The Italian cellist and composer Luigi Boccherini (1743 - 1805) composed 125 quintets for 2 violins, viola, and 2 violoncellos during his career. A vast majority of these works have never been published in modern editions, and those that have been published have been subjected to heavy editorial hands. These works are the first of their kind, and while the genre of the quintet with two cellos, as opposed to the more standard instrumentation with two violas, has never gained any real footing in terms of attention from better-known composers such as Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, they represent the pinnacle of Boccherini’s compositional output, and their neglect in both the publishing and performing fields is a subject that needs to be addressed.

The purpose of this study is to present one of these quintets in a scholarly, critical performing edition based on the three individual hand-written sources as well as the two published editions I have procured. Unlike all other previously published versions of any of these works, this edition will include a full score and individual parts, along with clear indications of source-derived markings and editorial additions. The G. 312 quintet has never been published in a modern edition, and the present version represents what is hoped to be the first of many critical editions to be undertaken by this author.

In addition to the score and parts, a detailed critical commentary has been included. This commentary outlines all of the changes, alterations, and editorial decisions that were made during the preparation of the performing materials. Also included are text
chapters that discuss the history of Boccherini’s quintets, historically relevant treatises, ornamentation practices, and the editorial process.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

It would be rather simple to classify the string quintets of Luigi Boccherini as a neglected body of works, though in many ways this is only a half-truth. There exists a small group of these quintets - the lucky few - that have been published numerous times, recorded and performed frequently, and are generally recognized by both cellists and chamber music aficionados alike. However, when one considers that there exists one hundred and twenty-five of these works, the picture becomes less clear. These quintets are generally regarded as the pinnacle of Boccherini’s style and compositional voice, yet a large majority of them lie dormant, in outdated, over-edited, and generally less than useful editions for the modern performer.

To be more specific about the usefulness of these old editions, let us explore the challenges presented by them. The first category is that of the musical text and the details that lie therein. A brief perusal of the existing published parts for the G. 312 quintet yielded the following general errors: incorrect multi-measure rest indications, incorrect pitches and rhythms, liberal altering of slurs, and inconclusive grace note indications.\(^1\) In terms of their feasibility for modern performers, further challenges presented themselves. One such challenge, specific to the violoncello I part, was the use of myriad clefs,

\(^1\) Luigi Boccherini, *Vingt-quatre nouveau quintetti pour deux violons, deux violoncelles et alto*, 5e livraison, œuvre 37 (Paris: Ignace Pleyel, 1802); Boccherini, *Collection des quintetti de Boccherini pour deux violins, alto et deux violoncelles* (Paris: Janet et Cotelle, 1819 - 1822).
including bass, tenor, alto, treble, and soprano. While cellists of the day may well have been fluent in all of these clefs, this is no longer the case. Another issue specific to the era of these publications was the irregular beaming of eighth notes, and other short note values. In these editions, beams were treated rather haphazardly, and while they often reflect the beaming to be found in the manuscript sources and thus are representative of some musical phrasing, this is also a practice that has fallen out of fashion and does not necessarily agree with the eyes of a modern performer.

While the Parisian publishing firms of Ignaz Pleyel and Janet et Cotelle may have seen the merit of these works by Boccherini, as evidenced by their publication of almost all of these compositions in multi-volume sets, their efforts have proven less than adequate in their ability to keep these works in the standard chamber repertoire as time has progressed. Moving forward into the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, what follows is a table of all of the currently available editions of Boccherini Quintets.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. Number</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Parts</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Editor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>271 - 276</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Noten-Roehr</td>
<td>NR.90190</td>
<td>Niedernhausen</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275, 280,</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Ricordi</td>
<td>ER 2171</td>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Enrico Polo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300, 376,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>IMC</td>
<td>IMC.2007</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Robert Sondheimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>IMC</td>
<td>IMC.1285</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Fritz Volbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noten-Roehr</td>
<td>NR.90206</td>
<td>Niedernhausen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Edition HH</td>
<td>HH.HH071-FSP</td>
<td>Launton</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Keith Pascoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>IMC</td>
<td>IMC.575</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Johann Lauterbach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>CF Viewig</td>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Gustav Lenzewski</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<sup>3</sup> The G. 310 editions as edited by Johann Lauterbach have an asterisk placed next to them, as they represent a most inauthentic version of this quintet. Lauterbach altered the movements that originally belonged to this work, and substituted whole passages, or movements from other Boccherini Quintets. The resulting publication represented more of a pastiche than an original work by Boccherini.
Upon examining the data presented in this table, it is clear just how many of these works have not made the journey into modern publications in order to be presented by currently active chamber ensembles in either the concert hall or in the recording studio. In fact, when duplicates are taken into consideration, a mere fifteen quintets are currently available out of Boccherini’s one hundred and twenty-five quintets. It is certainly hopeful that the G. 310 has been released in a critical edition, edited by Keith Pascoe, but the others suffer from many of the same inherited pitch and rhythmic errors, and a similar amount of over-editing as found in the early French editions.\(^4\)

The goal of this study is to present one of these quintets in a form that acknowledges the manuscript copies, but also brings the notation and layout practices up to date, presenting the material in both a critical and a performing format. The Urtext practices already in existence from publishers such as G. Henle Verlag and Wiener Urtext have served as models for the preparation of the G. 312 quintet, and it is hoped that this will be the first of many such editions of these important and undeservedly neglected works by Boccherini.

CHAPTER II
BACKGROUND OF THE G. 312 STRING QUINTET

Boccherini’s compositions for string quintet span from the year 1771 through 1802. During this time period, he held two important royal appointments. The first, at the court of the Infante Don Luis de Bourbón in Madrid, from 1770 - 1785, was followed immediately by his appointment to the court of King Frederick William II of Prussia, from 1785 - 1797.\textsuperscript{5} From these dates we can see that not only did Boccherini work in the string quintet medium throughout his life, but also that his court appointments played an invaluable role in his ability to produce such a large number of chamber works. Within this same time frame he also composed twelve piano quintets, six guitar quintets, seventy-seven string quartets, twenty-four string trios, eighteen flute (or oboe) quintets, six string sextets, and four divertimentos for mixed ensemble. His role as a court chamber composer in the Spanish and Prussian courts proved to be the ideal environment for Boccherini to produce such massive quantities of chamber works.

