

THE SOURCES OF  
CHOPIN'S STYLE  
INSPIRATIONS AND CONTEXTS

Warszawa 2005

Graphic design of a cover series

*Ryszard Grzyb*

Editor of the series

*Artur Szklener*

Editorial board

*Artur Szklener, John Comber, Magdalena Chylińska*

English language translation and revision

*John Comber*

© Copyright by Narodowy Instytut Fryderyka Chopina  
Warszawa, 2010

*Book published as part of the Polish Government program:  
'Fryderyk Chopin Heritage 2010'*

ISBN 978-83-917410-7-8

Narodowy Instytut Fryderyka Chopina

ul. Tamka 43

00-355 Warszawa

tel.: (+48 22) 44 16 117

fax: (+48 22) 44 16 113

e-mail: [nifc@nifc.pl](mailto:nifc@nifc.pl)

[www.chopin.nifc.pl](http://www.chopin.nifc.pl)

Printed by:

*Instytut Technologii Eksploatacji – Państwowy Instytut Badawczy*

[www.itce.rudom.pl](http://www.itce.rudom.pl)

ALISON HOOD

## INTRAOPUS CONNECTIONS IN CHOPIN'S NOCTURNES, OPUS 27

My analysis of the two Opus 27 Nocturnes grew out of my prior instinct (when performing these two pieces) that the connections between them range far deeper than their foreground similarities. Having read Jeffrey Kallberg's article on 'Compatibility in Chopin's Multipartite Publications', in which he refers to issues such as tonality and closure, I decided to investigate the possibility of fundamental connections within this opus.<sup>1</sup> The analytical method of this paper shows relationships between the individual pieces of Opus 27 that will concern performers as well as analysts.<sup>2</sup> Following the rhythmic implications of a Schenkerian analysis that focuses on the details (as well as the deep structure) of these pieces reveals these deeper connections in a way that may be of interest to performers. After noting interesting foreground similarities between the two pieces, the analysis looks at the connection from the first Nocturne into the second. Finally, it focuses on the 'premises' that are set up in the first piece and how they develop throughout both works. As we will see, some of these premises do not conclude totally in the first Nocturne and are more deeply explored and finally resolved in the second.

---

<sup>1</sup> Jeffrey Kallberg, 'Compatibility in Chopin's Multipartite Publications', *The Journal of Musicology*, 2/4 (Fall 1983), 391-417.

<sup>2</sup> Both of these Nocturnes have been graphed in full by Felix Salzer, 'Chopin's Nocturne in Csharp Minor, Opus 27, No. 1', in W.J. Mitchell and Salzer (eds.), *The Music Forum* (Columbia University Press, 1970), 283-297, 286; and *Structural Hearing: Tonal Coherence in Music* (New York: Dover Publications, 1982), 306-307.

### SIMILARITIES

The main surface similarities between the two works concern their keys, openings, and endings. The first Nocturne is in C sharp minor and the second is in D flat major—keys that enjoy a special relationship in Chopin's music. Their contrast gives dramatic and emotional effect within works such as the *Fantasy-impromptu* and the 'Raindrop' Prelude. While their relationship within individual pieces seems clear, what about their connection within an opus? The use of C minor versus C major in Opus 48 No. 1 demonstrates the same harmonic relationship (parallel major and minor tonics), but it is still not the typical one. Opus 27 No. 1 begins in sharps, moves to a key signature of flats, and returns again to sharps. The second Nocturne begins in flats, the build-up to the climax is notated with sharps, and it returns to flat notation.

The openings and codas of the two works have a lot in common. Both nocturnes open with the left hand playing solo sextuplets and the right hand then entering a tenth above on the third scale degree. The coda of No. 1 features a texture of two voices that answer each other before coming together. The left hand sounds on its own in bar 98 before the final cadence with  $\hat{3}$  on top. In the second Nocturne, the coda is also written in a texture of two voices that answer each other before coming together. The left hand sounds on its own in bar 74 and a simple closing gesture concludes the work with  $\hat{1}$  in the top voice.

