



Further remarks on Jehan Alain's organ music – the new Barenreiter edition

Stephen Farr

Journal of the Royal College of Organists
Volume 6 (2012) pp. 18-30

STEPHEN FARR is Director of Music at St Paul's Church, Knightsbridge, and at Worcester College, Oxford, posts he combines with a freelance career as a conductor, continuo player, teacher and soloist. He was Organ Scholar of Clare College, Cambridge, before undertaking postgraduate study with Hans Fagius and Piet Kee. He is a regular performer and reviewer on BBC Radio 3.

Further remarks on Jehan Alain's organ music—the new Bärenreiter edition

Stephen Farr

... as in a dream one searches with one's hand for an image which passes, which has vanished ...¹

A previous article in this journal² examined a selection of Jehan Alain's organ works as they appear in the Leduc edition of 2001–2003,³ and discussed a number of the (considerable) discrepancies and inconsistencies still present in the scores. A clear picture of continuing confusion in the editorial process emerged from this brief survey. Given the lack of certainty which still attends attempts to establish the composer's intentions for a given work, Helga Schauerte-Maubouet's new edition of Alain's organ music for Bärenreiter (which appeared too late for consideration in the first article) represents an important landmark.⁴ Drawing on new source material and a wide range of unpublished correspondence, it promises the nervous but conscientious interpreter that most reassuring of artefacts—the 'Urtext'. Two fundamental questions must be asked of the new publication. To what extent does it represent an advance on previous versions of the scores? And does it resolve the fundamental problems of the source material?

Some brief general remarks. The new scores have many virtues, not least among them a greatly enhanced sense of visual clarity and consistency. Facsimile material is generously supplied; there are illustrations from autograph MSS and copies by others, along with a number of pages of correspondence and some particularly instructive documents relating to the performance of specific works. The composer's own thematic catalogue, such a valuable and instructive aspect of the Leduc *Notes* (where it appeared in facsimile), is not included; on the other hand Bärenreiter 2011 offers greatly increased clarity concerning both the selection of sources and their means of treatment.⁵

The new edition groups the works into three categories: opus numbers published, or intended for publication, in Alain's lifetime; posthumous works and various marginalia; and the three major compositions originally intended for strings or orchestra (the *Suite* (JA 69, 70, 82/AWV 86a), *Trois Danses* (JA 120, 120bis/AWV 119), and *Intermezzo* (JA 66bis/AWV 74b)). The new edition offers new insights into the genesis of the *Intermezzo* in particular, and publishes for the first time the version of the work Alain made in fair copy for presentation to Marcel Dupré.

The most obviously striking aspect of the new edition is the amount of previously unpublished material it has utilised (although in respect of the 'completeness' of the edition, it should be noted that Bärenreiter 2011 omits a number of miniatures which Marie-Claire Alain includes in her most recent recording of the organ works).⁶ Several works, including the *Deuxième Fantaisie*, have important variant readings restored.⁷ The most substantial new item is the *Suite monodique* of 1934 (AWV 65/ JA80, JA89bis and JA116),⁸ a work which Alain presented in a piano version for publication by Hérelle in 1938. Only the

central 'Andante' has been previously published as an organ work:⁹ an edition of Alain's organ score of the first movement appears in print now for the first time, together with Schauerte-Maubouet's own speculative transcription for organ of the last movement (with registrations modelled on the composer's practice in other works).¹⁰ The *Choral dorien* (JA 67/AWV 75) and *Choral phrygien* (JA 68/AWV 76) also appear in versions differing in a number of respects from the previously available versions.

One specific point is worthy of brief consideration: in addition to new MS sources for the music, BÄ2011 presents previously undisclosed information about the changing specification of the Alain house organ. The composition of the *Récit* in particular, it now becomes clear, was altered frequently. From a division composed solely of 8' and 4' registers in 1922 it developed to a more resourceful ensemble around 1926 which included a Plein Jeu III (previously on the *Positif* and subsequently removed altogether in a 1933 rebuild), Doublette 2', Quinte 2²/₃' and 4' reed, before being finally recast with a greater emphasis on softer and more highly characterised colour (Quintaton 16', Cromorne 8') in around 1940.¹¹ Schauerte-Maubouet's view on the meaning of the term 'mixtures' in Alain's music has clearly now shifted to allow the possibility that the composer uses the term at least partly in its conventional sense, rather than solely as a portmanteau term for individual mutation registers; but there is still some lack of clarity around this issue, often compounded by Alain's own performance instructions, and the edition provides no concrete evidence from the composer himself for the assertion that mutation stops (Larigot, Quarte de Nazard, Tierce, Octavin) should be drawn before composite ranks.¹²