Another factor, which accounts for Boccherini’s enormous output of instrumental works, was the presence of the French brothers Jean-Pierre and Jean-Louis Duport at the Prussian Court during Boccherini’s period of employment there. The elder brother Jean-Pierre was active at the Prussian Court from the years 1774 - 1806, while his younger

brother Jean Louis was in King Frederick’s employment from 1790 - 1806.6 Both of the
brothers remained at the court after Frederick William II’s death, while Boccherini’s
employment was terminated upon the accession of Frederick Willliam III.7 These two
cellists, in addition to the King himself (who was reportedly a competent amateur cellist)
were surely the intended performers of the quintets with two cellos that Boccherini was
writing during his employment at the Prussian Court. We can safely assume that these
works were being performed there, as evidenced by the creation of two hand-written sets
of individual parts for the majority of these works by Frederick’s copyist.8 These parts
comprise two of the three primary sources for this project, and further discussion of them
can be found in Chapter III of this paper.

We do not know why Boccherini began writing works in a previously non-
existent genre. He invented the two cello quintet genre during his tenure at the Spanish
court, and it is plausible to reason that he was not the only cellist active at the court of the
Don Infante in Madrid. The relative simplicity of the second violoncello parts in these
quintets would not suggest that they were written for an accomplished player. One
possibility is that these second violoncello parts were intended for one of Boccherini’s
students while at the Spanish court. Though the role of instructor was never explicitly
listed in the very descriptive title that he held, it would also stand to reason that he might
have been charged with instructing members of the royal family. If that were indeed the

---

6 Drosopolou, 38.
7 Ibid., 20.
case, these quintets would have been the ideal vehicle for displaying Boccherini’s prowess as a composer, performer, and teacher.
CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION OF THE SOURCES

In preparing this edition, a number of primary and secondary sources were used. Three different manuscript copies, held at the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, comprise the primary sources, while two early French editions make up the group of secondary sources. There also exists the score found in the collected works edition, but that source proved to be unreliable for a number of reasons, which will be explored in this chapter.\(^9\)

The first manuscript (herein referred to as “MS”) was a hand-written score for the G. 312 quintet.\(^10\) According to Yves Gérard, author of Boccherini’s thematic catalogue, there is some doubt as to whether or not this score is in Boccherini’s hand or the hand of a copyist.\(^11\) This opinion is supported by Loukia Myrto Drosopoulou’s dissertation on Boccherini’s quintet manuscripts. She notes that the scores of the quintets Opp. 25, 27,

---

\(^9\) The sources examined here were: Luigi Boccherini, Opera 2da, 1779. Quintetto VI. Per due Violini, Viola, e due Violoncelli obbligati. Composto per S. A. R.le Don Luigi Infante di Spagna da Luigi Boccherini, virtuoso di Camera, e Compositore di S. A. R.le. manuscript score. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn - Archiv. Microfilm; Boccherini, Opera 2da, 1779. 6 Quintetti di Boccherini, manuscript set of parts. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn - Archiv. Microfilm; Boccherini, Opera 2da, 1779. 6 Quintetti di Boccherini, manuscript set of parts. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn - Archiv. Microfilm; Boccherini, Vingt-quatre nouveau quintetti pour deux violons, deux violoncelles et alto, 5e livraison, oeuvre 37, (Paris: Ignace Pleyel, 1802); Boccherini, Collection des quintetti de Boccherini pour deux violins, alto et deux violoncelles, (Paris: Janet et Cotelle, 1819 - 1822); Boccherini and Pina Carmirelli, Quintetti Volume VIII of Le Opera Complete di Luigi Boccherini, (Rome: Instituto Italiano per la storia della Musica, 1977).

\(^10\) The abbreviations used in this study are derived from Gérard’s identification of each source. MS refers to the manuscript score, FE refers to the first edition, and LE for a later edition. The indications of MSa and MSb are mine, as Gérard offers no abbreviations for these copies. See pp. 352 of Gérard for the specific indications.

\(^11\) Gérard, 332.
28, 29, 30, and 31 all contain handwriting discrepancies when compared to confirmed autograph manuscripts. The score bears the inscription, ‘Quinteto VI° per due violini, viola e due violoncelli obbligati composti per servizio del Smo Signor Infante D’n Luigi di Borbone da Luigi Boccherini, virtuoso di camera e compositore di musica di S.A.R. le Opera 2da. 1779.’ See Figure 1 for a reproduction of the title page.

**Figure 1. MS Title Page**

---

12 Drosopoulou, 23.
The score is very neatly written out, with most of the ledger lines still visible. Each page consists of ten lines of staves, allowing for two systems of music per page. The pages are laid out in landscape orientation and each system contains between five and six measures. On page nine two measures have been carefully crossed out, and re-written, though it is unclear what error was being corrected here. The microfilm scan provided by the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek was virtually error free, save for page 44 of the score where the majority of the page was blurred. Thankfully, this passage from movement IV was a repeat of earlier material, so no vital information or markings were lost.

Though it is likely not a true autograph manuscript, this is the earliest surviving source for this quintet, and is likely the source for the remaining two manuscript sources used for the present edition. This is a discovery made by me upon comparing each of the manuscript part sets to the score. In the viola part of movement IV, measure fifteen there are pitch discrepancies that can only be explained by a copyist error. The pitch locations are the same as in the first cello part, which appears one staff below the viola in score order. The following two examples will highlight this copy error.

**Figure 2. Viola wrong notes in MSb**

---

Though it is difficult to see clearly, the pitches in the second measure of Figure 2 are D and F-flat. In tenor clef, these same note locations produce the pitches B-flat and D-flat. Figure 3 will show this same measure from the manuscript score.

**Figure 3. Movement IV, mm. 15 in MS score**

In Figure 3, the measure in question is the third bar. Here, it is clear that the correct pitches are G and B-flat for the viola, and B-flat and D-flat for the first cello. It should be noted that the carried over clefs for each staff are as follows: violin I and II: treble clef; viola: alto clef; cello I: tenor clef; cello II: bass clef. The correct pitches of G and B-flat appear in every other source for measure fifteen of the viola part. This copy error could only have occurred if Frederick William II’s copyist was working from a score copy of the quintet, and at the time the only score in existence was the MS score used for this study.

15 Boccherini, Opera 2da, 1779. Quintetto VI. Per due Violini, Viola, e due Violoncelli obbligatti... manuscript score. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn - Archiv. Microfilm, 34.
Two sets of manuscript parts were also used in preparing this edition and will herein be referred to as MSa and MSb. Each set of parts also bear inscriptions on their respective cover pages. The cover page of MSa reads, “6 Quintetti, Opera 2\textsuperscript{a}, 1779. Per Due Violini, Viola, e due Violoncelli Obligati, Composto per S.A.R.\textsuperscript{le} D\textsuperscript{a} Luigi Infante di Spagna. da Luigi Boccherini, Virtuoso di Camera, e Compositore di S.A.R.\textsuperscript{le}.” Each individual part bears this inscription, along with the name of each instrument. Figure 4 shows the title page of the violin I part.

Figure 4. MSa Title Page

\footnote{Luigi Boccherini, Opera 2da, 1779. 6 Quintetti per due Violini, Viola, e due Violoncelli Obligati. Composto per S. A. R.le Don Luigi Infante di Spagna. da Luigi Boccherini, Virtuoso di Camera, e Compositore di S. A. R.le. manuscript set of parts. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn - Archiv. Microfilm, 1.}
These pages, like the score, are laid out in landscape orientation, though the parts contain twelve lines of musical staves. This copy has not been preserved as well as the score, and on many pages, the ledger lines are no longer visible, making this source less reliable in terms of pitch identification than the others. It is unclear if this is the actual state of the parts, or if the lack of lines is a result of the microfilm scanning process.

MSb bears a much shorter inscription than MS and MSa. It reads, “Opera 2\textsuperscript{da}. 1779. 6 Quintetti, di Boccherini.” As with MSa, each individual part has the same inscription on the cover page, with the addition of instrument names. The pages of MSb are also in landscape orientation, with ten lines of staves. In this copy, the ledger lines have remained visible, though in the process of being scanned for microfilm, there is extensive bleed-through from the opposite side of each page. Many measures are smudged or darkened as well. Despite this, each page is ultimately quite legible, with all pitches, articulations, dynamic markings, and slurs easily identifiable. See Figure 5 for the title page of the violin I part at the top of the following page.
Two early French editions comprise the secondary sources used in the preparation of this edition. The first printed edition was made in 1802 by the Parisian firm Pleyel. This set of parts (herein referred to as FE) was accessed via the International Music Score Library Project website (IMSLP), and the parts were subsequently downloaded for use in preparing this edition. These parts were scanned without title pages, so each part begins

---

17 Luigi Boccherini, Opera 2da, 1779. 6 Quintetti di Boccherini, manuscript set of parts. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn - Archiv. Microfilm, 1.
18 Luigi Boccherini, Vingt-quatre nouveau quintetti pour deux violons, deux violoncelles et alto, 5e livraison, oeuvre 37 (Paris: Ignace Pleyel, 1802).
with identifications of the volume and quintet numbers. Pleyel did not present these quintets according to Boccherini’s own opus numbers. As such, the parts bear the title, “5ᵉ Livraison. QUINTETTO III.” This publication also included an optional second viola part, to replace the first cello part in cases where there was not an accomplished cellist available to play the demanding first part.

The other French publication used was the set of parts published in 1822 by the firm Janet et Cotelle. This version was also published with six parts in order to include the optional second viola part. The copy used for this edition was held at the Harold Schiffman Music Library on the campus of University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Each instrument was printed in two leather-bound volumes, and all volumes bore the title page inscription of “Collection des QUINTETTI de Boccherini pour deux Violons, Alto et deux Violoncelles.” This edition will be referred to as LE in further discussion. The paper used measured 10” X 13.5” and has begun to exhibit signs of aging. This aging has taken the form of yellowing pages as well as a degree of translucency, making it possible to see the staves on the opposite side of each page; otherwise, this was a very well maintained set. Each part was scanned to .pdf format for use in this project.

There is one source that was not used but which bears mentioning here, as it was the main impetus for taking on this project. All of Boccherini’s string quintets have been

20 Luigi Boccherini, Collection des quintetti de Boccherini pour deux violins, alto et deux violoncelles. Paris: Janet et Cotelle, 1819 - 1822.
published in score form, as part of a collected works set. The score for the Op. 28 quartets proved to be problematic on two counts. The first count against it was the omission of the manuscript score as one of its primary sources. Owing to the fact that this score was the original source for the two handwritten sets of parts, this appeared to be a major oversight on the part of the preparers of the collected works score. The second count against using this edition as a reliable source of information was the editorial approach of Pina Carminelli, the edition’s lead editor. There exists no distinction between source-derived markings and editorial ones, despite the preponderance of editorial changes and additions. It is the second count that is to be corrected by the present edition.

What follows is a table of these five sources, organized by the description of the source type, the abbreviation used in this edition, the publication year, the location of the source, and the publisher (if applicable).

22 It is possible that the score was not available to those working on the collected works scores, though the publication dates of this edition and the Gérard catalogue do not support this. Gérard’s catalogue was published in 1969, and the collected works score was released in 1977. Gérard’s catalogue lists the manuscript score as a source for the Op. 28 quintets, and even provides the correct call number for the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek.
Table 2. Consulted Manuscript and Published Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Score</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Deutsche Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Parts</td>
<td>MSa</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Deutsche Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Parts</td>
<td>MSb</td>
<td>1779</td>
<td>Deutsche Staatsbibliothek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Edition Parts</td>
<td>FE</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>IMSLP.org</td>
<td>Pleyel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later Edition Parts</td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>UNCG Music Library</td>
<td>Janet et Cotelle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV
ORNAMENTATION

Throughout this particular quintet, there are three types of ornamentations used by Boccherini: grace notes, appoggiaturas, and trills. As was the convention during Boccherini’s lifetime, there was no notational distinction made between grace notes and appoggiaturas, nor was there any clear indication of the intended starting note for trills. In addition to these rather ambiguous notation practices, the five sources consulted in the preparation of this edition contained little to no agreement about the notation of these ornaments.

This lack of agreement amongst the sources meant that all notations of small ornamental notes in the present edition would have to be editorial choices. To further clarify the state of these notes in the sources, what follows is a listing of each edition and the notations used to indicate grace notes and appoggiaturas. In MS, the symbol † was used for both grace notes and appoggiaturas in all movements. In MSa, both † and ‡ were used with no discernable pattern as to which notation indicated which type of ornament. In MSb, all of these ornaments were notated with ‡. In the published sets of parts, FE used only † to indicate both appoggiaturas and grace notes. Finally, LE used both † and ‡ to indicate both types of ornamental notes, and similar to MSa, there does
not appear to be a discernable system employed to indicate which notation was meant to indicate which type of ornament.

In addition to the inconsistency of grace note and appoggiatura notation in these sources, it has also proven difficult to locate any type of historical agreement regarding the execution of these two types of ornaments. Ellen Iris Amsterdam summed up the two types this way: grace notes occur before the beat, serve a melodic function, and are generally placed on weak beats. Appoggiaturas occur on the beat, serve a harmonic function, and are generally placed on strong beats. While her distillation of the execution of these notes is attractive in its simplicity, the remainder of this chapter will show that the issue of grace notes and appoggiaturas is a historically problematic one. Still, her points form a reasonable starting point for investigating Boccherini’s use of grace notes and appoggiaturas.

Delving further into this topic proved to be equal parts frustrating and enlightening. As greater numbers of sources, both primary and secondary, were consulted, the overall picture of how these ornaments are to be treated became more muddled with each new treatise or study. For a few historical examples, we can turn to the treatises of Francesco Geminiani, Johann Joachim Quantz, Leopold Mozart, and C.P.E. Bach. These treatises were chosen to first establish the historical precedent for

23 Ellen Iris Amsterdam, “The String Quintets of Luigi Boccherini” (PhD diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1968), 47.
the generation that directly preceded Boccherini’s (Geminiani, and Quantz), followed by two of Boccherini’s contemporaries (L. Mozart and C.P.E. Bach).

Beginning with Geminiani, we can see both his explanation of appoggiaturas in text, as well as examples in musical notation of both ascending (superior) and descending (inferior) appoggiaturas. In the second example, Geminiani includes his own notation to show the intended execution of each ornament. The small triangle over the ascending appoggiatura indicates a swelling in volume; whereas the two slashes over the descending one indicates that it should last for a beat.

Figure 6a. Geminiani Text

(Third) Of the Superior Appoggiatura.

The Superior Appoggiatura is supposed to express Love, Affection, PLEASURE, &c. It should be made pretty long, giving it more than half the Length or Time of the Note it belongs to, observing to swell the Sound by degrees, and towards the End to force the Bow a little: If it be made short, it will lose much of the aforesaid Qualities; but will always have a pleasing Effect, and it may be added to any Note you will.

(Fourth) Of the Inferior Appoggiatura.

The Inferior Appoggiatura has the same Qualities with the preceding, except that it is much more confined, as it can only be made when the Melody rises the interval of a second or third, observing to make a Beat on the following Note.


Here, Geminiani is showing that appoggiaturas approached from either above or below should be played on the beat, with a stress or swell in volume, and that the length of the ornamental note should be taken from the principal note to which it is attached. In Quantz’s treatise he gives two more examples which essentially agree with Geminiani, although Quantz does provide more specific notation to indicate the desired length of the appoggiatura. This can be seen in Figure 7 on the following page.

In Quantz’s treatise, the appoggiatura is also played on the beat, though he is less clear about the stress or accentuation that it should receive when compared to Geminiani. In both cases though, we are beginning to see a consensus that appoggiaturas were intended to be placed on the beat.

\[^{26}\] Geminiani, 26.
Looking ahead to Leopold Mozart’s *Treatise on the Fundamentals of Violin Playing*, we find an equally detailed discussion of the treatment of ornamental notes in a variety of contexts. Concerning the appoggiatura, Mozart had this to offer: “The

---

Appoggiatura is therefore sustained the length of time equivalent to half the note and is slurred smoothly to it. What the note loses is given to the appoggiatura.”  

Figure 8 shows two examples given by Mozart clearly indicating that the appoggiatura was to be placed on the beat, and that the rhythm was to be equalized in order to accommodate the small note.

**Figure 8. Leopold Mozart Appoggiaturas**

![Figure 8](image)

C.P.E. Bach’s *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments*, published in 1753, provides a detailed account of appoggiatura practices encountered in researching this subject. He explores the art of the appoggiatura in many more contextual settings, and offers a significantly greater number of execution instructions, as compared to the other treatises examined. In this chapter, he advocated for the notation of the appoggiatura to be reflective of the intended length of the note. He does not initially offer advice concerning the metric placement of the appoggiatura; rather he begins in

---

28 Mozart, 167.
29 Ibid., 167.
30 Bach, 87.
general terms stating, “…the large notes before which they stand retain their length visually although in performance they always lose some of it to the ornament.”31

Similar to the other treatise authors, Bach further delineates appoggiaturas into two categories: the short and long appoggiatura. In all cases in the G. 312 quintet the appoggiatura notation has only been used to indicate the long variety, as the short option is essentially equal to the grace note. Thinking back to Ellen Amsterdam’s distillation, she advised that appoggiaturas only be placed on strong beats, while grace notes were more appropriate on weak beats. As we will see in Figure 9, C.P.E. Bach also preferred the long appoggiatura on metrically strong beats.