### CONNECTIONS

Beyond the surface similarities, pitches and gesture more strongly connect the end of Opus 27 No. 1 to the beginning of Opus 27 No. 2. Most of the pitches in the final chord of the first Nocturne are taken up in the left hand of the second. The top-voice E# at the end of the first piece is transposed up an octave and respelled as F ( $\hat{3}$ ) for the first pitch of the melody of the second piece. Finally, the upward moving, opening-out gesture of the cadence at the end of the first Nocturne is mirrored in the initial movement of the bass and the entry of the right hand in the second.

PREMISES IN OPUS 27 No. 1

Premises that are set up in No. 1 are developed through both pieces. The first Nocturne will therefore be examined in more detail. Premises set up in Nocturne No. 1 include:

- semitonal neighbours (featured also as part of an important motif)
- melodic events becoming bass lines
- the sixth
- enharmonic reinterpretation
- ‘new theme’

The first Nocturne opens with solo left-hand arpeggiation that omits the third of the tonic harmony. This introduces the element of modal ambiguity that characterises the whole piece. The melody enters on E $\natural$  and moves immediately up a semitone to E $\sharp$ . E $\natural$  returns in the subsequent descent. The theme then continues by exploring two semitones in the form of a double-neighbour motif—heard for the first time as D $\natural$ –C $\sharp$ –B $\sharp$ –C $\sharp$ . However, its final resolution back to C $\sharp$  is delayed by a bar's rest in the right hand. Motivic disjunction, and the fact that its final resolution is left hanging, heightens the tension at this point, and also joins these two phrases together.

In bars 25 and 26, the motif is left unresolved and a *ritenuto* leads into two bars of solo left hand. This sounds very mysterious and lacks tonal or metric stability. On closer inspection, however, the main movement in the left hand is of D $\natural$  to C $\sharp$ . The motif is completed with the initiation of the *Più mosso* section as the bass moves down to B $\sharp$  and back up to C $\sharp$ . Now, this motif is used to bridge not only phrases, but also whole sections. This motif, that started as a melodic motif, is now used in the bass line and has assumed even more importance. Thus far we have witnessed the introduction of two of the main premises of the piece. The semitonal neighbour motion was transformed into a thematic motif and this melodic event migrated into the bass line and took on more importance.

The *Più mosso* section highlights the prominence of the interval of a sixth. This section is also formed from the semitonal double-neighbour motif in the bass and alto. The main harmonic movement continues as shown in Example 1. The durational reduction is notated with one bar

of the score equal to one crotchet in the reduction. The overall ascent is of a sixth from G# to E $\natural$ .

Example 1. Durational Reduction of Opus 27 No. 1, 29–45.

Of course, one cannot claim that all pieces featuring a sixth function as a set, for it is a staple of the Nocturne style as exemplified by the nocturnes of John Field. Rather it is the way in which Chopin uses this interval and integrates it throughout both works that elevates it to the role of a premise. In this work, the interval of a sixth is used as a way of highlighting the E $\natural$ /E# ambiguity from the opening. Here, the sixth outlines C sharp minor—G#—E $\natural$ . Later, the sixth from G# to E# will be used to establish the major mode, and it will be respelled as A $\flat$  to F in the second Nocturne. A voice-leading sketch of bars 45–52 is shown in Example 2.

Example 2. Voice-leading sketch of Opus 27 No. 1, 45–52.

This passage outlines the descent of a sixth from E $\natural$  back to G#. G $\natural$  is then enharmonically respelled as A $\flat$  in a common tone modulation in bar 49. In this section, there is concentration on the sixth and it offers the first example of enharmonic reinterpretation. At the change of key

in bar 49, another sixth emerges. The melody descends a sixth from A<sub>3</sub> to C before falling to A<sub>2</sub> an octave lower.

