

BEETHOVEN



贝多芬

D大调钢琴协奏曲

根据《D大调小提琴协奏曲》作品 61 改编

作品 61a

(总谱)

Piano Concerto

in D major Op.61a

URTEXT

(原始版)



G. HENLE VERLAG

德国G.亨乐出版社提供版权



上海音乐出版社
WWW.SMPH.CN

BEETHOVEN

贝多芬

D大调钢琴协奏曲

根据《D大调小提琴协奏曲》作品 61 改编

作品 61a

(总谱)

Piano Concerto

in D major Op.61a

URTEXT

(原始版)

编者：汉斯-维尔纳·库滕 Hans-Werner Küthen

翻译：钱 泥



G. HENLE VERLAG

德国G.亨乐出版社提供版权



上海音乐出版社
WWW.SMPH.CN

中文版序

2010年是贝多芬诞生240周年,上海音乐出版社为此从德国G.亨乐音乐出版社引进出版贝多芬的钢琴协奏曲集,包括两架钢琴谱和袖珍总谱两种。这个曲集除了五首钢琴协奏曲外,还收入了由贝多芬自己改编的《D大调小提琴协奏曲》的钢琴版(Op. 61a)和《C大调钢琴、小提琴、大提琴三重协奏曲》(Op. 56),除了为钢琴、合唱与乐队写的《合唱幻想曲》(Op. 80)之外,这里囊括了贝多芬所有为钢琴和乐队而写的有作品编号的作品。

我们一般只知道贝多芬写了五首有作品编号的钢琴协奏曲,其实他还为他的《D大调小提琴协奏曲》(Op. 61)写过一个钢琴改编版,作品编号61a。贝多芬从未为小提琴协奏曲写过华彩段(cadenza),但是他却为钢琴版第一乐章写了一个极有特色的华彩段,为第三乐章写了两个华彩段。一般华彩段是由独奏者用该乐章的几个主题作即兴发挥,但贝多芬为第一乐章写的华彩段却在传统钢琴独奏即兴华彩以后别出心裁地插入了一个用钢琴和定音鼓合奏的插部,定音鼓奏出第一乐章开头的五下动机。而且他还创作了一个16小节的进行曲新

主题。此外,他还为第二乐章和第三乐章各写了一个连接乐段(Lead-ins),由此可见贝多芬对这个钢琴版的重视和钟爱程度。现在小提琴家演奏这首小提琴协奏曲时大都采用19世纪匈牙利小提琴家约阿希姆(Joseph Joachim 1831—1907)或20世纪小提琴家克莱斯勒(Fritz Kreisler 1875—1962)写的华彩段,不过奥地利小提琴家沃尔夫冈·施耐德汉(Wolfgang Schneiderhan 1915—2002)却把贝多芬为钢琴改写的华彩段改编给小提琴用(由G.亨乐音乐出版社出版),可惜目前小提琴家用施氏华彩段的并不多,演奏这首协奏曲钢琴版的钢琴家也不多。据我所知钢琴版的两架钢琴谱还是第一次出版。我们希望这次引进能引起钢琴界乃至音乐界的注意和兴趣,让贝多芬这首第六钢琴协奏曲更广泛地流传开来。

《C大调钢琴、小提琴、大提琴三重协奏曲》(Op. 56)创作于1804年,大概和《C小调第三钢琴协奏曲》(Op. 37)差不多同一时期,但出版于1807年,因此作品号较晚,属于贝多芬中期作品。由于需要一个钢琴三重奏组因此较少演出,谱子也比较难找。与五首钢琴协奏

曲同样,都是由亨乐音乐出版社选自汉斯-维尔纳·库滕主编的《新版贝多芬全集》(New Beethoven-Gesamtausgabe),是最新、最权威的版本,大开本的两架钢琴谱和小开本的袖珍总谱同时出版,也是上海音乐出版社“钢琴经典曲库”的一个重要组成部分。另外还有最新英国皇家