To return to the music itself, the statement that a 'definitive' Alain edition is a chimera has become a cliché; it must be reiterated that the difficulty in establishing the composer's intentions remains, in many instances, very substantial. The issues surrounding the Leduc editions (chiefly, the selection of readings from multiple sources in arriving at a text, and the simultaneous attempt to use the editorial process as a means of transmitting both performance habits and pedagogical information) are by now familiar. Consequently, this new edition could be of significance in two respects. First, it could offer the interpreter a 'pure' version of each work as it is preserved in the selected primary source; and secondly, it could clarify the extent of editorial intervention where the state of the sources makes any degree of certainty impossible. The editorial approach of BÄ2011 is summarised thus:

In principle, the youngest version is considered the principal source. In the event that it is not complete in all parameters, recourse has been taken to earlier manuscripts as secondary sources. The first edition is considered equivalent to the reference manuscript only if it was authorized by the composer ... Notes, performance instructions, and dynamic marks in parentheses derived from secondary sources are to be viewed as emendations or variants. Registration indications in parentheses convey an authentic variant from a secondary source ... or indicate an alternative registration by Jehan Alain in the same manuscript.¹³

A useful point of departure in the consideration of Schauerte-Maubouet's procedure is her treatment of a work for which BÄ2011 represents the only available edition, namely, the final organ version of the *Intermezzo* (AVW 74b).¹⁴ BÄ2011 lists the MS sources for the various versions of the work as follows:

- A Ms-LB: *Intermezzo pour quatuor à cordes avec piano* (score and parts)
 B Ms-MA: *Intermezzo pour 2 pianos et basson* (1st piano part)
 C Ms-MA: *Intermezzo pour 2 pianos et basson* (2nd piano part and bassoon part)
 D Ms-MA: *Pour 2 pianos et basson*¹⁵
 E Ms-MA: *Fileuse* (organ version of the ensemble work transmitted in B, C, D)
 F Ms-MA: unfinished copy of organ version in E
 G Ms-Dupré: *Intermezzo, orgue* (careful handwritten copy of final organ version differing in some respects from E)

The work as it appears in Bâ2011 was presented in fair copy by the composer to Marcel Dupré (listed above as G), and shows Alain exploring the full range of ‘orchestrations’ available on Dupré’s house organ at Meudon.¹⁶ Crucially, the work as it appears in G diverges in several particulars from the version transmitted in Leduc.¹⁷ This presentation copy is of crucial significance, representing as it does a ‘finished’ score for organ solo of a unique work, and, moreover, one which is preserved in what may be reasonably considered as a single authoritative source.

Although G transmits a unique version of the work for organ solo, Bâ2011 takes the view that this source lacks crucial information which must be supplied by comparison with other sources for the work. These emendations include (with their provenance, according to Schauerte-Maubouet’s stated procedure):¹⁸

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| bar 1 | (<i>pp</i>) after A; [Con moto] after Leduc 1943 ¹⁹ |
| bar 8 | duration of pedal upper note amended after B and C; (<i>poco piu f</i>) after A |
| bar 26 | (<i>riten.</i>) after Leduc 1943 and B and C |
| bar 28b | (A tempo) after B |
| bar 35 | duration of pedal upper note amended after A |
| bar 41 | (<i>molto riten.</i>) after B and C |
| bar 42 | <i>sf</i> marking in pedal after A but not indicated as such in the text |
| bar 43 | (<i>p</i>) after A; [Vif] after Leduc 1943 |
| bar 44 | (<i>cresc. poco a poco</i>) after A |
| bar 47 | (<i>mf</i>) after A |
| bar 52 | (<i>f</i>) after A; [Large] after Leduc 1943 |
| bar 55 | (<i>f, brillante</i>) after A; [Vif] after Leduc 1943 |
| bar 63 | (<i>f, molto sostenuto</i>) after A; [Large] after Leduc 1943 |
| bar 75 | (<i>piu p sub.</i>) after A |
| bars 79, 80 | (<i>sf/pp</i>) markings after A |
| bar 95 | (<i>poco piu f</i>) after A; (lirico) editorial? ²⁰ |
| bar 101 | (<i>espressivo</i>) editorial? |
| bar 105 | (<i>sostenuto</i>) editorial? |

Numerous phrasings and articulations are also emended after other sources.²¹ The resulting text in Bâ2011 not only draws on performance instructions intended for a variety of non-keyboard media, it does so in a not entirely consistent manner. For example, several indications from B and C (sources which, it may be seen, are treated as authoritative in similar matters elsewhere in Bâ2011) are not recorded in Bâ2011’s text. A representative

selection of such markings (in their translated form as given in the *Notes*) may include:

bar 3	'fairly slow, a bit mysterious'
bars 37, 38	' <i>mf</i> , <i>decresc</i> '
bar 52	'A tempo'
bar 62	'slow, declamatory'

It could be argued that the rationale for discarding, in particular, the dynamic markings in bars 37 and 38 (markings which are, incidentally, also omitted from Leduc 2002) is that they result in an ergonomically impossible *diminuendo*. But so do the dynamic markings transferred from A into bars 100ff of Bā2011:²² in both instances, the performer needs to close the swell box gradually while double-peddalling. However, if the performance markings in G are taken at face value—much as Schauerte-Maubouet prefers 'the rudimentary yet authentically documented indications' of her chosen primary source for the transcribed version of the *Intermezzo*—the result is a work characterised less by subtle shades of dynamic variation than by sudden changes of texture and the juxtaposition of blocks of relatively 'un-nuanced' organ sound, in an almost Stravinskian manner.²³

At this point discussion may be widened to consider works for which the edition draws on a slightly wider range of primary source material. Despite the often confused and confusing state of the Alain MSS, a few works are transmitted in a small number of sources which preserve only a modest number of variant readings. In terms of previous editions the two *Chorals* represent something of a special case. Both appeared in print in 1938, but were not included in the Alain family's editions of the organ works and are therefore also excluded from mention in the *Notes*.²⁴ The *Choral dorien* in particular offers a useful opportunity to test the editorial principles summarised above. A number of significant variants to this work are made available for the first time in Bärenreiter, including a version of the work supplied with a different registration scheme from the published score. A close comparison of readings may prove instructive in illuminating the editorial process.

The new edition takes as its primary source for this work a copy (designated Ms-LB) originally in the possession of Lola Bluhm. According to the editor's own categorisation of the MSS, it is not chronologically the earliest source: rather, it preserves the most complete set of performance and registration indications. Bā2011 lists six sources whose provenance (in largely undated MSS) and general characteristics may be summarised as follows:

A Ms-MA: *Choral dorien* (without registration indication, in the possession of Madeleine Alain)

B Ms-MD: *Choral dorien. Lent et lié* (in the possession of André Jouany)

C Ms-LB: ink notation (formerly in the possession of Lola Bluhm, now in the possession of the editor)

D Ms-AP: piano transcription (with no slurs, time signature, or dynamic/agogic markings)

FE: the Hérelle print of 1938

FEX: exemplar with 'authentic additional performance indications' added to the published text

In choosing C as her primary source, Schauerte-Maubouet speculates that the markings it

preserves, involving the use of Bourdon 16' and Prestant 4' in addition to foundation stops at 8' pitch, represent Alain's later intentions for performance on a more resourceful instrument than that envisaged for the 1938 engraving. The work as it was published by Hérelle in 1938 is therefore relegated to the appendix, which some may feel to be a debatable decision given the more 'finished' appearance of this published score in comparison to the 1935 score: certainly, phrasing and articulation is indicated with a much greater degree of finesse in the 1938 version.

The suggestion that Ms-LB preserves a version of the piece revised to exploit the capabilities of an instrument with two divisions under expression seems rather to overstate the case, given the relative lack of sophistication with which this resource is used in the marked MS. Only two markings relating to a second enclosed division—one for *Positif* 'boîte fermée', the other for 'boîtes ouvertes'—occur in the course of the piece as transmitted in C.²⁵ Furthermore, markings in this source, which supposedly represents Alain's most 'developed' conception of the piece, are supplemented in several instances in Bâ2011 with articulation and registration markings from two other MSS—one of them, B, the source which acted as the engraver's model for the 1938 publication. Bâ2011 therefore draws from a range of secondary sources to supplement readings in the designated primary source as follows:

Markings in Bâ2011 supplementary to the 1935 score (Ms-LB)

Initial registration marking for G.O. is taken from Ms-MD
 bar 3 articulation marking added to Bâ2011 from FEX
 bar 13 articulation marking added to Bâ2011 from FEX
 bar 27 *diminuendo* marking added to Bâ2011 from Ms-MD
 bar 28 the provenance of the [fermé] marking is uncertain
 bar 30 *ritenuto* marking added to Bâ2011 from FEX

The 1938 version of the work is also characterised by numerous emendations in Bâ2011:

Markings in Bâ2011 supplementary to the first edition (FE) of the 1938 score

bars 1–2 pedal slurs are inconsistent between MS-MD and FE: Bâ2011 adopts the reading of FE; slur from bars 1–2 is not reproduced from Ms-MD
 bar 15 Ms-MD has *mf* rather than *f* dynamic marking of FE and Bâ2011
 bar 21 crescendo is editorial in Bâ2011
 bar 28 tie on g¹ is inserted in Bâ2011 from Ms-MD without visual identification in the score; conversely, ties indicating *notes communes* in upper parts which are present in Ms-MD are not reproduced in Bâ2011; 'elongation marks' present in Ms-MD are omitted in Bâ2011