The section that follows uses the original E<sub>4</sub>–E<sub>5</sub> semitonal motif to prepare a synthesis of this motif and the motif of the sixth. The rising sequence that follows in bar 53 is full of semitonal motion and the original motif. The alto voice contains a chromatically altered, retrograde version of the motif that is expanded over four bars. The tenor and top voices feature semitonal motion, and there is a general rise in tension. The goal of this motion arrives in bar 65. The tenor voice in the two preceding bars focuses on B<sub>4</sub> resolving to A<sub>4</sub>. B<sub>4</sub> is heard seven times before finally falling to A<sub>4</sub>. This highlights it and provides a further example of the focus on semitonal neighbour motion—this time to the fifth scale degree of the tonic, D flat major.

The theme that appears in bar 65 may sound like a new theme. Salzer writes of this passage: 'It is as if the major mode demanded a different thematic content'.<sup>3</sup> It is a distinctive melody and does provide an attractive contrast with the material that precedes it. However, it may also be heard as the end result of a process of developing variations that smoothly transforms the opening material into this theme. The opening melody focuses on semitonal movement (from E to E<sub>5</sub> and the double-neighbour motif), and it features repetition of the pitch E<sub>5</sub>. This is transformed into the material used in the *Più mosso* section from bar 29. As mentioned previously, the double-neighbour motif appears throughout this section. It also makes a feature of the pitch repetition evident in the opening theme and hints at an arpeggiated melody (in the second bar of each phrase). The interval of a sixth (from G<sub>4</sub> to E) emerges as the overall contour of the melody and triple metre takes over. The goal of this section arrives in bar 45 and a new melody enters. This melody retains pitch repetition and it answers the previous ascending sixth from G<sub>4</sub> to E<sub>4</sub> with a descending sixth from E<sub>4</sub> to G<sub>4</sub>. Whereas previously the interval of a sixth was formed by the overall contour of the melody, now the sixth is formed by melodic arpeggiation that was only hinted at in the previous section—thereby intensifying focus on this interval. The melody is now in E major. Bars 49 to 52 form a consequent phrase that enharmonically respells G<sub>4</sub> as A<sub>4</sub> and descends a sixth in a melodic

<sup>3</sup> Salzer, 'Chopin's Nocturne in C sharp Minor, Opus 27, No. 1', 286–287.

arpeggiation. The key signature has now changed to that of four flats and the harmony rests on V of D flat major. The section from bar 53 to bar 64 features the double-neighbour motif and is similar, both in character and organisation, to the *Più mosso* section. Thus the theme in D flat major in bar 65 seems to have evolved through a series of developing variations. The double-neighbour motif and pitch repetitions were both used as links on the way towards this theme. It is thus noteworthy that this theme makes a feature of the neighbour B $\flat$ . In bar 67, the semitonal lower neighbour to A $\flat$  initiates the ascent back to F. Semitonal movement then takes over at the end of each ascent. Repetition is retained in the harmonic support to the melody. The characteristic outline of a sixth began in the overall contour of the *Più mosso* section before taking on more melodic importance from bar 45. Its triple metre was also established from bar 29, and the key of D $\flat$  was prepared by the enharmonic reinterpretation of G $\sharp$  as A $\flat$  leading to its dominant.

Hearing such a process not only seems central to the dramatic process of Opus 27 No. 1, but also enhances our experience of Opus 27 as a single whole. If this theme is compared to the theme of the second Nocturne, further similarities become apparent. These two themes (and an offshoot of the theme of No. 2) are juxtaposed in Example 3 to demonstrate this similarity.

Example 3. Melodic outline of themes of Opus 27 Nos. 1 and 2.

The 'new' theme is in D flat major—the key of the second Nocturne. Both themes have a melodic contour of a descending sixth from

F to A $\flat$  and subsequent ascent of a sixth back to F, and both emphasise the neighbour B $\flat$ . This theme thereby strengthens the relationship between these two pieces.

