

ARTISTIC EXPRESSION, INDIVIDUALITY AND
AUTHENTICITY IN CHOPIN PERFORMANCE

by

ELIZABETH STRICKLAND

A THESIS

Presented to the Department of Music
and the Robert D. Clark Honors College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Music

June, 2016

An Abstract of the Thesis of

Elizabeth Strickland for the degree of Bachelor of Arts
in the Department of Music to be taken June, 2016

Title: Artistic Expression, Individuality and Authenticity in Chopin Performance

Approved: 

Claire Wachter

The ability to perform Chopin fluently is an essential skill for any accomplished classical pianist. Chopin composed primarily for solo piano, and his technical and musical mastery of the instrument allowed him to write some of the most outstanding compositions in the piano repertoire. Two of these compositions, the Barcarolle Op. 60 and the Sonata in B-Flat Minor, Op. 35, are especially deserving of close study. Both of these pieces have unique technical and musical challenges as well as unusual musical forms. I have listened to various historical interpretations and each pianist makes vastly different choices in tempo, tone, dynamics, and artistic detail. It is important to understand how and why these choices are made, and what helps to create the most successful and musically inspiring performances. I will examine five performances of the Barcarolle, and four performances of the Sonata Op. 35, to study the interpretations by each pianist.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professors Claire Wachter and Dean Kramer for their outstanding teaching during my time at the University of Oregon, as well as their patient help with editing and presenting this thesis. It has been a privilege to work with both of these professors and I am very grateful for their guidance as I continue to develop as a musician. I would also like to thank Michelle Sulaiman for her thoughtful suggestions and assistance. Finally, I am grateful for the loving support of my parents Mike and Kristi Strickland, who have always encouraged my musical goals.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chopin's Unique Style and Artistic Demands	4
Alterations to the Score	5
<i>Barcarolle, Op. 60: Overview</i>	7
How Great Performers Interpret The <i>Barcarolle, Op. 60</i>	10
<i>Sonata Op. 35 in B-Flat Minor: Overview</i>	17
How Great Performers Interpret <i>Sonata Op. 35 in B-Flat Minor</i>	19
Conclusion	27
Appendix: Scores	29
Bibliography	64

List of Accompanying Materials

1. Links to recordings studied:

Barcarolle, Op. 60:

Maurizio Pollini (b. 1942): <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e-4vMJ9c0RQ>

1992 (Deutsche Grammophon)

Vladimir Horowitz (1903-1989):

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8JKv2FyvJ8I&list=RD8JKv2FyvJ8I>

1990 (RCA Gold)

Martha Argerich (b. 1941): <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f99mfQOldx0>

2008 (Deutsche Grammophon)

Vladimir Ashkenazy (b. 1937): <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FFDS3CIdoIw>

1995 (Decca Music Group)

Arthur Rubinstein (1887-1982): <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q9umBE2Gn7Q>

2013 (Mangora Classical) Recorded 1962.

Sonata in B-flat Minor, Op. 35:

Martha Argerich: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qu8ai8sh80U>

2002 (Deutsche Grammophon)

Sergei Rachmaninoff (1873-1943):

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PUS_V4V3vwk

1930 (RCA)

Vladimir Horowitz: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EnHrjNRUwMo>

1962 (Sony BMG Music)

Arturo Benedetti Michelangeli (1920-1995):

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gw7UDd7r7fI>

1962 (RAI Television)

List of Figures

<i>Barcarolle Op. 60</i> , measures 4-9	8
Examples of descending sixth passages in the Barcarolle.	9
Double trills in the Barcarolle	10
Measures 31-32 in the Barcarolle.	13

Introduction

The music of Chopin is interesting and meaningful on several levels. Chopin is one of the most important and frequently performed composers of Romantic classical music. A musician with knowledge of Chopin's life, compositional styles, and pieces will be better prepared to perform and teach. In addition, Chopin is one of my favorite composers because of the way audiences relate to his music. Personally, in fifteen years of performing experience, I have found some of the most appreciative and emotional audience responses have come after my performance of Chopin works. His melodies are extremely vocal in nature and easily resonate with a large majority of listeners, even those with little previous exposure to classical music.

There have been many developments and changes in how Chopin's music has been performed based on historical trends, changes to the structure of the piano throughout history, and influential pianists who brought their own unique and personal style to their interpretation of Chopin. A thorough understanding of past performances of any given Chopin piece, as well as an appreciation of its unique technical and artistic challenges, will be extremely valuable to my work as a teacher and performer.

In the literature available on the subject of Chopin performance and interpretation, as well as literature specifically about the Barcarolle and Sonata Op.35 (the main pieces addressed in this thesis), I have found a lot of information from musicological, historical, and theoretical viewpoints. From this information, it is possible to learn about the structure and form of the great Chopin works, how they were performed in the past, and the differences between Chopin's Romantic style and earlier styles of the Classical period. However, there is far less information relating to practical

performance and practice strategies. Although some performers have valuable experience and knowledge about these strategies, they may not write professionally in their careers unless they pursue a career in academia. The most comprehensive papers I found on Chopin's Barcarolle were written by theorists who also played this piece at some point, but their papers mostly center around discussions of harmony and are written in language that is difficult for the average person to absorb.

For example, David Kopp's 2014 article titled "On Performing Chopin's Barcarolle" states in the abstract that it "focuses on the author's experience relating musical analysis to performance issues in Chopin's Barcarolle". Although it is true that Kopp relates some of his arguments to questions of how to perform the Barcarolle, the article primarily focuses on discussion of specific harmonic moments in the piece, using language most familiar to a theorist. Although Kopp makes some excellent points about structure and form, the points are written in such a complex and theoretical way that it is challenging to take away any specific information that would improve one's ability to interpret and perform the piece more effectively.

This rift between the performer and the analyst/historian is also acknowledged by Kopp, who states:

"Any inquiry of this type must necessarily engage with the issues raised by the relevant literature of the last few decades on the relationship of analysis to performance. The classic pitfalls are well-documented: the prioritization of the analyst's way of thinking over the performer's, with a certain disdain for the latter, the related dependence on analytic notions of musical structure foreign to typical performance lingo; and the tendency toward highly prescriptive conclusions dictating one preferred way of performing a passage..." (Kopp 2014, 1-2.)

This is an excellent summary of the issues that sometimes prevent performers from fully engaging with research completed by other scholars. There is a definite need for more scholars to consider issues from the viewpoint of the performer.

The process of becoming an accomplished classical pianist is difficult without the help of a master teacher. The musical and technical demands of the classical repertoire absolutely necessitate the assistance of an experienced, successful performer. After a certain point, however, classical pianists need to be capable of independent study and research. Each teacher has unique strengths and abilities, and a teacher's expertise on any given composer will vary. Many pieces in the advanced repertoire are related to other works of art or historical figures, specific musical genres, or historical periods that give significant direction to the interpretation of the piece. The research and analysis I will present in this thesis is meant to be useful and practical to the performer, as a way to begin investigating a new piece or enhance studies already in progress.

What kinds of research are most usable and helpful to the performer? One area of inquiry I have personally found lacking in many years of researching pieces I perform is practice strategy. Complex classical pieces each have unique and challenging trouble spots that require special attention. If a teacher is unavailable, it can be very frustrating to try to work out the most efficient way to practice a new piece. Additionally, when researching a new work, it is extremely helpful to know in advance what the challenges are. There is also the question of hand size and flexibility, as some pieces include large stretches or chords that require specific physical abilities.

