

SCHUMANN



舒曼 钢琴作品全集

第四卷

Complete Piano Works

Volume IV

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.SMPPH.CN

4J0550

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

舒曼钢琴作品全集 第四卷 / 恩斯特·赫特利希编; 瓦尔瑟·兰珀
等指法编注; 段劲楠等翻译 - 上海: 上海音乐出版社,
2014.9

ISBN 978-7-5523-0615-6

I. 舒… II. ①恩… ②瓦… ③段… III. 钢琴曲 - 德国 - 近代 -
选集 IV. J657.41

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2014) 第 179697 号

© Authorized by G. Henle Verlag, München

Chinese Translation Copyright © 2014 by Shanghai Music Publishing House

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

书 名: 舒曼钢琴作品全集 第四卷

编 者: 恩斯特·赫特利希

指法编注: 瓦尔瑟·兰珀 等

翻 译: 段劲楠 等

出 品 人: 费维耀

项目负责: 秦展闻

责任编辑: 王 琳

封面设计: 陆震伟

印务总监: 李霄云

出版: 上海世纪出版集团 上海市福建中路 193 号 200001

上海音乐出版社 上海市绍兴路 7 号 200020

网址: www.ewen.cc

www.smph.cn

发行: 上海音乐出版社

印订: 上海书刊印刷有限公司

开本: 640×978 1/8 印张: 37.5 插页: 4 谱、文: 300 面

2014 年 9 月第 1 版 2014 年 9 月第 1 次印刷

印数: 1 - 3,000 册

ISBN 978-7-5523-0615-6/J · 0550

定价: 98.00 元

读者服务热线: (021) 64375066 印装质量热线: (021) 64310542

反盗版热线: (021) 64734302 (021) 64375066-241

郑重声明: 版权所有 翻印必究

前言

我们以六卷本的形式呈现了罗伯特·舒曼(Robert Schumann, 1810~1856)的所有钢琴独奏作品,这是自1879~1893年克拉拉·舒曼(Clara Schumann)编辑的完整版问世以来的首部评注版全集。包括38个作品,按作品编号升序排列(两首无编号的作品排在第六卷的最后)。尽管这种排列方法未严格遵循创作时间顺序,打破了按体裁和系列所进行的分类,但这样的编排至少便于人们快速检索。

第四卷收录了Op.17~23。这些作品创作于1838年初至1839年3月,其中的《G小调钢琴奏鸣曲》Op.22除外,它不在这期间创作,创作年代更早,即1833至1835年间。实际上,这部作品应当与《升F小调奏鸣曲》Op.11属同时期作品,但之后在1836至1837年间重新修订过,并于1838年末创作了新的尾声。本卷七部作品出版于1838年5月至1840年6月之间。

幻想曲 Op.17

舒曼的大型作品《C大调幻想曲》(Fantasie)Op.17最初是为了在“贝多芬崇拜者的号召下”而进行一项筹款倡议而创作的,该倡议由“波恩贝多芬纪念碑协会”于1835年12月17日为纪念贝多芬诞辰65周年而面向公众发出。这项倡议在德国多家报纸上进行了刊登,并且于1836

年4月8日刊登在了《新音乐杂志》(Neue Zeitschrift Für Musik)上,当时舒曼依旧担当着该杂志的编辑一职。舒曼在倡议部分后附加了一篇由四部分构成的评述性文本,其分别署名为弗洛雷斯坦(Florestan)、约拿单(Jonathan)、优西比乌斯(Eusebius)和拉罗(Raro),该文本后来被舒曼收录在自己的《评论文集》(Gesammelte Schriften)之中。舒曼想捐献自己新作品的收益所得,用于修建波恩的贝多芬纪念碑,并于1836年9月9日在一篇名为“为贝多芬进行构思”的日记中记述了自己的想法。之后,这首《贝多芬奏鸣曲》——即《幻想曲》Op.17的原名——“除一些小的细节部分之外,于12月初基本完成”(他的日记条目记载为“1836年12月底”)。12月19日,舒曼致信莱比锡出版商弗里德里希·基斯特纳(Friedrich Kistner)称:“弗洛雷斯坦与优西比乌斯非常愿意为贝多芬纪念碑的建造助一臂之力,为此我将创作以下标题的作品:废墟,战利品,棕榈。大型钢琴奏鸣曲。为贝多芬纪念碑而作。鉴于您可能希望专享对这些作品的保护权利,我恳请您为波恩委员会免费提供100份作品复本,以便委员会能够即刻启用。这些作品的所得收益(约80塔勒^①)将用于贝多芬纪念碑的修建。”正是出于这点,在第一乐章结尾部分(第295及其之后小节)中,有一段旋律同贝多芬著名声乐套曲《致远方爱人》(An die ferne Geliebte)当中最后一首《请您收下这首歌》(Nimm Sie hin denn, diese Lieder)中的旋律有着很大关

联。随着时间的流逝,创作《贝多芬奏鸣曲》的想法逐渐隐去,大概是被正在创作的另一个作品所掩盖。在终乐章结尾处,舒曼原来打算再次使用出现在第一乐章末尾的贝多芬主题,但在提交给刻版者的副本中,他却将这一段删掉了,这一做法绝非偶然之举。后来舒曼针对此部分构想了一些其他的创作方案。1838年3月18日舒曼在写给克拉拉的信件中提及了这首幻想曲:“第一乐章可能是我创作过的作品中最具激情的[埃娃·魏斯韦勒(Eva Weissweiler)对此的记述为“最具艺术性的”]——那是为你深深地叹息——相比之下其余乐章则稍逊一筹,但它们也不至于让我为之羞愧。”在这封信件中,舒曼还称自己已经“于1836年6月详尽起草”了这首幻想曲。由此我们得出的结论应是,假如舒曼对这一事件在记忆上没有出错的话,那么他一开始创作这部作品时绝不会“在脑海中构思了贝多芬的内容”。当作为德国首座贝多芬像的波恩贝多芬纪念碑于1845年8月建成并揭幕时,舒曼对其已丝毫不再关注了。印制在初版作品首页上的题词与最初的创作动机也没有任何联系。

舒曼与上述提及的基斯特纳在作品出版事宜上谈崩之后,这部作品的出版搁置了一段时期。在舒曼之后几年日记的一些记录中曾数次提及“幻想曲”,但并不明确他是指《幻想曲集》(Fantasiestücke)Op.12,还是指三乐章的《幻想曲》Op.17。人们确信无疑的是在这段时期中,《C大调幻想曲》经历了一系列大量的进

^① 塔勒(Thaler),德国15至19世纪的银币,1塔勒=3马克。——译者注

一步修改。舒曼还更换了乐章的标题。在1838年4月16日写给克拉拉的信中,舒曼将各乐章称为“遗迹,凯旋门和星座”。整部作品名当时称为《诗集》(Dichtungen)。

第一乐章亲笔手稿(第二及第三乐章无现存手稿)的扉页上依旧可见作品的原名及原作品号(12)。新的作品名和题献李斯特的文字出现在了一份由舒曼审阅的刻版者副本中。此版首页最初标注的作品号是Op. 16,后来由舒曼更改为Op. 17。每一乐章独立的标题在印制时同样被舍弃,最后舒曼于1838年12月19日时将作品名《诗集》改为《幻想曲》。1839年1月6日舒曼致信出版商,写道:“如果可能的话,您有义务尽快出版题献李斯特的这部幻想曲”。2月时,舒曼审阅了校样,并“以最快的速度”(据舒曼《书信集》记述)在3月2日将乐谱返给出版社。这部作品最终于1839年4月出版。

在一封日期标记为1839年5月的信件中,舒曼向音乐批评家赫尔曼·赫尔什巴赫(Hermann Hirschbach)这样坦言:“Breitkopf & Härtel出版社最近出版了我的《C大调幻想曲》。重新审视自己曾经(在三年前)感到是最优秀的作品——即第一乐章——已不认为是那么优秀了。”舒曼往往会对自己先前创作过的作品在之后不同时期进行差异较大的评论,这种现象常常出现在他的信件以及日记记录中。无论如何,《幻想曲》Op. 17在今天无疑被人们视为是舒曼最为重要的钢琴作品之一。

任时光流逝,它仍以代表着浪漫时期最高水平的音乐创作语言和精雕细琢的结构吸引着源源不断的听众。

阿拉伯风格曲 Op. 18 与花之歌 Op. 19

1838年9月末,罗伯特·舒曼由莱比锡途径德累斯顿和布拉格前往维也纳,并于10月3日抵达目的地。但他的维也纳之行却不尽如人意——《新音乐杂志》期刊出版事宜商议未果,并且在维也纳几乎无人认可他是一位作曲家。尽管如此,舒曼在维也纳的逗留却见证了他许多优秀作品的诞生,它们几乎全部是钢琴作品。尽管它们或许并不被认为是舒曼最优秀的作品,但是直至今日它们始终是钢琴家们的保留曲目:《阿拉伯风格曲》(Arabeske) Op. 18,《花之歌》(Blumenstück) Op. 19,《幽默曲》(Humoreske) Op. 20,《新事曲》(Novelletten) Op. 21,《D小调钢琴协奏曲》的未完成乐章,还有逗留后期创作的《夜曲》(Nachtstücke) Op. 23,以及《维也纳狂欢节》(Faschingsschwank aus Wien) Op. 26。这些作品中还包括一大批后来舒曼在《彩色的叶子》(Bunte Blätter) Op. 99和《纪念册页》(Albumblätter) Op. 124中才出版的曲目。1839年1月26日舒曼在给克拉拉的信中写道:“整整最后一周我都在创作中度过,然而我的思绪并没有真正快乐过,甚至没有一丝美丽的忧伤(……)此外我已创作完成一套无主题的变奏曲。我希望以‘花环’来命名这首作品。此作品中的一切元