After the new theme at bar 65, a sequence follows that leads to a *fff* climax and the return of the original key signature. A fascinating analogy is provided here when A $\natural$  is heard seven times before resolving to G $\sharp$  ( $\hat{6}$  in C sharp minor). This might be heard as a direct reference to the seven-fold repetition of B $\flat$  that resolved to A $\flat$  ( $\hat{6}$  in D flat major) in bars 63–64, providing another prominent example of enharmonic reinterpretation in this piece. The pitches G $\sharp$  and A $\flat$  were associated previously with the common tone modulation leading into the D $\flat$  section. B $\flat$  is now made equivalent to A $\natural$ , and G $\sharp$  to A $\flat$ . Not only is this an example of further enharmonic reinterpretation, but it also incorporates the semitonal neighbour motion, and these techniques are now combined. The alto voice contains semitonal neighbour motion as B $\sharp$  moves to C $\sharp$  and E then moves to D $\sharp$  in a new version of the motif. This figure then migrates into the bass, incorporating C $\sharp\sharp$ , and a left-hand cadenza over the dominant arrives finally on the minim A $\natural$ . The original double-neighbour motif returns as A $\natural$  moves through G $\sharp$  and F $\sharp\sharp$ , and arrives back on G $\sharp$ . The motif is reinstated and it now incorporates the semitonal neighbour motion of A $\natural$  to G $\sharp$   $\hat{6}$ . Thus, it also refers to the former process of the enharmonic reinterpretation of these pitches and provides another example of melodic events migrating into the bass line.

The first theme returns in bar 84. Bars 1–7 merge midway through the bar with bars 22–26, and thus form an abridged version of the theme. Resolution to C $\sharp$  occurs in the lower register on a bare octave in bar 94. The coda focuses on the descent of a sixth from E $\sharp$  to G $\sharp$ , as can be seen in Example 4. The major mode has taken over and finally resolves the sense of uncertainty caused by the modal ambiguity of the theme. The final cadence is in the major mode and rises a sixth from G $\sharp$  to E $\sharp$  in preparation for the opening of the second Nocturne.

The premises that were introduced in the first Nocturne will now be summarised. Semitonal neighbour motion is developed and takes the form of a motif. The tendency of melodic events to become bass lines incorporates this motif in joining phrases and sections. The interval of a sixth is used to characterise thematic contour and is also used in conjunction with the E $\sharp$ /E $\natural$  alternation to establish mode.



Example 4. Opus 27 No. 1, 93–101, noting the sixth.

This takes the form of the sixth from G $\sharp$  to E $\flat$  or from G $\sharp$  to E $\sharp$ . The enharmonic reinterpretation of G $\sharp$  as A $\flat$  is taken even further by incorporating the semitonal neighbour motion of B $\flat$ –A $\flat$  and A $\flat$ –G $\sharp$ . Finally, the ‘new’ theme introduced in bar 65 emerges from a gradual process of transformation and sounds suspiciously like the main theme of the second Nocturne.

Hearing the themes of the first Nocturne in terms of this process of transformation gives added meaning to that Nocturne. Realising that the same process of transformation links the two Nocturnes may give added meaning to a performance in which the second Nocturne follows the first.

#### PREMISES IN OPUS 27 No. 2

The following are the main premises of the second Nocturne:

- semitonal neighbours
- melodic events becoming bass lines

- the sixth
- enharmonic reinterpretation
- thematic similarities

As already noted, the second Nocturne has a lot in common with the first. Nevertheless, it is distinctive in many ways. The opening theme of Opus 27 No. 2 descends a sixth to  $A\flat$  and is characterised by semitonal neighbours:  $E\sharp$  to  $F$ ,  $C$  to  $D\flat$ , and  $A\sharp$  to  $B\flat$ .  $A\sharp$  is extended and only resolves up to  $B\flat$  after a whole bar. This is an effective device that heightens tension at this point. The eventual arrival on  $B\flat$  coincides with the low bass  $D\flat$  and thereby adds weight to this pitch. This semitonal neighbour motion is mirrored in the tenor voice and takes on a life of its own in this register.  $A\sharp$  moves to  $B\flat$  in bar 6. In bar 7,  $A\sharp$  moves back up to  $B\flat$  within the bar.  $B\flat$  enters in bar 8 and resolves down to  $A$ , and this is now doubled by the bass.  $A\flat$  falls to  $D\flat$  and thereby completes the  $\flat\hat{6}-\hat{5}-\hat{1}$  motion that was such a feature of the first Nocturne. In this small passage, we have already encountered prominence of the sixth, semitonal neighbour motion, enharmonic reinterpretation of  $A\sharp$  as  $B\flat$ , and a melodic event becoming a bass line.  $B\flat$  in the bass in bar 8 is heard simultaneously with a leap up an octave to high  $g\flat^3$  in the right hand and a marking of *sforzando*.  $G\flat$  is the upper semitonal neighbour to  $\hat{3}$  and is only resolved in the lower octave at this stage as the upper octave is abandoned. The use of semitonal neighbour motion to  $\hat{5}$  and  $\hat{1}$  (as part of the motif  $D\sharp-C\sharp-B\sharp-C\sharp$ ) in the first Nocturne is extended in this Nocturne to include a similar treatment of  $\hat{3}$ , with emphasis on the neighbour  $G\flat\flat^4$ .

For ease of reference, this Nocturne will be divided into three phases defined by the return of the theme. Phase two begins in bar 26 and phase three begins in bar 46. Phase one contains significant working of the  $B\flat-A\flat$  motion. This begins in bar 17 as a syncopated  $G\flat$  entry initiates the  $B\flat-A\flat$  issue again.

Phase one introduces the main premises listed above and substantially develops the  $B\flat-A\flat$  relationship. The melody emphasises  $B\flat$  and its resolution to  $A\flat$ , which subsequently descends a sixth to  $C$ . Enharmonic change is reintroduced in bar 23 and leads to the chord of  $A$  major in bar 24.  $A\sharp$  in the bass is respelled as  $B\flat$ , and  $C\sharp$  becomes  $D\flat$  in the melody.  $B\flat$  resolves down to  $A\flat$  in the bass as the dominant chord before finally resolving to the tonic with the return of the theme.

This melodic event has once more migrated into the bass line and is characterised by enharmonic reinterpretation.

The second phase further develops these premises, especially the migration of melodic events to the bass line. This phase begins with the theme and continues as before until bar 32. High  $g^{\flat 3}$  now resolves in this higher register, as well as in the lower octave. The harmony from this point onward is fascinating. Sharps are reintroduced in bar 34 when  $D^{\flat}$  in the bass of the previous bar is enharmonically reinterpreted as  $C^{\sharp}$ . A major harmony takes over at this point and thereby tonicises the previous focus on  $A^{\sharp}$ . The melody is doubled in sixths, and the melodic outline highlights the interval of a sixth from  $C^{\sharp}$  down to  $E$ , as well as the leap of a sixth upward from  $C^{\sharp}$  to  $A$  in bar 37. Both texture and melodic contour have now integrated the sixth. A major moves to  $G^{\sharp}$  dominant harmony in bar 38. The aural expectation at this point is of resolution to the key of  $C^{\sharp}$  minor—the key of the first Nocturne. This section provides a perfect example of melodic events taking on more importance and migrating into the bass line. In the first Nocturne,  $B^{\flat\flat}-A^{\flat}-D^{\flat}$  was enharmonically reinterpreted as  $A-G^{\sharp}-C^{\sharp}$ . In the second Nocturne, there is play between  $A^{\sharp}$  and  $B^{\flat\flat}$ .  $B^{\flat\flat}-A^{\flat}-D^{\flat}$  first appeared in the bass line in bars 8–9.  $A^{\sharp}$  was harmonised with an  $A$  major chord in bar 24 before being respelled as  $B^{\flat\flat}$ , and the motif resolved to the tonic with the return of the theme. Finally, this movement is totally assimilated into the harmonic structure in the section from bar 34 to bar 46. Here again, resolution occurs with the return of the theme. This may therefore be regarded as a huge expansion and harmonic exploration of the lead-in to the theme in bars 24–26.

The voice-leading sketch (Example 5) shows the main movement from bars 37 to 46.