Another area of research I will address in my thesis is the question of how great pianists have chosen to interpret a piece. It is important to listen to a variety of

recordings, notice the differences, strengths and weaknesses, and avoid the pitfall of unintentionally (or intentionally!) copying someone's performance. Although there are many observations a pianist can take away and integrate into their own playing, it is disconcerting to hear someone perform as if they are trying to imitate their favorite recording.

In addition to studying practice strategy and historical interpretation, it is also helpful to be aware of specific technical and musical challenges inherent in a specific piece. There are numerous ways to classify and identify these challenges. When reading through an analysis of a piece from a theorist's perspective, one can find an entire dictionary of words that have been invented for the purposes of classification within that discipline. I will instead describe the unique technical and musical challenges present in the Barcarolle and Sonata Op. 35 in the useful, practical terms that performers use in lessons, master classes, and lecture-recitals, which can hopefully be understood by anyone with a little basic music knowledge.

Chopin's Unique Style and Artistic Demands

An important component of performing and teaching Chopin's music is the mastery of Chopin's unique keyboard techniques and styles. One of the singular aspects of Chopin's music is his use of "rubato," a term that asks the performer to alter the flow of time in a piece. The effective use of rubato is one of the most challenging aspects of performing Chopin's music. Performers use rubato in radically different ways and still create artistic interpretations of Chopin's music. Although rubato can be used successfully in a variety of ways, it is important to consider the musical context surrounding a phrase where rubato is used. Chopin's dynamic, tempo, ornamentation,

and phrasing marks usually help to suggest how rubato could be used in any given phrase.

It is important to understand the major influences on Chopin's compositional style. A universally acknowledged element in Chopin's writing for piano is melodic lines that imitate the voice. As George Jonson notes, "...he always urged his pupils to hear good singing, and even to take singing lessons themselves, in order that they might develop a true and expressive method of *cantabile* playing" (Jonson 1905, xxxi.) In both the Barcarolle and many parts of the Sonata Op. 35, we must produce a singing, smooth tone for the melodies and avoid any choppiness, with particular attention to those sections marked *cantabile* by Chopin.

Chopin's chromaticism is also important to highlight in performance. Chromaticism, or the use of notes outside of the seven-note scale or mode that a piece is based on, is used by Chopin in many ways. David Dubal states, "Chopin was one of the most original harmonists in history, creating an exquisite chromatic garden." Gerald Abraham describes Chopin's chromatic language as "A stage of the greatest importance in the evolution of the harmonic language...[He was] the first composer seriously to undermine the solid system of diatonic tonalism created by the Viennese classical masters and the contemporaries in other countries." (cited in Dubal 2004, 72.) The performer who studies and listens to chromaticism in Chopin's music will produce more interesting changes in harmonic color.

Alterations to the Score

Chopin wrote hundreds of details in the score of each piece, including dynamic markings, notes, ornaments, and many other musical details. Many performers choose

to leave out a particular nuance Chopin has indicated or add their own interpretive devices. Some interpreters insist that the score must be rigidly followed in order to achieve success in performing Chopin's music. Other performers deviate markedly from what Chopin indicates; yet provide us with incredibly brilliant and inspired recordings that continue to influence Chopin performances today.

The "correct" way to interpret Chopin's music is still debated fiercely today, with different teachers and influential single performers all having their own ideas of what is "correct". As John Rink states, "Finding one's 'voice' as a performer is becoming increasingly difficult in this age of historically and analytically informed interpretation. The stringent demands now imposed on musicians by scholars, critics and listeners threaten the pursuit of individual artistic convictions to an unprecedented extent" (Rink 1994, 214.) As a teacher, I wish to give my students the skill to interpret music on their own, rather than having to rely on me or another teacher to answer every possible question about how to interpret music. Therefore, when I teach Chopin's music to all my future students, I want to have a thorough understanding both of how Chopin originally intended his music to be interpreted as well as how performances have changed throughout history.

Certain performers are somewhat obsessed with the idea of "performance practice," the art of performing in the closest manner possible to the original context of the piece, often using rare period instruments to increase authenticity. I believe the quest for authenticity is somewhat useless because it ignores significant and meaningful developments in culture, piano technology, and pianism that have occurred in the last hundred and fifty years. Although it is impossible to identify one "correct" way to

interpret Chopin's music, there are similarities between the greatest performers of his music that can be identified and understood to illuminate one's personal interpretation of his compositions.

Barcarolle, Op. 60: Overview

The title of this iconic Chopin composition originates from a musical form based on a type of folk song sung by Venetian gondoliers. Chopin's Barcarolle is perhaps the most famous piano piece written in this genre, described by musicologist Maurice Hinson as "the greatest barcarolle ever written" (Hinson 2000), although there are several hundred other barcarolles for solo piano in existence (James Margetts 2008.) The flowing 12/8 meter and characteristic, wave-like left hand figures set the piece apart from any other Chopin composition.

Mastering the Barcarolle involves solving some unique technical and musical challenges. It is essential to create a consistent, rich, yet subtle tone in the left hand in order to not disrupt the undulating, 12/8 meter and bring out the barcarolle character. The pianist must prevent the thumb from disrupting the flowing left hand line with accents. Since the thumb is a pianist's strongest and potentially least graceful finger, it is easy to overplay many of the sensitive left hand sections of the Barcarolle, especially during the ascending figures.

Barcarolle Op. 60, measures 4-9

Circled notes are played by the thumb. It is important to maintain the long slurs without accents.

It is challenging to achieve the correct tone in the right hand. Many of the slurs in the Barcarolle extend over several measures, and the production of a singing, smooth, unbroken line is clearly necessary because of the *cantabile* indicated in measure 6. Pianists who play the Barcarolle must control the melodies set in thirds and sixths, creating fingering issues that are far more complex than a single melody line. The descending sixths in measures 14-15, 18-19, 22, 33, and 111-112 are especially difficult.

The image displays two systems of musical notation for Chopin's Barcarolle. Each system consists of a piano (treble clef) and bass clef staff. The piano part features descending sixteenth-note passages with intricate fingering (e.g., 5-4-3-2-1, 2-1, 5-4-3-2-1) and articulation markings such as 'leg.' and asterisks. The bass part features a more melodic line with slurs and articulation. Dynamics like 'p' (piano) and 'trill' are indicated. The score is in G major and 3/4 time.

Examples of descending sixteenth passages in the Barcarolle.

These figures require careful shaping of the legato melody line.

One of the most exciting challenges in the Barcarolle is mastering the double trills. Chopin uses thirds melodically in this composition, and many of the trills he notates are either double (two sets of fingers rapidly changing at the same time) or a trill with a melody line below. The pianist must create a shimmering, sustained sonority.



Double trills in the Barcarolle

The coda of the Barcarolle is unique in Chopin's oeuvre. The thick chords in the left hand can easily overwhelm the melody and disrupt the interesting harmonic shifts occurring in the right hand. The slurs in the right hand are difficult because the entire melody is set in octaves, and the pianist must maintain the integrity of the melodic line through strategic fingering and pedaling. The coda is marked fortissimo at the beginning but the pianist must save the maximum sonority for the end of the section.