素都以特殊的方式互相交织。我还创作了一首小曲,这是一首短回旋曲(Rondelet)^①。之后我将把手头这些如此之多的小作品精美地编排在一起,命名为“小花集”——就像人们称呼画作那样。你喜欢这个名字吗?”后来,克拉拉本人感到那首被舒曼称为“花环”的作品可能就是指《阿拉伯风格曲》。然而,这两首作品的形式结构引发人们推测“无主题的变奏曲”这一描述似乎更贴近于作品《花之歌》,而“短回旋曲”则更适用于《阿拉伯风格曲》。

与舒曼在维也纳不断游离于愉快的期待和无奈的沮丧之间的情绪相似,他在维也纳期间创作的作品在特点和表达上也具有异常丰富的变化。他既创作了趣味盎然的《幽默曲》,也写出了阴郁黯然的《夜曲》;既创作了生气勃勃的《维也纳狂欢节》,也谱写出更为婉转抒情的《阿位伯风格曲》和《花之歌》。舒曼自己则于1839年8月11日致信好友——钢琴家亨丽埃特·福格特(Henriette Voigt):“(从维也纳)带来的三首新作正等待着您,其中一首是《幽默曲》,那无疑是一首颇为忧郁的曲目,另两首分别为《花之歌》和《阿位伯风格曲》,相比之下则不那么重要。曲名表达了曲目所需诠释的一切,乐谱中音符符干和谱线书写纤细不清则完全不是我的过错。”四天之后他写信给自己的故交恩斯特·阿道夫·贝克尔(Ernst Adolph Becker):“Op. 18和Op. 19的音乐较为柔弱,是为女士而创作,对我而言,Op. 20则更加强

^① 短回旋曲(Rondelet),一种法国诗体。——译者注

健一些。”或许可以并不牵强地假定,舒曼为迎合维也纳高贵的音乐审美品味而量身定制了这两首音乐小品,特别是正如他于1838年末向钢琴家约瑟夫·菲施霍夫(Joseph Fischhof)所述:“(这两部作品)是为了将自己提升为受维也纳全体女性所喜爱的一位作曲家而创作的。”这两首音乐作品代表着最受欢迎且最为高雅的轻音乐,无论是在其优美特质,还是舒曼在对其精致的钢琴织体的技术把握上。

1839年3月15日舒曼致信自己的崇拜者西莫南·德·希勒(Simonin de Sire),我们从信中可以得知《阿拉伯风格曲》于1838年时便已完成了创作。舒曼一如既往地自己私人副本的扉页上标注了作品完成的地点和时间:“1839年于维也纳”。假如舒曼在1839年1月26日写给克拉拉的信中所提到的“花环”或“短回旋曲”实际上是《阿拉伯风格曲》的话,那么这首曲目至少在此时已完成了创作。一个月之后,舒曼将自己的手稿寄给了维也纳出版商彼得罗·梅凯蒂(Pietro Mechetti)。

《花之歌》Op. 19必定同样创作于1838年末。舒曼于1837年7月至1839年10月间为克拉拉编撰了一部《新婚纪念册》(*Brautbuch*)。除大量的语录铭言、印制的鲜花和其他插入物品之外,还印有各种乐谱。其中一份乐谱的最后一篇便是《花之歌》的第一部分,该版本上的日期注释为“1838年于维也纳”,这与出版商所标注的时间具有明显的差异。因此,舒曼完成该作品的确切时间不得而知。

《阿拉伯风格曲》Op. 18的刻版者副本是于1839年2月26日发送至维也纳出版商彼得罗·梅凯蒂的,而《幽默曲》Op. 20的发送日期为3月10日。《花之歌》Op. 19的手稿给出版商的发送时间一定位于这两个日期之间。舒曼于6月18日在莱比锡致信梅凯蒂,要求其“加紧校对”,之后他又于7月13日向梅凯蒂发去了作品Op. 18至Op. 20的所有权证书,舒曼期待能在8月8日前收到首份“印好的副本”。后来这份乐谱比预期时间略微提前几天到了。8月5日舒曼在自己书信列表编号为“571e”的条目中记述道:“贝克尔 德累斯顿 免费/将《阿拉伯风格曲》、《花之歌》及《幽默曲》献给他,克莱根(Krägen)和少校夫人”。“少校夫人”必定是指作品Op. 18与Op. 19的题献者——弗里德里克·冯·泽雷(Friederike von Serre),她同舒曼一直保持着亲密的友情直至舒曼晚年。

《阿拉伯风格曲》的手稿如今已经不复存在。除了上述提及的《新婚纪念册》中的第一部分之外,《花之歌》同样也无手稿存世。因而,初版乐谱是本版唯一相关的底本来源。舒曼的私人副本中在音乐文本上并未含有作曲家本人的注释,其版本中错误连篇,有些地方必须加以编辑整理才可辨认。

幽默曲 Op. 20

“Humoreske”(文学上指“幽默小说”)这一术语最初是对一种文学体裁的称谓,该体裁在彼德麦(Biedermeier)时期的流行杂志中尤其受欢迎,尽管它后来并未发展出任何独到之处。在罗伯特·舒曼首次采用该术语进

行音乐创作并继而引领音乐界悠久的“幽默曲”创作传统之前,这一概念已经被人们当作是一种文学比喻而应用到了音乐批评之中。因而,舒曼《新音乐杂志》的编辑同事奥斯瓦尔德·洛伦茨(Oswald Lorenz)曾于1838年12月25日撰写过一篇评论,在文中便运用了这一文学体裁,将克拉拉·维克(Clara Wieck)的《谐谑曲》Op. 10称为是一首“幽默曲”。大约在同一时期,《汉堡新报》(*Hamburger Neue Zeitung*)上的一篇无署名文章报道了舒曼在维也纳的逗留,并称舒曼迄今已出版的钢琴曲均为“优秀的幽默作品”。

舒曼于1838年春开始在莱比锡着手《幽默曲》Op. 20的创作。然而当时他并未决定该作品的曲名。在为克拉拉·维克编撰的《新婚纪念册》中,舒曼记载了一段23小节的柔板草稿,日期标记为“1838年4月”。这一草稿后来成为了《幽默曲》的引子(底本A1,见本书“评注”部分)。1838年9月舒曼旅访维也纳,在那里他重拾自己的柔板草稿,但并未对其做本质上的发展。在一本册子里的一页上,记载有额外的全部14小节(小节1至37),日期标记为“维也纳,1839年2月2日”,题为“一首短回旋曲的前奏”(底本A2),并且题献给钢琴家卡尔·格奥尔格·里克(Karl Georg Lickl)。这份手稿于1839年初开始创作,整部作品之后逐渐成型,而如今这份手稿仅剩零碎片段传世(底本A3),现存为第693至799小节。刻版所用的手稿同样也已遗失,因而我们无法确定舒曼给作品添加曲名的准确时间。或许是上述引用的两篇杂志文章启发他使用这一曲名的。

这部作品于1839年3月完成于维也纳。在3月11日写给克拉拉·维克的信中,舒曼明确地称其为《幽默曲》。此前一天,舒曼刚刚将刻版用的副本交付给维也纳出版商彼得罗·梅凯蒂。6月18日,在舒曼返回莱比锡后,他恳请梅凯蒂以最快速度给自己发来校样。1839年7月13日梅凯蒂依舒曼之愿发去校样,并同样恳请舒曼尽快寄回,以便初版乐谱能够在8月8日准备就绪。初版《幽默曲》的确发行于1839年8月,题献给作曲家-钢琴家尤丽叶·冯·韦伯瑙,原姓:巴罗尼-卡瓦卡布(Julie von Webenau, née Baroni-Cavalcabò),她是莫扎特最小儿子的学生。舒曼最初于1835年在莱比锡与这位年轻女士相识,并且在维也纳逗留期间与其重聚。

作品名所表述的音乐情趣并非意在唤起任何外在的欢乐,而是包含着一种审美观。尤为能够体现这一语境的例子是舒曼对比利时音乐爱好者、业余作曲家西莫南·德·希勒的评论:“法国人不理解‘幽默’一词。可悲的是这个词在德国人思想精神之中最深层的两种特质与概念在法语中没有正确而合适的词汇与之对应,一个是‘惬意(醉心)’,另一个是‘幽默’——后者是‘惬意’和‘滑稽’的巧妙结合。这反映了两个民族的基本特征。你知道我们国家伟大的作家让·保尔(Jean Paul)吗?我从他那里学到的对位法知识甚至

要多于我从自己音乐教师那里所学到的。”舒曼对“幽默”如此简明的解释暗示着他曾阅读过让·保尔的《美学导论》(*Vorschule der Ästhetik*, 1804),而浪漫主义幽默正是该著作的一个核心主题。与今天的用法相对照,让·保尔使用“惬意”这一术语来表达情感上一种极致的深度和一种能够被人们感知的高度敏感性,它如同地震仪一般可以捕捉到人们生活中所有细微的迹象。相应的,“滑稽”则是一种犀利敏锐的思维能力,它可以以一种意外而微妙的方式将涉猎广泛的各种对立之物结合在一起。这种思想所产生的结果使得一种新式的审美视角脱颖而出。舒曼用优西比乌斯与弗洛雷斯坦的结合以及双重性格来比喻幽默家们所具备的两方面特点:敏感而情感丰富的优西比乌斯代表着舒曼的情感深度(感性层面),机敏、批判甚至有时进行犀利讽刺的弗洛雷斯坦则代表着舒曼双重性格中机智的一面(智慧层面)。