音乐学院联合委员会版的《贝多芬钢琴奏鸣曲全集》也将出版,一并作为纪念贝多芬诞生 240 周年的重要项目。

李名强

2009 年 1 月 26 日

正月初一于香港

前言

我们这个版本的贝多芬钢琴协奏曲的文字来自于在慕尼黑出版的《贝多芬作品全集》(第三部,卷五,2004年)。关于文本内容、原始资料 and 作品创作、早期演出及出版的历史的更多详细信息,请您参见该套全集相应卷本的前言和评论部分。

这部由小提琴协奏曲改编而来的钢琴协奏曲的原始资料以及相关记录残缺不全,乐曲作者的真实面目仿佛隐藏在迷雾之中,直至今天,怀疑它是否出自贝多芬手笔的观点不在少数。虽然谱中小提琴声部旁确有个别用铅笔记录的和弦或乐句,看上去像是大师在进行钢琴思考,除此之外却没有完整钢琴声部的手迹存在。但从完整的华彩乐段及两次引入的回旋结束来看,此曲谱写人是贝多芬本人,且对这部源自小提琴协奏曲的钢琴作品相当重视,这一点不容质疑。

1807年4月20日,克莱门蒂(Muzio Clementi)在维也纳与贝多芬签订了《D大调小提琴协奏曲》(Op. 61)的出版合同,两天后克莱门蒂在一封给他伦敦同事柯拉尔德(William Fredrick Col-lard)的信中这样写道:“我已经同意接受他(贝多芬)的作品……《D大调小提琴协奏曲》,一首动听的乐曲。同时在我的要求之下,他答应再改写成钢琴版本,不过是否加进新音调则由他决定。”信中提到的便是此前一年的12月23日首演的

小提琴协奏曲原始版。克莱门蒂本人作为出版家、钢琴作曲家和钢琴制造商,显然对这一作品的钢琴改编版之商业意义十分感兴趣。要满足克莱门蒂的这一要求,必须跨越弦乐器和键盘乐器间的鸿沟,这并不容易。贝多芬当时并没有计划在同期出版的一系列总共六部作品之外再加一首钢琴协奏曲。这一系列的六部杰出的作品分属不同音乐体裁,在音乐中心巴黎、伦敦、维也纳和莱比锡同时出版,其中已包含一部钢琴协奏曲 Op. 58,紧接着的 Op. 59 是三首弦乐四重奏,Op. 60 是《“英雄”交响曲》,Op. 61 是《D大调小提琴协奏曲》,最后是《科里奥兰序曲》(Op. 62)。

这位颇具国际影响力的出版商兼钢琴作曲家提出将一部小提琴独奏的协奏曲改编成其更加偏爱的以键盘乐器主奏的作品,并给出确定的要求,使贝多芬面临一个棘手的任务:钢琴独奏部分的炫技势必打些折扣,钢琴特性也不可能发挥得淋漓尽致。从今天展现在我们眼前的手稿(奥地利国家图书馆,编号 Mus. Hs. 17. 538)不难看出,贝多芬只在小提琴协奏曲原稿上用铅笔大致简略勾涂,就可以构成对后来钢琴协奏曲整体钢琴声部的想象。这样在关于这部作品的历史资料严重不全的情况下,我们所能得到的全部版本来源如下:少量粗略写就的草稿、一份经过抄谱员誊清的手

稿以及两个分别于维也纳和伦敦出版的原始版本。

关于副本

经推断,第一份(即流失的)协奏曲总谱由当时贝多芬的专业抄谱员克隆帕尔(Joseph Klumpar)抄写完成。克隆帕尔亦为此曲第二份副本的抄写者。此副本以贝多芬本人校对的第一份副本为蓝本,得以保存至今,现藏于伦敦大英图书馆,编号 Add. Ms. 47 851。这本“伦敦副本”自始至终使用十六行总谱记谱,同时包括两种独奏乐器版本的声部,其中第十一、十二行为钢琴声部,第十四行为小提琴声部(标注 *violino principale*),在第二和第三乐章中,钢琴与小提琴声部之间留了一条空行。第一乐章的相同位置没有空行,但在独奏小提琴声部与大提琴和低音提琴声部之间留有空行。也许凭藉伦敦副本我们不难想象第一份流失了的谱子,它们不应该差异过多吧。