How Great Performers Interpret The *Barcarolle*, Op. 60

Although there are many outstanding performances of the Barcarolle by famous pianists, I have chosen to examine recordings by Maurizio Pollini, Vladimir Horowitz, Martha Argerich, Vladimir Ashkenazy, and Arthur Rubinstein. These five pianists are considered some of the greatest Chopin interpreters in history, especially Horowitz and Rubinstein, who have achieved a legendary status among pianists.

Maurizio Pollini (b. 1942)

Pollini's interpretation of the Barcarolle is exciting and effective, yet restrained in certain ways. After a strange moment in the first chord where he appears to speed ahead a full eighth note, his opening creates an absolutely beautiful, smooth marriage between the right and left hand that sets up a graceful *cantabile* atmosphere.

Throughout the opening section of the piece, Pollini extends most of the trills, including the double-note trills, for as long as possible, which is very effective in maintaining the flow of the piece. Although his overall rhythm and tempo are very consistent throughout this section, the middle section reveals some rhythmic choices that could be considered very distracting. Beginning at measure 39, Pollini changes the mood and color to begin a section with a new left hand pattern including the repetition of a slurred eighth note-quarter note. This rhythmic motif brings water or waves to mind. Pollini, however, chooses to alter the rhythm throughout most of this section by lengthening the quarter note and shortening the eighth note, creating a continuous pattern of rubato that makes the gondola sound a bit rocky. One could argue that this rubato is less effective as a continuous choice throughout the passage rather than being employed strategically when the right hand has an expressive melody to bring out. However, Pollini uses rubato in a subtle way and it is a reasonable artistic choice. At measure 103, Pollini alters the rhythmic pattern noticeably by prolonging each eighth note at the beginning of the beat, making the eighth notes sound like quarter notes for most of the section. Although this rubato serves to emphasize the melody at the top of the right hand, it completely disrupts the melodic flow and makes strange gaps and silences in places where Chopin has written slurs. This performance is thoughtful, with excellent tone and dynamic control, but one possible criticism is that whenever Pollini employs a type of rubato, he reuses it in similar sections in a noticeably repetitious way. For example, in the several instances of repeated descending sixths in the Barcarolle, Pollini holds the first sixth of each group for an eighth note instead of the indicated sixteenth note. This

can be a very effective way to play that passage, except that Pollini plays it almost identically each time and there are many similar sections, making the rubato feel stale.

Vladimir Horowitz (1903-1989)

Where Pollini's Barcarolle sounds somewhat planned, Horowitz seems to be making musical decisions in the moment, creating an intriguing and compelling recording. He begins the first main section by dropping the dynamic of the left hand noticeably just before the right hand enters, just as an accomplished collaborative pianist would do for his or her vocalist. Keeping the overall rhythm of the section stable, Horowitz nonetheless manages to dot the opening pages with small, extremely expressive moments of rubato that feel incredibly natural and unplanned. Many of these moments occur at the same places where a singer would naturally need to stretch the rhythm in order to make a difficult leap or transition vocally.

When performing a piece with multiple melodic lines occurring simultaneously, pianists must choose which line or lines are most important to bring out, a process called "voicing." At measure 32, Horowitz makes a very interesting and unique voicing choice that is not indicated by Chopin. In a pattern of gently ascending chords before the close of the first large section of the piece, he brings out the top voice of the left hand chords very noticeably. This effectively brings out a beautiful line, as well as enhancing the easily heard melody at the top of the right hand chords.



Measures 31-32 in the Barcarolle.

In 32, Horowitz voices the top-most voice in the left hand.

In the middle section, Horowitz pays special attention to the beginning of every new voice line introduced, allowing the multiple lines that Chopin sets against each other to be heard individually. In contrast to Pollini, Horowitz tailors his rubato to the individual harmonic moments within the section that seem to require it, rather than altering rhythmic patterns within an entire section. This idea can also be observed in the very unusual chromatic section of measures 103-109, where Horowitz sometimes takes time in a way similar to Pollini but continues the flow of the music when the melodic line seems to demand it.

When Horowitz reaches measure 84, where the first melody of the Barcarolle comes back with octaves in the left hand, he manages the dynamic buildup to the coda carefully. This section can easily be too loud prematurely, but Horowitz continuously pulls back to a quieter dynamic at the beginning of each new phrase to save room for dynamic expansion into the coda. Here, his playing sounds free and exultant, with several fortissimo peaks and thunderous bass notes. This contrasts well with the chromatic section at measures 103-109, which is reflective and at a slightly slower tempo, allowing all the unusual chromatic shifts to be completely highlighted. This

rendition of the Barcarolle is extremely faithful to Chopin's score, yet personalized in a profound way by Horowitz's masterful use of rubato and consistent flowing, *cantabile* tone.

Martha Argerich (b. 1941)

Argerich, a pianist known for her daring tempo choices and outstanding technique, begins the short introductory section of the Barcarolle much faster than many other performers. Her left hand begins in measure 4 with a slower tempo, which is not maintained when the right hand comes in at measure 6. She speeds up and slows down around ten beats per minute during this section, ranging between 63 and 74 per dotted quarter note. Her rhythmic instability continues through the first major section of the piece, speeding up and slowing down according to the harmonic tension in the piece. Although Argerich effectively brings out the expressive, tender moments in this section, most notably the high C at measure 14, the more technical sections are played so fast that her technique overwhelms the music.

In the A major section, Argerich adds numerous expressive devices of her own invention, starting the section very slowly, and gradually increasing speed and intensity to an almost ludicrous point around measures 52-57. This is the least convincing section of her interpretation, as the rhythmic changes distract the listener from the interesting harmonic progressions leading into the next section. Although Argerich follows most of the expressive marks and dynamics in the score, she alters Chopin's phrase lengths and compresses rhythms. This is her main weakness in her performance of the Barcarolle.

Vladimir Ashkenazy (b. 1937):

Ashkenazy's performance of the Barcarolle is completely different from Argerich's interpretation. His tempo is extremely steady and flowing, with only the smallest amounts of rubato added in between phrases. Although he handles the double trills easily and expressively, his technical expertise does not distract from the composition. One notable divergence from the score happens in measure 35, when Ashkenazy completely ignores the *poco più mosso* marking for the transitional section between measures 34 and 39. The *dolce sfogato* section beginning at measure 78 is one of the most potentially expressive moments in the Barcarolle, but Ashkenazy uses very little rubato. The rarely used term *sfogato* refers to a soprano with a high, airy range. Although rubato can be extremely effective in measures 78-81, Ashkenazy plays almost metronomically, even at the top of the melody line in 80-81.

In this group of performers, Ashkenazy is one of the most faithful to Chopin's score. It is difficult to find instances where he ignores a slur or leaves out a note. Additionally, his tempo remains convincingly steady throughout the piece, adhering (with the one exception at measure 35) to Chopin's tempo markings. His technique is excellent, and listeners can clearly hear multiple voices simultaneously in the thickly textured coda and middle section. It is difficult, however, to hear the recording and find nuances that are specifically attributable to Ashkenazy's playing. Each of the other performers has a sense of individuality that is distinctly missing in Ashkenazy's interpretation of the Barcarolle.