在创作《幽默曲》之前,舒曼曾发表文章参与了关于音乐中喜剧与幽默的激烈讨论(文章题名“论《塞西莉亚》^①第60期中C.斯坦^②的‘音乐中的喜剧’一文”,发表于舒曼主编的《新音乐杂志》,1834年4月10日,第一卷之三,第10及其之后页)。1839年8月7日舒曼在写给恩斯特·阿道夫·贝克尔的信中称《幽默曲》是他迄今为止所创作过的作品

中“非但不欢乐,并且或许是最为忧郁的一部了”。他的这一种说法并不令人感到惊奇。在1839年3月11日写给克拉拉·维克的信中,舒曼这样讲述自己在创作这首作品时的心理状态:“整整一星期我都坐在钢琴前,作曲、写作、放声大笑和失声痛哭全部一同袭来。你可以发觉,即将制版印刷的大幽默曲Op.20完好地展现了我的这种状态。你瞧如今我的事情进展得多么快啊。构思,写作,付印。”

对这部大型作品963小节形式结构的解读,存在着截然相反的说法[关于该作品在形式上的其他问题、浪漫主义概念下对“幽默”的诠释及其《幽默曲》在音乐语义中的概念转变方式,参见伯恩哈德·R.阿佩尔(Bernhard R.Appel)所著“从特定音乐形式视角出发审视19世纪上半叶音乐中的幽默元素——以罗伯特·舒曼钢琴作品《幽默曲》Op.20为例”,博士论文,萨尔布吕肯,1981,第294及其之后页]^③。很多不同的诠释都在尝试解读蕴藏在作品中模糊的概念。每当有人试图以规范的学术理论对其结构进行描述时,总会让人找不到思路。

长久以来,由于这部作品的复杂性及其需要高度的诠释能力来进行演奏,使很多钢琴家都对它望而却步。即便是克拉拉·舒曼也极少在公开场合演奏《幽默曲》,或许她是质疑这部作品对公众的号召力。在

① 19世纪时期杂志,原文名*Der Cäcilie*。详见 Enrique Alberto Arias, *Comedy in music: a historical bibliographical resource guide*, Greenwood Publishing Group, 2001。——译者注

② 全名为古斯塔夫·凯福尔斯坦(Gustav Keferstein),出处同上。——译者注

③ 文章原名: *Rober Schumanns Humoreske für Klavier op. 20. Zum musikalischen Humor in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Formproblems*, Diss. Saarbrücken, 1981, pp.294ff.

埃及举办于 1894 年 5 月的一场私人音乐会时,她对孙子费迪南德·舒曼(Ferdinand Schumann)解释道:“说到‘幽默’,人们需要构想出忧伤、夸张而又梦幻的意象。那一段 d 小调的卡农(第 358 及其之后小节)便极具幽默感。”在当代,我们常将音乐性的幽默视为舒曼音乐作品的固有本质,而 Op. 20 则占据着至关重要的位置,它是对舒曼早期全部钢琴作品在创作和审美上的一个总结。

应当如何对书写在独立一行乐谱(第 251 至 274 小节)上的“内心之声”(inner Stimme)这一注释进行解读,舒曼本人并未提供任何信息。在一封写于 1883 年 5 月 14 日的未出版的信件中,克拉拉向格奥尔格·亨舍尔(Georg Henschel)解释称,她感到“内心之声”意在“为钢琴家在右手演奏的旋律部分提供一种支持,即应以并能使听众感受旋律的方式演奏。然而,“‘内心之声’是不应被弹奏出来的。我相信,作曲家希望听众对这段旋律有若隐若现之感,它既不该完全被埋没,也不该被生硬地加重强调。但是,我的丈夫有可能在这里仅仅是提示演奏者应该关注内心听觉或建议他们将旋律哼唱出来,如同在演奏时内心充满音乐一样。”此外,“内心之声”并非仅仅隐藏于对上方乐谱交错的切分节奏进行“不严格的高八度”演奏,还隐藏于对下方乐谱中声部进行的“不严格的同度”演奏。在第 447 至 482 小节间,“内心之声”的和声进行同样是安静的、具有神秘音响色彩的和弦系列形态重现。它的旋律线使人回想起克拉拉·维克的《浪漫曲》Op. 11 No. 2[由汉斯-乔基姆·科勒(Hans-Joachim

Köhler)指出,见莱比锡的 Peters 出版公司于 1981 年出版的《幽默曲》],并且时不时还会出现在克拉拉和罗伯特·舒曼所编撰的大量音乐作品中。这点可以从一封日期为“1839 年 7 月 12 日”由舒曼写给克拉拉·维克的信件中得到确认:“棒极了——你何时创作了这首 g 小调的作品(Op. 11 No. 2)? 三月时我曾有过与你极为相似的想法,你将会在《幽默曲》中听到。我们如此默契真是不可思议。”

这段文字的大部分来自我的朋友伯恩哈德·R. 阿佩尔的著述,上述提及的他针对舒曼《幽默曲》Op. 20 所撰写的博士论文是本作品研究的一座里程碑。

新事曲 Op. 21

《新事曲》一名很可能意指短篇小说故事。如同其他标题一样,舒曼是首位用此名称来命名音乐作品的作曲家,之后其他作曲家纷纷效仿。这一曲名最早见于舒曼日记中关于私人作品的注释之中,最早出现的时间为 1838 年 1 月 20 日:“开始着手创作《新事曲》,直到周三”。2 月 6 日,他在一封写给克拉拉·维克的信中探讨了这首新作:“在过去的三个星期里,我又一次为你创作了数量惊人的作品——恶作剧、艾格蒙特的故事、有父亲们在场的家庭场景、一场婚礼。简言之,都是一些使人着迷的事情。”换句话说,整部套曲从一开始就被人们假定为在叙述事情,或是在叙述“小故事”(Novelle)。然而这也是文学意蕴在舒曼早期钢琴作品中扮演着重要角色的另一例证。在同一封信中,舒曼暗示了作品标题

与英国女高音歌唱家克拉拉·诺韦洛(Clara Novello)名字之间的相似之处。诺韦洛曾于 1837 至 1838 年冬季访问莱比锡。他在信中补充说自己“之所以称整部作品为《新事曲》,是因为你的名字是克拉拉,而用‘维克’来命名作品则听起来不够顺耳。”这段文字使人们猜测正是诺韦洛的名字最初使得舒曼造出了“新事曲”这一曲名。然而更有可能的是,这一双关语是舒曼后来在回顾“小故事”一词与“诺韦洛”这一名字之间的相似性时才意识到的。

《新事曲》的文学性根源在这部作品的两首曲目最初命名为“第二首”和“第三首”时同样明显。在“第二首”的一份早期副本中,两个部分原先所加标题分别为“撒拉逊人”和“朱莱卡”。而在“第三首”间奏曲的一份副本中,乐谱之前列出了莎士比亚《麦克白》(Macbeth)的开篇语。舒曼后来这样解释道:“作曲家并非希望将乐曲视为附加题词的背景,恰恰相反,作曲家直至后来才发觉这些文字描述接近自己音乐作品所要表达的意思。”然而,在舒曼晚期创作中,他的钢琴音乐刻意远离他早期钢琴作品中的大部分文学意蕴,其原因或许并非出于他内心的创作理念,而是唯恐自己的作品被误解为是标题音乐。

根据舒曼日记的记述,他于 1 月初至 4 月中旬按照颇为规范的顺序完成了《新事曲》中八首曲目的创作,其中仅第五首及第八首是最后创作的。4 月 22 日,舒曼将“第二首”的副本寄给了弗朗茨·李斯特(Franz Liszt),8 月 14 日他最终在日记中写道,他已经“将整套《新事曲》编订好

了顺序”,8月30日他又将此事记述了一遍。在创作《新事曲》的同时,舒曼还忙于完成他的《童年情景》。当他于1838年3月21日将《童年情景》寄给 Breitkopf & Härtel 出版社时,他甚至这样写道:“承蒙您厚爱,我将附于信中的作品《童年情景》(Kinderszenen,原引文如此)委托于您。这些曲目最初准备作为《新事曲》的附加曲目,但我感到它们如能独立成册则更佳。”这两套作品之间如此这般的关联可能会使现今对舒曼颇有研究的人们感到惊奇。除了两套作品间的各种差异之外,我们不可否认它们相似的起源使得作品在优雅和无忧无虑的情绪特点上存在着独特的相似性。在1839年6月30日写给海因里希·赫尔什巴赫(Heinrich Hirschbach)的信中,舒曼称《新事曲》“总体而言带有欢快且漫不经心的意味,仅有几处的音乐情绪十分低落”。另一方面,他在1839年9月5日给自己从前的教师海因里希·多恩(Heinrich Dorn)的信中,声称“一些因克拉拉而起的斗争情绪也包含在作品中,当然您肯定也能听出来她实际上是我的协奏曲、奏鸣曲、《大卫同盟舞曲》(Davidbündlertänze)和《新事曲》唯一的创作源泉”。舒曼于1839年6月30日写给克拉拉的信中记述了同样意思的文字:“昨天我还收到了我的《新事曲》,这套作品如今丰满了,共有四册,我亲爱的克拉拉。我想你一定会在这套作品中找到自己的身影(……)我的新娘,《新事曲》中你无时无刻不在,魅力四射!没错,你想想看!我坚信:只有亲眼凝望过你双眸的人,只有亲手抚摸过你双唇的人才能创作出《新事曲》这

样的作品。简而言之,或许人们可以创作出更为优秀的作品,但是绝不可能创作出相似的作品。”无论情况如何,我们至少可以从这八首作品中找到一处舒曼对克拉拉的记忆,第198小节处注释有“来自远方的声音”,由此开始的旋律选自克拉拉的《夜曲》Op.6 No.2。

上述提及的《新事曲》第三首中间奏曲的印刷本于1838年5月22日作为《音乐集:昔日及新近作品》(*Sammlung von Musik – Stücken alter und neuer Zeit*)的第二卷之第六首出版,该作品集是《新音乐杂志》的增补本。简言之,舒曼在8月才为《新事曲》第三首完成了最后一笔,而这一间奏曲的印刷版在整整三个月前便已出版了。即便如此,在间奏曲印刷版的首页上,舒曼加注了一段文字说明该间奏曲“选自不久将由 Breitkopf & Härtel 出版的《新事曲》”,这表明当时出版商已经同意将该作品编入其出版目录之中。除此之外,我们无法进一步确定舒曼何时将全部八首《新事曲》的刻版者副本交付 Breitkopf & Härtel 出版社。根据刻版者副本中的标题所示,这套作品起初题献给肖邦,原作品号标注为 Op.16。1838年12月19日,舒曼告知出版商,希望将“三册(原引文如此)的《新事曲》题献给阿道夫·亨泽尔特,并且作品号应为 Op.19。在一封日期为1839年3月21日的信中,舒曼再次变更了作品号,还写道:“因为与此同时,这里(维也纳)的梅凯蒂先生已经出版了一些作品。”

八首曲目原先并未排序,并且刻版者副本中曲目顺序也几经调整。最初,这些曲目出现的顺序依次为

五、六、七、三、二、一、四,第八首原是插在第六首之后。在紧临出版前夕的校样审读过程中,这些作品最终被划分为四册,每一册仅有两首曲目。仅从这一点来看便足以证明,这些作品并非依照严格的套曲形式来规划。结果是,直到现在,《新事曲》中的许多曲目都经常在音乐会上独立演奏。对于这套作品,舒曼自己记录下来的想法多少有些自相矛盾。一方面,他在1839年4月3日写给自己在维也纳的故交约瑟夫·菲施霍夫的信中,将《新事曲》称为“篇幅颇长且相互联系的冒险故事”,在上述多次提及的写给赫尔什巴赫的信中,他亦称这些曲目“紧密相关”。另一方面,他向弗朗茨·李斯特转寄了一份《新事曲》第二首的单独副本,并鼓励克拉拉·维克将此曲从庞大的整套作品中抽出来在公开场合演奏,并称她“一定能够通过此曲赢得最强烈的反响,该曲拥有独立的开篇与结尾,能够被听众所理解和引起共鸣,而且它的三声中部的曲调非常优美”。与之相反,他对克拉拉明确表示希望单独演奏的第六首却做出了不同的看法:“只有在整套作品中这首曲目才有效果,那首E大调的曲目(第七首)进行得太快了。”即便如此,在第七首的问题上舒曼也打算妥协:“就算做个实验吧,我恳请你来演奏这首E大调,紧随其后再演奏那首D大调(第二首),让我们来看看哪首赢得的反响更为强烈。”

G 小调钢琴奏鸣曲 Op.22

据《G 小调钢琴奏鸣曲》的作品号来看,这是舒曼所创作的最后一部该体裁的作品。然而,它实际上几

乎与作品 Op. 11 创作时期相同,并早于作品 Op. 14。这首曲目的作品号之所以编排靠后,是由于其出版时间较晚,而迟迟不出版的原因则同该作品复杂的起源紧密相关。这部作品从一开始便未能连贯地进行创作,相反,人们常常认为作品的各个乐章彼此间或多或少表现出独立性,且认为各乐章分别创作于不同的时期。

作品第二乐章是一首歌曲的钢琴改编曲,直至舒曼离世后才出版,曲名为《在秋季》(Im Herbste, 舒曼作品表, Anh. M2 No. 8)。这部改编作品创作于 1830 年 6 月。舒曼还采用了歌曲《在安娜旁》(An Anna, Anh. M2, No. 7)进行钢琴曲的创作,很可能创作时期与前者相同。之后他将这段乐曲作为《升 F 小调奏鸣曲》Op. 11 的慢板乐章进行了出版。实际上舒曼很可能在同一时期创作了这两首钢琴改编曲,但最初他丝毫没有打算以后将它们用作奏鸣曲的慢板乐章。这些作品的创作意图至今不为人知。能够确定歌曲《在秋季》改编于 1830 年 6 月的唯一证据呈现在《G 小调奏鸣曲》亲笔手稿 A2 的结尾处(见评注)。

据此资料显示,在作品 Op. 22 中仅有第一乐章与谐谑曲乐章创作于同一时期,即 1833 年 6 月,并且舒曼直至 1835 年 10 月才开始着手最后一个乐章的创作。此乐章单独的手稿上标注有“完成于 1835 年 10 月 27 日”。这是一份创作手稿,其中包含大量的修改。此外,该手稿中还不时出现插入乐谱的注释,所插入的乐谱中一定包含各部分的新创作版本,但遗憾的是并未留存于世。舒曼在完成最后一

个乐章的创作后,应当是立刻着手其他乐章的修改,这导致了大量的变更和修改,特别是在第一乐章之中。

1836 年圣诞节时,舒曼向亨丽埃特·福格特提供了一份手稿,后来舒曼将此作品题献给她。然而,在 1837 年 1 月初,舒曼要求福格特返还手稿,因为他认为此奏鸣曲“应当更加动人”。的确,在后续的几周中,舒曼开始非常勤奋地重新修改这部作品,并在自己 3 月份的日记中写道:“整理好《G 小调奏鸣曲》,为无法完成的结尾空出最后两页乐谱。”正如琳达·科雷尔·勒斯纳(Linda Correll Roesner)在其“舒曼对《G 小调钢琴奏鸣曲》Op. 22 第一乐章的修改”中解释的那样,“最后两页乐谱”最有可能是指第一乐章的结尾。舒曼对它的创作煞费苦心,并且将其从底本 A2 中删去——而并非像第四乐章结尾那样不曾进行过任何修改。我们能够从手稿中辨识出五个不同的修改版本,其中较早的版本可能与后来出版的版本最为接近。

1838 年 2 月 4 日,舒曼向莱比锡的 Breitkopf & Härtel 出版社提供了一份完成于 1837 年的奏鸣曲手稿。他写道:“我以极大的热忱忙于几部新作品的创作及部分作品的抄谱工作:第二钢琴奏鸣曲、钢琴幻想曲(Op. 17)、钢琴新事曲(……)它们是我计划在未来两年中出版的全部作品。如果您愿意的话,我希望能够留在您身边,在您身边任何问题都能轻易解决。而身为一位艺术家的我对于给您带来的如此小的麻烦则无能为力,只有对您保持高度的尊敬。”显然,出版商与舒曼之间很快达成了一致,因为布赖特科普夫

(Breitkopf)于 2 月 18 日便收到了一份刻版者的副本。

之后的印刷过程却被中止,其原因很可能是克拉拉·维克的一封信。很显然舒曼曾将布赖特科普夫与自己之间的协议一事告知于克拉拉,而她则于 1838 年 3 月 3 日从维也纳回信称:“我以无尽的欢乐期待着第二首奏鸣曲,它使我回想起许多幸福的时刻,但也让我记忆起痛苦的瞬间。我如同爱恋你一样喜爱着这部作品,你的所有特质都如此鲜明地展现在这部作品之中。此外,这部作品并未过分的晦涩难懂。但有一点:你真的确定让最后一个乐章保持这样吗?你为何不稍加改动以使其简单一些,因为它的难度的确有些过大了。我能够理解它,如果需要,我也可以演奏,但是你作品的最终对象——人群、公众、甚至是那些内行们——他们却并不理解。我希望你不要因此产生反感,因为你为我创作了这部作品,而你作为我的丈夫,我应当告诉你我的感受。”舒曼并未由于克拉拉的评论而反对她,相反,他听从了她的建议并于 3 月 17/18 日给她回信道:“对于奏鸣曲终乐章的问题你说得太对了。我对它非常不满意(除了各种各样热烈的瞬间之外),以至于我彻底将它删掉了。”

后来,舒曼生活中所发生的诸多事情阻碍了他在当时为此作品创作一个新的终乐章。直至 1838 年末他前往维也纳作了为期一个月的逗留,他才找寻到继续进行创作的时间和宁静。12 月 29 日,他写信告诉克拉拉:“我将很快把《G 小调奏鸣曲》交付印刷,我已完成了终乐章的创作。它非常简单,但却与第一乐章的内在

情绪完美契合。我还保留了最初(于1833年)创作的第一乐章,它虽不同于如今你所知的版本,但你一定会喜欢。”在维也纳逗留期间,舒曼不仅创作了一个新的终乐章,还创作了一个崭新的第一乐章,在该乐章中他删去了过去几年中所做的大部分变更。在维也纳时,舒曼必定还调整了第二乐章,因为第二乐章所使用的稿纸上印有维也纳出版商安东·迪亚贝利(Anton Diabelli)的印纹。舒曼实际上创作了一份崭新的手稿,之后他将刻版者副本交付出版社用于印制。奇怪的是,这份副本后来散落成了几个部分。其中第一乐章与第四乐章成为了私人藏品,并且很遗憾我们无法获得。我们能够获得的只有第二乐章。第三乐章则下落不明。

舒曼可能是在1838年与1839年之交将新的刻版者副本交付于Breitkopf & Härtel公司的,因为我们可以从他《书信集》1839年1月7日条目中看到这样一句话:“为了加快我的作品的印制,我应当尽快给予回复。”此处的“作品”很可能包含了奏鸣曲Op.22。8月29日询问是否“有可能在9月13日(克拉拉的生日)前成功出版我的奏鸣曲”,因为克拉拉“对这首奏鸣曲情有独钟”。这部作品最终在9月出版,对作品所题献的亨丽埃特·福格特来说十分及时,因为她在1839年10月15日与世长辞了。