这两个版本究竟是怎样诞生的呢?在此,即使不对贝多芬小提琴独奏声部作细致的分解研究,也要将它与乐队的关系分析透彻。小提琴独奏部分对作曲家来说无比重要,这一点从手稿中犹豫不定的三种方案可以看出。直至 1808 年两个版本同时出版前,贝多芬的主要创作精力都花在了推敲小提琴独奏声部上。毫无疑问,贝多芬是聚焦小提琴技巧难度,读谱人亦可一目了然。然而与此有关的文字记载却无从觅见。很有可能贝多芬参考了珀辛格(Franz Alexander Pössinger, 1767—1827)的专业意见,以不改变整体构造和艺术品质以及尊重

小提琴演奏特性为前提,让它风头出足。在珀辛格的帮助之下,贝多芬终于完成了这部尽善尽美的作品。感兴趣的读者可以参看海尔特利希(Ernst Herttrich)最近的研究文章《谁为贝多芬 Op. 61 小提琴协奏曲最终定稿?》(《贝多芬研究》第 91 至 109 页,第四版,波恩 2005)。

对这个具有争议的版本起源的来龙去脉必须加以梳理。首先我们需假设(但绝非妄猜)“第一副本”存在,并直接根据贝多芬的手稿而制成。假如没有第一副本,哪里来的“伦敦副本”(伦敦不列颠图书馆,编号 Add. Ms. 47 851)? 没有以上假设,也难作解释该副本中何以同时包含小提琴独奏声部终稿以及随后完成的钢琴改编谱。此后的独奏及乐队谱子的铅版稿正是以伦敦副本为准。另一种可能是贝多芬将钢琴独奏声部写在了单独的谱纸上,但这对克隆帕尔保留下来的乐谱来说是不必要的迂回工作。弦乐作曲家珀辛格曾手中掌握过一份原始谱,这一点出版社记事表中有这样的记载:“珀辛格急件”(第 120 页背面,伦敦副本),为指导珀辛格对照已流失的原稿中的小提琴声部,贝多芬在四处用红笔进行标注。

珀辛格对小提琴声部所作修改应该也在这份流失了的“第一副本”中,也许钢琴独奏声部亦在其中。这样就可以解释,为什么贝多芬在保存至今的总谱上只草草点化了几个音几条线,即使这些也仅限于第一、二乐章的左手声部,而且很少有连贯的句子。详细说明请参看《贝多芬全集》(第三部,卷五,后记一)。

与起草了多种方案的小提琴独奏相

比,由它而生的钢琴部分显得流畅自如、华丽壮观,因为钢琴创作是贝多芬的拿手好戏。1796年施特莱歇尔(Johann Andreas Streicher)曾对他说过一句话,“只要你有感觉,你就能让钢琴歌唱。”那时贝多芬便产生了让钢琴像人声般歌唱这个念头,现在证明的机会来到了。把小提琴声部中最高音小字四组c搬上钢琴显然不能满足贝多芬的激情,在华彩乐段中他居然在谱纸上写下了小字四组f!要知道1810年制造的钢琴还没有这个琴键,可见贝多芬的想象力远远超越了现实!当然,弦乐的超级炫技转化成键盘手指练习,就会出现新问题,乃在意料之中。