Arthur Rubinstein (1887-1982)

Rubinstein begins his performance of the Barcarolle with an interesting inclusion of G# in the fourth beat of the first measure, rather than holding it with a tie, as is indicated by all of the editions available. It is hard to imagine this is a mistake, and no other performer I have found chooses to do this. In measures 17 and 19, Rubinstein starts the trill on the principal note, which repeats the A# and G# respectively. This is very effective at emphasizing the change at measure 17 from F#7 to B, and at measure 19 from the dramatic G#m7 to (harmonic) Bb. Throughout the beginning of the Barcarolle, Rubinstein often takes moments of rubato or expression between phrases, or colors a phrase in a new way, but he never disrupts the rhythmic and lyric flow of the music. It seems possible to listen to this recording and accurately mark where all the slurs begin and end, because Rubinstein always shows them clearly.

In measures 78-81, Rubinstein plays the light, airy soprano solo with the most vocal interpretation of this group of performers. Where Horowitz takes a chance to fly ahead and show a more pianistic arc of sound, and Ashkenazy plays as if a teacher is lurking behind him with a metronome, Rubinstein handles the passage like a soprano with plenty of breath capacity to spare. Moving into the return to *tempo primo* at measure 84, Rubinstein injects the sixteenth notes of the left hand with rhythmic energy, bringing them out in a unique way.

The coda is the weakest part of Rubinstein's interpretation. The lack of voicing in the left hand, combined with minimal usage of rubato, makes the section sound heavy and slow. Rubinstein makes up for it, however, by listening intently from measures 103-109, showing each new harmonic idea and voicing the top melody clearly. Rubinstein's

impeccable singing tone and attention to detail make his personality impossible to overlook. It would be easy for a listener to guess who performed this rendition of the Barcarolle.

Sonata Op. 35 in B-Flat Minor: Overview

After writing his first sonata at the age of seventeen, Chopin waited eleven years before making another attempt at the form. The Sonata No. 2 is considered his first mature sonata and is among the more advanced and musically complex works Chopin composed. Schumann famously described the four-movement sonata as four of Chopin's maddest children under the same roof. The work includes a funeral march that Chopin had completed two years before writing the rest of the sonata (Samson 1992, 161.) The initial four measures of the first movement comprise one of the most dramatic and unusual beginnings of a sonata up until that point, and every pianist has a different opinion on how they should be played. Mieczyslaw Tomaszewski writes:

“Much has been written about the first four bars and two chords – so distinctive, so memorable. In 1929, Ludwik Bronarski devoted a separate study to them. Chopin instructs them to be played grave and forte. Thus they have weight and strength. One hears in them tragedy, menace, knowing questions and oracular judgment... There is no doubt that it does not augur anything good. And that is probably its function”
(Tomaszewski 2015.)

Immediately after the ominous beginning, the sonata launches into an extremely, disturbed, restless section with a melody that seems to cry out urgently for help. Soon enough, however, at measure 41, the relentless movement stops and a warm, passionate second theme is introduced. There are many challenges in this movement, and managing the contrast and character of these two themes is one of the greatest difficulties.

The Scherzo movement is full of excitement and fireworks, demanding the full technical ability of a performer for its many leaps and quick octave passages. It is very easy to overplay this movement or use a harsh tone unintentionally. The greatest performers of this movement shape the repeated note sections and voice the chords clearly so that the listener can always tell what direction the music is heading. A retrospective, serene middle section with long slurs and thickly textured chords brings an entirely different mood to the movement. The voicing in the trio is sometimes just as hard as playing the wild leaps accurately at the end of the movement.

The third movement, marked *lento*, gives the performer a break from the intense adrenaline of the first two movements, and poses different challenges. The pianist must choose a tempo that is fast enough to move the melody convincingly yet also reflects the title of *marche funèbre*. The middle section, in the relative major key of Db, has a left hand part that more than one pianist has remarked to be the hardest part of the entire movement. Beginning at measure 31, the left hand begins graceful, slurred figures that rise up from some of the lower bass notes on the piano. The pianist has to maintain a smooth, warm tone without any thumb accents. The movement ends with a return to the funeral march, repeating almost exactly the opening section. The fact that these two sections are similar is also an interpretive challenge, and it is interesting to note the wide variety of different choices made by each performer.

The fourth movement, lasting less than two minutes, is a baffling four-page ending to the entire sonata. Anton Rubinstein described the last movement as “night winds sweeping over churchyard graves,” an image that seems extremely suitable to the restless, agitated stream of eighth notes that continues unabated until the end of the

piece (Alan Walker, 2005.) A person familiar with Chopin but unfamiliar with this work would be extremely unlikely to name the correct composer. The movement is a fascinating conclusion to this sonata, and no other Chopin composition comes remotely close to its character. Tomaszewski states that this work could be called "...a Sonata of love and death." Both of these themes are clearly highlighted in this work and each interpretation shows different ways of achieving a certain emotional effect.

How Great Performers Interpret *Sonata Op. 35 in B-Flat Minor*

Martha Argerich (b. 1941)

Argerich chooses a tempo for the opening Grave that is exactly half as slow as the *Doppio movimento* section at measure 5, creating an audible relationship between the two sections. In navigating the agitated beginning of the movement, she excels at keeping her left hand from overwhelming the plaintive right hand outbursts, although she misses an opportunity in measures 37-38 to outline the exciting, rising bass notes. At the beginning of the *sostenuto* section, Argerich seems to still hold some restless tension from the previous section, waiting until measure 49 to fully relax into the softer *piano* dynamic. Her relatively quick tempo for the rest of the exposition makes Chopin's long slurs easier to achieve, although she uses much less rubato than many other pianists. From measures 141-153, one of the most exciting parts of this movement, Argerich effectively brings out the transformed opening theme of the movement in the bass. Although her brilliant tempo is very exciting, the tempo is so fast that there is much less depth of tone and change of color in the music.

In the Scherzo, Argerich's outstanding pianism and boldly fast tempo are extremely effective. She executes the many small crescendos and diminuendos that Chopin asks for, while bringing out the melody cleanly and playing with virtuosity and accuracy. Her use of rubato in the trio section is also very thoughtful, with extra time taken after a high note is reached. Although the right hand melodies are very consistently and gracefully shaped, there are times when Argerich neglects to shape or voice her left hand as thoughtfully, such as measures 144-147.

Rather than being dignified and sad, Argerich's funeral march is bold and declamatory. She emphasizes each bass note that occurs on the beat equally, especially during measures 15-26. She also brings out the contrast between piano at measure 21 and fortissimo at measure 22 to great effect, making the repeated material sound like a complete surprise. The middle section, which has two subdivided repeated sections, can run the risk of sounding repetitious because of the abundance of repeated melodies. Argerich, however, manages this well by playing the first repetition of each section without much rubato and then adding several small expressive moments during the repeat. At the very end of the movement, she adds a noticeable *ritardando*, which is not indicated in the score.

Interestingly, Argerich's finale is much more understated and slower than any of the other pianists I have examined. Her tempo is moderate and allows one to hear the strange harmonic shifts continuously occurring. During the last few measures of the piece, where many other pianists make the repeating figure at measures 72-74 into a rhythmic gesture, Argerich slows down and blurs the notes together, an interesting interpretive decision that makes the final fortissimo measure sound like a surprise.