很显然,初版乐谱仅包含舒曼在维也纳创作的终乐章。直到很多年以后,即1866年,约翰内斯·勃拉姆斯(Johannes Brahms)才通过温特图尔(Winterthur)的里特-比德尔曼(Rieter-Biedermann)出版了舒曼

最初创作的终乐章。尽管如此,勃拉姆斯所拥有的手稿仅仅呈现了还处于构思阶段的原始终乐章。1866年1月12日勃拉姆斯在给里特-比德尔曼的信中说道:“很遗憾,更好的手稿在巴登(Baden,当时克拉拉·舒曼的居住地)。”勃拉姆斯称自己近期将会前去,届时“将可以使用那份迟来的手稿”。然而这一切并未发生。他使用了一份包含旧版本的手稿对作品进行了编辑——或许人们会认为,他并不愿意这样做。真正的终乐章是由G. Henle Verlag出版社于1981年出版的,它是本版本的前身。尽管舒曼曾经将此乐章摒弃,但是这一极具音乐性且钢琴演奏技巧复杂的乐章作为原作构思的一个组成部分,当然值得我们关注,因而我们将这一乐章纳入了现在的版本中。

与其他另两首奏鸣曲——Op. 11、Op. 14,以及《幻想曲》Op.17不同,克拉拉很早便将《G小调钢琴奏鸣曲》收入到自己的演奏曲目当中。她于1840年2月1日在柏林的一场晚会上面对大批听众首演了该作品。这部作品除了在创作上经历了很长的时间之外,实际上可以堪称舒曼各类奏鸣曲中“最为经典”的一部。它不仅如克拉拉在上文所述的那样“如此鲜明”地展现了作曲家的所有特质,作品本身还在形式和内容上清晰地流露着古典音乐气息。

夜曲 Op.23

与《幽默曲》Op.20和《新事曲》Op. 21相同,《夜曲》Op. 23也反映出舒曼的文学修养。“夜曲”一词最初是指具有强烈明暗对比的绘画作品——

在卡拉瓦乔(Caravaggio)和伦勃朗(Rembrandt)的创作传统中突出体现画家在作品的局部使用了明亮的光效,而其余部分则布满了深夜般的幽暗。E.T.A. 霍夫曼(E.T.A. Hoffmann)在其出版于1816至1817年的《夜曲》中[以及特别是在其单行本故事《睡魔》(*Der Sandmann*)、《古堡恩仇》(*Das Majorat*)和《冷酷的心》(*Das steinerne Herz*)],将这一创作技巧从绘画领域转移到了文学范畴。他通过恐怖而神秘的事件来展示人性的阴暗面,与之相对的则是欢乐且具有讽刺性的故事场景。因而,我们或许可以推测舒曼在为自己的作品寻找标题时,必然深谙“夜曲”这一术语,特别是这也并非是他首次以这种方式从霍夫曼那里借用了素材(见《克莱斯勒偶记》及各种各样的《幻想曲》)。

舒曼原本构思将该作品命名为“尸体幻想曲”(Leichenphantasie),而这一标题在某种程度上直至今天还“困扰”着这部作品。但此标题的由来要归因于一种极为特别的氛围。当舒曼在1839年春创作这一作品时,这种氛围始终占据着他的内心。在维也纳屡屡受挫后,舒曼的情绪低迷消沉,1839年3月底,他又得知自己的兄长爱德华在茨维考已奄奄一息。他在3月31日的日记中写道:“从星期一(3月25日)开始创作一部‘尸体幻想曲’,多么奇怪的想法。此外,我清晰地意识到爱德华将要离去,他的身体状况正在恶化。”在返回莱比锡的途中,他从布拉格给克拉拉写信道:“我写信告诉你一种预感,它在3月24日至27日我创作新作品期间萦绕心头。我不断到一个地方去,那里一直在发生着一些事情,我仿佛总

是听到有人在那里用沉重的口吻叹息着‘噢，上帝！’。在创作期间，我不断地遇到葬礼、棺材、不幸和绝望的人们。而当我完成创作并花费大量时间去为其寻找一个标题之时，我总是想到‘尸体幻想曲’这个名字。这不奇怪吧？在创作期间，我常常深深动情，泪水夺眶而出，尽管我并不知道这是为什么，并且也毫无缘由。之后特蕾泽(Therese)^①的信(其中告知了舒曼兄长的死讯)到了，至此一切都明了地呈现在我面前。”在同一封信中，他还告诉克拉拉他打算让维也纳出版商梅凯蒂出版该作品，但他希望称这些作品为“夜曲”而非“尸体幻想曲”。这一更名反映出这样一个问题：假如仅从原名理解作品含义，那么我们对舒曼创造性幻想曲的复杂本质的认识会有很大局限。9个月后，当舒曼最终准备好将这些作品交付出版时，他(于1840年1月17日)写信给克拉拉称，他希望用以下标题来命名这四部作品：1. 送葬的队伍；2. 怪诞的同伴；3. 夜晚的狂欢；4. 回旋独唱曲。这四部作品所勾勒出的广博意义远远超出了作品原名的表述。在克拉拉的建议下，舒曼在1月21日致信梅凯蒂称“他应当用数字编号来替代每首作品的独立标题”(《舒曼书信集》，条目630)。

事实上，对于舒曼而言，从创作到作品出版如此漫长并不足为奇，但是对于《夜曲》而言，迟迟不得出版却另有缘由。在1839年6月时，舒曼便已询问梅凯蒂“是否能即刻

出版《夜曲》”(《舒曼书信集》，条目564b)。但是在此后一段时期里，他深深陷入了为争取同克拉拉结婚一事的苦战之中，同样也忙于未来的各种计划与安排。10月27日舒曼致信克拉拉称已经“无法继续创作”，而在三天之后的一封信中他又表达了同样的情绪：“所有的事都一同袭来。我已经失去了创作能力。”直至深秋，舒曼才重新开始着眼于自己未出版的作品，因为他——正如他在11月30日给克拉拉写的信中所说——“希望能够让梅凯蒂满意”。奇怪的是，很显然此时《夜曲》的编号以及出版之事仍未得到处理，因为直至12月11日时，他才向友人——后来本作的题献者恩斯特·阿道夫·贝克尔写信道：“近来我对创作颇为用心，我的三套作品已进入收尾阶段，我将其中一部题献于你。你是喜欢三首(原引文如此)‘夜曲’，还是三首‘浪漫曲’，还是喜欢两首短小的‘花之歌’？”假如所谓的“三首夜曲”并非单纯是一个笔误，那么《夜曲》在当时必定仅包含三部作品。而舒曼后来将所谓“两首花之歌”中的一首归入了《夜曲》，则似乎不太可能。但是，有几首单曲，舒曼的确曾纠结于应当放入《夜曲》《浪漫曲》还是《维也纳狂欢节》里。《夜曲》便是这样，其迹象始于3月：《维也纳狂欢节》中的《间奏曲》曾于1839年12月在《新音乐杂志》的增补本中先行出版，当时该作品被舒曼称为是《夜曲》中的一个“片段”。

在“收尾阶段”之后，克拉拉最先收到了《夜曲》的手稿，但她于1840年1月3日将乐谱寄回给舒曼，并请求舒曼“再次仔细地审阅乐谱”。1月8日舒曼答复克拉拉，称自己已经“暗自窃喜且一丝不苟地审阅完了整篇乐谱(……)”。顺便提及，我对作品中多处地方仍不满意，但我将把它们搁置一段时间”。显然，此处所谓的“一段时间”实际上非常短，因为在1月17日，舒曼便告诉克拉拉自己已经“彻底理顺了整部作品”，三天之后他向出版商发出了刻版者的副本，遗憾的是该稿件已不复存在。4月10日，他从莱比锡将修改过的校样回寄给维也纳出版商，并于6月收到了初版的印刷乐谱。6月28日他将其中一份乐谱寄给恩斯特·阿道夫·贝克尔并写信道：“信中所附为《夜曲》，或许它能够常常让你快乐地想起我。其中第一首与最后一首或许会让你最为喜爱。”舒曼的“让你快乐地想起”这一措辞再次明确反映了他不希望人们将此作理解为一套阴郁的作品。同样，克拉拉经常将这些作品列入到自己的演奏曲目之中。这也可以印证克拉拉对这些曲目具有同样的感觉，并且在1840年2月——甚至是在本作品出版之前，克拉拉便汉堡的一场私人音乐会上演奏了这些作品。

*

关于底本及其解读的信息，请参见评注部分。

^① 特蕾泽：舒曼之兄爱德华的妻子。——译者注

编者和出版社对支持本书编撰而慷慨提供相关版本资料的所有图书馆,一并表示感谢。

恩斯特·赫特利希

2009 年秋于柏林

Preface

With this six-volume set we present all of Robert Schumann's (1810–56) works for solo piano, in the first critical edition since Clara Schumann's complete edition of 1879–93. The works – 38 in total – appear in ascending opus number order (with two works without opus number placed at the end of volume VI). Although such a sequence does not follow a strict chronological order, and breaks up genres and groups of works that belong together, our arrangement at least allows the pieces to be located quickly.

The present volume – no. IV – contains opus nos. 17–23. These were composed between the beginning of 1838 and March 1839, except for the g-minor

Piano Sonata, op. 22, which falls outside this time frame. It was composed earlier, in 1833–35, practically contemporaneously with the Sonata in f# minor op. 11, but was then revised again in the winter of 1836–37, and finally received a new finale at the end of 1838. The seven works were printed between May 1838 and June 1840.

