



## Étude in E-flat Major, Op. 10 No. 11

Frédéric Chopin

🎵 Nivel 75/100 (Avanzado)

**¡Consigue hoy tu suscripción OKTAV Premium!**

Solo tienes que comprar este título o conseguir una suscripción OKTAV Premium. Así disfrutarás de acceso ilimitado a nuestra gran biblioteca de partituras que se ajustan a tu nivel a coste fijo.

Más información

## Allegretto (♩ = 76)

11.

The score shows a piano and bass part. The piano part has dynamics *f*, *sfz*, *p*, and *cresc.*. The bass part has dynamics *f* and *cresc.*. There are fingerings and slurs indicated throughout.

a) Bülow ha abolito dal secondo accordo in poi il segno indicante l'arpeggiato, segno che nell'originale si trova a fianco di ciascun accordo. L'abolizione è da adottare senz'altro perchè rende indubbiamente più snella la grafia e quindi più agevole la lettura del pezzo. L'allievo tenga presente, però, che gli accordi vanno tutti arpeggiati, compresi quelli la cui estensione consentirebbe l'esecuzione simultanea.

Lo stesso Bülow, poi, indica questa maniera d'eseguire gli accordi:

The notation shows a chord in the piano part being arpeggiated upwards. It is labeled "ecc. etc.".

A mio parere ciò appesantisce il pezzo, la cui melodia si trova quasi sempre all'acuto, raramente nel registro centrale (misura 45.<sup>a</sup> e corrispondente rivolto) e mai al grave degli accordi. Ritengo perciò più appropriata questa interpretazione:

The notation shows a chord in the piano part with a different articulation. It is labeled "ecc. etc.".

la quale elimina quel non so che di traballante che deriverebbe dal percepire le note della melodia ⊕ sempre in ritardo d'una biscroma rispetto alle note gravi degli accordi al basso + costituenti, nella versione di Bülow, l'ossatura ritmica della composizione, perchè percepite in battere:

The notation shows a chord in the piano part with a different articulation. It is labeled "ecc. etc.".

Nella versione qui proposta tale elemento si manifesta sulla nota acuta degli accordi stessi, dal che deriva quella sincronia ritmica atta ad evitare la sgradevole sensazione suaccennata. Ottimo, invece, è il consiglio dato da Bülow di esercitare, cioè, gli accordi anche in modo che, accettando la mia interpretazione, suonino così:

The notation shows a chord in the piano part with a different articulation. It is labeled "ecc. etc.".

b) Secondo Scholtz:

The notation shows a chord in the piano part.

b) Selon Scholtz:

The notation shows a chord in the piano part.

b) According to Scholtz:

The notation shows a chord in the piano part.

a) A partir du deuxième accord, Bülow a aboli le signe qui indique l'arpégé, signe que l'on rencontre à côté de chaque accord dans l'original. Cette abolition doit être adoptée sans hésitation pour rendre la lecture du morceau plus aisée. L'élève doit cependant se rappeler que l'on doit arpéger tous les accords, y compris ceux qui par leur extension pourraient être frappés simultanément.

Du reste Bülow lui-même indique cette manière d'exécuter les accords:

The notation shows a chord in the piano part being arpeggiated upwards. It is labeled "ecc. etc.".

A mon avis cela donne de la lourdeur au morceau, dont la mélodie se trouve presque toujours à l'aigu et rarement dans le registre moyen (45<sup>ème</sup> mesure et renversement correspondant), mais jamais sur la note grave des accords. Cette interprétation:

The notation shows a chord in the piano part with a different articulation. It is labeled "ecc. etc.".

me semble cependant plus appropriée; elle élimine ce je ne sais quoi de chancelant qui proviendrait de la perception de la mélodie ⊕ toujours en retard d'une triple croche sur les notes graves des accords de la basse + qui constituent, dans la version de Bülow, la charpente rythmique de la composition, parce qu'elles sont perçues en frappé:

The notation shows a chord in the piano part with a different articulation. It is labeled "ecc. etc.".

Dans la version que voici, cet élément se manifeste sur la note aiguë des accords mêmes, d'où dérive cette synchronie rythmique apte à éviter la désagréable sensation mentionnée plus haut. Excellent, au contraire, le conseil que donne Bülow de travailler les accords aussi de façon qu' en acceptant mon interprétation, ils s'exécutent ainsi:

a) From the second chord on, Bülow has abolished the arpeggiato sign which in the original is found beside each chord. The abolition is to be adopted without hesitation because it makes the reading of the piece much easier. The pupil must, however, remember that all the chords are to be harped including even those whose compass would allow of their being performed simultaneously.

Bülow himself then suggests this way of performing the chords:

The notation shows a chord in the piano part being arpeggiated upwards. It is labeled "ecc. etc.".

In my opinion this makes the piece heavy, for the melody is almost always to be found in the high register, seldom in the middle one (45<sup>th</sup> measure and corresponding inversion), but never in the low part of the chords. I therefore believe this interpretation to be the most appropriate:

The notation shows a chord in the piano part with a different articulation. It is labeled "ecc. etc.".

for it eliminates the vacillating effect which would be produced by the perception of the notes of the melody ⊕ always a demisemiquaver behind the low notes of the chords in the bass + which in Bülow's revision constitute the rhythmical frame of the composition, because perceived in the beat:

The notation shows a chord in the piano part with a different articulation. It is labeled "ecc. etc.".

In the version here suggested, this element manifests itself in the high notes of the chords, whence a rhythmical synchrony results, avoiding the above mentioned disagreeable sensation. Excellent, instead, is Bülow's advice to practise the chords also in such way that, accepting my interpretation, they result thus: