Études

(3 Études pour la Méthode des Méthodes)



Edition Peters 73229

CRITICAL COMMENTARY

The three Etudes for the *Méthode des Méthodes* were published using the same procedure as for Op. 10: Chopin's autograph *Stichvorlage* served for engraving the French first edition, the proofs of which served in turn as engraving copy for the German and English first editions. The German and English editions thus carried over various misprints from the French proofs, except for any obvious enough to have been spotted by their house editors (who also introduced a few well-intentioned errors of their own). Only the proofs for the French edition were corrected by Chopin, though to a limited extent. Subsequent reprints during Chopin's lifetime introduced some revisions and textural variants; a few of the latter are debatable.

Sources

Various sources listed below are viewable online via www.polona.pl, www.chopinonline.ac.uk/ocve or www.gallica.fr.

- A¹ Autograph draft of No. 1, undated, devoid of performing indications. [PL-Wmfc: MC/188]
- A² Autograph of Nos. 1–3, undated, used as *Stichvorlage* for **F**¹; each piece is separate, Nos. 2 and 3 numbered by Chopin as here. [E-Valm: M/52–54; facsimile of music pages in Burger, *Frédéric Chopin*, pp. 223–225]
- A³ Autograph fragment of No. 1, bars 1–21, signed and dated Paris, 12 May 1841: unidentified album, unlocated. [PL-Wnifc: F. 7845 (photograph)]
- A⁴ Autograph fragment of No. 1, bars 1–14, signed and dated Paris, 16 June 1841: album of Jean-Pierre Dantan. [F-Pn: Rés. Vm⁷ 537]
- A⁵ Autograph fragment of No. 1, ending bar 24 RH note 1, signed and dated Paris, 8 December 1841: album of Jenny Veny. [US-CAh: Ms Mus. 103]
- Proof for F¹, as part of Fétis & Moscheles, Méthode des
 Méthodes (henceforth MdM). 2 exemplars in F-Pn: L. 6281
 (hand-dated January 1840, showing corrections but not to
 Chopin's musical text), Vm⁸ s 285 (hand-dated 1840, no other
 annotations). The pieces, unnumbered, each occupy a rectoverso folio; the respective verso pages of Etudes 2 and 3 are
 erroneously transposed (i.e. each where the other should be).
- F1 French first edition, published in vol. 2 of MdM, legal deposit 16 November 1840. M. Schlesinger, Paris, plate no. M.S. 2345 bis. Each piece, still unnumbered, now occupies facing pages; the page sequence is corrected within Etudes 2 and 3 but the order of the pieces is transposed, the Etude in Db preceding the one in Ab (as in G¹, E, F²,³).
- F² Corrected reprint of F¹, late 1844.
- F³ Another French first edition, published separately from MdM, late 1844. M. Schlesinger, Paris, plate no. M.S. 4102.

F = F⁰⁻³

- G¹ German first edition, published in MdM, November 1840.
 A. M. Schlesinger, Berlin, plate no. S.2207.
- Another German first edition, published separately from MdM (newly titled *Trois Nouvelles Etudes*), June 1841; Etudes 2, 3 ordered as in A². A. M. Schlesinger, Berlin, plate No. S.2423.

 $G = G^{1,2}$

- E English first edition, published in MdM, c. 1841. Chappell, London, plate No. 6084.
- Mik Mikuli edition (together with Op. 10 and Op. 25). Kistner, Leipzig, 1879.

Of the three traced exemplars from Chopin's circle, those of Jane Stirling (F-Pn: Rés. Vma. 241 (VII, 66)) and Auguste Franchomme (F-Pmounier)

show no annotations; annotations by his pupil Zofia Zaleska-Rosengardt in her exemplar of \mathbf{G}^2 (F-Ppo: F.N. 15858 (b)) have no editorial bearing beyond correcting two minor misprints in \mathbf{G}^2 . The pieces do not figure among the scores of Chopin's pupil Camille Dubois bequeathed in 1919 to F-Pc (now at F-Pn); however, the 1949 edition prepared by Paderewski, Bronarski and Turczyński lists her exemplar (its location unstated) as the source for some fingering in No. 1, 'written in pencil, probably by Chopin'. This attribution, if correct, would denote a now-unlocated exemplar separate from the collection at F-Pn; indeed, for Dubois not to have possessed these pieces would be surprising. The quoted fingering, over bars 9–17, is shown below. The 1879 edition by Chopin's pupil Carl Mikuli (Mik) is noted when apt, but with circumspection given its lack of critical apparatus; like \mathbf{G}^2 it orders the pieces as here. \mathbf{G} and \mathbf{E} , as offshoots of \mathbf{F}^1 , are not mentioned below when they concur with \mathbf{F}^1 .

Suggested filiation

A1 appears to have been a preparatory draft of No. 1, thus predating A². A² served as the Stichvorlage for F⁰ before apparently undergoing further revision by Chopin, mostly in Etude 1 (Fo follows several of the unrevised readings); the revisions were only patchily carried over to F1. (A few accidentals added at that stage appear in another hand, while a few others in pencil were probably added by Moscheles prior to engraving, as they figure in **F**⁰.) Chopin appears to have corrected proofs only up to Fo, with subsequent proofing probably effected by Moscheles on the basis of A² (which his family retained until the 1900s). G¹ evidently derived from a final proof for F1, and E from either a final proof for F1 or $\mathbf{F^1}$ itself. A corrected exemplar of $\mathbf{F^1}$ would have served for $\mathbf{F^2}$ and/ or F³, possibly with reference to A². G², the first stand-alone edition (published more than three years before F2), curiously restores two readings from F^0 superseded in F^1 , G^1 and E, but it is the only edition from Chopin's lifetime to order Etudes 2 and 3 as in A2, possibly on the basis of information conveyed from Paris or via Moscheles; this might also lend weight to the new title it gives the pieces. The mostly indifferent variants in the post-publication A^{3-5} – along with one important variant - suggest that they were written from memory or copied from $\mathbf{F^1}$ with intermittent attention; like $\mathbf{A^1}$ they show no fingering.

The principal source in this edition is A^2 , including the order of the pieces, as made explicit in this source. The first edition by comparison shows endemic corruption of detail, rendering it unviable as a principal source even with the revisions of $F^{2,3}$; the main contribution of F^{1-3} lies in some essential accidentals. Added dynamics and textural retouches in $F^{2,3}$ (a few of them suspect) are shown here as variants where appropriate.

No. 1 in F minor

Time signature. A1: semi-legible, probably as here; A2.4: as here; A3: indecipherable; A5, F: C

- Bar 1. A^2 : deleted 'Agitato' above beginning of RH slur. A^4 starts with RH $e
 mathred ^1
 mathred$, not mathred, mathred from $mathred ^3.5
 mathred$, mathred
- Bar 4. **A**⁵: rhythm to RH notes 5, 6 originally as in **A**², then amended as in variant
- **Bar 5. A**⁴: as **A**^{3,5} variant
- Bars 5–8. F¹-3: LH slur (absent in F⁰) ends bar 5 LH note 8, at end of system; in F¹ it continues as a carried-over slur but one system too low, i.e. to bars 11–13 rather than bars 6–8; F².3 correct that to LH slur from bar 6 LH note 1, extending to bar 9 LH note 1 in F², ending as here in F³. A⁴: LH slur to bar 5 only, with ✗ used as LH shorthand in each of bars 6, 7, 8; A⁵: single LH slur from bar 5 extending beyond bar 24 RH note 1, where extract ends.