Fantasie op. 17

Schumann's great *Fantasie* in C major op. 17 was initiated by a "call to Beethoven's admirers", published by the "Bonner Verein für Beethovens Monument" (Bonn Society for Beethoven's Monument) on 17 December 1835, Beethoven's 65th birthday. It appeared in numerous German newspapers and also, on 8 April 1836, in the periodical *NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR MUSIK*, which Schumann himself still edited at the time. Schumann added to it a four-part, not uncritical text signed Florestan, Jonathan, Eusebius and Raro, and later included it in his *Gesammelte Schriften*. Schumann had in mind to donate the proceeds of a new composition to the Bonn Beethoven monument, and he noted down the idea in his diary on 9 September 1836: "Idea for Beethoven." The *Sonata for Beethoven* – the original title of the *Fantasie* op. 17 – was then "finished at beginning of December except for a few minor details" (entry in his diary at the end of December 1836). On 19 December he wrote to the publisher Friedrich Kistner in Leipzig: "Florestan and Eusebius would very much like to do something for Beethoven's monument and to this end have written something which goes by the following title: *Ruinen, Trophaeen, Palmen*. Grand Sonata for Pianoforte. For Beethoven's Monument. In the event that you should wish to take the work under your protection, I would ask you to let the Bonn Committee have one hundred complimentary copies, which the committee would soon dispose of. The proceeds from these (around 80 thaler) would be for the monument." It is therefore highly relevant that, at the close of the first movement (M. 295 ff.), there is a reference to the well-known passage in the

last of Beethoven's songs in his cycle *An die ferne Geliebte* "Nimm sie hin denn, diese Lieder." It seems, though, that the idea of a *Sonate für Beethoven* faded further and further into the background as time went by, and was probably eclipsed by other aspects even while the piece was being written. It is no accident that the end of the last movement, which was originally supposed to take up once again the Beethoven citation from the end of the first part, is deleted in the engraver's copy. Instead, other agendas came to the fore. On 18 March 1838 Schumann wrote to Clara in reference to the *Fantasie*: "The first movement is probably the most passionate [Eva Weissweiler's reading here is 'most artful'] I have ever written – a deep lamentation for you – the others are weaker, but they don't exactly need to hang their heads in shame." In the same letter Schumann said that he had "drafted" the *Fantasie* "in detail, in June 1836." The conclusion must then be that if his memory did not fail him in this particular instance, he in any case initially wrote the piece without "Beethoven at the back of his mind." When the Bonn monument was finally completed and unveiled in August 1845 as the first Beethoven statue in Germany, Schumann no longer took any notice of it. Nor is the motto placed at the beginning of the first edition of the work in any way connected with the original impulse.

After the collapse of the aforementioned negotiations with Kistner on publishing the work, it was put aside for a while. Several entries in Schumann's diary in the years following make mention of "Fantasies", but it is not clear whether he means the *Fantasiestücke* op. 12 or the three parts of the *Fantasie* op. 17. One may safely assume that the C-major *Fantasie* underwent a number of further revisions during this time. Schumann also changed the headings to the movements in the course of these revisions, and in a letter to Clara on 16 April 1838 he now called them "Ruins, Victory Arch and Constellation." The overall title of the work then became "*Dichtungen*" (Poems).

The title page of the autograph for the 1st movement (no autograph survives for the 2nd and 3rd movements) still contains the old names and the opus number 12. The new titles and the dedication to Franz Liszt already appear in the engraver's copy, a copyist's manuscript that was checked by Schumann; the opus number on its title page was originally *Op. 16* and was then changed by Schumann to *Op. 17*. The individual movement titles were also abandoned at the printing stage, and on 19 December 1838 Schumann finally also had the main title *Dichtungen* replaced by *Fantasie*. On 6 January 1839 Schumann wrote to the publishers: "If it is at all possible, you will very much oblige me by early publication of the *Fantasie* dedicated to Liszt." In February Schumann read the proofs, which he (according to his "Briefbuch") returned "post-haste" on 2 March. The work was finally published in April 1839.

Schumann confessed to the music critic Hermann Hirschbach in a letter dated May 1839 that "Breitkopf and Härtel recently published my *Fantasie* in C major. Have a look at the first movement, which I believed at the time (three years ago) to be my greatest achievement. I now think differently." This critical distance to works written earlier is typical for Schumann and frequently recurs in his letters and diary entries. At all events, the *Fantasie* op. 17 is today indisputably regarded as one of his most important piano works and it captivates the listener time and again with its highly romantic language and yet meticulously devised form.

Arabeske op. 18 and Blumenstück op. 19

In late September 1838 Robert Schumann travelled from Leipzig via Dresden and Prague to Vienna, where he arrived on 3 October. His stay there was not blessed by fate: the negotiations for the publication of his periodical *NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR MUSIK* came to nought, and he was virtually unknown in Vienna as a composer. Nonetheless, Schumann's stay in Vienna witnessed the birth of a good many compositions,

almost all of them for piano. While they may not number among his most significant creations, they have maintained a firm hold in the pianist's repertoire to the present day: the *Arabeske* op. 18, the *Blumenstück* op. 19, the *Humoreske* op. 20, the *Novelletten* op. 21, an unfinished movement for a piano concerto in d minor, and, toward the end of his stay, the *Nachtstücke* op. 23 and *Faschingsschwank aus Wien* op. 26. Also among these works was the bulk of the pieces that he published only later, in the *Bunte Blätter* op. 99 and *Albumblätter* op. 124. "The whole of last week," he wrote to Clara on 26 January 1839, "passed by in composition; and yet, there is no real joy in my thoughts, nor even a beautiful melancholy [...]" Other than that, I've polished off a set of variations on no theme. I want to call the opus *Guirlande*; everything about it intertwines in a special way. I also finished another little piece, a *Rondelett*. Then I will neatly gather together all the many little things I've got at the moment and call them 'Kleine Blumenstücke', just as pictures are called. Do you like the name?" Later Clara herself felt that the piece called "Guirlande" probably referred to the *Arabeske*. However, the formal structure of the two works has led to the supposition that the phrase "variations on no theme" more likely applies to the *Blumenstück*, with the more fitting term for the *Arabeske* being "Rondelett."

Just as Schumann's moods in Vienna vacillated between joyful expectation and despondency, the works he composed there are no less varied in character and expression. The buoyant and affirmative *Humoreske* stands alongside the gloomy *Nachtstücke*, the vibrant *Faschingsschwank* alongside the more docile and lyrical *Arabeske* and *Blumenstück*. Schumann himself, writing on 11 August 1839 to his friend, the pianist Henriette Voigt, confided that "three new compositions have arrived [from Vienna] and are waiting for you, among them a *Humoreske*, to be sure of a more melancholy sort, and a *Blumenstück* and an *Arabeske*, which are of less importance; the titles say all there is to

know, and I am quite blameless that the stems and fronds are so frail and delicate." Four days later he wrote to his longstanding friend Ernst Adolph Becker: "Op. 18 and op. 19 are frail and for the ladies, but op. 20 seems to me more substantial." It is probably not far-fetched to assume that Schumann deliberately tailored these two little pieces to suit the lighter Viennese taste, especially as he himself told the pianist Joseph Fischhof in late 1838 that he wanted to "rise up to become the favourite composer of all the ladies of Vienna." These two opuses are examples of light music in the very best and loftiest sense, masterly in their gracefulness and in their technical command of the delicate piano texture.

A letter of 15 March 1839 from Schumann to his admirer Simonin de Sire informs us that the *Arabeske* was already finished in 1838. All the same, Schumann wrote the place and date of composition as *Wien 1839* on the flyleaf of his personal copy. Assuming that the 'Guirlande' or 'Rondelett' mentioned in his letter of 26 January 1839 to Clara was in fact the *Arabeske*, the piece was at least finished by that date. One month later he sent the manuscript to the Viennese publisher Pietro Mechetti.

The *Blumenstück* op. 19 must also have been composed by the end of 1838. In the *Brautbuch* (bridal book) that Schumann compiled for Clara and that covers the period between July 1837 and October 1839, various pieces of musical notation appear alongside the verbal inscriptions, pressed flowers, and other inserted objects. One of the last is part 1 of *Blumenstück*, in a version dated *Wien. October 1838* that differs markedly from the published text. Exactly when Schumann completed the piece is unknown.

The engraver's copy for the *Arabeske* op. 18, was dispatched to Pietro Mechetti in Vienna on 26 February 1839, and that of the *Humoreske* op. 20, on 10 March. The manuscript of *Blumenstück* op. 19 must have been sent to the publisher sometime between these two dates. Writing from Leipzig on 18 June,

Schumann asked Mechetti to be “quick about the proofs,” and on 13 July he forwarded authorisations of ownership for op. 18 to 20, expecting to receive the first “fair printed copies” by 8 August. In the event, they arrived somewhat earlier than that, for on 5 August Schumann jotted down, as item no. 571e in his list of letters, “Becker Dresden free / with Arabeske, Blumenstück and Humoreske for him, Krägen and the ‘Majorin’.” The “Majorin” was, of course, the major’s wife Friederike von Serre, the dedicatee of op. 18 and 19, who remained a close friend of the composer even in later years.

The autograph manuscript of the *Arabeske* has not survived. Apart from the abovementioned manuscript of Part 1 in the *Brautbuch*, no autograph material for *Blumenstück* survives either. Consequently, the first editions were the only relevant sources for our edition. Schumann’s personal copies contain no authorial annotations in the musical text. The text is rather full of mistakes, occasionally necessitating minor editorial interventions.

Humoreske op. 20

The term “Humoreske” was originally used to designate a literary genre that flourished above all in the popular periodicals of the Biedermeier era, even though it did not develop any idiosyncratic characteristics. Before Robert Schumann became the first to use the term for a musical composition, thus initiating a long tradition of musical “Humoresques,” the concept had found its way into music criticism as a literary metaphor. Thus in a review of 25 December 1838, Oswald Lorenz, Schumann’s editorial colleague at the *NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR MUSIK*, characterised Clara Wieck’s Scherzo op. 10 as a humoresque, with reference to the literary genre. Around the same time, an anonymous article in the *HAMBURGER NEUE ZEITUNG* reported on Schumann’s stay in Vienna, and commended the piano pieces he had published thus far as “brilliant musical humoresques.”

