Ron Regev

Mendelssohn's Trio opus 49:
A Study of the Composer's Change of Mind

Volume III:

Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy

Piano Trio in D Minor

Draft Version – Completed in July 1839

Critical Performance Edition

Edited by Ron Regev

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Musical Arts degree

May 2005

The Juilliard School

Preface

As documented in his letters, Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy (1809-1847) expressed his wish to write piano trios several times to different people during the 1830s. In 1839 he finally got to writing one, mostly during a vacation he took in Frankfurt in the summer. At the end of July he sent letters to family members and friends, announcing the completion of the Trio. The manuscript of the piece is currently held in the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in Berlin. It is not, however, the manuscript of the work we now know as Mendelssohn's first piano trio in D minor, op. 49. During the fall and winter of 1839-1840 Mendelssohn performed the Trio several times on private occasions, and subsequently he kept revising it. Sir George Grove (1820-1900) dated the second version of the Trio to September 23, 1839; presumably he was referring to a manuscript that is now missing, and that was originally bound in the same volume as the first version, and then given by Mendelssohn's widow to violinist Ferdinand David (1810-1873), the concertmaster of Mendelssohn's orchestra in Leipzig. This too, however, was not the manuscript of the final version of the Trio.

Ferdinand Hiller (1811-1885), the 19th-century composer and pianist and one of Mendelssohn's closest friends at the time, gives a detailed account of a meeting he had with Mendelssohn, at which time Mendelssohn played the Trio for him. Hiller criticized his friend's style of piano writing as outdated. He recounts his success in persuading Mendelssohn to revise the piano part in order to conform to the more brilliant writing style of the new school of piano playing, as embodied by Chopin and Liszt. Although the scholarly community has tended to attribute the rejection of the first manuscript to Hiller's influence, the German scholar Friedhelm Krummacher established that the meeting between Hiller and Mendelssohn did not take place until the winter of 1839-1840. This suggests that two revisions of the piece took place: one of the continuity of the piece, and then one of the texture and style of the piano part. The other extant manuscript of the Trio supports this assumption: it is a piano part in Mendelssohn's hand, which was used by Breitkopf & Härtel for engraving the first edition, and which is essentially identical to the final version as far as the continuity is concerned, but shows extensive revisions of the piano texture. The date of submission of this manuscript is January 21, 1840; Mendelssohn's correspondence with the publishing house suggests that it was accompanied by the violin and cello parts, which are now missing. In the current edition this manuscript of the piano part is referred to as A2.

As close as this manuscript is to the first edition of the piece, it is not identical. This fact, along with another comment made by Hiller, supports the contention that the final version was created on the engraver's proofs, and that therefore the first edition, as published by Breitkopf & Härtel in April 1840 (plate no. 6320), should be regarded as the conclusive source for the final version of the Trio. Here the first edition will be referred to as **FE**.

A further study of the work's publication history, however, reveals that it was issued simultaneously by Breitkopf & Härtel in Germany, Richault in Paris, and Ewer in England – contracted independently by Mendelssohn himself. Whereas the Richault edition was based on the manuscripts Mendelssohn had sent to Breitkopf & Härtel on January 21, and did not incorporate his later revisions on the engraver's proofs, there is documented evidence to suggest that the Ewer edition was based on a more advanced manuscript, which is lost. The proximity of the date on which Mendelssohn sent that manuscript to the date of publication makes it likely that what he sent Ewer was a copy made of Breitkopf & Härtel's engraver's proofs. Mendelssohn entrusted pianist and composer Ignaz Moscheles (1794-1870) with the task of proofreading the English publication; the resulting edition was virtually identical to the version produced by Breitkopf & Härtel. Should the manuscript Mendelssohn sent Ewer be recovered, it

would need to be regarded as a source of equal importance and authority to the German first edition. Ewer also contracted Mendelssohn to transcribe the violin part for flute; it is difficult to determine from the correspondence alone whether Mendelssohn made the transcription himself or, rather, gave Ewer permission to do so. There is no extant manuscript of this version. If one ever surfaces, it would need to be consulted in any attempt to create a critical edition of the final version of the Trio.