The resulting musical text in Bâ2011 draws, without apparent consistency, on a number of sources: for example, in bar 28 of Bâ2011 markings from the same source (Ms-MD) are simultaneously adopted and ignored in establishing the text of FE, and elsewhere there seems to be some degree of inconsistency concerning the policy of transferring performance indications between sources. The rationale for transferring markings from

FEX into the Bâ2011 version of the 1935 score (e.g., articulation markings in bar 3 and bar 13), but not into the Bâ2011 version of FE is hard to understand, and ultimately results in the production of two composite scores of a single work—a fundamental aspect of the Leduc editions which urgently needed resolution.

None of the Leduc editions includes the *Choral dorien*, but the *Deux Danses à Agni Yavishita* (JA 77, 78/AWV 61) present an opportunity to make a comparison of editorial procedure in Bâ2011 and Leduc 2002 in works which, like the *Chorals*, are preserved in few sources. The *Notes* categorise these sources as HA 1 and HA 2, conforming to Bâ2011's Source A and Source B respectively. Each source contains (incomplete) performance markings which 'require' some degree of editorial clarification and enhancement.²⁶ A comparison of variants in tempo and registration markings may best be presented in tabular form (see Tables 1 and 2 on pp. 24–5): non-autograph readings adopted in Bâ2011 are recorded in bold type, and readings adopted in Bâ2011 from any one of the non-autograph indications in the Leduc editions are additionally underlined.²⁷

What emerges from this tabulation of readings is that Bâ2011 has clearly adopted a system of textual collation and expansion of source markings not all that dissimilar to that of Leduc. Additionally, markings quite clearly present in primary sources (the significant 'Pas très vite' of HA 1/Source A, for example) have been tacitly deleted, and extensive interpretative directions editorially supplied (many of them following in every particular the pattern of similar interventions in Leduc). Furthermore, there is no apparent means for the interpreter to distinguish in Bâ2011 between a marking in parentheses indicating Alain's own (alleged) practice as recorded in the earliest Leduc editions, and one indicating an editorial intervention originating in 2011. The 1943 edition has been (tacitly) resorted to for some indications of registration in some instances, but not in others, and some highly significant variants and annotations are left unrecorded.³² Little of the detail of this process has been recorded in the critical commentary to Bâ2011 and it is extremely hard to reconcile the edited text of the *Deux Danses* with the editorial principles quoted earlier in this article. Rather than using earlier editions to supplement information 'lacking' in the principal source, Bâ2011 seems in this instance to have suppressed that information entirely in favour of speculative interventions.

This process of tabulating and comparing variants in sources and editions is of course one that Schauerte-Maubouet has herself undertaken, in an article examining the *Deuxième Fantaisie* (JA 117/AWV 91).³³ This study in many respects acted as a catalyst for a more critical approach to the Alain editions, and the process of comparing its content with the text of the work as presented at numerous points in Bâ2011 is instructive. Although details of the text of Bâ2011 merit careful consideration in a number of places, two particular instances may serve as useful paradigms for the uncertainty still surrounding some aspects of the work.³⁴ OR 1987 tabulated the editorial markings in Leduc 1951 and 1971, and compared them to the readings of HA 3/Source C in a procedure designed to highlight what the article characterised as 'the gloomy veil' of inauthentic performance markings in those editions. In this context, it is instructive to compare the source indications for the opening registration of the work with the indication supplied in Bâ2011:

HA 75 1/Source A
No initial registration

Danse 1 ²⁸				
	HA1/A	HA2/B	Bä2011	Leduc 2002
	pas très vite	-	[vivement]	Allegro
b.0	B[ourdon] 8	-	[Réc.] Hautbois [boîte fermée] [Pos.] Bourdon 8 [GO Fonds 8] [Ped. Soubasse 16 Bourdon 8 Tir. Pos]	Réc. Hautbois 8 Pos. Bourdon 8 Ped. Soubasse 16
b.3	Hautbois, <i>pp</i>	Hautbois	-	-
b.9-10	<i>cresc./decresc.</i>	-	<i>cresc./decresc.</i> [rall.]	(rall.)
b.11	-	-	[A tempo]	(A tempo)
b.19	-	-	[cedez]	<i>cedez</i>
b.20	-	-	[pause on 3rd beat]	pause on 3rd beat
b.21-22	<i>A tempo:</i> B8 and F8 alternate in LH b.21-22, F8 LH b.23-24 ²⁹	-	<i>A tempo:</i> LH [Pos.] [Pos. + Flûte 4']	(Un peu plus lent) [Pos. + Flûte 4']
b.24	-	-	no pause on C	pause on C
b.25	<i>poco scherzando</i>	-	<i>poco scherzando</i>	(A tempo) <i>poco scherzando</i>
	LH alternates F8/B8 until b.30	-	RH [Réc.] LH [Pos.]	RH Réc. LH Pos.
b.30	lowest part in texture marked '8va'	-	-	(sempre stacc.)
b.36	B[ourdon] 8	-	[Pos. – Flûte 4']	-
b.39	<i>poco rall.</i>	-	<i>poco rall.</i>	-
b.41	<i>tempo</i>	-	<i>A tempo</i>	(accel. poco a poco)
b.45	no pauses in RH no ties in LH chords	- LH chords tied	pauses in LH/RH LH chords tied	pause in RH LH chords tied
b.46	HA1 concludes No RH Fb 'bref'	RH Fb <i>enchainez</i>	As HA2, (bref) from HA1	'sec' 'Tres long' ³⁰ Pause on RH Fb

Table 1: Comparison of tempo and registration variants in Danse 1.

Danse 2			
	HA2/B	Bä2011	Leduc 2002
	-	[Lentamente]	(Pas vite, <i>molto rubato</i>) ³¹
b.0	-	[Réc. Flûte 8, Dulciane 4] [Pos. Fonds 8] [Ped. – Tir. Pos]	(G.O. Fonds 8)
b.52	-	[<i>Animato</i>] [Pos.]	(Plus animé) (Pos. Fonds 8, 4)
b.60	-	[<i>Tempo primo</i>] [G.O.]	(Tempo primo) (G.O.)
b.66	-	[<i>Animato</i>] [Pos. Bourdon 8, Nazard]	(Plus anime) (Pos. 8 4 2 Nazard 2 ^{2/3})
b.70	-	[Réc.]	(Réc. Fl 8 et 4)
b.74	-	[Pos.]	(Pos.)
b.78	-	RH [Pos. + Octavin] LH [G.O.]	RH (Pos) LH (G.O.)
b.84	Pos.	Pos.	(Poco meno vivo) Pos.
b.85	Réc.	Réc. [- Dulciane 4]	Réc. (Bourdon 8 seul)
b.87	-	[<i>Tempo Primo</i>]	<i>Tempo I^o</i>
b.93	-	[Réc.]	(Réc. Fl. 8 seule)
b.95	+ 4'	Rec. + [Dulciane] 4	Réc. + 4
b.97	-	[<i>Animato</i>] [Pos. + Octavin]	(Plus animé) (Pos.)
b.101	-	[Pos. – Octavin]	(– 2)
b.105	Réc.	Réc.	Réc.
b.107	Pos.	Pos.	Pos.
b.109	-	[<i>Tempo Primo</i>] [Tir. Pos. seule]	(Plus Lent) (Ped. Principal 8 seule)
b.112	-	[<i>poco rall</i>]	(<i>ritard.</i>)
b.113	-	[<i>A tempo</i>] [G.O. ôtez un 8 p.]	(<i>A tempo</i>)
b.115	-	[Pos. – Nazard]	(– Nazard)
b.117	-	[<i>meno mosso</i>]	(<i>rall. poco a poco</i>)
b.119	-	[<i>estinguendosi</i>]	-

Table 2: Comparison of tempo and registration variants in Danse 2.

HA 2/Source B*Récit* Gambe 8*Positif* Salicional 8 (with Bourdon if available)**HA 3/Source C***Récit* (amended to Solo) Flûte 8, Gambe 8*Positif* Salicional

G.O. Bourdon 16

Pedal Soubasse 16**Bä2011***Récit* Gambe 8 (Flûte douce 8)*Positif* Salicional (and Bourdon 8)G.O. coupled to *Réc.* and *Positif* with no stops drawn*Pedal* Soubasse 16

Close examination and comparison reveals that Bä2011 perpetuates the process of conflation and assimilation of markings begun by Leduc 1951 and 1971. Sonorities separately specified in **HA 2/Source B** and **HA 3/Source C** are combined; the ‘douce’ marking in connection with the *Récit* registration is not present in any source; and Alain’s important qualifier, that the *Pedal* 16’ should only be employed ‘if it is soft enough’, is concealed. Matters are similarly confused at bar 9, where two separate markings from **B** (couple *Récit* and *Positif*; add *Réc.* Flûte 8) are conflated with a tacitly suppressed indication from **HA 3/Source C** (that the G.O. Bourdon 16 should be employed at this point with the other manuals coupled to it) and in the passage from bar 121 where two different versions of the changing 8’ sonority are reduced to a simple scheme derived from **HA 3/Source C** only.³⁵

