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CONFUSION AND ERROR (II)

Norman Del Mar

BEETHOVEN—OVERTURE, LEONORA NO. 3, OP. 72A

1. Bar 31: It is sometimes doubted whether the second horn chord should still be *forte*, since it comes together with the woodwind *p*. All editions agree upon this, however, and the effect is certainly correct and characteristic.

2. Bars 82/3: Editions vary as to whether the brass should tie their semibreves over to the crotchets in the following bar or whether the rhythm begins anew with the first note of bar 83. Comparison with bars 391/2 is not very profitable as the passages are not quite parallel.

3. Bar 106: In some editions (including Breitkopf) the 2nd Trombone has a B in this bar, in others D sharp. The latter is the more logical since the instrument thus follows the bass line exactly.

4. Bars 155/6: Here is a most interesting point. The imitations on 2nd Vls and Vlas come in a bar earlier than on every other parallel occasion throughout the work, and it is worth considering whether here too they should be moved to the corresponding position. All editions agree in the matter and if it is in fact an error then that error must date back to a very early stage—perhaps the manuscript itself.

5. Bar 237: The delayed entry of the oboes in this bar is very odd. Even if it could be heard, one wonders whether there is much point to be made or whether the manuscript was once more unclear!

6. Bar 280: All editions agree in the re-marking of the strings to *p* after their *pp* two bars earlier. This could be correct and indeed there are some very subtle changes through the degrees of *p, pp* and *ppp* shortly after. Yet the effect of the sudden doubling of the accompaniment in this rather inconsequential place does not quite ring true.

7. Bar 421: Here is another outstanding query. In the corresponding bar in the exposition (bar 137) the G♯ is changed to ♭ at the end of the bar. This is not only sequentially necessary after the F♯ two bars earlier but is also featured for the length of a whole bar at the equivalent place in the Leonora No. 2 (Bar 173). In Bar 421 however, the E flat is missing in all editions so that once again any suspected error must originate from the autograph.

8. Bars 499 *et seq.*: The marking of the crotchets in the 1st Vls is worthy of scrutiny. Beethoven's use of *staccato* dots raises innumerable problems. The middle movement of the G Major Piano Concerto is a famous case in point. Since however in the present instance all editions agree and the placing of the dots is by no means whimsical, it is perfectly possible that Beethoven really meant exactly what is written.

9. Bar 514: Another serious textual problem. There is a school of thought which considers the initial C of this passage to be incorrect and replaces it by D, thus
bringing it into line with the corresponding passage in *Leonora No. 2*. Indeed, Eulenburgh actually prints the D—a very hasty decision. Various distinguished commentators have discussed this variant; Weingartner in his book on conducting (p. 22) dismisses the alteration to D as an ‘unmotivated and enfeebling substitution’ (!), whilst Tovey in Vol. 4 of his essays (p. 39) takes the C for granted, and draws deductions from Beethoven’s revision of the earlier version.

In recent years no less a figure than Toscanini supported the D, playing and recording the passage thus altered. Yet there remains considerable force in the view that the C is a deliberate revision giving to the whole passage a strong tonic function which is emphasized by the stress on the note C from bars 526 onwards, a section and effect not to be found in the No. 2 Overture.

10. Bars 554 *et seq.*: Bearing in mind that all the horns are pitched in C, Beethoven’s persistent use of the second pair is most remarkable and suggests that he wrote for specific players. In fact all the important work in the Overture is given to the 3rd and 4th players. Already at bar 404 one might have expected the 1st pair to have played the corresponding passage to their colleagues’ solo in the exposition. In the present passage the differentiation has still less significance and in practice the part is generally executed by all four! A further point occurs ten bars before the end, where many conductors continue the horn parts with the woodwind for three bars longer than the composer has indicated. As however the notes are not only possible on Beethoven’s instruments but have actually just been played by them, there seems no reason why Beethoven should not have written them had he so wished.

11. Bar 578: It is remarkable that the timpani figure does not follow the rhythm of the trumpets in this bar, for otherwise the two coincide exactly up to and including bar 605. The exception may, however, be perfectly correct, especially in view of the fact that in this bar alone the trumpets play an E not available to the timpani.

12. Bar 606: Some editions omit the single f here, and indeed the whole question of dynamics is in some doubt. After the ff in bar 578 the long gradual cresc. culminating in a drop to f is uncharacteristic. On the other hand the sudden ffff without crescendo during the previous four bars is most typical of Beethoven’s mature style. The trombones, moreover, have no new dynamic for their significant entry at bar 590 and it is probably here that the error arose. A general mark of mf at this point would probably be the most satisfactory overall solution to the problem, but it must remain a decision for the individual interpreter.