把两个独奏声部同时写入总谱还可以解释一点,那就是为什么作曲家笔下钢琴声部如此自然流畅,没有丝毫的生硬和牵强,仿佛深深扎根于小提琴乐思。也许正是因为创作弦乐声部时贝多芬很费了一番脑筋,投入了大量的时间,经过深思熟虑,待到落笔钢琴便水到渠成。克莱门蒂希望让这部钢琴协奏曲Op. 61a与计划在1810年7月出版的《G大调钢琴协奏曲》同时和人们见面,早于英文原版的《第五钢琴协奏曲》(Op. 73)。贝多芬欣然接受他的要求,大方地满足了这位出版商的愿望。在钢琴声部改编过程中,克莱门蒂以“不能偏离原样”为由多次插手干预创作,又不断给以建议和意见。不难看出,克莱门蒂对小提琴原版是充满敬畏的。

这两个版本的协奏曲于1808年由维也纳艺术与工业出版社(Bureau des Arts et d'Industrie)印刷出版,其印板现

存于伦敦大英图书馆。而克莱门蒂手中只有一份维也纳铅版,因为由于拿破仑的大陆封锁,那份在合同上注明的他独家所有的原始版连同《科里奥兰序曲》和《G大调钢琴协奏曲》均在运输途中因邮差被迫绕道行走而不幸遗失。本版应感谢波恩贝多芬档案馆和奥地利国家图书馆(Hoboken藏品)提供的维也纳原始版本副本,以及英国皇家音乐学院和大英图书馆提供的克莱门蒂的原始版副本。

关于华彩段

由贝多芬亲手完成的华彩段,为这部作品“非贝多芬莫属”的观点提供了有力的证据。他没有为这部钢琴协奏曲初稿写华彩的事实也许可以证明这一点:身为钢琴家,他是站在克莱门蒂的立场。第一乐章(现存于波恩贝多芬故居, Mh20a)和第三乐章(现存于柏林国家图书馆-普鲁士文化遗产, Aut. 28)华彩段前呼后应,以及另外两个终曲前的导入段(Mh21, Mh22)都相当完整,它们与乐曲开头的风格、性格统一,并与曲中扮演重要角色的定音鼓一脉相承。第一乐章的大段华彩自第36小节起至华彩段结束,一直由定音鼓陪伴,还有另一个独立的定音鼓声部(Mh20b)与之并行。谱中贝多芬标注的“华彩/33”意为第33小节(事实上应该是第36小节),由于作曲家漏划小节线,导致谱中缺少三小节,此外,乐谱中还存在一些音值误差,但并不严重,无须小题大做。至于华彩与定音鼓的配器法,委实是作曲家偏爱的手法。追溯至1796年他起草创作《第三钢琴协奏曲》时就动了这个念头。他在一捆草

稿纸上这样写道(参见伦敦大英图书馆藏书 add. Ms. 29 801, 第 82 页正面):“为一首含定音鼓华彩的《C 小调协奏曲》而作”。后来在他创作 Op. 73 的末乐章时重现了这个技巧——结束部分让定音鼓的十七次固定低音来陪伴钢琴,如同二人间的对话。

当贝多芬的听力愈来愈差,直至无法自己登台演奏时,他才将钢琴华彩记录在谱面上。我们的作曲家于 1808 年 12 月 22 日最后一次身为独奏家演出自己的《第四钢琴协奏曲》及《合唱幻想曲》(Op. 80),壮丽辉煌的《第五钢琴协奏曲》(Op. 73)的首演则由别人担任独奏,贝多芬那时已感到力不从心。他开始将第一至第四钢琴协奏曲的华彩段完整写下,其中,部分华彩中重要音乐进行或和声业已存在。经过字迹学家鉴定,这确是出自作曲家之笔,又经形态学家考证,所用谱纸亦为当时通行的 KOTENS-CHLOS 牌,落笔于 1809 年至 1810 年间。这些贝多芬由于失聪而渐渐告别舞台并直至晚年才写就谱面上的光辉灿烂的华彩在他生前一直没有出版,只在他的钢琴学生中间流行。

本文提到的第一乐章的华彩(Mh20a)、与之相关的定音鼓声部(Mh20b)以及两个进入终曲回旋曲的导入段(Mh21、Mh22)来源于布赖特科普夫与黑特尔出版社(Breitkopf & Härtel)资料库,自 1956 年起藏于波恩贝多芬故居(H. C. Bodmer 藏品)。相对较短的华彩段(Aut. 28)现存于柏林国家图书馆-普鲁士文化遗产-音乐部。旧版《贝多芬全集》(布赖特科普夫与黑特尔出版社 1864 年版,70a)中缺少的华彩段,由海斯(Willy Hess)先生于 1969 年从自己的《全集补遗本》第十卷中摘引并补充完整。我们还要感谢由海斯先生撰写评论的全部华彩的精美手稿副本(苏黎世 1979 年出版)。华彩段被收入于新版《贝多芬全集》(第七部,卷七,1976 年)。本版全部由编者重新修订。钢琴缩编谱版(HN815)的编者对华彩段进行了修订。

虽然华彩乐段得以全部保留,但这部由 Op. 61 改编的钢琴版《D 大调协奏曲》在贝多芬在世时从未上演过。

汉斯-维尔纳·库滕

波恩,2005 年秋

PREFACE

The present volume follows the text published in Section III, Vol. 5, of the *Beethoven Complete Edition* (Munich, 2004). Further information on the presentation of the text, the state of the sources, and the genesis and publication history of the concerto can be found in the preface and the critical report for that volume.

The sources for the piano version of Beethoven's Violin Concerto are woefully incomplete. As a result, Beethoven's authorship has been questioned even in very recent times. To be sure, we have sketches in his hand running parallel to the violin part, but there is no autograph source for the continuous text. Still, the very fact that Beethoven himself considered the piano version worthy of a complete set of cadenzas, and two lead-ins to the Rondo-Finale, leaves no room for doubt that he was responsible for the transcription.

On 20 April 1807, Muzio Clementi personally concluded a publisher's contract with Beethoven in Vienna. Two days later, he wrote to his London associate, William Frederick Collard, at the same time adding a description of the D-major Violin Concerto: "I agreed with him [Beethoven] to take in MSS ... *a concerto for the violin*, which is beautiful, and which, at my request, he will adapt for the pianoforte with or without additional keys." Clementi's description related to the première of the original version for violin, which had taken place on 23 December of the preceding year. Not only had this version caught his attention as a publisher, but the proposed transcription appealed to him as a composer of piano music and, from a commercial perspective, as the owner of a pianoforte factory. What Clementi wanted from Beethoven was a straightforward transcription – no easy matter, as it involved transferring a piece for string instrument to a keyboard instrument. Beethoven had not

originally foreseen adding a second piano concerto to the brilliant series of six works, each in a different genre, that he intended to have published simultaneously in the musical capitals of Paris, London, and Vienna-Leipzig as a demonstration of his universality as a composer. The series already contained a piano concerto in the form of his op. 58, followed by a triptych of string quartets (op. 59), a symphony (op. 60), a violin concerto (op. 61), and an orchestral overture (op. 62).

The task of adequately transferring a violin concerto to the preferred instrument of an internationally famous publisher and composer of piano music, and at his specific request, confronted Beethoven with a stumbling block from the very outset: the impossibility of achieving an idiomatically pianistic, and thus virtuosic, character. However, as we can see from the inscriptions he pencilled into the bottom two staves of the autograph score of the original violin version (Vienna, Austrian National Library, shelf mark: Mus. Hs. 17.538), he needed no more than a few jottings to form a complete mental picture of the piano version. This is about all that we are able to infer from the highly incomplete body of sources: a few hasty sketches, a corrected copyist's manuscript, and two original editions published in Vienna and London.