Schumann began working on his *Humoreske* op. 20 in Leipzig in spring

1838. He had not yet settled on the title of the work, however. In the *Brautbuch* he compiled for Clara Wieck, he inscribed a 23-measure sketch of an Adagio dated *April 1838*; this later became the introduction to the *Humoreske* (source A1, see the *Comments* at the end of the present edition). In September 1838 Schumann travelled to Vienna, where he took up the Adagio sketch again, but did not substantially develop it. There are 14 additional measures (M. 1–37) in an album leaf dated *Wien. 2^{ten} / 2 39*, which is identified as a *Vorspiel zu einem Rondolett* (source A2) and is dedicated to the pianist Karl Georg Likl. The working manuscript, begun in early 1839 and in which the piece gradually took shape, has come down to us in only fragmentary form (source A3); all that survives are measures 693–799. The manuscript used for the engraving is also lost, so that we cannot determine with certainty exactly when Schumann laid down the work’s title. Perhaps the two magazine articles quoted above had inspired him to choose this title.

The work was completed in Vienna in March 1839, and explicitly designated as *Humoreske* in a letter of 11 March to Clara Wieck. Schumann had handed over the engraver’s copy to the publisher Pietro Mechetti in Vienna the previous day. On 18 June, having since returned to Leipzig, he asked Mechetti to send him the proofs as soon as possible. Mechetti complied with his wish on 3 July 1839 and requested, in his turn, that the proofs be returned quickly so that the first printed copies could be ready by 8 August. The first edition of the *Humoreske* did indeed appear in August 1839, with a dedication to composer-pianist Julie von Webenau, née Baroni-Cavalcabò, a pupil of Mozart’s youngest son. Schumann had first met the young woman in Leipzig in 1835, and reunited with her during his stay in Vienna.

The musical humour suggested by the title is not intended to evoke any outward mirth, but embodies an aesthetic program. Particularly revealing in this context are Schumann’s comments to Belgian music-lover and amateur com-

poser Simonin de Sire: “The French do not understand the word *Humoreske*. It is truly deplorable that no good, suitable words exist in French for the two characteristics and concepts that are most deeply rooted in the German mentality – *das Gemütliche* (*Schwärmerische*) and *Humor* – of which the latter is a felicitous combination of *gemütlich* and *witzig*. This reflects the basic character of the two nations. Do you know Jean Paul, our great writer? I learned more counterpoint from him than from my music teacher.” In this succinct definition of humour, Schumann alludes to his reading of Jean Paul’s *Vorschule der Ästhetik* (1804), in which romantic humour is a central theme. In contrast with present-day usage, Jean Paul uses the term “*das Gemütliche*” to designate a profound depth of emotion and a great sensitivity that is able to perceive – seismographically, as it were – all the phenomena of life. “*Das Witzige*,” in turn, refers to the ability of a sharp-witted mind to combine far-flung opposites in a surprising and subtle manner. The irony that this produces opens up and casts a bright light on new aesthetic perspectives. Schumann allegorises both components of the humourist in the combined, two-sided character of Eusebius and Florestan: the sensitive, effusive Eusebius stands for Schumann’s emotional depth (*Gemüt*), while the astute, critical, and sometimes biting ironic Florestan represents the intellectual side (*Witz*) of Schumann’s dual nature.

Prior to his *Humoreske*, Schumann had joined the heated discussion about comedy and humour in music with his article *Über den Aufsatz: das Komische in der Musik von C. Stein im 60. Hft. Der Cäcilia* (in: *NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR MUSIK*, vol. 1, no. 3, 10 April 1834, pp. 10 f.). It is not surprising that he characterised his *Humoreske* in a letter of 7 August 1839 to Ernst Adolph Becker as “not very merry, and perhaps the most melancholy” of the works he had written to date. In his letter to Clara Wieck dated 11 March 1839, he described as follows the psychological condition he was in while writing the piece: “I have been at the piano all week, com-

posing, writing, laughing and crying all at once. You will find this state of affairs nicely evoked in my opus 20, the big Humoreske, which is about to be engraved. You see how fast things are going with me now. Thought up, written down, off to print.”

There are contradictory interpretations of the formal structure of the very lengthy (963 measures) work (regarding formal problems as well as the interpretation of the Romantic concept of humour and its musical transposition in the *Humoreske*, see Bernhard R. Appel, *Robert Schumann's Humoreske für Klavier op. 20. Zum musikalischen Humor in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Formproblems*, Diss. Saarbrücken, 1981, pp. 294 ff.). The ambiguous concept underlying the composition is reflected in these different attempts to explain it. It eludes the analyst's grasp as soon as one tries to describe it with formal academic categories.

For a long time, pianists almost fearfully avoided the piece on account of its complexity and its great interpretative demands. Even Clara Schumann rarely played the *Humoreske* in public, perhaps doubting its impact on an audience. With reference to a private performance in May 1894, she explained to her grandson Ferdinand Schumann that “with the *Humoreske*, one had to conjure up melancholic, extravagant, fantastic ideas. The canonic passage in d minor [M. 358 ff.] is very humouristic.” In view of the musical humour that contemporaries felt was intrinsic to Schumann, opus 20 occupies a key position that represents the compositional and aesthetic sum of his early piano oeuvre.

Schumann provided no information on how to interpret the *innere Stimme* (inner voice) (M. 251–274) notated on a separate third staff. In an unpublished letter of 14 May 1883, Clara explained to Georg Henschel her feeling that the inner voice was intended to “give the pianist a support to the melody of the right hand. This must be performed in such a way that the listener senses the melody. However, the inner voice is not

to be played. I believe that the composer wanted the melody to be sensed, in a shadowy manner, rather than stressed or brought to the fore. But it is just as likely that my husband here intended only that the player should hear the voice inwardly or hum it, as one often does when one's heart is full while playing.” Moreover, the inner voice is hidden not only as “inexact all'ottava,” in a staggered syncopation in the upper staff, but also as “inexact unison” in the middle part of the lower staff. The harmonic progression of the inner voice also recurs in the static, mysterious-sounding chord sequence at measures 447–482. Its melodic line recalls Clara Wieck's *Romanze* op. 11 no. 2 (something pointed out by Hans-Joachim Köhler in his edition of the *Humoreske* published by Peters, Leipzig, 1981) and thus takes its place among the many compositional entwinements that are discernible, sometimes more, other times less, between Clara's and Robert's works. This is also confirmed by the following passage from Schumann's letter to Clara Wieck dated 12 July 1839: “Wonderful – when did you write the piece in g minor [op. 11 no. 2]? In March I had a very similar idea; you will find it in the *Humoreske*. How remarkable are our sympathies.”

This preface stems in great part from the pen of my friend Bernhard R. Appel, whose above mentioned dissertation on Schumann's *Humoreske* op. 20 is a milestone in the study of this work.

Novelletten op. 21

The title *Novelletten* probably refers to small novellas. As in the case of several other titles, Schumann was the first to use it to describe a piece of music, and it was later adopted by other composers. The title appears from the very outset among the private composition notes in his diary, where its earliest occurrence dates from 20 January 1838: “Worked on the *Novelletten* from then until Wednesday.” On 6 February, he discussed the newly composed pieces in a letter to Clara Wieck: “Then again, I've written such a frightful amount of music

for you over the past three weeks – pranks, Egmontian tales, family scenes with fathers, a wedding, in short, extremely engaging things.” In other words, the entire cycle was predicated from the very beginning on the telling of stories, or “novellas.” This is yet another indication of the large role that literary references played in Schumann's early piano music. In the same letter, Schumann alludes to the similarity between the title and the name of the English soprano Clara Novello, who had made a guest appearance in Leipzig in winter 1837–38, adding that he “called the entire piece *Novelletten* because your name is Clara and *Wiecketten* doesn't sound good enough.” This passage has led to the assumption that it was Novello's name that caused Schumann to coin the term *Novelletten* in the first place. It is more likely, however, that the pun only occurred to him as an afterthought in view of the similarities between the words *Novelle* and Novello.

The literary basis of the *Novelletten* is equally apparent in the titles originally given to numbers 2 and 3. The two sections of piece no. 2 are headed *Sarazene* and *Zuleika* in an early copy, and an advance print of the *Intermezzo* from piece no. 3 is prefixed with the opening lines of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. As Schumann later explained, “it is not the wish of the composer that the music be viewed as a background to the appended motto; on the contrary, it was only later that he discovered these words, which approximate the meaning of his music.” However, in later life, he similarly distanced himself from most of the literary references in his early piano pieces, probably less from inner conviction than from a fear that his works might be misconstrued as program music.