Bars 84ff are a locus of further considerable confusion in the Leduc editions, not least because the opening registration for the passage is not indicated in all sources but must be reconstructed from the composer’s inconsistent instructions for effecting a *diminuendo* in the following bars. In tabular form, the registrational variants between Leduc 2003 (and as it is modified in the *Notes*), Bä2011 and the sources are as laid out in **Table 3**.³⁶ There are evidently numerous discrepancies between the sources in this passage, but it must be questioned whether Bä2011 has presented a completely transparent and accurate picture of the material. For example, Schauerte-Maubouet makes the specific point that the Larigot cannot be included in the stop combination at bar 84, as Leduc and the *Notes* suggest, because it is left unspecified in the opening sonority: but both **B** and **C** expressly indicate its removal in bar 101, a point which goes unacknowledged in the editorial notes. Bä2011 here presents at best a simplistic picture of the markings in the sources, and furthermore omits to mention that *two* MSS—not one, as the editorial notes state—expressly stipulate the removal of the Larigot in this measure.³⁷

These various issues in combination may lead the performer to the view that, while Bä2011 brings to light an impressive range of new source material and undoubtedly clarifies some important issues, in fundamental matters of source treatment and editorial

	HA2/B	HA3/C	Leduc 2003	Notes	Bä2011
b.84	Bourdon 8, Flûte 4, Nazard 2 ^{2/3} , Octavin 2, Tierce 1 ^{3/5}	-	Bourdon 8, Flûte 4, Nazard 2 ^{2/3} , Octavin 2, Tierce 1 ^{3/5} , Larigot 1 ^{3/5}	Salicional 8, Cor de Nuit 8, Flûte 4, Nazard 2 ^{2/3} , Octavin 2, Tierce 1 ^{3/5} , Larigot 1 ^{1/3}	Salicional 8, Flûte 4, Nazard 2 ^{2/3} , Octavin 2, Tierce 1 ^{3/5}
b.98	– Sal, Fl4	– Octavin	– Octavin	-	– Octavin
b.100	Enlever des jeux mais laissez la Tierce	-	-	-	Enlever des jeux mais laissez la Tierce
b.101	– Larigot	– Sal, Larigot	– Sal, Larigot Garder B8, Tierce et Nazard	-	-
b.102	-	– Fl 4	-	-	-

Table 3: Comparison of registrational variants in the *2e Fantaisie* (bars 84–102).

procedure it has done too little to remove the layers of confusion and editorial interventionism that rendered the Leduc scores less than trustworthy. ‘Not yet definitive’ is, perhaps, the fairest assessment of the edition. If used with discernment and care alongside the full range of documentation available elsewhere, it will undoubtedly prove a valuable resource for serious interpreters; but its conclusions must be examined with care and every point of its text thoroughly scrutinised.

Notes

1. ‘... comme dans la sommeil on cherche avec la main un image qui passé, qui s’est évanouée ...’. Jehan Alain, letter of 15 April 1936. Quoted in Helga Schauerte, *Jehan Alain (1911–1940): L’homme et l’œuvre (L’Orgue, Dossier III, 1985)*, 116.
2. Stephen Farr, ‘Jehan Alain’s organ music: some remarks at the centenary on the sources and the Leduc edition of 2001–2003’, *Journal of the Royal College of Organists* 5 (2011), 53–64.
3. Marie-Claire Alain (ed.), *L’Œuvre d’Orgue de Jehan Alain*, 3 vols (Paris: Alphonse Leduc, 2001–2003). Accompanying this edition is Marie-Claire Alain, *Notes critiques sur l’œuvre d’orgue de Jehan Alain* (Paris: Alphonse Leduc, 2001), translated by Norma Stevlingson as *Critical Notes on the Organ Works of Jehan Alain* (Paris: Alphonse Leduc, 2003). Hereafter *Notes*, and referring to the English translation.
4. Helga Schauerte-Maubouet (ed.), *Jehan Alain: L’Œuvre d’Orgue*, 3 vols (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2011), BA 8428, 8429, and 8430. Hereafter, ‘Bä2011’.
5. Most of Alain’s organ MSS remain in private possession, and as a consequence the Leduc edition of 2001–3 was not able to utilise some extremely significant sources (for example, Alain’s original organ versions of the first *Prélude profane* JA 64/AWV 57).
6. These works as numbered in the composer’s own thematic index (hereafter, ‘Catalogue’) include the *Complainte à la mode ancienne* (Catalogue: Cahier 4.38), *Un cercle d’argent* (Catalogue: Cahier 4.30), *Romance* (Catalogue: Cahier 4.31), *Verset-Choral* (Catalogue: Cahier 1.6), and *Fugue en mode de Fa* (Catalogue: Cahier 4.28). While the status of some of these

pieces as organ compositions is debatable, Schauerte's decision to exclude the *Complainte* from her edition is inexplicable, given Jehan Alain's explicit statement that the work was written for his younger sister Marie-Claire 'to play on the organ at Valloires'—the piece was supplied with fingering indications by the composer for this purpose. All the works in question were included by Marie-Claire Alain in her recording of Alain's complete works for Erato in 1999–2000.