Despite the elaborate process of composition and revision, the piece exists essentially in only two versions: the one brought here, which was completed during the summer of 1839, and the one that was heavily reworked during the ensuing winter, and was published as Mendelssohn's op. 49 by Breitkopf & Härtel and Ewer in April 1840.

The current volume was created in 2004 by the editor as part of his doctoral work at the Juilliard School. This work also included the preparation of a facsimile of the Trio's earlier manuscript from a microfilm provided by the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in Berlin, a comparative study of the Trio's two versions, and a recording of both versions. The current edition is presented here for the benefit of performers and music scholars who may wish to study this early version on their own. This version, however, should in no way be regarded as a finalized conception of this piece; if Mendelssohn ever thought of it as such, he did so for a period of time not longer than a few days in late July of 1839.

Editorial Comments

This edition is based on one source only: the composer's autograph of the Trio, which is dated July 18, 1839, and which is housed in the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in Berlin, as part of the volume referred to as Mus.Ms.Autogr. Mendelssohn 31. Consequently, it strives to represent this manuscript in printed form in the most accurate way possible. The following guidelines were observed:

- Any editorial decisions and alterations of the original autograph are detailed in elaborate footnotes
- The locations of dynamic markings are preserved, as much as possible, to reflect their locations in the autograph.
- Mendelssohn frequently beamed eighth notes and sixteenth notes with some of the members of the group above the beam and some below it. His beamings have been preserved whenever possible.
- Mendelssohn was very economical in his use of accidentals, and sometimes of clefs. He
 did not indicate things he considered obvious. Any additions of accidentals or clefs,
 inferred by harmonic and textural contexts, are parenthesized.
- Other parenthesized additions occur only in two cases: when one part includes material that is closely related to that of another part, but missing dynamic indications or articulation marks; and when such indications and marks appear later in the same part, and should therefore be reflected in earlier appearances of similar materials. In all other instances the performers should use their judgment to complete missing indications.



- 1) M. M. according to A2 and FE. *Molto Allegro agitato* in A2 and FE.
- 2) The slur is written over a system break: it appears in the new system, but not in the previous one.
- 3) A *cresc*. in the violin part of this measure is erased. In consideration of the following dynamics, this *cresc*. may have been left here as an oversight. 4) The dynamics below the violin part are located low enough to seem to apply to the cello part as well.



- 1) The slur does not extend beyond this barline, because of a system break. However, see the parallel passage in mm. 39-40. 2) Measure 41, where this passage previously appears, is heavily revised. The *g* here is not crossed out as it is there.



- 1) The location of the *ff* in the manuscript is ambiguous; however, it seems to apply more to the l.h. than it does to the r.h. 2) This slur is over a page break; it exists in the new page, but not in the previous one.



- 1) Although this *cresc*. appears in the manuscript here, there are several factors concerning its execution that should be considered. The original cello part here consisted of low *Es*, and therefore the *cresc*. may have referred to the cello part; additionally, there is a crossed out *cresc*. in the violin part of this measure.
- 2) The slurs clearly end in the manuscript on the fifth eighth note. However, this measure is heavily corrected; the beginnings and endings of slurs throughout this passage are unclear. It is possible, then, that the slurs are intended to span the whole measure.
- 3) Originally d^2 , then corrected to f^2 , probably by mistake (see violin part of m. 96).
- 4) The f^I is crossed out in the manuscript, and the previous chord is extended to a dotted half note. However, the tr below the f^I is written with a different ink stroke, the same one that is used for the sf; therefore it is likely that Mendelssohn rethought the crossing out of the f^I .
- 5) Parallel passages (see m. 101) suggest that this must be an oversight, and the slur should begin on the second eighth note.



- 1) In the manuscript the slur and the f start on the second beat. This is because originally the first e^I was a quarter long, and the second eighth note was added later. It is most likely, then, that the dynamics and articulation here should correspond to the ones in m. 117.
- 2) The slurs in both the violin and the cello parts leave room for the possibility that they are supposed to extend to the b^{l} .
- 3) It is not clear whether the slur starts on the $c\#^l$ or on the a.