**HAYDN—SYMPHONY NO. 102 IN B FLAT**

1. This symphony was issued by Breitkopf not only in the familiar 8vo form, but also in large 4to at the time when the complete edition was being prepared. It goes without saying that the two scores are very different. The Eulenburgh miniature score has also appeared in two forms, the first of which corresponds exactly with the 8vo Breitkopf. This latter 8vo score has the usual preface stating that it has been carefully revised according to the autograph, and that it differs substantially from all earlier editions; and it draws special attention to the independent cello line in the slow movement which it states was entirely missing from all earlier editions. The revised Eulenburgh also goes back to the manuscript but the result is very different not only from the 8vo but also from the later 4to Breitkopf score! It was prepared in 1934 by Dr. Ernst Praetorius (who made companion editions for Eulenburgh of several of the late Haydn symphonies) and contains several startling discoveries.

2. I. Bars 3, 8 and ff: The many expression marks added into the Breitkopf 8vo score are naturally also in the parts, with the result that these do not correspond
at all with the newer 4to score, in which Haydn's original text has to a large extent been restored. In the Allegro vivace which follows, the phrasings and bowings need examination since the string parts have been subjected to still further editing, not to be found in any score. It is, of course, possible to overdo the revision of the Breitkopf material in respect of phrasings, since many of them, apocryphal though they may be, are essentially practical or even desirable. For example, 3 and 5 bars after letter D (bars 94 and 96) the purist editions remove the slurs in the figure: and in bar 97 change the violins' phrasing to: which the 8vo score breaks up to correspond with bars 93 and 95. It is naturally for each conductor to consider the relative merits of such variations of phrasing without regard to scholastic restoration.

3. I. Bars 225/6 (2 before H): The new Eulenburg suppresses the timpani crescendo. Both Breitkopf scores gives this extremely characteristic touch and one is most loth to lose it. A similar case, just as disconcerting, is the suppression of the rise and fall of the drums in the famous first bar of the Drum-roll Symphony. Eulenburg may be in the right from the scholarly point of view, but experience shows that the autograph is not necessarily the final arbiter in such a quandary!

4. I. 296/7: The poco rit. in these bars is apparently editing, but the musical sense demands some give in the tempo.

5. II: The Eulenburg editor claims that the con sordino should apply to horns and trumpets, instead of trumpets and drums. This is a thorny problem since the placing of these indications in the autograph is somewhat equivocal. Dr. Praetorius may well be right, and there is certainly logic on his side in the tonal balance of the brass ensemble. Yet the trumpets and drums belong together in the military sense and Haydn was quite capable of exploiting such an idea. The extraordinary held note in the two trumpets five bars before the end of the movement is evidence of this. (The latter effect was, incidentally, cut out by Dr. Koussevitzky in his recording of the work but fortunately no score doubts its authenticity!)

6. II. Bar 1: Perhaps the most problematical bar of all. Every score gives A natural in the violas on the third beat of the bar. At each return of the melody the note is changed to A flat, giving the infinitely more striking and satisfactory diminished 7th chord. But at each such repetition Haydn marks the place sf as if to draw attention to the new and interesting harmonization. The Breitkopf parts, however, give the violas A flat from the beginning and it is difficult to be sure that they are wrong. The A natural does not in fact sound very well. Reference to the F sharp minor Piano Trio (which has a version of the same movement a semitone higher) is not very profitable since this first statement of the opening 16 bars does not appear there at all, and the sf diminished seventh thus comes in the very first bar. This is a typically infuriating instance of a place where Dr. Praetorius could have discussed the autograph, but he merely gives the A natural without comment.

7. II. The famous independent cello line mentioned so proudly in the preface to the 8vo score is shown by Eulenburg to have been headed by Haydn 'Solo Violoncello'. Acting on the letter of the law Dr. Praetorius accordingly gives the entire line to a single player throughout the movement, the tutti cellos playing col Bassi. But it is unlikely that Haydn, with his enormous practical experience of orchestration, would entrust a line of this kind to a single player and then overweight it time and time again so that much of it would be virtually inaudible! Moreover many passages such as bars 43/44 require equal distribution of the string parts to be effective, and a solo cello could not support the entire weight
of the orchestral violins and violas. The indication solo can often mean obbligato as applied to a section, without necessarily limiting it to the leader of that section. Neither the earlier nor the later Breitkopf scores, let alone the parts, have any mention of this and I am convinced that they are right.

8. IV. Bars 173/4 (7/8 after letter V): The trumpets' held C's (sounding B flat) in these bars are often regarded with considerable suspicion. They are certainly dissonant and some conductors actually omit them on this account. But bearing in mind the composer with whom we are dealing, it is highly probable that this vividly presented minor ninth is one of the daring strokes for which Haydn is justly famous.