7. The editorial problems surrounding versions of this work published by Leduc are the subject of a number of articles by Schauerte-Maubouet. For further discussion, see below.
8. JA numbers correspond to the numbering of works in the 'Catalogue'. Schauerte adopts a different system of numbering (AWV), and where appropriate both sets of opus numbers are quoted in the text of this article.
9. In *Quatre Œuvres pour Orgue* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1980). Edition UE 17163.
10. Schauerte suggests that Alain's emendations to the title of the piece in his thematic catalogue (reproduced in facsimile in the *Notes*) demonstrate that the first movement was conceived as an isolated organ work.
11. Bâ2011, Vol. 2, XX–XXI. The Pedal division in 1922 included a Basson 16, which was subsequently removed in favour of a 4' register (1926). The division also gained a Cornet III by 1940.
12. Schauerte-Maubouet has apparently modified her earlier view that the *Positif* Larigot was not present before 1937, and quotes it as being part of the specification of the division in the 1926 stoplist. In adducing Alain's registration scheme in the *Aria* AWV 120 as paradigmatic, Schauerte-Maubouet neglects to mention that in some respects the scheme does not conform to any instrument with which the composer is known to have been closely associated.
13. Bärenreiter, Vol. 1, XIII.
14. Bâ2011 also includes the version of the work preserved in E. The text of this version presents a distinct set of editorial issues and will not be discussed here.
15. According to the *Notes*, p. 81, this source also adds the description 'phrygien' to the title.
16. The instrument included a split pedal (*coupure*) and a *sostenuto* device, as well as a range of divisional and general free combinations. One source of the work in its version for two pianos and bassoon has annotations referring to the capabilities of the Meudon instrument, and Alain eventually included a chart with registration changes and manual allocations in G. The clarity of this copy and the sophistication of its associated performing instructions (conceived purely in terms of Dupré's house organ in Meudon) have been discussed elsewhere by the editor. Whether Alain would have put other works into a similar state of finality in due course must remain a matter for speculation. See Helga Schauerte, 'Wie modern ist Jehan Alain', *Organ* 3 (1999), 36–41.
17. As well as registrational differences, two passages of intricate figuration are simplified and there is some reorganisation of pedal registers in the opening section of the work. As Schauerte-Maubouet indicates, G, the primary source for Bâ2011, was not available when Leduc was preparing any of its scores. Consequently, the work as it appears in Leduc 2002 (JA 66bis) is still a *mélange* of a number of sources of the work as it appears in versions for various instrumental ensembles and for organ solo. For discussion of the relationship between these sources, see Bâ2011, Vol. 3, XII–XIII, and p. 63.
18. Bar numbers conform to Bâ2011. The upbeat bar in this edition is counted as bar 1.
19. According to a remark in the *Notes*, p. 81, Alain's tempo indication of crotchet=108 in A was slower than his desired tempo in performance.
20. The provenance of this marking, and of the 'espressivo' and 'sostenuto' in bars 101 and 105 respectively, is hard to ascertain precisely. None of these markings is listed in the full description of variants in the *Notes*, pp. 81–5, so presumably cannot derive from Leduc. Conversely, they must have a different status from the markings in bars 44 and 52 ('legato' and

'sans rigueur' respectively) which are unbracketed and therefore presumably derived direct from **G**. If it is the editor's intention that indications such *espressivo* and *sostenuto* should fall under the category of dynamics or phrasing, then those intentions have at the very least been expressed with some lack of clarity, a state of affairs compounded by the decision to place in brackets what are apparently Alain's autograph indications of tempo relationships throughout the work.

