Concerto No. 2
in B♭ Major
Op.19

Allegro con brio. (M.M. $\mathfrak{d} = 132$; acc. to Czerny, (1) $\mathfrak{d} = 182$.)

Tutti

Concerto.
(Pfte. I or II.)

(1) Carl Czerny: "Die Kunst des Vortrags der ältern und neuer Claviercompositionen" The Art of Interpreting Early and Modern Compositions for the Pianoforte, Supplement to the Great Pianoforte-Method, op. 300. - Is not the "$\mathfrak{d}$" in "182" an engraver's mistake?

(2) Flute, 2 Oboes, 2 Bassoons, 2 Horns in B♭, and String-quartet (quintet). - In arranging the orchestral part of this Concerto, the editor thought it best to place ease of execution above completeness of harmony.

(3) Here we follow, with regard to the bass, the reading of the original bass part $\frac{3}{4}$, which has also been adopted in the printed scores (Breitkopf & Härtel; Peters). - In the Autograph, this is changed, by a later correction, to $\frac{2}{4}$.
(1) The $f$ belongs, according to the Autograph, to this syncopation, not to the preceding one.
(The bass-notes in the Tutti, as usual, with large heads; expression-marks of same size both for Tutti and Solo.)
(f) Slur and — are wanting in the Autograph here and in the parallel passage on p. 19. (Were they crossed out the first time? Quite illegible.) The slur is also omitted in both passages in the original violin part; Hoffmeister's pianoforte part gives, in this place, ; in the parallel passage, no sign whatever. (Bassoon I has, in the original part, only staccato dots without a slur; in the Autograph, no sign at all.)
(1) Originally: \(\text{\footnotesize etc. Trill with lower appoggiatura. Played: }\) etc.

(2) \(p\) in analogy to the parallel passage on p. 20.
(1) In the bass (by mistake?) originally
(1) "Senza sordino", with pedal; "con sordino", without pedal (e). — It is best, with our modern pianos, to take the pedal anew with each measure, and to release it during the scale.

(2)  
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(f) The flute has in the Autograph only \( \frac{3}{4} \), (in the original part, dots); the 1st violin adds — [\( \text{Additional notes} \)]. Compare the parallel passage, p. 7.
(1) Did the composer forget the $f$?—Compare the parallel passage, p. 10.
(1) For Cadenza by Beethoven, see Appendix.
Adagio. (M.M. = 80; acc. to Czerny, = 84.)

Solo

(t) This \( f \) is inadvertently omitted in the original Tutti-arrangement (but not the preceding \( ff \)). - Breitkopf & Härtel add \( f \) at beginning of Solo; Peters adds only the \( f \) in the Tutti.
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(1) Corrected, in Peters and Breitkopf & Härtel, thus: \(\text{\textfrac{1}{2}}\) \(\text{\textfrac{1}{4}}\) \(\text{\textfrac{1}{8}}\) or thus: \(\text{\textfrac{1}{4}}\) \(\text{\textfrac{1}{8}}\) (in large note-heads). The notation of the figure in the second measure is inexact, compared with the Autograph and the original parts.

(2) Originally: \(\text{\textfrac{1}{2}}\) \(\text{\textfrac{1}{4}}\) \(\text{\textfrac{1}{8}}\) \(\text{\textfrac{1}{16}}\) \(\text{\textfrac{1}{32}}\) etc. Dotted bars added by the editor, to facilitate reading.
According to the original parts, and the Autograph, cresc. (not cresc. poco).

(2) Was a “cresc.” forgotten here? Compare the following decresc., which to be sure, passes over into pp. — The cresc. missed by us occurs (though not till the beginning of the following measure) in later editions of the Bureau de Musique de C. F. Peters. One of these editions is entitled: Deuxième Concert...Nouvelle Édition, revue et corrigée. *) Leipzig, etc. Pr. 2 Thlr. (Pour Piano seul & Thlr.) [Register: 66.] — The title of the other reads: Deuxième Grand Concert...arrangé avec deux Violins, Viola et Violoncelle et augmenté d'une Cadence par Charles Czerny...Pr. 2 Thlr.” [Register: 3893]

*) “par l'auteur” is doubtless not appended. — The largely increased number of expression-marks in the last movement, greatly resembling those in the following edition (Czerny’s), admit of the possibility that Czerny also had a hand in this edition.
(1) Corrected in Peters, and Br. & H., to $\frac{1}{8}$ The Peters Edition (N° 65) already contains the above simplification of the embellishment, but not the above-mentioned one by Czerny (N° 8698).

(2) Peters (N° 65) writes "con sordino, ad libitum". The insertion of the comma is quite to the point, because the "ad libitum" can refer only to the tempo, as may be seen from the orchestral direction in the same place.
Rondo.
Allegro molto. (M.M. \( \cdot 104; \) acc. to Czerny, 112.)
Solo

(1) Here without expression-mark. At the repeat, \( p. \) — Except in a few places noted further on (see p. 37), the original Tutti-arrangement of this movement contains no expression-marks except the oft-recurring \( f. \)

(2) Staccato, in analogy with the parallel passage on p. 43.
(1) Originally \( \frac{3}{4} \). But cf. the parallel passage on p. 41.

(2) Here, in the old Tutti-arrangement, "f" [], and then, to the closing Tutti, no further expression-marks except the sf.

(3) According to the Autograph and the original parts, "f", then "ff", in the instruments bearing the melody. (The sf for the viola is omitted here in the original part; in the parallel passage on p. 46 it is merely inadvertently misplaced.)
(1) In Peters and Br. & H., "staccato". — Peters (No 65) reads \( \text{staccato} \). The staccato-signs also occur in the Czerny-Peters Edition No 3696, though without the additional "p cresc."

(2) The two Peters editions just mentioned have, at the beginning of this measure, "f", followed two measures later by "p", then in the next measure by "cresc."
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(1) Original notation: etc. In the Autograph, however, the eighth notes are joined, as above.
(1) Slurs and dots in analogy with the parallel passage on p. 37.
(2) But cf. Note on p. 38.
(3) Violin I has ♩, acc. to the Autograph; the original part, and also the scores of Peters and Breitkopf & Härtel, have, on the contrary, only a ♩ (no doubt by mistake).
(4) The word "Solo" was originally placed a little further to the right, so that it might seem doubtful whether the $b$ was meant to be included. But this $b$ is already written large; besides, just here a bit of piano-sketch in the Autograph begins with this $b$ (in the right hand).
(1) Even when practising this Concerto, play these measures either very softly, or not at all.
(1) The notation agrees with the Autograph and Br. & H.'s score. According to the original viola-part it would read: $\frac{4}{4}$ (evidently wrong). The two preceding measures are simply provided with marks of repetition.

(2) This fingering is also recommended by Czerny.