LISZT—EINE FAUST SYMPHONIE

1. The various editions of this work differ materially from each other in a large number of places. The basis of the text is the original material published by Schuberth, and the Eulenburg miniature score edited by Georg Göhler closely follows this, though it also incorporates some revisions made by the composer. The Breitkopf material, edited by Berthold Kellermann and published as late as 1917 in the complete edition of Liszt's works, again claims to follow the Schuberth with similar authoritative emendations, but is so radically different as to amount to a new text. The curious thing is that both Eulenburg and Breitkopf have lengthy prefaces which, disappointingly however, deal with only one or two of the numerous deviations.

2. I. 6 bars after A: Breitkopf adds a figure for 2nd Vls and Vlas not found in the other editions:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\textbf{Violante}} & \quad \text{\textbf{Violante}} \\
\text{\textbf{B}} & \quad \text{\textbf{B}}
\end{align*}
\]

This naturally recurs during the three bars before B.

3. I. 2 bars after E: There is no contradiction to the earlier marking for timpani mit Holzschlägel. This is a matter for serious concern throughout the movement, since if Liszt's specific instructions are to be taken as exhaustive, long stretches of normal timpani writing will remain with wooden sticks.

4. I. 2 bars after 0 et seq.: The timpani part here is very much open to doubt. In the original text, reproduced by Eulenburg, the part read: \[
\begin{align*}
\text{\textbf{P}} & \quad \text{\textbf{P}} \\
\text{\textbf{P}} & \quad \text{\textbf{P}}
\end{align*}
\]
as also at JJ, but changed to: \[
\begin{align*}
\text{\textbf{P}} & \quad \text{\textbf{P}} \\
\text{\textbf{P}} & \quad \text{\textbf{P}} \\
\text{\textbf{P}} & \quad \text{\textbf{P}}
\end{align*}
\] in the passage at Q. Breitkopf simply gives: \[
\begin{align*}
\text{\textbf{P}} & \quad \text{\textbf{P}} \\
\text{\textbf{P}} & \quad \text{\textbf{P}} \\
\text{\textbf{P}} & \quad \text{\textbf{P}} \\
\text{\textbf{P}} & \quad \text{\textbf{P}}
\end{align*}
\] for all three passages alike.

5. I. 3 after P et seq.: Breitkopf adds \[
\begin{align*}
\text{\textbf{P}} & \quad \text{\textbf{P}} \\
\text{\textbf{P}} & \quad \text{\textbf{P}}
\end{align*}
\] for trombones, with the equivalent 4 and 8 bars later. A similar addition for bassoons occurs at HH.

6. I. 5 after P: Here, as distinct from the parallel bars before and after, the basses curiously enough leave the cellos to finish the phrase alone. This must be an error and in fact the Eulenburg editor remarks upon it in a footnote, though the matter becomes obscured through faulty page references.

I. Letter R: The indication trillo above the figure for 1st Vls and Vlas is most remarkable, since Liszt writes out twelve notes (of only moderate speed) to the
bar. The section should be compared with the return passage at KK where the
violins have ordinary trills.

8. I. Letter Y: Eulenburg’s use of ‘new notation’ for the horn in bass clef is confusing
and I know of no instance of Liszt’s using it. Both Schuberth and Breitkopf
keep the passage in the treble clef with the use of leger lines.

9. II. Letter D: Eul. omits the alternate R_____ and A_____ given here for five
bars in the other editions. This notation for rall. and accel. so characteristic of
Elgar’s later scores appears throughout the work—though by no means consist-
ently—in both Schuberth and Breitkopf. At GG in the 1st Mvt. the indications
are missing from the Breitkopf parts, which give a set, at G in the 2nd Mvt., not
to be found in any other edition, but then leave them out in the corresponding
place at Z!

10. II. 3 bars after J: The horns’ semiquaver upbeat at the end of this bar (together
with the mf) does not appear in Eulenburg at all, though given in both Schuberth
and Breitkopf. This would seem to suggest a misprint, yet at no other time in the
Symphony does this theme begin with a rhythmic upbeat (cf. for example letter
X in the 1st Mvt.), so that the point remains in doubt.