Sergei Rachmaninov (1873-1943)

Rachmaninov begins the Grave of the first movement with a surprisingly fluid sense of rhythm, making the listener wait for each chord. This heightens the uneasiness and tension of the first measures, as well as making the entrance of the left hand in the *Doppio movimento* more exciting. Although Chopin indicates the usage of pedal after measure 5, Rachmaninov uses very little pedal here. He adds a distinct decrescendo and *ritardando* at measure 36, where Chopin has written a crescendo, heightening the effect of the *fortissimo* at measure 37. In the contrasting second theme of the movement, Rachmaninov chooses to add rubato primarily in the cello-like left hand voices at measures 44 and 48, as well as slowing down a passage with beautiful, ascending chords from measures 51-57. From this point until the end of the exposition, Rachmaninov increases the dynamic intensity and slowly pushes the tempo. In all of Rachmaninov's recordings, there is a masterful "audible structure." He adds a type of unusual and obviously intentional rubato from measures 97-100, stretching out the repeated chords and speeding up again at the end of the measure. I would speculate that it might be his way of transitioning from the preceding *stretto* into the long, held chords at measure 101, which can sound jarring if not approached with some kind of rubato.

Throughout the rest of the first movement, Rachmaninov makes many subtle but important changes to Chopin's rhythms that alter the musical effect. For example, at measure 108, he holds the F# in both hands for as long as possible instead of observing the quarter rest, making the entrance of a D7 harmony at measure 109 sound like it grows out of the F#, instead of emerging gently from silence. He also plays measures 117-121 very freely, waiting until the beginning of the phrase at measure 122 to begin

playing with direction and drive. At measure 154-161, Rachmaninov ignores Chopin's crescendi and does the opposite, getting quieter as the section climbs up the piano and finishing with a *pianissimo* moment at measure 162, where Chopin has indicated *fortissimo*. At this point, the number of deviations Rachmaninov makes from Chopin's score suggests that Rachmaninov feels free in his interpretation.

Rachmaninov's legendary technique makes the second movement sound easy, with his chosen tempo hovering consistently around 80 bpm per measure or slightly faster. Each time a recurring, ominous left hand octave section appears, such as the passage in measures 17-20, he slows down noticeably. In the middle section, Rachmaninov is extremely flexible with the tempo, speeding up during many of the accompaniment-like parts such as measures 91-92. He adds arpeggiations to the chords at measures 145 and 147, as well as making the cello-like bass melody sing out clearly.

The *marche funèbre* begins with an iconic, melancholy melody, which Rachmaninov plays slightly faster than the other pianists discussed in this paper. In measures 27 and 28, he adds a dotted rhythm to the grace notes before the bass trills. He then takes the opportunity to add an extra, thunderous octave voice during the last two measures of the opening section (ignoring the *piano* dynamic) and leaving out the Ab meant to transition into the middle section. After what sounds like the end of a piece, the middle section emerges gracefully, with few additions other than the elimination of the repeats and a trill that seems to last several years at measure 53. After the tranquil ending of the middle section, Rachmaninov opts to exchange Chopin's *piano* for a surprise, *fortissimo* entrance back into the funeral march, with the return of the low Bb on the first and third beats. The rest of the march functions as a giant decrescendo until

the end, creating a symmetric dynamic plan. Although it is very different from Chopin's original intention, Rachmaninov's interpretive choice sounds like an actual funeral march beginning in the distance, approaching, and fading away (with a kind of departure into an alternate reality in the middle). Although he ends the movement *piano*, Rachmaninov can not resist adding a final few low Bb octaves for final emphasis.

He ends the sonata with an insanely fast finale, with individual notes barely distinguishable in a wash of sound. All sense of rhythm is abandoned in the final three measures, with the final fortissimo notes coming out of nowhere to triumphantly announce the conclusion of the sonata, fitting perfectly with the ambiguous beginning of the first movement.

Vladimir Horowitz (1903-1989)

Horowitz has an entirely different focus for the sonata than either Rachmaninov or Argerich. Where Rachmaninov excels at bringing out the larger narrative structure and Argerich focuses on exploiting individual moments for their maximum potential for energy and excitement, Horowitz is primarily concerned with tone and voicing. Although he does not necessarily take the fastest tempo after the *Grave*, his clear melody and attention to shaping bring out the agitated character so well that the music sounds more exciting and appears faster. During a technically challenging section from measures 81-93, Horowitz uses just enough pedal and voices the top of the line with extreme care. Although many pianists, including Rachmaninov, play quickly through parts of this section as if it were merely transitional, Horowitz never stops sustaining a clear melody. He also has the clear intention to bring out the bass in measures 138-153,

an important compositional reference to the beginning of the movement. In the arrival of the major second theme at measure 170, arguably one of the most beautiful and passionate moments of the entire piece, Horowitz takes enough time and manipulates the pedal in order to get an outstandingly resonant moment. Compared to Argerich, who more or less steamrolls past the arrival to Bb, and Rachmaninov, who keeps his bass notes soft and unobtrusive, Horowitz's interpretation is sensitive and ardent.

Horowitz's choice of tempo in the Scherzo is fast enough to maintain excitement and yet not too fast, allowing him to play with voicing in a way the previous two performers could not. At the ascending fourths in measures 37-44, each voice can be clearly heard in its own register. At measure 59, he brings out the top voice to create an interesting, small solo in a place that could be easily overlooked. In the middle section, he emphasizes a beautiful inside voice in measures 88-92, 96-100, and 104-108, treating the music as melody rather than accompaniment or interlude. In the bass solo at measure 144, Horowitz's bass takes on the character of a vocalist, with plenty of rubato and even the addition of an interesting ornament at measures 154-155 that is not called for in the score.

Horowitz plays the funeral march at one of the slowest tempos musically possible. The dignified, drawn-out crescendos during the section from measures 15-30 emphasize the rhythm of the march. The middle section is never obscured by the left hand, which is almost overly quiet at times, but the tone of the right hand melody is sustained and clear. In his return to the reprise of the funeral march (marked *piano* with a long crescendo), there is a palpable sense of struggle, as if someone is fighting their

way uphill. The dotted eighth-sixteenth rhythm is exaggerated slightly, which is effective at Horowitz's slower tempo.

A finale with an extremely even and clear tempo completes the sonata. Horowitz outlines some small moments, such as a G natural arrival point at measure 17 and the descending figures at measure 49, yet the movement still sounds like a single, breathless outpouring. He slightly accents the end of the runs downward from measure 61-62, showing an interesting hidden melody off the beat that many pianists overlook.

Arturo Benedetti Michelangeli (1920-1995)

Michelangeli's opening *Grave* is much more plaintive, ending in a descent to a Bb in measure 5 one octave lower than what Chopin wrote. The effect is to begin the section in a less aggressive and more melancholy manner, emphasizing the lack of melody until the *agitato* at measure 9. Michelangeli also chooses a moderate tempo for this section, which fits well with his character in the opening four bars. Although he seems to share a concern for consistently excellent tone with Horowitz, Michelangeli also has a very active left hand in this opening section, with relentless movement forward that carries the right hand along. At measure 57, Michelangeli creates an entirely different character out of the restatement of the second theme, which is boldly joyous and passionate, fully exploiting the *forte* that Chopin writes. He drops the dynamic level back considerably at measure 65, creating enough room for the rest of the exposition to expand in intensity. Michelangeli shows a strong aversion to rushing or speeding through any exciting moment during the exposition, perhaps more so than any other pianist previously mentioned here. Although he maintains control of his tempo at all times, his passion and projection of the melody are so evident that it would be

difficult to accuse him of playing safely or lacking spontaneity. Like Horowitz, Michelangeli makes the triumphant return of the second theme at measure 170 supremely passionate, bringing back the same joyful character that he introduced at measure 57. His progression from the bouncing closing theme at measure 210 into the *stretto* at measure 231 is extremely musically effective. By holding back any rushing until the *stretto*, which he accomplishes with great effect, then slowing down dramatically for the ending chords, Michelangeli keeps the listener on the edge of their seat. He holds the final chord with a fermata for almost three times its length, an appropriate choice after such a dramatic ending.