- 1) Compare slur to m. 145 as well as to other instances of this phrase.
- 2) The slur starts above the second eighth note, but it may have been intended to include the beginning of the measure.

 3) In the piano part only there is a sharp before the *d*. This is because the next measure originally had a bass *e*; after it was crossed out the voice leading changed, and no reason was left for a d#. This assumption is supported by the cello part, which includes many corrections and appears to have been revised when the original following measures were crossed out.
- 4) The extensive revision in this place makes it difficult to ascertain whether a slur is intended.
- 5) The *pp* in the manuscript starts in the next measure, probably a relic of a heavily revised line.
- 6) This barline separates two systems. Whereas the cello's tie appears at the beginning of the new system (but not at the end of the previous one), there is no tie at all in the violin



- 1) The *cresc*. was placed according to its relative position in the measure; all three indications for the three instruments are aligned, whereas the beats are not. In the manuscript it is located under the second beat of the r.h.
- 2) The slur in the manuscript extends to the third beat. However, a comparison with mm. 181 and 185 reveals it to be a probable oversight.
- 3) The top note of the l.h. chord is an E-flat. It was corrected here to conform to the third beat, to the r.h., and to its proper harmonic context: it resolves to an E-natural.
- 4) Considering that the cello part does not have a slur when it plays the same rhythmic pattern, and the escalating dynamics, one feels that it is possible that here Mendelssohn left the slur out intentionally.
- 5) Originally the second beat consisted of an eighth note and an eighth-note rest; Mendelssohn neglected to cross out the rest, but the new quarter-note stem is clear. See m. 190.
- 6) The f may be misplaced; phrasing, as well as the sf in the piano part of the previous measure, suggests it belongs there.



- 1) Although there is no natural before the b^{I} in this measure, m. 209 shows that Mendelssohn considers this passage to be in A major with a minor subdominant, rather than in D minor. 2) Mendelssohn's original notation follows the older tradition of writing the cello part an octave higher when in the treble clef. It has been transposed here to actual pitch, following the modern standard.
- 3) Mendelssohn does not give either a sharp or a natural before the Cs of this measure. Since it is costumary for him to withhold notating accidentals in a new measure when the harmony is sustained from the previous one, it is possible C-sharps are intended; however, they would make the harmonic shift of m. 211 sound extremely abrupt.

 4) The shape of Mendelssohn's **ff** places a portion of it well into the third beat of the previous measure.



- 1) The articulation of the second and third quarter notes looks more like dots than wedges; since the wedges in the violin part of the next two measures are clear, these were kept as wedges as well.
- 2) The slur appears here as it does in the manuscript. Parallel passages suggest it may have been intended to start on the first beat; however, see mm. 694 and 698.
- 3) The changes of registers and dynamics, as well as the tie, would make a repeat here sound extremely forced. Mendelssohn may have been paying tribute to tradition by including it; the fact that he chose to remove it in the revision further suggests it should not be executed.
- 4) In the manuscript the *p* is not given until the beginning of the next measure. However, it was written before a revision, when the upbeat was a rest. After having revised the rest, Mendelssohn may have forgotten to change the location of the *p*.



- 1) The manuscript has a system break here. Whereas the piano part has clear indications of the continuation of the slur in both systems, the violin and the cello parts have such indications only in the new system.
- 2) Mendelssohn's voicing of this beat is reversed in the manuscript (the quarter note is stemmed up and the dotted half note is stemmed down); this is probably a mistake.
- 3) Once again, a system break; the slur in the beginning of the next system is ambiguous, and may be intended to tie the whole three bars together. However, see parallel passages (e.g. mm. 131-132, 145-146, etc.).
- 4) The tie appears only at the beginning of the new system.
 5) There is a page break here, and the slur appears only on the new page.
- 6) The p appears slightly later in the manuscript; the d was not a dotted half note when it was originally written.



- 1) Mendelssohn's slurs cease to be clear here. The l.h. has no slur, but m. 292 is written in short-hand as a unison with the right hand; there is a system break after m. 293, and at the end of the system Mendelssohn extends a slur beyond the barline without continuing it in the next system, perhaps as an indication of a general *legato*.