11. II. Letter K: The Breitkopf score prints two versions of this passage; the first,
incorporated into the main text, corresponds with that given in Eul. and Schuberth;
the other, given above the first in small print, reads as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{\textbf{With the 2nd Vls altered appropriately in the second bar to match. Considering}} \\
&\text{\textbf{that this variant appears as a mere ossia in the score, and is moreover referred}} \\
&\text{\textbf{to specifically as such in the editor’s Preface, it is amazing to find that the Breit-}} \\
&\text{\textbf{kopf parts give it exclusively, the normally accepted reading not appearing at all!}} \\
\end{align*}
\]

12. II. Letter Q: The editions vary here in several details of phrasing. In the first
place the ▷’s, given in both Eul. and Sch. two bars before Q, are omitted by
Br. On the other hand Br. supplies marc. and molto tranquillo 2 before and 2
after Q, not to be found in the other editions. In addition, in the Br. parts (though
not in the score) the hairpin in the bar of Q is broken up into two as in the preceding
bar (the omission of one of these in Eul. can only be a confusing misprint),
thus missing the point of the gradually lengthening phrases.

13. II. Letter T: Another series of different phrasings. Breitkopf continues the long
▷ in 1st Vls 4 before T in place of the p of the other editions, and adds pp
perdendo to the last phrase of all, the fermata being held ‘lang’. All editions agree
with the odd lack of slurs in the 2nd bar of T onwards but this must surely be
covered by the words sempre legato, the exact bowings being no doubt left to the
player.

14. II. Letter V: The entry of the ‘übrigen 1st Vls’ is very much in doubt. Eulenburg
clearly marks it in the bar of letter V, after a semiquaver rest. By ill fortune all
other scores and the Breitkopf parts come to this bar at the end of a line or page,
and as a result the entry appears on all three staves set out for 2nd, 3rd and 4th
Solo violins, thus suggesting a double entry with the tutti playing only in the
following bar. The Eulenburg seems more logical and may well be the only
correct text.

15. II. 19 bars after Z: Both the Eulenburg and Breitkopf editors refer in their
prefaces to the 12-bar interpolation at this point, given by Liszt in a letter to Dr.
Friedrich Stade. But whereas Eul. incorporates the passage into the text, Br.
merely adds it in an appendix to the score, the parts omitting it altogether.

16. II. 13 bars before the end: Eulenburg marks this Coda *Un poco più lento*. Neither of the other scores has this and one wonders where Göhler found it! From the bar before the Common Time to the end, Br. and Sch. make all the violin lines solo parts while Eul. reserves this indication for the top part only. All editions agree on a solo cello, but none has any indication for the viola which must surely also be given to a single player!

17. III. One bar before A: The string parts are none too clear here. The cellos must be *pizz.* though all scores and parts forget to say so. Also the 2nd Vls and Vlas have no new dynamic marking, so that the cellos are *p* like the woodwind whilst the upper strings remain at something above *forte!* To my mind the *pizz.* should surely be strong and hence the cellos should mark up rather than the others down.

18. III. 2 before K: In view of the many doubtful points not cleared up by the Breitkopf editor, it is curious that he singles out this place for detailed reference. There is no great likelihood that the *E* in the double basses is an error, since it recurs identically, not only two bars before *L* but also in the two corresponding places around KK and LL.


20. III. 2-5 bars after X: Here is an important variant. During these four bars Breitkopf alone interpolates an essential thematic figure for flute and piccolo, as follows:

![](image)

It is curious that this should receive no word of mention from either editor.

21. III. 3 before HH: Sch. and Eul. give the horn solo to the 2nd horn, Br. to the 3rd! At HH, however, comes another substantial variant of even greater scope and importance than that quoted in note 20 above. Breitkopf gives the accompaniment to Gretchen’s melody not only to the clarinet but also to the harp, in an extended solo which, moreover, continues the clarinet’s upward *arpeggio* for a further two octaves, *viz*:

![](image)

Again neither Preface contains the slightest reference to this most interesting revision.

22. Choral Finale: 7 bars after F: From this Common Time until the 4/2, Breitkopf gives the whole flute part to two players in unison as against the long solo shown by both Schuberth and Eulenburg.

**MOZART—SYMPHONY NO. 40 IN G MINOR, K.550**

1. A fearful state of confusion reigns over the two versions of this Symphony. It is therefore a lasting shame that the editors of the Breitkopf Gesamtausgabe decided to economize by merely printing the altered oboe and new clarinet parts above
what they considered to be the original 'oboes only' version. Unfortunately their
text is not reliable and in any case they have restored all the clarinet parts to the
oboe, overlooking the fact that Mozart derived two of these in the Andante from
the flute! A revised edition of the Eulenburg score edited, like all the later Mozart
symphonies, by Theodor Kroyer is of the utmost interest. In a long Preface
Kroyer carefully studies all the available editions and compares them with the
autograph to which he had access. The corruptions and errors are for the most
part listed in a Revisionsbericht, but unfortunately this is not comprehensive.