**Figure 9. C.P.E. Bach Appoggiaturas**32

---

31 Bach, 87.
32 Ibid., 90.
At this stage, it would appear that there is at least some general agreement on the execution of appoggiaturas. However, the potential for further confusion has been well documented by Clive Brown as follows:

Should the performer have resolved that a small note was intended to signify an appoggiatura rather than a grace-note, there remained the problem of deciding what its duration should be. The matter was obfuscated, both during the period of their general use and later, by the existence of two widely disseminated but sometimes incompatible guidelines for determining their length. On the one hand was a series of not entirely consistent prescriptions for deciding what proportion of the value of the main note should be given to the appoggiatura in any given circumstances: on the other was the idea that the notational value of the small note would show the approximate value that the composer intended it to receive.\(^{33}\)

Brown’s assessment of the confusion could also be easily applied to the discussion of grace notes, whose guidelines for interpretation were as varied and often conflicting as were those for the appoggiatura. As a means to reach a logical approach for this edition, one further source was considered: Frederick Munger Miller’s 1970 dissertation on seventeen cello sonatas by Boccherini. Miller’s work contains an extensive chapter on musical ornaments, as they relate specifically to Boccherini, and it proved to be fruitful in terms of developing a clear practice for the notation and expected execution of ornamental notes in the G. 312 quintet.\(^{34}\) His ornamentation chapter also provides an overview of the approaches of Geminiani, Tartini, Quantz, Leopold Mozart, and C.P.E. Bach, thus making it useful as a guide for the current study.

Through the use of a long series of specific examples from Boccherini’s cello sonatas, Miller draws the following conclusions concerning grace notes and appoggiaturas: appoggiaturas occurring on downbeats are to be held for half the value of the principal note; appoggiaturas that precede triplet groups are to be played short, and before the beat; appoggiaturas and grace notes above all must not interfere with the underlying harmonies in the other voices.

Regarding the execution of trills, there was widespread agreement amongst all of the consulted treatises that trills were to begin with the diatonic note above the printed trill pitch. In addition, Miller also points to examples of Leopold Mozart and C.P.E. Bach whose writings supported this practice. In light of the overwhelming amount of historical evidence, this execution is to be followed in the performance of the G. 312 quintet, and all other works of Boccherini.

---

35 Miller, 68.
36 Miller, 72.
37 Miller, 73.
38 See Geminiani, 7; and Quantz, 98, Mozart, 186 - 202, and Bach, 99 - 112.
39 Miller, 97.
CHAPTER V
EDITORIAL PROCESS

With this project being this author’s first attempt at creating a critical performing edition, a narrative of the editorial process, challenges, successes, and failures seemed apt to include in this text. Upon successfully locating three manuscript sources in addition to the two early printed sources, the task of compiling all of that information into one logical, coherent edition seemed fairly straightforward. Once the task of transcribing the materials into a new modernized edition had begun, the immense quantity of questions, discrepancies, and editorial decisions requiring attention became apparent. In the following chapter, a number of these cases will be presented, along with a general listing of the overall editorial practices employed in the preparation of this edition.

Despite the initial excitement over having many sources to consult, this quickly became the most difficult aspect of the editing and compiling process. In many cases, the manuscript sources were all in agreement with each other, while the two published editions presented the same, conflicting solution. In other cases, all five sources presented subtly different markings for the same passage, which required in-depth comparison of similar passages in order to identify patterns in slur marking, and to make decisions about which markings were copy errors and not composer-based discrepancies.

One such case concerns the octave displacement of the second cello part in the first movement. In many passages, the manuscript sources showed an approach to octave
changes in the second cello part that required a slightly disjointed, but very consistent method of changing octaves during the course of a phrase. Meanwhile, the two published editions flattened out these passages, moving various notes up or down by an octave as needed, in order to encapsulate all of the notes in a given passage within one octave. Figure 10 shows one such example of this.

**Figure 10. Movement I, mm. 13 - 16, vcl II**

![Figure 10](image)

In each case where this particular discrepancy between the sources existed, the manuscript sources were consistently in agreement with each other, while the published editions were in agreement with their alternate treatment of the octave placement. As such, the present edition restores the manuscript version in every case of this particular type of source disagreement.

In other cases, there existed no direct agreement between any of the manuscript sources, while the two published editions were in agreement, and the solution presented by the published editions was more idiomatic than what was found in any manuscript copy. In these cases, it proved fruitful to examine other instances of the same music, whether in the same instrumental part or in other parts, to conclude what the intended slur indications were needed.
A passage from the third movement exemplifies this editorial problem. In mm. 70 - 73, the first cello part contains three different slur indications in each of the manuscript copies, while the two published editions present an alternate interpretation that does not appear in any of the manuscripts. This same passage appears again in mm. 74, as well in early measures in the viola part. In each of those other instances, the slur indications are much closer to what appears in FE and LE. Often, one of the first two slurs will be missing in each of these passages, but when taken in as a whole, the pattern found in FE and LE, and retained in the present edition, becomes obvious. Figure 11 exhibits each of the options found in all five sources.

Figure 11. Movement III, mm. 70 - 73, vcl I

There are many other cases in which the various sources presented conflicting options, including different pitches, the existence or absence of staccato dots, slur indications, dynamic markings, accidentals, and others. An in-depth exploration of these issues can be found in Chapter VI, the critical commentary.
In an effort to keep this edition as uncluttered as possible, parentheses were used to indicate all editorial changes, additions, suggestions, and markings. In the case of slurs, dotted line slurs were used to indicate editorial slur changes. These changes were only added to the individual parts in order to present a score that reflects as closely as possible the musical text of the manuscripts. In this way, the score presents the music in its most distilled format, with as little editorial intervention as possible, while the parts then become practical performance copies; in this way the integrity of the critical edition is maintained.

In most cases, the parenthetical additions were obvious copyist errors. For example, in many passages, particularly in the accompanying voices, clear patterns of staccato dot usage were present, and there would be cases where one dot would be missing, or one voice would have a dot attached to each note, while another voice, with the same material, would have no dots. In such cases, the staccato dots were added where they were deemed to be incorrectly absent.

Two passages where the parenthetical additions were of greater consequence can be found in the second movement. The first of these appears at mm. 8 in both the first and second violoncello parts. In MS, MSa, and MSb, this measure only contains the two B-flat eighth notes, while in FE and LE, there is a third note, a B-flat quarter note on the second beat. The version found in FE and LE conforms to the pattern found in the analogous passage in mm. 32, where the second beat quarter note appears in all five sources. Armed with this evidence, the decision was made to add the quarter note in mm.
8, in parentheses, to indicate that this note should be played, but does not appear in any of the manuscript sources.