 2) The *ff*s in both the cello and the piano parts have portions of them written well into the previous measure, in the case of the piano part covering most of the third beat.







- 1) The reason for the difference between the slurs in mm. 359 and 363 is not clear. However, the slur in m. 363 corresponds to the phrasing that governs this theme in its appearances in the exposition and the recapitulation, so perhaps it should reflect on the one in m. 359.

 2) The violin's slur does not extend all the way to the f^1 ; it was modified here to match the cello's slur, as well as most appearances of this phrase.
- 3) Here and in m. 377 the slur ends decisively on the third beat.



- 1) There is a system break here, and the tie in the cello part appears only at the beginning of the new system.

 2) The expression *sempre ff* appears in the manuscript as one continuous expression. Here it was spaced in order to reflect the relative positions of its beginning and ending.

 3) Mendelssohn's original placement of the hairpin is retained here. However, it is very likely that it should indicate a *diminuendo* from the e^2 to the $c\#^2$ (compare the indications preceding and following this one).
- 4) The slur's ending in the manuscript is not clear. It seems likely that it should extend to include the eighth note, which is the final note of the arpeggiated gesture; however, it may have been intended to end before the eighth note, thus lending more weight to it.
- 5) The first beat is obscured by sealing wax. It has been reconstructed by comparison to the following measures.



- 1) In the manuscript the *sf* is in fact located under the first eighth note of the r.h. However, it appears to have been placed there because of lack of space, and is much more likely to be intended to apply to the l.h. bass.
- 2) The four measures following m. 450 are the last ones on page 139 of the manuscript, and they have been crossed out. However, the first two systems of the following page have also been crossed out, only to be reinstated with the words *gilt alles* at the top of the page. Although this may suggest that Mendelssohn intended to reinstate the preceding four measures as well, one should compare the voice leading from m. 450 to the first measure of p. 140 with the voice leading from the last measure of p. 139 to the first measure of p. 140. This comparison reveals that the first measure of p. 140 is designated as the continuation of m. 450, and that Mendelssohn intended exactly what is written: the last four measures of p. 139 are discarded, whereas the first two systems of p. 140 are maintained. Compare mm. 449-455 here with mm. 405-411 of FE.



- 1) The f was placed on the second beat in the manuscript before the l.h. part was changed from quarter notes to eighth notes. It is highly improbable that the first eighth note
- of the l.h. is intended to be executed with a different dynamic from what follows.

 2) The beginning of the slur is not indicated clearly in the manuscript. It is possible that it is intended to begin on the second eighth note; however, a separate bow on the first eighth note would cause it to stand out far beyond its accompanying role in the current texture.
- 3) Part of the f extends in the manuscript below the first beat.
- 4) Compare slur to m. 139.



- 1) Mendelssohn does not write a separate change of clef. It is implied by his use of the bass clef at the beginning of the current staff in the manuscript (m. 499).
- 2) These slurs are across a system break in the manuscript. It is most likely that Mendelssohn intended both measures to be played with the same bow.

³⁾ In the manuscript the slur does not start until m. 516; however, its angle and position suggest it is intended to include the previous measure as well. This would result in a considerably long bow stroke for the cellist; perhaps here would be the right place to discreetly change bows without interrupting the overall phrasing intended by Mendelssohn.





1) Mendelssohn does not write a separate change of clef. It is implied by his use of the bass clef at the beginning of the current staff in the manuscript (m. 559).





1) In the manuscript the slur is broken and then continued above the third beat of m. 612; its ending points to the f^{I} , but does not extend beyond the barline between mm. 613 and 614.