The original oboe version, with the variants ignored by Breitkopf faultlessly
observed, is to be found in the old Eulenburg miniature, in the Peters edition, and
in an old octavo Breitkopf score to which reference will be made later. (It must
be added at this point that Kroyer proves some of these variants to be wrong
readings.) The Philharmonia gives only the clarinet version in the Breitkopf text
as do the other more recent reprints in miniature score. Kroyer in his new Eulenburg
score also gives the clarinet version though radically revised. Finally, it
must be added that the Penguin score proves to be an extraordinary mixture of the
two versions and quite impossible to use for practical purposes.

2. I. Bars 15/16: The oboe version separates the phrase: Breitkopf ties it over. The
same happens in bars 178 ff.

3. Bars 34 et seq.: Br. omits the sforzandi in 1st and 2nd Vls, and again in bars 217 ff.

4. Bars 39 et seq.: The woodwind ties need careful comparison between the editions,
as also in bars 115 ff. and 133 ff.

5. Bars 58 et seq.: Br. gives pp both here and in bar 241. This is in neither the oboe
version nor Kroyer and can be presumed to be editing.

6. Bars 73/75: The minimis in 1st Vls are most curious. They appear in all versions,
but never recur and even here are not imitated by the lower strings. Unfortunately
Kroyer makes no reference to this inconsistency which may have originated in
some slip on the part of Mozart himself.

7. Bar 114: The position of the f in 1st Vls is given differently in every edition!
Kroyer is unique in bringing it as far forward as the half bar. Presumably this is
authentic, though he makes no comment.

8. Bars 136 et seq.: The staccato crotchets in the 1st Vls are extremely doubtful. All
editions vary as to when and where they should occur and the Breitkopf edited
parts simply add them throughout until bar 146. Yet nowhere else in the move-
ment are these crotchets staccato in any edition, and indeed the character of the
phrase and of the movement as a whole suggests that perhaps they should not
appear here either.

9. Bar 161: The oboe version gives the Fl. in keeping with the
similarly chromatic bars, 162 and 164. Neither Breitkopf nor any of the clarinet
versions have C sharp, however, and Kroyer cites the autograph as agreeing with
this.

10. Bar 190: Here is a Kroyer special. The manuscript gives the flute part as follows:

The high F is not in any edition.

11. Bar 247: The 1st Vl turns read in the oboe version and in the clarinet.
12. Bars 293 et seq.: The 1st Vi ties are not in the oboe version but seem justified as they bring the passage into line with bars 95 ff.

13. II. The famous slur from the upbeat to the first of the repeated notes in this melody is not to be found in any score and has been proved incorrect by the autograph.

14. Bars 18/19: The oboe version gives the following variant to the oboes and horns:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Ob} \\
\text{Horns (Eb)}
\end{array}
\]

Unfortunately Kroyer makes no comment on this interesting point.

15. Bars 20/22: The oboe version reads:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Vla} \\
\text{Vla} \\
\text{Vc} \\
\text{cb}
\end{array}
\]

and similarly in all parallel places. In Breitkopf and the clarinet version scores, all string parts are marked p from the third quaver of the bar, which is the more curious in view of the sustained f of the newly added oboes. Once again this is clearly not a question of error but of variation between the two versions and as such wrongly omitted from Breitkopf's portmanteau edition.

16. Bars 27/28: This is the passage in which the clarinet part is derived from the flute and not from the oboe. The Breitkopf material needs to be corrected here and also at the equivalent place in bars 98/99. The Penguin score gets into a splendid muddle by giving the line to both clarinet and flute!

17. Bars 29/32: Kroyer refers in his substantial foreword to a rescored of these four bars, with the demisemiquaver figures given entirely to strings. This version also reappears at the recapitulation in bars 100-103 and Kroyer goes to the length of giving the texts of these variants in full, a most valuable contribution. Although these bars are not given in any modern edition, they are to be found in the octavo Breitkopf score (Plate No. 4580) where they appear not instead of, but as well as, the version now recognized. In each case therefore the passages are 8 bars long, with a fearful jolt in the musical sense at the point where the 'string' version passes directly to the 'wind'. The strange thing is that although Kroyer acknowledges the octavo Breitkopf score (designating it 'C' in his notes) he makes no reference to this extraordinary mistake in his detailed Revisionsbericht, in which the features of each edition are generally given with such thoroughness.
18. Bar 30: Kroyer shows that the G flat in the bassoon is an error common to all editions. The manuscript gives G natural.


20. Bars 39 et seq.: The phrasing in all parts needs careful comparison between the different scores here and in the corresponding passage in bars 114 ff.

21. Bar 65: In the oboe version the 1st VIs remain \(f\) here and only change to \(p\) with the entry of the 2nd VIs. This is by no means unlikely. In the same bar the B for 2nd bassoon at the fourth quaver is an error, the Breitkopf G being the correct reading. On the other hand the \textit{staccato} dots for the 2nd bassoon in bar 67 are very odd, though Kroyer adopts them. The oboe version merely gives a single slur for the bassoons, which shows exactly how the error might have originated.