Example 5. Voice-leading sketch of Opus 27 No. 2, 37–46

A $\sharp$  moves to G $\sharp$  in the top voice and in the bass. Bass G $\sharp$  is enharmonically reinterpreted as A $\flat$  before resolving to the tonic. The top voice respells F $\sharp$  as G $\flat$  NN before resolving down to F  $\hat{3}$ . So,  $\hat{2}-\hat{6}-\hat{1}$  is now totally integrated into the harmony and incorporates enharmonic reinterpretation. The chromatic ascent in the bass adds to the overall rise in tension, and this is enhanced by the rhythmic structure of this climactic section. Another fascinating aspect of this section becomes evident if it is compared to the opening theme. The theme introduced G $\flat$  neighbour moving to F in the melody with B $\flat\flat$  moving to A $\flat$  in the bass. This section forms a huge expansion of those premises. B $\flat\flat$ -A $\flat$  is now integrated into the harmony as A major moving to G $\sharp$  major. G $\sharp$  is retranslated as A $\flat$ —the dominant of D flat major. The neighbour G $\flat$  of the theme is now highly accented and developed.

Thus far, there has been significant development of the semitonal neighbour figure—both as B $\flat\flat$ -A $\flat$  and as G $\flat$ -F. Phase one included substantial musical discussion of B $\flat\flat$ -A $\flat$ . In phase two, G $\flat$  appears with increasing urgency and frequency approaching the climax and it is finally resolved down to F  $\hat{3}$  for the final appearance of the theme.

The third phase (beginning in bar 46) synthesises the premises already discussed. The final return of the theme is dramatic, although editions differ regarding the dynamic markings at this point.<sup>4</sup> Instead of the previous entry of A $\sharp$  for the expansion of the semitonal neighbour motif, C $\flat$  is heard in bar 49. This is the other semitonal neighbour to B $\flat$ . Previously, the entry of A $\sharp$  had been reinterpreted as B $\flat\flat$  and had activated its migration into the bass line. Now, however, there is a sense of relaxation, as no new issues are activated. C $\flat$  is transposed up an octave and the dynamic falls to *pp*. The cadenza passage that starts in bar 51 basically moves from C $\flat$  to B $\flat$  and is constructed from many repetitions of the semitonal neighbour motif. Resolution to B $\flat$  arrives in the lower octave in bar 53, with D $\sharp$  in the bass. Resolution in the higher octave forms the anticipatory entry to bar 54. This B $\flat$  is held over as

<sup>4</sup> Paderewski marks a *crescendo* in bar 45 followed by *fff* in bar 46. Henle has a *diminuendo* in bar 45 and no dynamic marking in bar 46. Paderewski explains that in bar 45 'FE and GE give a long *diminuendo* sign after *f*, and the word *diminuendo*. The Oxford edition, however, adds *crescendo* after *f* in bar 45 and *fff* in bar 46. In the copy belonging to Madame Jędrzejewicz, this *crescendo* and *fff* are also written in pencil in place of the work *diminuendo*, which is crossed out', Paderewski, 'Commentary', 115.

D $\sharp$  in the bass resolves up to E $\flat$ , thereby completing another semitonal neighbour motion. Whereas previously in the theme A $\sharp$  resolved up to B $\flat$  in the following bar, C $\flat$  is now extended to incorporate the expansive cadenza before resolving to B $\flat$  four bars later.

Bar 55 features the upward leap of a sixth heard before in this theme. G $\flat$  enters *con forza* in bar 57. It is accented, preceded by an upward leap of an octave, and is syncopated. A descent in sixths begins from this pitch and another theme is heard. This is marked *appassionato*. It is based on the main theme of the second Nocturne but also incorporates the texture of sixths. When compared to the 'new' theme of the first Nocturne and the main theme of this piece, it is obvious how closely they are related to one another. This theme also outlines a descent of a sixth from F to A $\flat$ , and emphasises and accents the neighbour B $\flat$ . G $\flat$  is incorporated within this melody as an upper neighbour to F and has lost its dominant position.