- 1) Starting in m. 627, the slurring pattern in the strings changes consistently to preclude the half note. In m. 631 the violin changes back to the previous pattern, in which the slur ends on the downbeat half note, and the cello follows suit in m. 634. The slur here does not reach the downbeat in the manuscript, and was changed in order to maintain consistency with the violin part, as well as with m. 634 in the cello part.
- 2) The indication sempre crescendo takes two whole measures in the manuscript, and was therefore spread out here.
- 3) The slur is over a system break. It appears to continue to the downbeat in the previous system, but does not appear in the new one. However, compare with the following measures.
- 4) Here the inclusion of the upbeat under the slur is implied in the new system, but does not appear in the previous one. Compare to the following measures.
- 5) In the manuscript the first three note heads are above the beam, whereas the next three are under it. This results in the clef being obscured, and was therefore not maintained.



- $1) \ Slurs \ follow \ the \ manuscript \ and \ are \ consistent \ between \ the \ violin \ and \ the \ cello \ parts.$
- 2) In both the violin and the cello parts, the slurs do not extend all the way to the downbeat, but do extend beyond the last note of the previous measure, and suggest the
- 3) In the manuscript the middle voice is stemmed up, which makes it virtually impossible to determine which note belongs to which voice on the third beat. The separation of the octave from the fifth seems to be the logical conclusion, considering the preceding texture.



- 1) The slur originally connected to the downbeat, but when the following measure was revised to go up an octave, another slur was added, and the extension of the previous slur (over a system break) was crossed out.
- 2) There is a dot above the cello's *a*, which is most likely the abbreviation dot of the *ff*.
- 3) It is hard to ascertain whether the ff is intended to include the upbeat, since Mendelssohn used a measure repetition sign in the previous measure rather than write it out.
- 4) 8va alta in the manuscript.



- 1) M.M. according to A2 and FE. Andante tranquillo in A2; Andante con moto tranquillo in FE.
- 2) Slur following the strings in m. 11, etc.
 3) The B-flat in the manuscript is below the beam. It may be telling as to Mendelssohn's idea of this beat's voicing, but impossible to duplicate satisfactorily in print.
 4) Mendelssohn must have neglected to write a natural here, since according to the last beat of the violin part, the harmony reverted back to a normal dominant.



1) The exact beginning and ending of the slur in the manuscript are not clear; the slur does not extend beyond the G. However, parallel slurs cover all four notes.



- 1) Although the slur clearly starts on the c^2 , a comparison of the phrase to mm. 29, 74, and 76 suggests it may have been intended to start on the d^2 .
- 2) The manuscript is not completely conclusive with regard to the beginning of this slur. It may have been intended to start on the f, in which case the whole phrase would be executed using one bow.
- 3) The slur continues a little beyond the beginning of the second beat. It may have been intended to include the following sixteenth note.
- 4) Slurs according to the manuscript; however, see the violin part of m. 33.
- 5) The slur extends in the manuscript to include the a^2 . However, being that it is the only instance in which it does, it is most probably an oversight.
- 6) The p in the manuscript is positioned after the first quarter note, since originally the first beat in the violin part was a rest.



- 1) A c^2 appears to have been erased from this chord; its presence, however, seems to be logical because of the importance of the octave C in this passage. 2) In the manuscript the middle of this measure is a system break. Whereas the slurs at the end of the previous system appear to be continuing into the next one, the slurs in the next one appear to be starting with the first eighth notes.





- 1) It is not clear in the manuscript whether the slur should include the first sixteenth note or not. Whereas the harmonic phrasing suggests it should begin with the second sixteenth note, the slurs in all parallel passages include the first sixteenth note as well.
- 2) The reason for the isolated slur here is not clear. It may have been intended to emphasize the secondary voice. In that case, however, it is possible it was intended to start on the e^{l} .
- 3) The pitches of the third beat were originally $g^l bb^l db^l$; the correction of the third sixteenth note to c^l is not conclusive, but consistent with the current harmony.
- 4) The slur may have been intended to extend into the next measure. There is a page break after this measure, and the next one starts its own slur, but this is typical of Mendelssohn; it is the length of this phrase, as well as the slurring of the cello imitation of this line, that makes it logical not to extend this slur beyond the end of this measure.