21. The decision to adopt **A** as a template for so many parameters 'lacking' in **G** may perhaps be questioned on the grounds that **A** may preserve Alain's first thoughts on the work; it was substantially revised on the recommendation of Paul Dukas. See Bâ2011, Vol. 3, XII–XIII. Several accidentals from **G** are corrected in Bâ2011 after other sources, notably in bar 45 (where none of the discrepancies between sources is unique): here, Bâ2011 combines readings from **A**, **B**, and **C** in the interests of conformity between bar 45 and bar 47. There is some confusion about Alain's precise harmonic intentions at this point.
22. The *sf/pp* markings of bars 79 and 80 also make little practical sense in the context of organ, rather than string, performance.
23. In support of this view of the work (as presented in **G**) may be adduced the sudden change of sonority at bar 93, where mutations suddenly give way to soft 8' and 4' foundations, and the sole notated dynamic modification, which occurs on the last chord of the work. The '*pp*' marking here is awkward, but not impossible, to realise if treated as a sudden drop in intensity rather than as a gradual change. Alain wrote of his *Choral* (JA 82/AWV 86aⁱⁱⁱ), composed in February 1936, that it represented a turning away from 'the more delicate sounds that one approaches gently, and that ... create a transparent and supple sound ... to a large chorale that resembles a mighty façade ... [w]ith large masses, ponderous ascents ... Abrupt shadows ...'. Letter of 12 February 1936, translation from Bâ2011, Vol. 3, XI. Perhaps the version of the *Intermezzo* presented to Dupré represents a further experiment with this style of writing.
24. The assertion (Bâ2011, Vol. 1, 45) that the first edition of the *Choral phrygien* was in the 'Complete Works' seems to contradict the source material listed in the editorial commentary. The first edition (described in Bâ2011 as 'corrupt') was characterised by a number of printing errors.
25. Indeed, close comparison of the placing and nature of dynamic and agogic nuances in the two versions of the piece reveal a subtly different conception of the work in each instance, rather than a sense that one has 'refined' and 'differentiated' the performance markings of the other.
26. Bâ2011 lists no more than five divergences between the two sources in the critical commentary: the *Notes* list several dozen. **HA 1/Source A** contains only the first of the two movements, with the title 'Médine'. Bâ2011's criticism of the Leduc edition for inserting performance markings that are not corroborated by the MSS seems harsh, given that it adopts many of these same markings in its own text.
27. Variants from Leduc 1943, 1952 and 1971 are omitted here. There are also numerous variants in articulation: for example, **HA 1** marks the LH crotchet/minim chords in the first three bars with *staccato* and slur respectively; in **HA 2** both chords are marked *staccato*. Bâ2011 gives the crotchet chord only a *staccato* marking, while Leduc 2002 marks the crotchet *staccato* and gives the minim chord an accent. **HA 1/Source A** has a four-bar introductory passage before the entry of the RH melody. Most of the variants in **HA 2** concern phrasing and articulation markings. Notes 28–31 relate to material in **Tables 1 and 2**.
28. **HA 1/Source A** has four bars before the entry of the RH melody. Bar numbers referred to in the table conform to the barring of Bâ2011 and Leduc 2002. Leduc 2002 bars the dances as separate movements: Bâ2011 as a single work. Bar numbers in the table for *Danse 1* (where **HA 1/Source A** has an extra bar) conform to Bâ2011.
29. Pencil corrections clearly visible in the facsimile (*Notes*, 68–9) suggest that Alain at first intended the LH in bar 21 to be played on B[ourdon] 8, and in bar 22 on F[lûte] 8, and

that he subsequently reversed the order of these markings. The alternation of F8 and B8 continues until bar 24, where the MS marking ‘non’ seems to refer quite clearly to the termination of the LH chordal ostinato pattern rather than to the alternation of sonorities.

30. The commentary to Bâ2011 and the *Notes* give differing accounts of the markings in HA 2 at this point.
31. The 1952 edition gives MM crotchet=48; 2002 gives crotchet=56.
32. The subtle distinction between 4’ flute and string tone in the 1943 edition is obfuscated, for example.
33. Helga Schauerte, “Well-liked but not well respected”—thoughts on Jehan Alain’s 75th birthday: on the problem of registration in his organ works illustrated by the *Deuxième Fantaisie*, *Organists’ Review* 72/3 (July 1987), 219–24. Hereafter, OR 1987.
34. Among further such uncertainties may be included the exact nature of the registration change to be effected in bar 24, and the status of the ‘Fonds 8’ marking in bar 24, a marking which conforms to none of those attached to this passage in the MSS.
35. The precise extent to which 16’ pedal should be employed is uncertain.
36. For a full description of sources, see *Notes*, 102, and Bâ2011, Vol. 3, 84. Editorial abbreviations in stop nomenclature have been expanded, and all bracketed editorial indications of pitch have brackets removed.
37. The subtle distinction between markings in B and C—one requiring the removal of the mutation alone, the other the additional removal of the Salicional 8—is also not conveyed by the detailed notes for Bâ2011. Schauerte-Maubouet’s conclusions about several aspects of this work in particular, and about the Leduc editions in general, were challenged in 1990 by Norma Stevlingson: see *The American Organist* 24/9 (September 1990), 22–6.