22. III. The \textit{tempo} indication of the \textit{Menuetto} is given variously as \textit{Allegro} or \textit{Allegretto}. Even Kroyer hovers between the two, referring to the movement as \textit{Allegro} in the \textit{Revisionsbericht}, but heading the actual text \textit{Allegretto}! Nor does he make any comment in his Preface on the existence of such a discrepancy. In general the oboe version gives \textit{Allegro} and the clarinet version \textit{Allegretto}.

23. There have been various ways of presenting this Minuet and Trio. I myself heard Richard Strauss bring the Trio round a second time as in Beethoven, while Frederick Stock recorded the movement with the second section of the minuet repeating at bar 36, thus making the wind passage into an epilogue. There are, however, no texts to support these interesting if eccentric readings.

24. Bar 13: Breitkopf gives various slurs and no dots; the oboe version no slurs and all dots! Unfortunately Breitkopf is not consistent and forgets the slur in the violas, which Kroyer supplies. The slurs need careful checking all through this movement, especially in the Trio.

25. Trio Bar 2: The oboe version rests the violas in this bar.

26. Trio Bar 5: One item of phrasing requires especial mention. The figure in 1st VIs and Violas is slurred in the oboe version but detached in Breitkopf. Oddly enough the Breitkopf edited parts restore the slur each time the figure occurs!

27. IV. It has become more and more the custom to write out Mozart’s short repeats at the beginning of this movement. Even Breitkopf has now followed suit in the latest reprint of both score and parts. Normally this kind of practice seems to me entirely wrong, but since in the present instance it has become the rule rather than the exception, it is futile to protest! However, since the bar numbering varies as a result in different editions, the notes below will refer to the Breitkopf lettering.

28. 3 bars after letter A et seq.: The phrasing of the second subject varies considerably between the versions. See especially the last 6 bars before the \textit{forte} at letter B.

29. Letter B: Breitkopf marks the violins \(f\) only at the second quaver. The oboe version gives the \(f\) at the barline as at letter G, and Kroyer confirms that this is correct.

30. 9 after letter C: The oboe version gives the 1st horn: \[\text{music notation}\]. The autograph apparently proves this incorrect.

31. 14 after C: The oboe version gives the cellos and basses \(A\) in this bar. Kroyer again agrees with the Br. \(A\). The oboe version also has no viola slur either here or at 12 after C, and Kroyer agrees with Breitkopf but without comment. This is a pity as the slur is by no means the obviously correct reading.

32. 12 before D: Here is a very strange situation, for Mozart seems to have removed
the 2nd Oboe line: in rescoring the passage with clarinets. This was possibly to avoid the leap of a ninth to the following D (as shown), though there would have been no difficulty in execution.

33. 4/5 after D: The G sharps for woodwind across the barlines are given *staccato* in Breitkopf but are tied in the oboe version. Kroyer makes no comment.

34. 11 after D: Another Kroyer special. The flute part should apparently read:

![Flute part diagram](image)

The amusing thing is that Kroyer is quite exceptionally scathing about the corrupt reading which has, however, remained uncorrected in the text of his own score! The oboe version keeps the bassoons in thirds throughout this passage, whereas to make better counterpoint Breitkopf changes the D sharp to F sharp, 9 bars after D.

35. 6 before F: The oboe version gives the 1st and 2nd Vls:

![Violin part diagram](image)

At x Kroyer shows that the F sharp is right as shown and the A given in Breitkopf wrong. At y the G shown is wrong and Breitkopf’s correction to A stands. At z the middle note of the chord is D in Breitkopf but Kroyer makes no mention of this.

36. 8 after G: The oboe version gives the violins: Breitkopf changes the note marked x to B flat, bringing it into line with the passage after letter B. The woodwind phrasing during this whole section also needs comparison between the different scores.

37. 16 before the end: The rising scales are marked *staccato* in the oboe version. Not only are the dots not in Breitkopf but the wind parts are slurred. Kroyer makes no comment but brackets the wind slurs wherever the scales occur.

38. 3 before the end: Kroyer shows that the crotchet for 2nd oboe should be C not D. This is wrong in all editions.

**RAVEL—DAPHNIS ET CHLOÉ**

1. Fig. 155 (Beginning of 2nd Series of *Fragments Symphoniques*) Bar 2: The violas’ *Div. en 3* is very odd indeed. The more one studies it the more it is palpably *Div. en 4* and this must certainly be a misprint. Unfortunately the parts have taken the direction at face value and have done their best with an impossible task! The result is that they give the divided upper part to the top line and the divided lower part a line apiece to the 2nd and 3rd lines. At the fourth bar, however, they abandon the unequal struggle and divide correctly ‘*en 4*’ though the music is identical.
2. 2 bars after 156 et seq.: The harmonic on the 3rd Solo VI must surely be C natural —i.e. sounding G two octaves above the open string. This has the advantage not only of being possible but of supplying a note in the prevailing harmony.