Although Michelangeli has excellent technique, his interpretation of the Scherzo is not centered on bravura or display. He slows down select moments in order to listen to harmonic changes, such as the chords at measures 73-80. He also takes time during all the large technical leaps to achieve the maximum depth of tone possible. In the expressive middle section, Michelangeli could be accused of overdoing his use of hand splitting, or playing a right hand part slightly after the simultaneous left hand part. Although this technique is considered by many to be overly sentimental, it also fits with Michelangeli's genuinely passionate interpretation of the sonata, which is much closer to the "love" side of the spectrum than "death." Interestingly, when he transitions back to Tempo 1 at measure 190, Michelangeli's rhythmic drive and intensity is greater than at the opening.

The funeral march is also on the slower side, sounding slightly plodding at the beginning. Michelangeli's left hand trills are absolutely explosive, creating a huge wash of sound. He appears to add octaves to the beginning of the trills, which certainly

contributes to their effectiveness. The constant hand splitting in the middle section of this movement is more difficult to justify, as it disrupts the sense of rhythm and production of an unbroken, singing line. Although Michelangeli's tone is supremely beautiful, he cannot compete with Horowitz's interpretation of this section.

In the finale, Michelangeli is able to achieve a very difficult balance between enunciation of the individual notes, like Horowitz, and the creation of a dynamic wash of sound, like Rachmaninov. Although he takes a monstrously fast tempo and has many small crescendi and decrescendi added for effect, the individual notes are still incredibly clear. Michelangeli ends the movement decisively and in tempo, choosing not to add any expressive pauses. The left hand bass octave and the Bb minor chord are equally loud.

Conclusion

There were profound interpretive differences in each performance of the Barcarolle and the Sonata Op. 35 that I studied. When Chopin wrote these pieces, he included meticulous markings specifying dynamics, articulation, tone, and ornamentation. Although all the performers mentioned in this paper followed most of Chopin's intentions, the most striking performances added inventive nuances that went beyond the score. Some performers, especially Rachmaninov, deliberately altered Chopin's details in order to achieve a unique interpretation. The analysis of a great performance is certainly a subjective process. It is very useful, however, to notice how a pianist balances individuality with the demands of the score. Some performances, like Ashkenazy's rendition of the Barcarolle, are faithful to Chopin's notes and markings but lack musical color and personality. Rachmaninov's bold interpretation of the Sonata

Op. 35 is superb, but he strays noticeably from Chopin's musical directions. Martha Argerich's performance of the Barcarolle has brilliant technique and accuracy, but her interpretive choices are distracting at times.

Pianists can improve in several ways by examining outstanding performances of a piece. Artists who have solved the most intimidating technical obstacles in a piece can give performers ideas on practice strategy. When practicing, it is extremely helpful for the pianist to have a clear idea of the tone and articulation necessary to execute a passage. Additionally, each performer has unique musical strengths. When we hear Horowitz's impeccable tone, Rachmaninov's clearly outlined musical structure, and Rubinstein's masterful rubato, we can understand why these performers are so highly regarded and we can work towards further mastery in our own studies.

Finally, it is important to hear how each pianist interprets what Chopin has written. There is a broad spectrum of interpretive choices available to the pianist for many of Chopin's markings. Pianists who continue to study great works such as the Barcarolle and the Sonata Op. 35 will find that many interpretive options are waiting to be explored.

Appendix: Scores

1. Score for *Barcarolle*, Op. 60
2. Score for *Sonata No. 2 in B-Flat Minor*, Op. 35

Barcarolle.

Op. 60.

9

Allegretto.

s *dim.* *cantabile* *p* *mf* *cresc.* *leggero* *dimin.*

Edition Peters. 4219

The image displays a musical score for piano, consisting of five systems of staves. Each system includes a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The music is written in a key signature of three sharps (F#, C#, G#) and a 3/4 time signature. The score is heavily annotated with performance instructions and technical markings.
 - **System 1:** Features a complex right-hand part with many beamed sixteenth notes and triplets. The left hand has a steady eighth-note accompaniment. Performance markings include *rit.* and *dim.*.
 - **System 2:** Continues the intricate right-hand texture. The left hand maintains its accompaniment. Markings include *rit.* and *dim.*.
 - **System 3:** The right hand shows more melodic movement within the complex texture. The left hand accompaniment remains consistent. Markings include *rit.* and *dim.*.
 - **System 4:** The right hand part becomes more rhythmic and driving. The left hand accompaniment is still present. Markings include *rit.* and *dim.*.
 - **System 5:** The final system shows a gradual deceleration. The right hand part simplifies slightly. The left hand accompaniment continues. Markings include *rit.* and *dim.*.
 - **Additional markings:** The score is filled with *rit.* (ritardando) and *dim.* (diminuendo) markings throughout. There are also numerous asterisks (*) and small numbers (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) placed below notes, likely indicating fingerings or specific performance techniques. The word *meno mosso* appears in the second system.

Poco più mosso.

The musical score consists of six systems of music, each with a treble and bass clef staff. The key signature is three sharps (F#, C#, G#) and the time signature is 3/4. The tempo is marked "Poco più mosso." The dynamics range from *pp* (pianissimo) to *legato*. Performance instructions include *ten.* (tenuto), *sotto voce*, and *sempre p*. The score includes various musical notations such as slurs, ties, and fingerings. There are several asterisks (*) and "ced." markings throughout the score, likely indicating editorial changes or specific performance notes. The bottom left corner of the page is marked "Edition Peters" and the bottom center is marked "6219".

This page of a musical score for piano contains six systems of music. Each system consists of a grand staff with a treble and bass clef. The music is written in a key signature of two sharps (F# and C#) and a 4/4 time signature. The score includes various musical notations such as slurs, ties, and fingerings. Performance instructions are placed throughout the score, including *cresc.*, *f*, *p*, *sempre legato*, and *ritenuto*. The page number '13' is located in the top right corner. At the bottom left, it says 'Edition Peters.' and at the bottom center, '6219'.

poco più mosso

Ornaments: ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯

Ornaments: ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯

p

Ornaments: ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯

dimin.

Meno mosso.

Ornaments: ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯

Ornaments: ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯, ♯

First system of musical notation, featuring a treble and bass clef. The music includes various notes, rests, and fingerings. A *ped.* marking is present at the end of the system.

Second system of musical notation, featuring a treble and bass clef. The music includes various notes, rests, and fingerings. A *dolce sfogato* marking is present in the bass clef. *ped.* markings are present at the end of the system.