In No. 2, as in No. 1, there is a sense that the piece needs to end in the higher octave that is established at the beginning in order to achieve a sufficient degree of closure. F  $\hat{3}$  is extremely strong and dominant throughout this Nocturne. Resolution in the lower register in bar 62 is very strong but does lack the necessary resolution in the higher octave. The coda attempts to recapture this register. A chromatic descent that incorporates B $\flat$ –A $\flat$  eludes the expected resolution to d $\flat^2$ . A $\flat$  is given a lot of weight, as it forms the goal of the upper line of the descent and lasts for over a bar. This reinforces this pitch after the previous focus on B $\flat$  and A $\sharp$ . The second attempt to reach D $\flat$  is successful. It arrives on the downbeat of bar 70 beneath A $\flat$ . This close incorporates the motif B $\flat$ –A $\flat$ –D $\flat$ .

In bar 72, a final reminder of the B $\flat$ –A $\flat$  sounds in the melodic fragment in the lower voice before concluding as B $\flat$ –A $\flat$ . This melodic motif can be compared to that found in bars 22 and 89 of the first Nocturne. This idea is so important throughout both pieces that it seems only natural that the piece closes by referring to it. A simple F–D $\flat$  summary leads into bar 74, where the left hand sounds on its own. Finally, F is sent off into the upper register of the piano in an ascending run in sixths. The final gesture arpeggiates the tonic chord and the top voice concludes F–D $\flat$ . Tritones feature prominently in this coda, and they were not a feature of this Nocturne. The theme of the first Nocturne outlined a tritone,



and this was answered by the concentration on fifths in the coda of that Nocturne. Perhaps this coda functions as a reminder of that melodic characteristic.

Before proceeding, it may be useful to summarise the main premises of the first Nocturne. It sets up the semitonal neighbour motion with the alternation between E $\flat$ /E $\sharp$  and its inherent ambiguity. This is then resolved in the major-mode ending. Semitonal neighbour motion then develops into a motif: D $\flat$ -C $\sharp$ -B $\sharp$ -C $\sharp$ . This motif then migrates into the bass line. G $\sharp$  is reinterpreted as A $\flat$ . Movement from A $\sharp$  to G $\sharp$  incorporates the semitonal motion and is then reinterpreted as B $\flat$ -A $\flat$ . This leads into the 'new' theme that sounds suspiciously like the theme of the second Nocturne. The interval of a sixth plays an important role throughout the piece. Many of the premises that are set up and developed in the first Nocturne are taken up and further developed in the second.

#### CLOSURE

The unusual close of the first Nocturne depends on register and harmonic support, and is reflected in the score markings. Towards the end of the first section (bars 21–22), we get a perfect cadence, with a root-position dominant, and we end in the obligatory register. However, in bars 92–93 the upper register is abandoned, and B $\sharp$  in this register does not immediately resolve to C $\sharp$ . Chopin double stems the lower C $\sharp$ , perhaps to highlight its dual function as a resolution of the lower C $\sharp$  and as a replacement resolution for the higher C $\sharp$ . C $\sharp$   $\hat{=}$  is still needed in the higher register, however, in order to achieve a satisfying sense of closure. Comparing bars 21–22 with bars 93–94 underscores the lack of closure. The melodic descent and resolution to C $\sharp$  has bass support in bars 21–22. Bars 93–94 are heard over a bass pedal C $\sharp$ . In fact, the final structural dominant of the piece is heard in bar 83 before the return of the theme. The sense of closure is thus weakened in bars 93–94, as it occurs in the lower register and is not supported by a dominant chord. The *Adagio* at the end of the piece does not contain a dominant chord and the final cadence of the work is plagal. C $\sharp$  is heard in the obligatory register in bar 100; however, a *sforzando* E $\sharp$  is followed by a rise of a sixth

from G# to another E# above this final cadence. E# is still heard retaining its strong position. In summary, there is a sense of resolution at the end of the Nocturne, but it maintains a certain open-ended feeling.