Note on the Stemma: An initial full draft of the score of the concerto, now lost, was presumably prepared by Beethoven's professional scribe, Joseph Klumpar. At any rate, Klumpar was responsible for producing the extant second copy from the first. This second copy, the "London MS" (preserved in the British Library, London, shelf mark: Add. Ms. 47 851), was proofread by the composer. It contains, synchronously on sixteen staves, both of the alternative solo

parts in the reverse order of their origin (and significance): namely, the piano part on staves 11 and 12, and the solo violin part (marked *violino principale*) on staff 14. These two parts are tidily separated by a “blank line” in the second and third movements. No such spatial separation exists in the first movement, although a staff has been left blank between the *violino principale* and the cellos and double basses in the two lowermost staves. The lost first draft in full score was probably laid out in much the same way.

What does this tell us about the genesis of the two versions? Without delving deeply into the completion of the violin part, we must at least cast a glance at that part as notated in Beethoven's score. Beethoven kept the violin part constantly at the forefront of his compositional labors until the two versions were published jointly in August 1808. The undecided passages, often spread over more than three layers, contain miscellaneous jottings for the *violino principale* produced at many different points in time. Besides the composer's difficulties with violin technique, these jottings reveal that his primary interest centered on the original version, although a definitive text cannot be made out. In the end, Beethoven most likely sought the expert advice of Franz Alexander Pössinger (1767–1827), who helped him to produce a version as idiomatic for the violin as possible, leaving the substance of the music untouched while paying sufficient attention to the demands of violin technique. Only the version that Beethoven approved for publication bears, with Pössinger's assistance, the hallmarks of a work genuinely composed for the violin. Interested readers may wish to consult the present author's article “Wer schrieb den Endtext des Violinkonzerts op. 61 von Beethoven? Franz Alexander Pössinger als letzte Instanz für den Komponisten”, in *Bonner Beethoven-Studien*, iv, ed. by Ernst Herttrich (Bonn, 2005), pp. 91–109.

In light of this putative genesis, we must

now flesh out the source material to achieve a functional tree diagram. First, we must posit the existence of the aforementioned hypothetical (but by no means fictitious) first copy prepared directly from Beethoven's autograph score. Only this manuscript provides a simple explanation for the fact that both the final solo part of the violin version and its transcription for piano are contained in the London MS (Add. Ms. 47851), which served as an engraver's copy for both versions of the solo part and their common orchestral accompaniment. One conceivable alternative is that Beethoven wrote out a separate part for solo piano. This would have been an unnecessary and circuitous route for obtaining the surviving score in Klumpar's hand. An unambiguous reference to a preceding source in Pössinger's possession is provided by the publisher's mark “Pössinger Pressant” on fol. 120v of the London MS in combination with Beethoven's four “Nb:” marks in this source. These last instructions to Pössinger to coordinate the readings with the solo violin part in the lost manuscript.

Pössinger's preliminary version of the definitive violin part was most likely entered in this lost copyist's manuscript. Beethoven probably wrote out the piano part there as well. This would account for the sketchiness of the penciled inscriptions in his autograph score, which generally involve the added left-hand part, albeit sporadically, only for the first and second movements, and almost invariably with lengthy gaps. Interested readers are referred to the transcription of these sketches in Appendix I of Volume III/5.

Compared to the heterogeneous readings of the violin part, the pianistic figurations in the piano version provide impressive proof that Beethoven, quite unlike the problems he faced in writing idiomatically for the violin, had little difficulty in producing a piano part that nevertheless allowed the original to stand out clearly. While turning out this *pièce d'occasion*, he may well have recalled the suggestion he made to Johann Andreas

Streicher in the summer of 1796: “provided one can feel the music, one can also make the pianoforte sing.” Here Beethoven found an opportunity to create a largely literal replica (with occasional refractions) of a violin part whose melody line never goes beyond c^4 . Nonetheless, his two cadenzas presuppose a keyboard compass extending to f^4 , a wholly imaginary ambitus in the years around 1810. Here the free unfolding of his imagination superseded any real conditions of performance – a quality often found in his other cadenzas as well. Other lasting problems resulted from the step leading from the string concerto, a genre to which he devoted a single work, to his more fluent handling of the piano.