Third system of musical notation, featuring a treble and bass clef. The music includes various notes, rests, and fingerings. *ped.* markings are present at the end of the system.

Fourth system of musical notation, featuring a treble and bass clef. The music includes various notes, rests, and fingerings. *cresc.* markings are present in both staves. A *ritenuto* marking is present in the treble clef. *ped.* markings are present at the end of the system.

Fifth system of musical notation, featuring a treble and bass clef. The music includes various notes, rests, and fingerings. A **Tempo I.** marking is present at the beginning. *f* and *cresc.* markings are present. *ped.* markings are present at the end of the system.

First system of musical notation. The right hand features a complex, arpeggiated texture with many beamed notes and slurs. The left hand plays a steady eighth-note accompaniment. Fingerings are indicated by numbers 1-5. The system concludes with a double bar line and a repeat sign.

Second system of musical notation. The right hand continues with intricate arpeggiated patterns. The left hand maintains the eighth-note accompaniment. The system ends with a double bar line and a repeat sign.

Third system of musical notation. The right hand shows more complex rhythmic patterns, including some sixteenth notes. The left hand accompaniment remains consistent. The system ends with a double bar line and a repeat sign.

Fourth system of musical notation. The right hand features a dense, block-like texture. The left hand accompaniment is marked with a *cresc.* (crescendo) and a *ff* (fortissimo) dynamic. The system ends with a double bar line and a repeat sign.

First system of a piano score. The right hand features a complex, arpeggiated texture with many beamed notes and some accidentals. The left hand has a more rhythmic accompaniment with some chords. There are dynamic markings like *mf* and *ff* and some performance instructions like *acc.* and *rit.* below the staff.

Second system of the piano score, continuing the complex textures from the first system. The right hand has a dense, flowing line of notes, while the left hand provides a steady accompaniment.

Third system of the piano score. The right hand continues with intricate arpeggiated patterns. The left hand has some more active passages with beamed notes.

Fourth system of the piano score, the final system on this page. It concludes with a final chord in the right hand and a few notes in the left hand.

Tempo I.

The musical score consists of four systems of piano music, each with a treble and bass staff. The key signature is three sharps (F#, C#, G#) and the time signature is 3/4. The first system includes dynamic markings *ff*, *ritenuto*, and *sempre f*. The second system features various fingering numbers (1-5) and accents. The third system includes fingering numbers 453423 and 4535. The fourth system continues the melodic and harmonic development. The score is marked with 'Ed.' and '*' symbols below the bass staff of each system.

The musical score consists of five systems of staves. The first system features a grand staff with a treble clef and a bass clef, containing a complex melodic line with many accidentals and a bass line with chords. The second system includes dynamic markings such as *calando*, *mp*, and *dim.*, along with fingerings and slurs. The third system is marked *leggiere* and *mp*, showing a more rhythmic and melodic passage. The fourth system continues the melodic development with intricate fingerings. The fifth system features a *cresc.* marking and a *ff* dynamic, leading to a powerful conclusion with a final chord and fermata.

This page of musical notation, numbered 784, features six systems of piano accompaniment. Each system consists of a treble and bass staff. The key signature is three flats (B-flat, E-flat, A-flat). The notation includes various rhythmic patterns, including eighth and sixteenth notes, and rests. Fingerings are indicated by numbers 1 through 5. Dynamics include *cresc.*, *ff*, and *p*. The word *sosten.* is written above the fourth system. Ornaments are marked with a star and a flourish symbol. The notation is complex, with many notes beamed together and some notes marked with accents.

The image displays a page of piano sheet music, numbered 785 at the bottom center. The music is arranged in six systems, each consisting of a grand staff with a treble and bass clef. The key signature is three flats (B-flat, E-flat, A-flat), and the time signature is 3/4. The music is characterized by intricate rhythmic patterns, including triplets and sixteenth-note runs. Fingerings are indicated by numbers 1, 2, and 3. Dynamic markings such as *cresc.* and *p* are used throughout. The notation includes various articulations like slurs and accents. The page number 785 is centered at the bottom.

This page of musical notation is for a piano piece, likely in the key of E-flat major (three flats) and 3/4 time. It consists of six systems of staves, each with a treble and bass clef. The notation is highly detailed, featuring numerous slurs, accents, and dynamic markings.

- System 1:** Starts with a forte (*f*) dynamic. The right hand features complex chordal textures with slurs and accents. The left hand provides a steady accompaniment. A *segue* instruction is placed at the end of the system.
- System 2:** Continues the complex texture. The right hand has many slurs and accents, while the left hand maintains a consistent rhythmic pattern.
- System 3:** Includes a *stretto.* marking, indicating a change in tempo. The dynamics shift to *f*. The right hand has a prominent melodic line with many slurs and accents.
- System 4:** Features a *cresc.* (crescendo) marking. The texture becomes denser. The right hand has many slurs and accents, and the left hand has some trills.
- System 5:** Includes a *riten.* (ritardando) marking. The right hand has a melodic line with slurs and accents. The left hand has some trills. The system ends with a first and second ending bracket.
- System 6:** Starts with a *riten.* marking. The right hand has a melodic line with slurs and accents. The left hand has some trills. The system ends with a *sotto voce.* marking and a *pp* (pianissimo) dynamic.

787

788

The musical score is written for piano and consists of six systems of staves. Each system contains a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The key signature is three flats (B-flat, E-flat, A-flat). The notation includes various musical markings and ornaments:

- System 1:** Features a melodic line in the treble with a series of ornaments (circles with a vertical line) and a bass line with a similar ornamented pattern. A bracket above the treble staff indicates a section.
- System 2:** The treble staff begins with the marking *stretto.* and *ff*. The bass line continues with ornaments. A *cresc.* marking appears at the end of the system.
- System 3:** Shows a continuation of the melodic and bass lines with complex chordal textures and ornaments.
- System 4:** The treble staff is marked *sostenuto.* and features a series of ornaments. The bass line continues with a steady accompaniment.
- System 5:** The treble staff has a long, sustained chordal texture. The bass line continues with a melodic line.
- System 6:** The final system shows a continuation of the complex textures and ornaments in both staves.

First system of a piano score. The right hand plays a series of chords and single notes, while the left hand plays a rhythmic pattern of eighth notes with fingerings 1 3 2 1. The tempo marking *come sopra.* is present below the bass staff.

Second system of the piano score. The right hand continues with chords and the left hand plays eighth notes with fingerings 1 3 2 3 1.

Third system of the piano score. The right hand features a melodic line with a *cresc.* marking. The left hand plays eighth notes with fingerings 1 2 1 3 2 1.

Fourth system of the piano score. The right hand has a melodic line with slurs, and the left hand plays eighth notes with slurs and fingerings 5 4 3 2 1.

Fifth system of the piano score. The right hand has a melodic line with a *>stretto>* marking. The left hand plays eighth notes with slurs and fingerings 5 4 3 2 1.

Sixth system of the piano score. The right hand has a melodic line with slurs and accents. The left hand plays chords with slurs and accents.

790

segue.

p

cresc.

cresc.

ff

stretto.

cresc.

fff

791

Capriccio

Scherzo.