This unusual close may explain why Schenkerian analysts have provided divergent readings of the first Nocturne. In Salzer's interpretation of the *Urlinie* of No. 1,<sup>5</sup> he suggests that the final descent occurs with the return of the theme— $\hat{2}$  over the dominant cadenza in bar 83, and that the return itself marks the descent to  $\hat{1}$ . In favour of this interpretation, note that the final dominant chord of the piece occurs in bar 83 and D# occurs there in the correct register. However, as John Rink points out,<sup>6</sup> this reading goes against the form of the piece. The return of the theme should denote the return of the primary tone, particularly when preceded by the pitches G# and F#. Salzer places the interruption at bar 52 with  $\hat{2}$ , and the post-interruption section beginning with  $\hat{3}\#$  in bar 65. Rink suggests an alternative reading with  $\hat{3}-\hat{3}\#-\hat{3}\natural$  spanning bars 1–64, 65–83, and 84–92, and the structural descent in bars 93–94. Rink explains that this reading 'avoids the binary–ternary opposition from which Salzer's study suffers'.<sup>7</sup> In favour of Rink's analysis, note that bars 93–94 do sound like the final descent of the *Urlinie*. A *ritenuto* and accents, as well as the double-stemmed C#, support this reading. However, this descent lacks harmonic support.

The only 'cadence' in the final section is the plagal cadence at the end, which precludes a descent. Perhaps these contradictory readings reflect the possibility that this piece does not conclude in a true Schenkerian sense, that it retains a sense of openness and only really concludes at the end of the second Nocturne. Perhaps Chopin has continued the C sharp minor/D flat major connection into an opus.

The close of the second Nocturne might be compared to that of the first. Many of the premises introduced in the first Nocturne are taken up in the second and developed further. In the first Nocturne, the final descent of the *Urlinie* takes place in bars 93–94; in the second Nocturne, it comes in bars 61–62. In the first Nocturne, C# resolves in the lower register over a bare octave. In the second Nocturne, D $\flat$  also

<sup>5</sup> Salzer, 'Chopin's Nocturne in C sharp Minor, Opus 27, No. 1', 285.

<sup>6</sup> John Rink, 'The Evolution of Chopin's 'Structural Style' and its Relation to Improvisation', (Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1989), 228–229.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 228.

resolves in the lower register over a bare octave; however, it is immediately preceded by a root-position dominant, and therefore sounds more conclusive. The coda re-establishes the obligatory register in both Nocturnes. In the first Nocturne, the final cadence forms an opening-out gesture that stresses  $\hat{3}$ ; in the second Nocturne, the final arpeggiation closes inward and ends on  $\hat{1}$ . It seems, therefore, that the close of the second Nocturne is much stronger than that of the first. This supports the hypothesis that the close of the second Nocturne may have the dual function of ultimately resolving the first Nocturne.

This analytical approach raises the larger question of compatibility within other multiple works by Chopin. Investigating how similar premises are worked out—not just in a single piece but in a pair of pieces—reveals interesting intraopus connections. In Opus 48, for example, the two Nocturnes seem to offer different solutions to similar compositional problems. Both pieces deal with the same rhythmic and metric issues. This concerns not only the surface of the works but also the background level of organisation. If the pieces are performed together, a temporal relationship may even flow through the two. It seems, however, that similarity of premise runs even deeper in Opus 27. Premises that are introduced and developed in the first Nocturne are continued and concluded in the second, thus forming a much deeper exploration of the premises throughout the two works. If these two Nocturnes are performed as a pair, the continuity of these premises is made audible. The lack of complete closure at the end of the first Nocturne can be compared to the open-ended nature of some of the preludes. Perhaps the weaker sense of closure at the end of the first Nocturne may help us to hear the second as finally concluding the premises of the first. Regarding interpretation, performers will decide for themselves how best to highlight certain musical issues, but understanding the musical threads that connect the two pieces will aid in the communication of their musical content. It is important to stress that the foregoing analysis does not suggest that these pieces must be performed as a pair—many great pianists have performed them separately. If they are performed together, however, a deep relationship between the pieces will emerge and the conclusion of the second Nocturne will seem even more satisfying.