According to notes in his diary, Schumann composed the eight pieces of the *Novelletten* in a fairly regular sequence between early January and mid-April, with nos. 5 and 8 the last to be composed. On 22 April Schumann sent a copy of no. 2 to Franz Liszt, and on 14 August he finally noted in his diary that he had “put the whole of the *Novel-*

letten in order“, noting the same again on 30 August. At the same time as working on the *Novelletten* Schumann was also occupied with his *Kinderszenen*. When he sent the latter to Breitkopf & Härtel on 21 March 1838, he even went so far as to write: “I commend the enclosed *Kinderszenen* [sic] to your benevolence; originally they were meant to form an appendix to the *Novelletten*, but I find it more fitting that they appear in a separate volume.” This association may surprise the present-day Schumann connoisseur, but for all the differences between the two works, there is no denying that their parallel genesis led to a distinct similarity in their graceful and largely untroubled mood. In a letter to Heinrich Hirschbach, dated 30 June 1839, Schumann referred to the *Novelletten* as “on the whole cheerful and perfunctory, apart from a few moments where I get to the bottom of things.” On the other hand, writing to his former teacher Heinrich Dorn on 5 September 1839, he could claim that “something of the struggles that Clara cost me may be heard in my music and will certainly be understood by you as well. She was practically the sole begetter of the concerto, the sonata, the *Davidbündlertänze* and the *Novelletten*.” This accords with the following letter of 30 June 1839 from Schumann to Clara: “Yesterday I also received my *Novelletten*; they have become strong; four books dear little Clara – I think you will certainly see yourself in them [...] My bride, in the *Novelletten* you appear in all possible conditions and situations, and in other irresistible things! Yes, just consider! I declare: *Novelletten* can only be composed by one who has seen such eyes as yours, and has touched such lips as yours. In short, one can probably do something better; but something similar, hardly.” Whatever the case, a reminiscence of Clara is to be found in the eighth piece, where the annotation in measure 198, *Stimme aus der Ferne* (a voice from afar), points out that the melody beginning in that measure has been taken from Clara’s *Notturmo*, op. 6, no. 2.

The above-mentioned advance print of the Intermezzo from *Novellette* no. 3 appeared on 22 May 1838 as item no. 6 in volume 2 of the *Sammlung von Musik=Stücken alter und neuer Zeit*, a supplement to the *NEUE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR MUSIK*. In short, it appeared in print a full three months before Schumann put the finishing touches to the entire opus in August prior to its publication. None the less, the first page contains a remark pointing out that the Intermezzo was “taken from the *Novelletten* soon to be published by Breitkopf & Härtel,” indicating that the publishers had already agreed to include the work in their catalogue at that time. There is no longer any way of knowing exactly when Schumann sent the completed engraver’s copy of all eight *Novelletten* to Breitkopf & Härtel. According to the title of the engraver’s copy, the work was originally to have been dedicated to Chopin, and to carry the opus number 16. On 19 December 1838, Schumann informed the publishers that he wanted to dedicate “the three [sic] fascicles of *Novelletten*” to Adolph Henselt and that their opus number should be 19. Schumann changed the opus number yet again in a letter of 21 March 1839, “as in the meantime several items have been published here [in Vienna] by Herr Mechetti.”

The order of the eight pieces was not established at the outset, and was also altered several times in the engraver’s copy. At first, they appeared in the sequence 5, 6, 7, 3, 2, 1 and 4, with no. 8 originally inserted after no. 6. The final subdivision into four fascicles of two pieces each apparently only occurred during the process of proofreading, just before the work was published. This alone is sufficient to prove that the work was not organised on a strict cyclic plan. As a result, even today many of the *Novelletten* are frequently heard separately in recitals. Schumann’s recorded thoughts on this subject are somewhat contradictory. On the one hand, writing to his Viennese acquaintance Joseph Fischhof on 3 April 1839, he referred to the *Novelletten* as “fairly lengthy inter-related adventure stories,” and the letter

to Hirschbach, mentioned several times above, claims that they are *innig zusammenhängend* (intimately interrelated). On the other hand, he forwarded a separate copy of *Novellette* no. 2 by itself to Franz Liszt and encouraged Clara Wieck to extract this very piece from the larger work and to play it in public, adding that she could be “certain of achieving the greatest effect with it; it has a beginning and an end, evolves well in a way that audiences can follow, and even has a good tune in the Trio.” In contrast, piece no. 6, which Clara evidently also wanted to single out for separate performance, did not meet with the same approval: “It only makes its effect within the full cycle; the one in E major [no. 7] goes by too quickly.” Nevertheless, he was, even in the case of no. 7, prepared to compromise: “As an experiment, let me ask you to play the one in E, say, and to follow it with the one in D [no. 2], and see which one has the greater effect.”

Piano Sonata in g minor op. 22

According to its opus number, the Piano Sonata in g minor op. 22 is the last of Schumann’s pieces in this genre. Actually, however, the work was written nearly contemporaneously with opus 11 and prior to opus 14. The higher opus number of the g-minor Sonata is due to delays with the publication which, in their turn, arose in conjunction with the complicated genesis of the work. The compositional process did not unfold continuously from its inception; on the contrary, the individual movements were conceived more or less independently of one another and at totally different times.

The 2nd movement is a piano arrangement of a song that was not published until after the composer’s death, *Im Herbste* (In the autumn; see *Schumann Werkverzeichnis*, Anh. M2 No. 8). The arrangement was written in June 1830, Schumann also adapted the song *An Anna* (Anh. M2 No. 7) to the piano, probably during this same period; it was then published as the slow movement of the f♯-minor Sonata op. 11. It is possible that Schumann arranged the two

songs for piano practically at the same time, but first of all without any intention to use them later as the slow movement of a sonata. The reason for their composition remains obscure. The only confirmation that the arrangement of *Im Herbste* was written in June 1830 is found at the end of autograph A₂ of the g-minor Sonata (see *Comments*).

According to these indications, only the first movement and the Scherzo of op. 22 were written contemporaneously, in June 1833, and Schumann did not begin working on the final movement until October 1835. The separate autograph of this movement is dated *Schluss am 27sten October 35* (completed on 27 October 35). It is a working manuscript which contains many corrections; moreover, there are occasional references to inserted sheets which must have contained new versions of various sections but which are unfortunately no longer extant. Schumann seems to have begun revising the other sections immediately after he first wrote down the final movement, which resulted in countless changes and emendations, especially in the first movement.

At Christmas 1836, Schumann gave a manuscript of the Sonata to Henriette Voigt, to whom he later dedicated the work. In early January 1837, however, he asked her to return the manuscript, as the Sonata had to “become much more beautiful yet.” Indeed, he returned to work with great diligence on the composition in the following weeks and noted in his diary in March: “Put the Sonata in g minor in order save for the last two pages, which I cannot bring to completion.” As Linda Correll Roesner elucidates in her *Schumann's Revisions in the First Movement of the Piano Sonata in G minor, op. 22*, these “last two pages” most likely refer to the close of the 1st movement, which seems to have caused Schumann considerable difficulties and which – contrary to the completely correction-free close of the 4th movement – is deleted in A₂. Altogether, five different stages of corrections can be discerned in the manuscript, where the earlier versions most closely approximate the one that was later printed.

On 4 February 1838 Schumann offered the Sonata to the Leipzig publisher Breitkopf & Härtel in the version completed in 1837. He wrote: “I am working on and, in part, copying out several new pieces with great industry: 2nd Sonata for piano – Fantasias for piano [op. 17] – Novelletten for piano [...] – the only ones which I plan to have published in the next two years. I would like to stay with you, if you so wish; everything proceeds so easily with you and with such little ado that an artist can do nothing but hold this in high regard.” Publisher and composer apparently came to an agreement very quickly, for Breitkopf received the engraver's copy, on 18 February.

The printing process was then interrupted, possibly as a result of a letter from Clara Wieck. Schumann had apparently told Clara about his agreement with Breitkopf, and she replied from Vienna on 3 March 1838: “I am looking forward to the second sonata with endless joy; it reminds me of many happy hours, but also of painful ones. I love it as I love you, and it expresses your entire being so clearly. Moreover, it is not too incomprehensible. But there is one thing: do you really want to leave the last movement as it was? Why don't you change it a bit and make it simpler, for it is really somewhat too difficult. I understand it and can play it if need be, but the masses, the public, and even the connoisseurs for whom one is ultimately writing – they don't understand it. I hope you don't hold this against me, for – you wrote me that I should tell you what I feel as if you were my husband.” Schumann did not hold Clara's critique against her; on the contrary, he followed up on it and wrote her on 17/18 March: “You are so right about the last movement of the sonata. I am so dissatisfied with it (with the exception of various passionate moments) that I have discarded it completely.”

A number of events then occurred in Schumann's life which prevented him from straight away tackling the composition of a new final movement at that time. It was not until about the end of the year 1838, during his month-long

stay in Vienna, that he found the time and peace to do so. On 29 December he informed Clara: “I am sending the Sonata in g minor off to print shortly; I wrote the last movement here. It is very simple, but corresponds to the inner mood of the first movement very well. I have also left the first movement as I had first written it [in 1833], thus not as you know it now. But you will like it.” During his stay in Vienna, Schumann thus not only composed a new finale, but also made a new version of the 1st movement, in which he cancelled most of the changes he had made in the previous years. He must also have transcribed the 2nd movement anew in Vienna, since it is written on paper bearing the imprint of the Viennese publisher Anton Diabelli. He thus produced an entirely new manuscript, which he then sent to the publisher as the engraver's copy. Curiously, this engraver's copy was later divided up into several parts. The 1st and 4th movements are in a private collection and unfortunately inaccessible. Only copies of the 2nd movement were available. There is no trace of the 3rd movement.

Schumann appears to have dispatched this new engraver's copy to Breitkopf & Härtel probably around the turn of the year 1838/39, for in his correspondence book we read under 7 January 1839: “To speed up the printing of my compositions, a quick reply would be opportune.” He was presumably also including the Sonata op. 22 here. On 29 August Schumann inquired whether “it would be possible to produce a good copy of my sonata by 13 September [Clara Wieck's birthday],” since Clara “has a particular fondness for this sonata.” The print was released in September, just in time for the dedicatee Henriette Voigt to receive a copy, for she passed away on 15 October 1839.

The first edition obviously contained only the closing movement written in Vienna. It was only many years later, in 1866, that Johannes Brahms had the original finale published by Rieter-Biedermann in Winterthur. Nevertheless, the manuscript that Brahms had at his disposal represented only a preliminary