3. Fig. 175: The 1st VI pizzicato chord should certainly be a 6/4 chord of C sharp. The sharp does not appear before the G in any score or part—a general misprint.

4. 3 bars after 176: Here is a famous query. The flute run up has an E sharp in the part though there is nothing of the kind in any score. It is impossible to establish beyond doubt which is right. The reading of the part is most attractive and corresponds with the return of this colourful note later in the solo. Perhaps it was inserted at some early rehearsal and thus never incorporated into the already published score.

5. Fig. 180: The indication $\frac{1}{4}=\frac{3}{8}$ sometimes causes confusion. Ravel is reputed to have said that it is a misprint for $\frac{1}{4}=\frac{1}{4}$. It all depends on the interpretation of the term ‘précédente’. If this is taken to mean the bars immediately before, then twice as fast is ample and four times impossible! If on the other hand (and it is probable that this is what Ravel originally meant, whatever second thoughts he may have had later!) it refers to the basic tempo, Très lent, of the flute melody (Fig. 176 et seq.), then the new crotchet must certainly equal the semiquaver of that section.

6. Fig. 182: Here is splendid confusion. The cor anglais must quite obviously read a semitone higher for the four bars on this page. One can only suppose that Ravel momentarily forgot that he had left this instrument with a key signature of 5 flats! On the following page all is well.

7. Fig. 193: The slurring of the trumpet line has been rather loosely carried out in the score where, however, the intention is clear. This is not true of the parts, however, where similar carelessness has more misleading results.

8. One bar before Fig. 205: The 1st and 2nd bassoons should certainly have G natural in this bar. The accidental is missing from both score and parts.

9. 6 bars before Fig. 210: The omission of the rising and falling hairpins in the strings and brass parts is serious in view of the different dynamic marking in woodwind and percussion, especially since the parts are unanimous in this misprint.

SCHOENBERG—KAMMERSYMPHONIE NO. 1, Op. 9

1. The problem of performing this work is made more complex through the difficulty of establishing the correct text. Schoenberg’s instructions are immensely detailed but the details differ in every score and the parts are different again. What is so splendid is that all the scores are described in bold letters as Verbesserte Ausgabe. One can only assume that at every performance Schoenberg found new improvements and means of ensuring a true performance which he immediately put into the score, or into the parts if the score was not due for reprinting. As a result there is a note in the miniature score, probably the most ‘Verbesserte Ausgabe’ which can be obtained, to the effect that a large number of ‘prescriptions’ exist in the parts which are not to be found in the score, and this is indeed the truth. Where the note in the miniature goes astray, however, is when it says that although the interpretation marks to be found in the parts do not correspond with those in the score, they are nowhere actually contradictory to one another. On the contrary, in many places they are exactly that!

It would be impossible and confusing to list every one of the endless tiny revisions and variations of phrasing to be found in the different editions. In the notes which follow, only the principal corrections will be referred to, and these will be dealt with on the assumption that the miniature score is the most
reliable and that no full score should be relied upon without careful checking.¹

2. The diagram of the grouping of the 15 instruments varies from score to score; the miniature places the flute in the front row on the extreme left, the viola moving to a position immediately in front of the conductor.

3. Fig. 1: Schoenberg seems to have had many misgivings as to the speed at which it would be prudent to play the first movement, which is marked sehr rasch. Originally he thought of it in quick crotchets, although the conductor was instructed actually to beat minims. The miniature score then gives \( \mathcal{J} = \text{ca. 104} \) but this is mercifully changed in the parts to 88!

4. 2 bars after Fig. 4: The figure \( \mathcal{J} \), at one time general, is changed gradually through the various editions to \( \overline{\mathcal{J}} \) and by the last printings the latter version is practically universal. A few places still survive, however, where the two versions remain mixed. (See for example 3 and 5 bars after Fig. 33.)

5. Fig. 6: The parts give the tempo here as \( \mathcal{J} = 72 \) changing to 69 at Fig. 11 and returning to 88 at Fig. 13.

6. Fig. 18: All scores give etwas langsamer at the barline, but from the musical sense the change of tempo should surely come only at the second crotchet of the bar. In addition the parts change the 'etwas' to 'viel'. A similar change in degree occurs at 21 where the miniature changes the ein wenig langsamer to viel langsamer als., etc.