- 3) Although Mendelssohn indicated that the first three beats of this measure are under one slur, a comparison with the following measures, as well as an examination of the phrasing, suggests it may be better to change bows in the middle of the measure rather than on the last beat.
- 4) Mendelssohn may have intended to keep the first sixteenth note separated from the others, as is the case with the first sixteenth note in the cello part; see also the next footnote.

 5) There is a dot above the *d* in the cello part, and a hint of one above the *f* in the violin part. These may indicate *staccati*, and thus support the notion that the slur in the violin part should start on the second sixteenth note; however, Mendelssohn's tendency to write dots after abbreviated dynamics provides a more likely explanation.



- 1) M.M. according to A2 and FE. Scherzo / Leggiero e vivace in A2 and FE.
- 2) The articulation and slurring of this motive are not consistent in the manuscript. This edition follows Mendelssohn's original indications; however, it is likely that he intended the more frequent articulation of this motive (a *staccato* mark above the slur on the last eighth note, see mm. 6-7, etc.) to prevail throughout the movement.
- 3) The beams in mm. 6-7 follow the manuscript, except here, where the r.h. has a beam connecting the fifth and the sixth beats whereas the l.h. does not. Here the r.h. was made to conform to the l.h. following the example of mm. 54-55.
- 4) The slurs here occur over a page break, and are not consistent: in the manuscript the r.h. has an ending of a slur on the next page, but not a beginning of one here; the l.h. has a slur over the two sixteenth notes, but it does not connect to the eighth note on the following page.
- 5) This part of the manuscript page is not clean, and consequently it is difficult to ascertain whether the *staccato* dots on the upbeat and the following downbeat are intended. What seems to be an additional dot appears above the first of the sixteenth notes of the next measure of the violin part. It might also be inferred here that the cello part upbeat should have a dot; the one on the downbeat is conclusive.



¹⁾ The location of the p is not clear. Mendelssohn's handwritten p is diagonal, with the top part being under the eighth-note rest, and the bottom being under the a^2 . A reasonable interpretation would be that the grace note a^1 , being the resolution of the previous dynamic build-up, is still within the previous dynamic indication, whereas the a^2 , which starts the new phrase, is within the new p.



- 1) Once again the exact location of the f is not clear in the manuscript because of its angle, and even more so in m. 40. Although parts of both indications do cover the first eighth notes of their respective measures, phrasing suggests they are intended to apply to the second eighth notes.

 2) As is so many times the case, it is very difficult to distinguish in the manuscript between dots and wedges. However, in this particular case it does seem that Mendelssohn intended
- the passage in the piano part to be articulated with wedges.

³⁾ Mendelssohn had an oversight here, which also affected his beaming (maintained here): instead of the logical c^{l} , he gave the violin a b. Compare with the cello part.



- 1) The location of the dots here has been maintained as it is in the manuscript. It is possible that Mendelssohn placed them above the l.h. part in order to indicate that they apply to the r.h. as well.
- 2) The *cresc*. for the cello is written above the staff, and is possibly intended for the violin as well. The fact that the piano part has the same indication and the same textural role as the violin supports this assumption.
- 3) Mendelssohn does not write slurs for the cello here; it is safe to assume that the same slurs are intended as in mm. 59-60.



- 1) The slurs here are maintained as they appear in the manuscript in order to emphasize their support of the melodic top voice.
- 2) This slur extends in the manuscript to the third eighth note, probably by mistake.

 3) Once again, the bulk of the *f* is located between the upbeat and the downbeat, with its bottom portion extending to include the upbeat.



- Mendelssohn uses here a diagonal beam; the first chord is above the beam and the material in the treble clef is below the beam. Whereas this edition tries to maintain the original beaming whenever possible, here it would result in the beam obscuring the treble clef.
 Originally the r.h. of the first half of the measure was similar to the r. h. of the second. Mendelssohn corrected it to include an eighth note and four sixteenth notes, but the eighth note was a# rather than c#1. This was parobably an oversight. See mm. 90 and 94.



- 1) The swell is positioned according to its relative location within the measure in the manuscript and in relation to the violin's swell. In relation to the cello's notes, however, the swell goes to its peak and back before the *G*2) The original notation of mm. 111-112 consists of two tied dotted quarter notes; this is due to revision of the l.h.



- 1) It is unclear in the manuscript whether this dot is a staccato dot or an abbreviation period after the a of c.a. If one judges from the articulation marks of the violin in previous measures, it may well be either.
- 2) There is a hint of a dot above the *a* in the manuscript, which may just be dirt; however, it has been interepreted here as a *staccato* dot, which is consistent with the preceding measures. 3) The beginning and ending of this slur are not distinct; it starts roughly above the *a*¹ and ends above the *g*². Most likely it is there to indicate a general *legato* touch.
- 4) The slur starts between the d^2 and the $f^{\#^2}$. It may have been intended to start from the d^2 .
- 5) The beginning of the slur is not distinct; it is probable that it is intended to include the grace note.



- No sf is indicated here for the violin. It may be an accidental omission, or an intentional attempt to have the cello part dominate this passage.
 The f lies diagonally between the preceding e² and the d³.
 The ff lies diagonally between the preceding b#² and the d³.
 The manuscript seems to suggest that Mendelssohn wanted to employ wedges in the second measure of the passage; still, it is possible that these are simply elongated dots.
 In the manuscript the first three sixteenth notes are under the beam and the second three are above it; consequently, it obscures the clef.



- 1) Mendelssohn's use of the treble clef here is according to the older tradition, in which treble clef material in the cello part is notated an octave above its actual pitch. Here it has been converted to the modern standard.
- 2) The natural here is not consistent with m. 144. Interestingly enough, A2 and FE do not correct this contradiction, but rather they reverse it. It was therefore kept here.
- 3) This slur extends over a page break. In the first page it is clearly extended beyond the barline, but in the second page it does not appear. Still, the following measures suggest this interpretation is the correct one.
- 4) The *dim*. here appears between the violin and the cello staves, and seems to apply to both.
- 5) In the manuscript the end of the slur looks like a dash above the $f\#^2$. It is unlikely that Mendelssohn intended a dash here, since he did not use dashes in the following measures.
- 6) The slur may be intended to start on the d^2 .





- M.M. according to A2 and FE. *Allegro assai appassionato* in A2 and FE.
 The slurs here are maintained as they appear in the manuscript in order to emphasize their support of the melodic top voice.
 The manuscript has a system break at the end of the previous bar. This is probably why the wedges do not continue here.



- 1) The wedges are placed in the manuscript between the piano staves, equidistant from both. They are not as clearly defined as they are in mm. 6-7: they may be elongated dots.
- 2) The difference between the piano figuration in this measure and the one in the next may have a simple explanation: there is a page break between them in the manuscript. However, the original figuration appears once more in m. 32ff.; therefore the editor leaves to the performer's discretion the decision whether to execute m. 28 as it appears in the manuscript or rather as it appears in A2 and FE.



- In the manuscript the first eighth note is separated. However, it is connected to the ensuing figuration in all parallel passages. The secondary beam is extended here to include the first sixteenth-note rest, in order to clarify the rhythmic pattern (in the manuscript the secondary beam starts on the e^l-a^l fourth).
 Originally Mendelssohn wrote a c², which was elongated to become the d² rather than crossed out. The following c² was originally a b¹ (natural), and therefore it can be concluded
- that that voice in the piano part was revised to match the strings, a revision which resulted in the minor ninth between the r.h. and the l.h. of the piano part.



- The inconsistencies in the articulations of the violin part in mm. 48-50 are reproduced here as they appear in the manuscript. Once again, it should be mentioned that often Mendlessohn is not careful about clearly distinguishing between dots and wedges.
 The *staccato* dot, which does not seem to belong here, may be be the beginning of a later-rethought notehead in the vicinity of b or c^l.



- 1) In the manuscript this slur is carried over a system break: it does not appear at the end of the previous system, but does at the beginning of the new one.

 2) The slurs in both the violin part and the piano part start above the second quarter note of the bar; their angles in the manuscript, however, suggest the possibility that they were intended to start above the first quarter note.
- 3) The *staccato* dot is missing in the manuscript.
 4) The placement of dynamics in all parts here follows the manuscript.



