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VAR. I \( \nu = 63 \)

\( \text{p legatissimo} \)

(F. Chopin)
Secondo

\[52\]

\[54\]

\[56\]

\[58\]
VAR. II \( \uparrow \uparrow 72 \)  

*p sempre staccato*

\( \text{dolce grazioso} \)

(sotto)
VAR. IV J-126

Secondo

(staccato e leggero)
VAR. IV  \( \text{\textit{J}126} \)

\( P r i m o \)

\( \text{\textit{scherza\u00fando e brillante}} \)

\( \text{\textit{cre\u00e8sc.}} \)
The existence of the Variations in D Major* on theme of one of Thomas Moore’s Irish Melodies, which were popular in Chopin’s time, was recorded more than a hundred years ago by Chopin’s sister, Ludwika Jędrzejewicz. In the list of unpublished compositions, which she prepared at some time around 1854 for the publishers of his posthumous works, she placed under no. 11 the four opening bars of the Variations sur un air national de Moore à 4 mains, and ascribed it to the year 1826.

But the joy that the discovery in 1964 of the autograph copy of this work occasioned was somewhat diminished by the fact that the manuscript was incomplete, for of the twelve pages of music, two — the first and the last — were missing.

When I was invited by Polish Music Publications to attempt a reconstruction of the missing pages, I was aware from the beginning of the difficulties that lay before me. The greatest of these was the fact that the missing pages were the Secondo part of the Introduction (bars 1–27) and the Primo part of most of the Finale (bars 149–179). That is, first, the section where the element of improvisation would be present to a greater extent than in the variations, and which, in addition, opens the work; and then second, the concluding section, where again in the Primo part the factor of virtuosity may have come to the fore to a greater extent. (The absence of any accompaniment to the theme, in bars 28–43, clearly suggests also the conventional nature of the Secondo part.)

In these circumstances the word “reconstruction” can be used only in its broadest sense, that is the recreating of the atmosphere of the missing sections of the work, a recreation of one of the many shapes which Chopin may eventually have given to the music. It is not an endeavour to move in the direction of a faithful imitation of what the composer did actually write in these missing sections.

The following principles served, therefore, the editor as a guide and a point of departure in making the present reconstruction.

1. To keep as far as possible within the means used by the composer in the existing sections of the Variations.

2. In the cases where it is necessary to go beyond these means, as is required in some places by the nature of the Introduction and Finale, to use those characteristic compositional and pianistic devices found in Chopin’s works of the similar genre contemporaneous with the Variations in D Major (e.g. the Variations in E Major on a theme from a German song, 1824–26), or in those of another kind and of a little later date (Opp. 2, 8, 11, 13, 14, 21, and the Rondo in C Major for two pianos), or, finally, in those works close to the Variations in genre, but written at a much later date (Op. 12 and the Introduction from Op. 16). In the case of these last models, a corresponding simplification of the compositional technique has, of course, been made.

The few performing indications provided by Chopin for the Variations in D Major are as follows:

a. Metronome marks for the Introduction, Theme, and Variations I and II.

b. The indication of the tempo of the Finale as Vivace.

c. A pause at bar 27.

d. A pause and ritardando at bar 140.

e. Short phrasing slurs over two notes in the Secondo part in bars 161–163 and 165–166.

As it is the aim of the present edition not merely to reconstruct the missing fragments and to print the bare text of Chopin’s manuscript, but also to set out the work in a form which lends itself to practical use, the text of the Variations has been provided with those performing indications which the editor has judged to be indispensable. These are printed in a form which distinguishes them from the few original indications. The editor wishes
to state here that he has tried to derive also the small number of performing indications from the signs and indications employed by Chopin himself in the early period of his creative activity.

Editorial indications are distinguished in the score by smaller type, or by square brackets. Round brackets indicate notes doubled in the other hand or in the other performer’s part, and also suggestions for the shortening of the time values of those notes which, if held as written, would overlap in the right hand of the Secondo part and in the left hand of the Primo part. When the hands of the two players cross, the term “sopra” indicates that it is necessary to play over the partner’s hand; the term “sotto” indicates under.

The fingerling and the pedal marks are editorial.

The Editorial Notes show the most important deviations of the printed text from the original.

In the music, many obvious mistakes and oversights concerning mainly the values of notes and rests have been corrected without any reference being made in the Editorial Notes.

Jan Ekier

* Detailed information on the genesis of the work and the history of the manuscript is given by the editor of the facsimile edition of the Variations, Wladyslaw Hordynski, who has in addition identified the composition as a work by Chopin (cf. Facsimile Edition of the Manuscripts of Chopin, Vol. 11 — Polish Music Publications, 1966)
EDITORIAL NOTES

A = autograph copy in the possession of the Jagiellonian Library, Cracow (MS BJ 1964: 1)

Prima

Bars 19 and 21 In A an aff ottava sign is most probably missing in the first halves of the bars.

Bar 24 A notates the first note as \( \text{а}^\# \).

Bars 44–45 and 48–49 A gives the right-hand part as demisemiquavers. In order to obtain the correct note-values, i.e., the hemidemisemiquavers, the fourth line is added in appropriate places and the irregular rhythmic groups provided with the relevant figures.

Bars 56–57 A incorrectly continues the aff ottava sign until the middle of bar 57.

Bar 107 A notates the first note of the right-hand part in the second half of the bar as \( \text{г} \).

Bar 111 Under the first note of the right-hand part, \( \text{б} \), A writes, presumably through an oversight, its lower third, \( \text{г} \).

Bar 127 At the beginning of the bar in the right-hand part A gives a superfluous \( \text{г} \).

Secundo

Bar 50 In the sheet at the beginning of the second half of the bar A gives a superfluous \( \text{г} \).

Bar 51 A gives the second note in the right-hand part as \( \text{г} \), presumably incorrectly.

Bar 56 A through the same note \( \text{г} \) as in A.

Bars 73–75 In A presumably owing to the lack of space or the loss of space at the end of the passage, bars 73–75 have been divided in the notation of the three-part structure of the second half of bar 73 and the last of bar 75 and in two parts one in bars 74 leading to the transition from the notation on two lines to that on the lower three lines.

Bars 158 and 160 A incorrectly gives the left-hand part in the same pitch as the right-hand part, neglecting the shifting to another system that has not been marked in the left-hand part.

Bars 161–162 In A the slur and the lacking of the dot to the introduction of both hands in the second division of bars 161–162 have been marked, which was probably meant to be held and appears in A (see in 218 158).

Bars 177–178 In A at the beginning of the right-hand part, a note of a superfluous \( \text{ж} \) has been introduced in the wrong place.