7. Numerous tempo indications occur in the parts from Fig. 27 onwards not to be found in any score: \( \mathcal{J} = 72 \) at Fig. 27 itself, 80 at Fig. 30, accel. at 32, and 88 at the 1. Zeitmass at Fig. 33.

8. Fig. 46: The metronome marks between here and Fig. 60 can only be described as fantastic. Both Fig. 38 and Fig. 46 are headed sehr rasch, yet although minim is constantly given as equalling minim or crotchet equalling crotchet, at 38 the \( \mathcal{J} \) is only 92-96 whereas at 46 the minim has suddenly reached the incredible speed of 160! Moreover this is by no means the end of our troubles: at Fig. 48 the music is a little slower ('—not much!' adds Schoenberg hastily in parenthesis), after which we soon get gradually faster once more only to find ourselves at Fig. 50 with the minim equalling no more than 116! This is a mere brief respite, however, for at 52 we are suddenly once more tearing along on the borderline of possibility at \( \mathcal{J} = \text{ca. 160} \) with still faster passages shortly before us at Fig. 54 ff! If all this were at least consistent it would matter little that enthusiasm needs to be tempered with practical prudence if the passage is not to sound a mere scramble. But the sudden appearance of the \( \mathcal{J} = 116 \) at Fig. 50 suggests that Schoenberg has erred somewhere, though it is not easy to establish exactly where or why.

9. 2 bars before 75: As the material reads, the 2nd horn is open during these next four bars while the 1st horn is specifically marked muted. Then at the fortissimo entry of the main theme both are marked open. At 75 where they move together it seems unlikely, to say the least, that one should be open and the other muted, and it seems to me that Schoenberg forgot that he had removed the mute of the 2nd horn, or else considered that the player would not have time to put it back before starting the new figure two before 75.

10. One bar before 76: The indication \( \mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J} \) is sometimes held open to doubt on account of the woodwind notation (see overleaf):

¹ In view of the relatively recent version made of this work by Schoenberg for full orchestra (published in a reproduction of the composer's autograph by Schirmer) it is necessary to add that the further variants to be found in this have deliberately not been mentioned here since they arise through the exigencies of the new medium employed.
It is indeed remarkable to discover that the identical triplet quaver figures in the 9/4 bar go half again as fast as those in the preceding bar, and faulty readings have resulted from the misleading appearance of the score.

11. 3 bars after 95: In the full score this bar appears at the beginning of a new page and the E flat crotchet in the cor anglais is slurred back as if this instrument had been playing with the oboe for some time, as perhaps it once did in an earlier version. In the existing score, however, the cor anglais has nothing whatever on the last bar of the previous page and this initial E flat now looks somewhat unlikely! It has, though, survived (without its slur) into the miniature score, although the pages are naturally redistributed.

RICHARD STRAUSS—4 LAST SONGS

1. I. Frühling: 4 after B the 1st Flute’s trill should surely be to E flat.

2. II. September: 2 after B: The 3rd and 4th horns are certainly not pitched in D as marked! There have been various attempts at making sense of the harmony, including the removal of the change to bass clef, a very dubious remedy. In fact, if the horns remain in the bass clef as marked but change to horns in B flat they will then be in unison with the basses, the obvious solution. How the error arose is somewhat mysterious. In any case they revert to Horns in D with the restoration of the treble clef at letter C.

3. III. Beim Schlafengehen: 2 before H: the C flat in the 1st horn is decidedly weird. As before, various attempts have been made at retransposing the instrument, but this time the correct harmony is restored simply by removing the accidental.

4. IV. Im Abendrot: 4 after F: The timpani part is at fault here and it is not even certain whether there should be anything for it to play in this bar. The isolated B flat looks suspiciously like a left-over from the end of the roll in the previous bar. If its existence is accepted, then the decision has to be taken as to where the missing rest should be restored—after the note, as the player’s part would suggest, or before it as the position of the note in the score indicates.

WAGNER—EINE FAUST-OUVERTURE

1. Bar 58: Here is an instance of a major textual problem to which no conclusive solution can be given. The original Breitkopf material reads:

   ![Music notation image]

in all melodic instruments. On the other hand every other statement of this principal subject gives the semitone rise (to E flat) which is its strongest characteristic. Opinions differ as to whether the omission of the flat here is a mere slip on Wagner’s part or a masterstroke of additional emphasis! The nearest equivalent place is in bar 320 where the note is indeed E flat, but the setting is not identical and moreover the harmony has no delayed retardations as here. The Eulenburg miniature actually goes so far as to add the flats under the authority of Professor Ernst Praetorius who in 1934 edited the revised printing, though without a Revisionsbericht to substantiate his decision. The case is by no means proved and many conductors prefer the variety and strength of the whole tone step.