Figure 12. Movement II, mm. 7 - 8/30 - 31, vcl I and vcl II

In mm. 28, there is a passage that proved to be equally problematic. In the three manuscript sources, all of the parts contain a quarter note on beat one, followed by two beats of rest. In FE and LE, the first violin part has four descending sixteenth notes on the third beat, acting as a lead-in to the next measure. This lead-in is present in all sources four bars earlier, in mm. 24. In examining this passage, the dilemma that presented itself was that without these four lead-in notes, mm. 28 becomes something of a dramatic moment, similar to the empty measure in the last movement, in mm. 72. Boccherini may have intended this dramatic pause, or it may have been a copying error. A third possibility could have been that Boccherini was leaving room for an improvisatory flourish for the first violinist to lead the group to the ensuing passage. The inclusion of these notes in both of the published editions, and their presence in the similar passage in mm. 24, led the author to the conclusion that these notes belonged in this passage. However, owing to the fact they also do not appear in any of the primary sources, they
Figure 13 shows this discrepancy between mm. 23 and 27.

![Figure 13. Movement II, mm. 23 - 24/27 - 28, vln I](image)

Regarding Chapter IV, and the use of grace notes and appoggiaturas, the following solution was devised: all grace notes have been notated with a slashed eighth note, meant to be played before the beat, and without stress or accent. All appoggiaturas have been notated with the approximate rhythmic value that they are intended to receive, without a slash, and meant to be played on the beat, with stress or accent. These decisions were made based on the metric placement of the ornamental notes. In general, weak beat ornaments have been interpreted as grace notes, while those on strong beats have been notated as appoggiaturas. Another factor pertained to the rhythmic grouping that was attached to the small notes. Most groups of duple meter notes with small notes have been deemed ideal candidates for appoggiaturas, and most triple meter notes (either triplets or groups of three notes in 6/8 meter) have been notated as grace notes. The latter decision was made in order to adhere to the advice given by C.P.E. Bach, and reiterated by Frederick Munger Miller that all triplet groupings must be preserved.⁴⁰

One special case pertains to the opening motif of the second movement. In this movement, both violin parts contain double grace notes, an issue addressed by both

---

⁴⁰ C.P.E. Bach, 92.
C.P.E. Bach and Leopold Mozart. Mozart stated that such ornaments were to be played “with the greatest rapidity; and the stress falls at all times on the principal note.”\footnote{Mozart, 207.} C.P.E. Bach called this a slide, “and ornament of either two or three small notes which are played before the main note.”\footnote{Bach, 136.} This evidence supports placing the double grace notes in the second movement before the beat, and this is also the only practical method of execution that allows for a sense of rhythmic integrity in performance.

Finally, there were certain passages that were altered from their state in the manuscripts, but did not receive parentheses, as the author believes them to be copy errors, and that these errors masked the likely intention of the composer. For an example of this we can look to the following measures in movement I: mm. 24/25; 40/41; 116/117; 132/133. In these measures there was a pattern established in mm. 24/25, which was not adhered to in the analogous passages throughout the movement. See Figure 14a and 14b for the two conflicting versions, both from MS. Note that in Figure 14a, the leading voice (vcl I) does not have a trill over the initial note, and is notated as written-out thirty-second notes, while the second entrance (vla) has the trill, and is notated as a dotted sixteenth note followed by a thirty-second note.
In Figure 14b, the leading voice (vln I) has the trill over the first thirty-second note. This lack of consistency required editorial attention.

Example 14a, which represents the first appearance of this motivic feature, is somewhat problematic since it is the only one that does not have the second voice, the viola in this case, slurred to the first sixteenth note of the subsequent measure. Nonetheless, the pattern in question is concerned with the lack of a trill in the first voice, and the presence of a trill in the second voice. It is this editor’s opinion that what is presented above, in Figure 14a, with the addition of a slur in the viola part, represents Boccherini’s intention for this passage. In later iterations the copyist(s) added the trill over the first thirty-second note in the leading voice, thus requiring either the addition of that trill in mm. 24, or the removal of that trill in the subsequent passages. In this edition,
the decision was made to remove the trill, maintaining the clarity of the two differing rhythms of the voices for this passage, and keeping with the indications found in MS.

As was stated in the introductory remarks, the standardized use of beaming had not been adopted at the time of the early French publications of these quintets. In some cases this beaming irregularity was of musical significance. One such example can be found in the first movement of the G. 312 quintet. Figure 15a shows the first eighth-note in measure thirty-four separated from the beaming of the remaining three notes. This is indicative of a phrasing break that would not be as clear were all four notes in that measure beamed together. In an effort to maintain this phrasing idea while also adhering to present-day publishing standards, the bowing found in Figure 15b has been added to each occurrence of this passage.

Figure 15a. MS, Movement I, mm. 33 - 34, vla

---

An example where the beaming does not appear to indicate any particular phrasing can also be found in the first movement. In this passage the first cello part in the manuscript copies is represented in Figure 16a. Here we can see that the beaming has largely been broken up into eighth-note groupings in measure eleven, but is grouped in larger terms in measure twelve. Figure 16b shows the updated version found in the present edition, keeping sixteenth (and smaller) note figures grouped by the quarter-note, and in measure twelve, the beaming is spread over the bar for eighth-note groupings. This practice is consistent with that found in the collected works score, as well as the three International Music Company publications of the G. 266, 276, and 310 quintets.

Figure 16a, MS, movement I, mm. 11, vcl I

---

The final subject of editorial emendations is that of dynamic indications. In this quintet Boccherini used the following markings to indicate dynamic levels: *pp, p, f, ff, poco f, dolce, and dolcissimo*. There also exist two indications that pertain to volume, but that were not used consistently: *sotto voce and soave*. In most cases, the placement and distribution of these dynamic markings was logical and easy to follow. In these cases Boccherini’s indications have been retained in the present edition. However, there existed many examples where the specific metric placement of dynamics appeared to be haphazard at best, and required editorial intervention. While the critical commentary in Chapter VI offers a complete listing of all the editorial dynamic changes and additions, what follows are two examples of manuscript discrepancies or omissions, and the editorial suggestions made in the present edition.

Figure 17a is from the second movement, and is representative of the most common type of dynamic incongruence found in MS. In the beginning of the second section of the Minuetto, the vln II part has a *pp* indication against the *dolcissimo* marking found in both the vla and vcl I parts. The vln I and vcl II parts are both lacking any type

---

45 For a comprehensive survey of Boccherini’s dynamic markings in the string quintet manuscripts, see Drosopolou, “Dynamic, Articulation, and Special Effect Markings in Manuscript Sources of Luigi Boccherini’s String Quintets.”
of dynamic indication. Figure 17b shows that a *pp* has been added to both parts in order to equalize the relationship between the leading voices (vla and vcl I) and the secondary voices (vln I, vln II, and vcl II). Boccherini consistently marks the primary and secondary voices this way throughout this movement. The first violin has been deemed a secondary voice here due to the exact repetition on its figure for eight measures.

**Figure 17a. MS, Movement II, mm. 8 - 9**

---

Changes like the ones found in the second movement were less about asserting an editorial voice, but were rather concerned with filling perceived gaps in the manuscript sources. In the third movement however, dynamic markings were rather sparse and a stronger editorial role was taken in order to create variety and to give the players a greater amount of instructions concerning the author’s desired execution.

To illuminate this point, let us look at the first two statements of the main theme in the third movement. In Figure 18a, Boccherini provides clear indications of *dolce* for vcl I (also marked ‘solo’) and *dolcissimo* for vla and vcl II. It is clear both from the solo indication and from the dolce/dolcissimo split, that vcl I is the primary voice, and the other two comprise the accompanying voices.
Figure 18a. MS, Movement III, mm. 1

Figure 18b shows the subsequent statement of the same musical material in measures nine and ten, this time presented in the vln I, vln II, and vla parts. In this second statement, Boccherini gives no dynamic indications and so in the present edition the indications from the opening statement have been supplanted.

---

The third movement was rife with similar examples where Boccherini gave no dynamic indications for later appearances of previously annotated passages. In each case every effort was made to preserve his initial indications in these later passages. Other small alterations throughout the work fall into this same category.

---

CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSION

In compiling and presenting this new edition of the G. 312 quintet, the author is hopeful that this will be the first of many such projects undertaken and that making new editions of these works available will create an avenue for future performance of Boccherini’s string quintets. Although these works do not contain the type of formal or melodic innovation introduced by Haydn, Mozart, and later Beethoven, they do represent a turning point in music history, particularly in the chamber music realm. Boccherini’s ability to present charming tunes and beautiful textures and harmonies, coupled with the difficulties to be discovered in the first cello parts make these works worthy of our attention. Cellists in particular will find that studying the quintets will yield worthy insights to be applied to the sonatas and concertos of Boccherini.

There exists a plethora of manuscript sources for the majority of his quintets, making the publication of further critical editions a viable endeavor. With time the heavy handed editorial practices that have been applied to Boccherini’s music can be supplanted by new editions, which will more closely reflect the composer’s written intentions and restore the grace, charm, and wit inherent in these works.
CHAPTER VII

CRITICAL COMMENTARY

Sources

**MS** - Manuscript score, held at the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek. As discussed in chapter III, this manuscript is in a copyist’s hand, though it was likely overseen by Boccherini.

**MSa** - Manuscript set of parts, also held at the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek. The parts for this quintet, as well as all of the other quintets sent to the Prussian court, were made from the scores sent by Boccherini to King Frederick William II.

**MSb** - Manuscript set of parts, also held at the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek.


As it has been described in Chapter IV, the majority of these changes have been reflected in the individual parts, leaving the score to be as close to the original manuscript score as possible. In some cases, where an obvious wrong note or omission had occurred, these changes have been made to the score, without the use of parentheses. In the individual parts, all changes are marked either by placing markings or notes in parentheses. Dotted slurs notate editorial slurs, while solid slurs indicate slurs derived from the MS sources. Finally, in an effort to de-clutter the presentation of the parts as much as possible, I decided against including parentheses around the grace notes, as that
would have resulted in placing an inordinate number of parenthetical marks, and would have rendered certain passages illegible. The notation of grace notes is discussed in Chapter V of this study.

I. Allegro giusto (♩ = 80 - 88)

5 vcl II: All three MS sources agree on the octave placement of the pitches for the passage from mm. 5-7. FE/LE both contain the same pitches as the MS sources, but with various notes being moved up or down by an octave.

13 vcl II: Similar octave disagreement between the MS sources and FE/LE.

23 vln II: tr on first A, though there is no tr present in either FE or LE.

30 vla: beat 1 pitch in MS, and MSb is a G. MSa is inconclusive, as the staff lines are not visible. In both FE and LE, an F is notated.

40/41 vln I: FE and LE show the slur extending to the downbeat of mm. 41. All three MS sources only have the slur over the notes in mm. 40. However, all other instances of this figure are shown to have the slur extend to the downbeat of the following measure in all of the MS sources. This slur has been adjusted accordingly.

44 vln I: Beat 2 - MS shows MSa and MSb show FE and LE have no slurs here. For this edition, the version that appears in MSa and MSb has been chosen. The remainder of this passage has the same slur pattern, consistent with the MSa and MSb version.
48 vln II/vla: MS has the indication, *pia e sciolto*. ‘Sciolto’ translates from Italian as agile or nimble. The closest modern equivalent to this marking is *leggiero*. For the present edition, *p (leggiero)* has been used.

61 vln I: Beat 2 - MSa: [music notation]; MS and MSb show [music notation]. In mm. 60, all MS sources agree with only the first two thirty-second notes slurred. FE and LE also agree with MS and MSb in both instances.

63 vln II: Beat 2 - All three MS sources: [music notation]

   FE and LE: [music notation]

69-81 vla, vcl I, vcl II: There is a discrepancy about the use of A-natural or A-flat in this passage. FE and LE show A-flats throughout this passage, while none of the MS sources do. The only hint in the MS sources is the presence of courtesy A-naturals in both vln I and vcl I parts in mm. 80. This indication would presumably cancel out the A-flats intended for the preceding material. For this edition, the A-flats found in FE and LE have been used.

70 - 72 vcl II: Similar to mm. 5 and 13. The MS sources differ from FE/LE in the octave placement for this passage. The octave placement of the MS sources has been used.

94 - 95 vcl II: Beat 4 - Beat 1 - All MS sources indicate the D - E-flat are one octave lower, while FE and LE keep these two pitches in the same octave as the surrounding notes.

98 vcl I: Beat 1 - All three MS sources: [music notation]

   FE and LE: [music notation]
103 vln I: Beat 2 - All three MS sources: FE and LE:

107 vln II: MSa shows a doubling of the vln I part here. No other source contains this doubling.

122 vcl II: All MS sources: FE and LE:

II. Minuetto (♩ = 108 - 116)

6 vln II: MS:

MSa & MSb:

8 vcl I/II: Beat 2 - All three MS sources have a rest here. FE & LE have a B-flat quarter note here. It has been included in parentheses in the parts, as the MS sources do have a quarter note on beat 2 of mm. 31, which is the analogous measure later in the movement.

7/8 vln I/vcl II: Added \( pp \). All three MS sources show this dynamic marking in the vln II part, against the \textit{dolcissimo} in the vla and vcl II parts. FE & LE also omit this dynamic in these two parts, but it has been added in order to equalize the markings for the three secondary voices.

13 vln I: Added (.) over the last eighth note in this measure. The pattern of the previous five measures dictate that this note should have a staccato dot.

17 vln I: Added slur to beat 3, in order to match the identical passage in mm. 16.

25 vln I: MS and MSa:

MSb:
27: vln I: FE and LE have four sixteenth notes on beat 3, similar to those found in mm.

23. These notes in mm. 27 do not appear in any MS source, but this must be an omission. They have been added to the vln I part in parentheses.

31 vln I: Added *p* to match the marking found in vcl II. This is similar to the voicings and dynamics found in mm. 6/7.

38 vln I: All MS sources: \[ \text{\textcode{\textasciitilde\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet}} \]

FE & LE: \[ \text{\textcode{\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet}} \]

38 vln II: Added *f* on the fourth eighth note. It appears at this point in the measure in all of the other parts in each of the MS sources.

40 vln II: Added *(dolcissimo)* in the part to match the vcl II line.

44/45 vln I/vln II/vla: Added *p* to equalize the dynamic markings against the other parts. These pianos appear in both FE and LE, but not in any of the MS sources.

57 vcl II: Added *dolce* to match vcl I. This marking does not appear in any source, but it matches the patterns of all other occurrences of *dolce* and *dolcissimo* markings elsewhere in this movement.

**III. Larghetto (\( \mathcal{\dot{\jmath}} = 54 - 60 \))**

9 vln I/vln II/vla: Added *(dolce)* to vln I and *(dolcissimo)* to vln II and vla to match the performance markings indicated in mm. 1.

17 vcl I: Added *(dolce)* for consistency of the three eighth note motive.

18 vcl II: Added *(dolce)* for consistency of the three eighth note motive.
21/23 vln II: All MS sources: \[\text{\begin{array}{l}
\text{FE and LE:}
\end{array}}\]

21 all parts: Added (f) to vln I, and (p) to the other parts to indicate the leading and secondary voices for this passage.

26 vcl I: Added (poco f) to match vln I and vln II in mm. 24 and 25.

29 vcl I: Added (poco f) to match vln I and vln II in mm. 28 and 29.

49/50 all parts: Added (dolce) to vln I, vla, and vcl II; added (dolcissimo) to vla and vcl I in order to match earlier occurrences of the same material.

68 vln I/vcl I: FE and LE indicate a cadenza in the second half of this measure. This indication does not appear in any MS source, though it would be stylistically appropriate to add a cadenza here. See Quantz, pp. 182.

69 vln I: Added (p).

70 vcl I: Added (p).

71 vcl II: Added (p).

73 vln I: Moved poco f to the third eighth note, in order to match the previous occurrences of this passage.

74 vcl II: Added (poco f) to match the vln I and vln II parts in mm. 73.

IV. Allegro vivo (\( \frac{1}{4} = 84 - 92 \))

4 vcl II: Added (.) to match the rest of the quarter notes in this passage.

11 vln II: Beat 2 - Added (.) to match the articulation found in vln I. This staccato dot is present in all sources in vln I, but missing in all sources in vln II.
12 vln I/vln II: Beat 2 - Added (,) to match the articulation found in the previous measure.
13 vla: Added (,) to the final eighth note to match the articulation of the other parts here.
17 vcl II: Octave discrepancies similar to those found in movement I. All three MS sources have the two cello parts in unison for this passage, while FE and LE set them apart by an octave.
18/20 vln I: Beat 2 - All MS sources:

FE and LE:

31 vcl II: Beat 1 - All three MS sources have a quarter rest here, while FE and LE have a quarter note F-natural.
44-47 vla: Added (,) to every quarter note in this passage to match the articulation found in vcl II.
60 vcl I/vcl II: Moved ff to Beat 3 to match the other parts. All of the sources have this dynamic marking on Beat 2, but this is divergent with the same material in mm. 63, where all parts have the ff marking on Beat 3.
86-90 vcl I: Octave displacement disagreement between MS sources and FE/LE. In the MS sources, the two cello parts are in unison, while FE and LE have the vcl I part moved up one octave.
90 vcl II: Beat 3 - Added (,) to match the articulation found in vla.
94 vla: Beat 3 - Added (,) to match the articulation found in vcl II.
99-102 vcl I: The same as mm. 85-89 in terms of octave agreement. In addition, mm. 98 MS sources: ; FE and LE: 
102 vla: Moved ff to the pick-up to Beat 2 in order to match the other parts.
114 vln II: Beat 1 - All MS sources: 

FE and LE: ♩
CHAPTER VIII
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