- 1) The placement of dynamics here follows the manuscript, but they are most likely supposed to include the l.h. of the piano part as well.

 2) Although the *cresc*. indications are nearly aligned in the manuscript, the notes of the different parts are not. Here the indications are placed according to their locations relative to the notes in the different parts of the manuscript.









- 1) Whereas the slur's angle in the manuscript suggests it is inteded to extend from the c^2 , the slur itself does not start until the d^2 . Compare to the l.h. part. 2) The grace note in the violin part is not slashed in the manuscript. This must be an oversight, since it is slashed in the cello part and in all of the parallel passages.
- 3) The angle of the slur allows the possibility that it was intended to extend to the following quarter note.
- 4) The *pp* appears in the manuscript below the second beat of the measure; however, that beat was originally a rest. From that fact, as well as from the change of the texture in the middle of the measure, it can be surmised that the dynamics apply to the new appearance of the first theme.



1) g^2 missing in the manuscript.



The alignment of the cello's *ff* in the manuscript is different than that of the violin and the piano.
 Despite having slurred the following measures, Mendelssohn clearly crossed out a slur here.
 In the manuscript the r.h. plays an octave (d¹-d²); the entire previous passage was doubled with octaves that were then crossed out. Mendelssohn must have left this one in because it is rendered redundant by the l.h.



The manuscript originally had here c#¹ for the r.h. and a third A-c# for the l.h. The l.h. was revised to what is shown here; a g¹ was added to the r.h. (it is mostly obscured by the beam) - but the c#¹ is not crossed out. Judging from the revision of the l.h., as well as the general texture of the passage, one gathers that this is probably an oversight.
 This tie is over a page break in the manuscript. As in many other instances, the tie appears only at the beginning of the new page, and not at the end of the previous one.



- Dot missing in the manuscript. Compare with the violin part of m. 207.
 Once again the tie appears only at the beginning of a new system, and not at the end of a previous one.
 Similar.
- 4) Dot missing in the manuscript. Compare with the piano part of m. 199.



The slur here follows the manuscript. It is likely that dots were intended above the d²s.
 The spacing of the e-flats in the manuscript suggests that they were afterthoughts. It is probable, then, that they were intended to share the articulation of their surrounding notes.
 The manuscript has an unclear slur here, most likely the result of ink bleeding through the page. However, the performer may decide to articulate this phrase similarly to the manner in which it is indicated in parallel passages (slurring the first two notes and dotting the third).



1) The slur starts in the manuscript above the f^2 . However, see the cello part in m. 232.



1) Mendelssohn's use of rests here is irregular. This lack of care obviously stems from the minimal significance of these rests; however, they have been retained here as they appear in the manuscript.



- 1) Since Mendelssohn does not repeat the slur that appears in the violin part of m. 250, it is up to the performers to decide whether they want to play these two notes with the same bow or not.
- 2) Measure 259 is the last one in its system. Mendelssohn's slur extends beyond the end of the measure, but does not continue in the next system. This may suggest that he was indicating a general *legato* for the entire passage.



- 1) The *fp* here extends from the first quarter note to the beginning of the third; it may have even been intended as two separate indications: *f* on the first beat and *p* on the third.

 2) The slur in the violin part of the manuscript starts above the middle of the second quarter note; it is corrected here to follow the cello part.

- 3) Slurs shown here as they appear in the manuscript.
 4) The *p* appears between the first and second beats; it is likely that it is meant to follow the violin part.



- 1) The word *sempre* starts in the middle of the last beat of the previous measure; the word *crescendo* extends all the way to the middle of the second beat of the next measure.

 2) This passage is heavily corrected. The lower stem is added here following the example of the next measure.



The bottom part of the *f* starts as early as the second sixteenth note of the last beat of the previous measure.
 The *f* and the *cresc*. appear between the violin and the cello parts.
 The *f#*² in the chord appears to have been crossed out; however, a comparison with the rest of the passage suggests it does belong here. Perhaps the note originally belonged to the r.h. and was crossed out; it was later reinstated as part of the l.h. chord.