The musical score consists of six systems of piano notation. Each system contains a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The key signature is three flats (B-flat, E-flat, A-flat) and the time signature is 3/4. The score includes various dynamic markings: *f* (forte), *pp* (pianissimo), and *p* (piano). There are also performance instructions such as *rit.* (ritardando) and *tr.* (trill). The notation includes complex chords, arpeggios, and melodic lines with slurs and ornaments. The page number 792 is located at the bottom center of the page.

793

Più lento.

p

Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea *

Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea *

Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea *

Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea *

Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea *

Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea *

Rea * Rea * Rea * Rea *

This page of musical notation is for a piano piece, likely in the key of B-flat major or D-flat major (three flats). It consists of six systems of staves, each with a treble and bass clef. The notation includes various musical elements:

- System 1:** Features a melody in the treble clef and a bass line in the bass clef. The bass line includes several ornaments (marked with a star) and a fermata.
- System 2:** Starts with a piano (*p*) dynamic marking. The bass line contains complex rhythmic patterns with fingerings (1-4, 2-1, 3-2, 4-1) and slurs.
- System 3:** Continues the melodic and bass line development, with more ornaments in the bass.
- System 4:** Shows a steady bass line with chords and some melodic movement in the treble.
- System 5:** Features a more active treble line with slurs and ornaments in the bass.
- System 6:** Concludes with a first ending (1.) and a second ending (2.). The second ending includes the instruction *accelerando* and *cresc.* (crescendo). The piece ends with a forte (*f*) dynamic marking.

Tempo I.

The image shows five systems of piano music. Each system consists of a grand staff with a treble and bass clef. The music is written in a minor key, indicated by three flats in the key signature. The tempo is marked 'Tempo I.' at the beginning. The first system has a dynamic marking of *pp* (pianissimo) and features a complex texture with many chords and moving lines. The second system has a dynamic marking of *p* (piano) and includes a slur over a group of notes. The third system has a dynamic marking of *pp* and features a complex texture with many chords and moving lines. The fourth system has a dynamic marking of *p* and includes a slur over a group of notes. The fifth system has a dynamic marking of *p* and includes a slur over a group of notes. There are asterisks and other markings below the staves, likely indicating specific performance instructions or editorial changes.

First system of a piano score. It features a treble and bass clef with a key signature of three flats. The music is characterized by dense, complex chords and intricate melodic lines. A dynamic marking of *f* (forte) is present. Fingerings are indicated with numbers 1-5. A fermata is placed over a measure in the bass line.

Second system of the piano score. It continues the dense harmonic texture from the first system. A dynamic marking of *f* is present. The bass line includes a fermata and a double bar line.

Third system of the piano score. The texture remains complex. A dynamic marking of *cresc.* (crescendo) is present. The system concludes with a double bar line.

Fourth system of the piano score. The music features a series of chords in the bass line, some marked with a fermata. The treble line continues with complex figures. A dynamic marking of *f* is present.

Fifth system of the piano score. The music transitions to a softer dynamic, marked *pp* (pianissimo). The texture becomes less dense, with more space between notes. The system ends with a double bar line.

First system of a piano score. The right hand features a melodic line with eighth notes and some chords, while the left hand provides a steady accompaniment of eighth notes. There are several dynamic markings, including accents and a *ff* (fortissimo) marking.

Second system of the piano score. The right hand continues with a melodic line, and the left hand has a more complex accompaniment with some chords. A *ff* (fortissimo) marking is present.

Third system of the piano score. The right hand has a melodic line with some chords, and the left hand has a steady accompaniment. A *p* (piano) marking and a *dimin.* (diminuendo) marking are present.

Fourth system of the piano score. The right hand has a melodic line with some chords, and the left hand has a steady accompaniment. A *Lento.* (Lento) marking and a *smorz.* (smorzando) marking are present.

Fifth system of the piano score. The right hand has a melodic line with some chords, and the left hand has a steady accompaniment. There are several dynamic markings, including accents and a *ff* (fortissimo) marking.

pp

cresc.

pp

p

800

This page of musical notation consists of six systems of grand staff notation. Each system contains a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The key signature is three flats (B-flat, E-flat, A-flat). The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, slurs, and dynamic markings. The dynamics include *f* (forte), *ff* (fortissimo), *p* (piano), and *dim.* (diminuendo). The piece concludes with a double bar line and repeat signs.

Presto.
sotto voce e legato.

The image displays six systems of musical notation for a piano piece. Each system consists of a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The music is written in a key signature of three flats (B-flat, E-flat, A-flat) and a 2/4 time signature. The tempo is marked 'Presto' and the performance style is 'sotto voce e legato'. The notation includes numerous slurs, ties, and dynamic markings such as 'p' (piano) and 'f' (forte). Fingerings are indicated by numbers 1-5 above or below notes. The piece features intricate melodic lines and complex rhythmic patterns, particularly in the right hand, which often plays sixteenth-note passages. The bass line provides a steady accompaniment with various rhythmic figures. The overall texture is dense and technically demanding.

4 3 1 3 2 1 5 3 1 4 3 2 1 2 3 4 3 1 5 3 2 1 3 2

1 2 1 2 3 5 2 3 1 2 3 4 1 3 4 1 3 4 1 3 5 5 3 1 4 3 2 5 3 2 5 3 1

5 3 2 1 3 2 1 3 1 3 5 2 3 1 1 3 5 3 2 4 1 2 5 3 2 4 1 2 5 3 2 4 1

2 5 3 2 4 1 2 4 1 2 5 4 5 3 2 1 4 3 2 1 3 2 1 4 3 1 3 5 3 2 4 1

2 5 3 2 4 1 2 5 3 2 4 1 2 4 1 2 5 1 1 2 3 3 1 4 5 1 4 2 3 4

5 1 4 2 3 4 5 1 4 2 3 5 1 2 3 4 1 4 5 1 3 1 2 4 5 1 3 1 2 4 5 1 3 1 2 5

*) Between measures 8 and 9 are found, in earlier editions, *two measures more* which Chopin crossed out with his own hand in the copies belonging to Princess Czartoryska and Frau Streicher.

This page of musical notation consists of seven systems, each with a treble and bass staff. The music is written in a minor key, indicated by three flats in the key signature. The notation includes various rhythmic patterns, slurs, and fingerings (numbers 1-5). Dynamic markings include 'Cresc.' and 'ff'. The piece concludes with a double bar line and a fermata. The page number '805' is centered at the bottom.

Bibliography

Dubal, David. *The Art of the Piano: Its Performers, Literature, and Recordings*. New Jersey: Amadeus, 2004.

Hinson, Maurice. *Guide to the Pianist's Repertoire*. 3rd ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000.

Jonson, George C. A. *A Handbook to Chopin's Works*. New York: Doubleday, 1905.

Kopp, David. "On Performing Chopin's Barcarolle". *Society for Music Theory*, Vol 20 No 4. 2014. <http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.14.20.4/mto.14.20.4.kopp.pdf>.

Margetts, James. "Echoes of Venice: The Origins of the Barcarolle for Solo Piano. DMA Document. Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati, 2008.

Rink, John. *Chopin Studies*. United States: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Samson, Jim. *The Cambridge Companion to Chopin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Tomaszewski, Mieczyslaw. "Sonata in B flat minor". The Frederic Chopin Institute, 2015. <http://en.chopin.nifc.pl/chopin/composition/detail/id/92>.

Walker, Alan. *Reflections on Liszt*. Cornell University Press: United States. 2005.