The combined notation of the two solo parts also explains why some of the readings in the piano transcription appear almost embedded among the variants cast up by the difficult gestation of the violin part. Nonetheless, the piano version was a generous gesture towards Clementi’s request for a piano concerto to publish alongside his planned edition of the G-major Concerto, op. 58. In the event, the piano version appeared in July 1810, shortly before Clementi issued the original English edition of the Fifth Piano Concerto, op. 73. The Clementi print frequently changes the articulation to make it more consistent with that of the violin version. This reveals that even he took pains to respect the original form of the solo part wherever possible.

The original editions of both versions were published by the Bureau des Arts et d’Industrie, Vienna and Pest, in August 1808. Both were prepared from the engraver’s copy preserved today in the British Library. Later, both versions were also issued in London by Clementi. He probably based his editions entirely on the Vienna prints, for the manuscript promised to him by the terms of his contract (along with engraver’s copies for several other works, including the *Coriolanus* Overture and the G-major Piano Concerto) was evidently lost in transit while

trying to avoid Britain’s blockade of the Continent. Our edition is based on copies of the original Vienna print, published by the Bureau d’Industrie (preserved today in the Beethoven Archive, Bonn, and the Hoboken Collection of the Austrian National Library, Vienna), and on copies of Clementi’s original English edition, located in the Royal College of Music and the British Library (both in London).

Note on the Cadenzas: Beethoven’s two broadly conceived cadenzas effectively rehabilitate his authorship of the piano version and elevate the very idea of a transcription. The fact that he wrote no cadenzas for the original version of the concerto might be taken as further proof that, being a pianist, he was firmly on Clementi’s side. The inter-related pair of cadenzas for the first movement (Beethoven House, Bonn, Mh 20a) and the third movement (Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, Aut. 28), along with the two lead-ins to the Rondo-Finale (Mh 21 and Mh 22), are conceived as a self-contained set. This likewise means that they draw on the Violin Concerto’s characteristic opening and the predominant role it assigns to the timpani. The great first-movement cadenza (Mh 20a) integrates the timpani of the *Marcia* directly in the notation from m. 36 to the end of the cadenza. There is also a concordant separate timpani part (Mh 20b) which Beethoven marked “Cadenza / 33” in reference to its entrance in m. 33 (*recte* m. 36), which he numbered incorrectly owing to the absence of two bar-lines in Mh 20a. These two timpani parts are textually identical apart from a few insignificant differences in note-values. By conjoining the piano and the timpani, Beethoven reverted to a favorite device that he had lit upon as early as 1796 for the opening of his Third Piano Concerto. As he noted on fol. 82r of the Kafka Miscellany (London, British Library, shelf mark: Add. Ms. 29801): “Zum Concert aus c moll pauke bej der Cadent” (use timpani in cadenza for C minor concerto). He later re-

called this device in the concluding bars of the final movement to op. 73, with its seventeen-fold timpani ostinato in dialogue with the piano.

Beethoven did not write out his cadenzas until he had been forced by increasing deafness to stop giving solo performances of his concertos. His final public appearance as a soloist in the Fourth Piano Concerto and the Choral Fantasy (op. 80) took place on 22 December 1808. By that time he had already thought better of giving up the première of his great Eb major Concerto, op. 73. The cadenzas to his first through fourth piano concertos were all set down *ex post facto*, apart from the occasional sketched or draft cadenzas used in early performances (e. g. on the Toscanini Sketchleaf for op. 15 or the harmonic sketch for the chamber version of op. 58). Their later date of origin is also confirmed by his preference for KOTEN-SCHLOS paper types in 1809–10, along with other morphological evidence. These later manuscripts from the years of Beethoven's forced inactivity, though highly useful for the "channeling" of his piano pupils, remained unpublished during his lifetime.

The autograph source of the first-movement cadenza (Mh 20a), together with its as-

sociated timpani part (Mh 20b) and the two lead-ins to the Rondo (Mh 21 and Mh 22), all stem from the archives of Breitkopf & Härtel and have been located in the H. C. Bodmer Collection at the Beethoven House, Bonn, since 1956. The comparatively brief cadenza for the Rondo (Aut. 28) is found in the Music Department of the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin. In 1969 Willy Hess, in volume 10 of his "Supplements to the *Gesamtausgabe*," supplied the cadenzas missing in the old Breitkopf & Härtel *Gesamtausgabe* (Series 70a, 1864). It is also to Hess that we owe a beautiful annotated facsimile edition of all the cadenzas (Zurich, 1979). The cadenzas have been published in Volume VII/7 of the new *Beethoven Complete Edition* since 1967. All of these interpolated cadenzas have been revised by the present editor for the piano reduction HN 815.

Despite the surviving cadenzas, no performance of the piano version of op. 61 is known to have taken place during Beethoven's lifetime.

Bonn, autumn 2005
Hans-Werner Küthen

目录

| | |
|-------------------|-------|
| 第一乐章 不甚快的快板 | 1 |
| 第二乐章 小广板 | 51 |
| 第三乐章 回旋曲-快板 | 63 |
| 评注 | 91/98 |

| | |
|---------------------------------|-------|
| 1. Allegro, ma non troppo | 1 |
| 2. Larghetto | 51 |
| 3. Rondo (Allegro) | 63 |
| Comments | 91/98 |

钢琴协奏曲

D 大调

根据小提琴协奏曲(作品 61)改编

献给朱丽叶·冯·布怀宁夫人

Allegro, ma non troppo

Tutti

Opus 61a

Flauto

Oboi

Clarinetti in A

Fagotti

Corni in D

Trombe in D

Timpani in D-A

Pianoforte

Violino I

Violino II

Viola

Violoncello

Contrabbasso

p dolce

cresc.

sf

p

无论以任何方式复制本乐谱都属侵权行为。

Vervielfältigungen jeglicher Art sind gesetzlich verboten.

© 2004 by G. Henle Verlag, München

19

19

musical score for 'The Rose Tree'.

The score is written for a full orchestra and includes the following instruments and parts:

- Flutes:** Flute 1 and Flute 2.
- Oboes:** Oboe 1 and Oboe 2.
- Clarinets:** Clarinet in B-flat and Clarinet in A.
- Bassoons:** Bassoon 1 and Bassoon 2.
- String Ensemble:** Violins I, Violins II, Violas, Cellos, and Double Basses.
- Woodwinds:** Saxophone in E-flat and Saxophone in A.
- Brass:** Trumpets in C and Trombones in C.
- Timpani:** Timpani.
- Percussion:** Percussion.
- Conductor:** Conductor.

The score is in 4/4 time and features a variety of musical notations, including dynamics (e.g., *cresc.*, *f*, *dimin.*), articulation (e.g., *acc.*, *stacc.*), and phrasing (e.g., *leg.*, *marcato*). The score is divided into measures, with some measures containing multiple notes and rests.

[illegible]

33

Sheet music for 'The Rose Tree' (No. 100). The score is written for a large ensemble, including voices and various instruments. The key signature is one sharp (F#), and the time signature is 4/4. The music is in common time (C). The score is divided into two systems. The first system contains staves for Soprano, Alto, Tenor, Bass, and Piano. The second system contains staves for Violin I, Violin II, Viola, Cello, and Double Bass. The music features a variety of musical notations, including notes, rests, and dynamic markings such as *f* (forte) and *sf* (sforzando). The lyrics 'The Rose Tree' are written below the vocal staves.

38 **A**

44

p *pp* *sempre p*

pizz. *(p)* *pizz.* *(p)*